



Surveillance Audit Report

2010-2014 Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard

August 19, 2011

A. Wisconsin DNR County Forest System

FRS #: 1Y943

B. Scope:

No Change Changed

The sustainable forestry activities and land management operations of participating counties within the Wisconsin County Forest System, encompassing approximately 2,193,294 acres of forestland in the following 25 counties: Ashland, Barron, Bayfield, Burnett, Douglas, Eau Claire, Florence, Forest, Iron, Jackson, Juneau, Langlade, Lincoln, Marathon, Marinette, Oconto, Oneida, Polk, Price, Rusk, Sawyer, Taylor, Vilas, Washburn, and Wood. The SFI Certification Number is NSF-SFIS-1Y943.

C. NSF Audit Team:

Lead Auditor: Mike Ferrucci Auditors: JoAnn Hanowski (Brendan Grady SCS Lead)

D. Audit Dates: August 10-12, 2011

E. Reference Documentation:

2010-2014 SFI Standard®

Company SFI Documentation: Rev. Level: Date Revised:

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

- Acceptable with no nonconformances; or
- Acceptable with minor nonconformances to be corrected before the next scheduled audit visit;
- Not acceptable with one or two major nonconformances - corrective action required;
- Several major nonconformances - certification may be canceled without immediate action

G. Changes to Operations or to the SFI Standard:

Are there any significant changes in operations, procedures, specifications, FRS, etc. from the previous visit? Yes No If yes, provide brief description of the changes:

H. Other Issues Reviewed:

- Yes No Public report from previous audit(s) is posted on SFB web site.
- Yes No N.A. SFI and other relevant logos or labels are utilized correctly. If no, document on CAR forms.

Yes **No** The program is a Multi-site Organization:
Multi-Site Organization: A n organization having an identified central function (hereafter referred to as a central office — but not necessarily the headquarters of the organization) at which certain activities are planned, controlled or managed and a network of local offices or branches (sites) at which such activities are fully or partially carried out.

Source: SFI Requirements, Section 9, Appendix: Audits of Multi-Site Organizations

IAF-MD1 or The alternate approach outlined in SFI Requirements, Section 9, Appendix 1 was assessed by NSF’s Lead Auditor during the certification audit.

Yes **No** Concerns/ issues are listed in the checklist (to be reviewed by NSF Forestry Program Manager)

I. Corrective Action Requests:

- 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). The auditor will make arrangements to verify the corrective action has been effectively implemented.

Your Corrective Action Plans should be provided through your NSF On-line Interface. Any questions should be directed to Tyrek A. Morgan 734-827-6869 tmorgan@nsf-isr.org.

At the conclusion of this Surveillance Audit visit, the following CARs remain open:
 MAJOR(S): 0 MINOR(S): 0 Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs) identified: 2

J. Future Audit Schedule:

Follow-up or Surveillance Audits are required by the 2010-2014 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ®. The next Surveillance Audit is scheduled for August 8-10, 2012. The assigned lead auditor will contact you 2-3 months prior to this date to reconfirm and begin preparations. Recertification must be completed before January, 2013.

For multi-site organizations the sampling plan requires audits of the central function and 3 of 25 } sites each year for Surveillance Audits and 4 sites for recertification.

Appendices:

- Appendix I: Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule
- Appendix II: Public Surveillance Audit Report
- Appendix III: Audit Matrix
- Appendix IV: SFI Reporting Form (no changes, not needed)

Appendix I



Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule



July 12, 2011; Revised July 27, 2011; Confirmed August 1, 2011

Jeff Barkley, CountyForest Program Specialist
Bureau of Forest Management
WI Department of Natural Resources
PO Box 7921, Madison, WI53707-7921

Re: Confirmation of SFI and FSC Surveillance Audits, WisconsinCountyForest System

Dear Mr. Barkley:

As previously arranged, we are scheduled to conduct the Surveillance Audit for the Wisconsin County Forest System on August 10- 12 as provided on the attached itinerary.

This is a partial review of your SFI Program to confirm that it continue to be in conformance with the requirements of the SFI 2010-2014 Standard. The focus will be on SFI requirements for a multi-site group as well as on selected forest management requirements within Objectives 2 through 7 and issues relating to science and research (Objective 15), training (Objective 16), Public Land Management Responsibilities (Objective 18), and as well as management review (Objective 20). During the audit I will also review that progress being made in closing your remaining two open Minor Non-conformances.

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

The enclosed tentative schedule (previously agreed to) should be reviewed by all participants. It can be adapted either in advance or on-site to accommodate any special circumstances, particularly the locations of actively harvested sites. If you have any questions regarding this planned audit, please contact either of us.

We have discussed the process for selecting field audit sites. This should be completed by August 1 if possible. I'll continue to work directly with you on this key task.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Michael Ferrucci".

Mike Ferrucci, SFI Program Manager, NSF-ISR
mferrucci@iforest.com Office and Mobile: 203-887-9248

PS: This audit will be observed by 2 auditors from ANAB, our accreditation body. Thank you for making hotel reservations for everyone, including two extra rooms for the ANAB folks in the same places that I will be staying.

WisconsinCountyForest Certification Audit - Hotels

Tuesday - August 9

Conf

Ashland

Americinn

*All reservations under Ken Symes (switch to your own credit card upon registering)

3009 North Lake Shore Dr. East, Ashland, WI. 54806

715-682-9950

JoAnn Hanowski Y6V7MTTBJ

Brendan Grady Y6V7MTTB3

Jim Warren Y6V7MTTBT

Spoooner

Best Western American Heritage

*All reservations are under "County Forest Certification" and Jeff Barkley's credit card

(switch to your own credit card upon registering)

101 W. Maple St.

Spoooner, WI. 54801

715-635-9770

Accreditation

Auditor #1

16502 Registered for Tues-Thurs. nights

Accreditation

Auditor #2

16503 Registered for Tues-Thurs. nights

Mike Ferrucci

16501 Registered for Tues-Thurs. nights

Jeff Barkley

16504 Registered for Tues-Thurs. nights

Ken Symes

16505 Registered for Tues-Thurs. nights

Wednesday - August 10

Spoooner

*All auditors & accompanying staff staying in Spoooner

Best Western American Heritage

*Reservations under "CountyForest Certification"

Mike Ferrucci

See above

Accreditation #1

See above

Accreditation #2

See above

Jeff Barkley

See above

Ken Symes

See above

JoAnn Hanowski

16506 Registered for Weds.-Thurs. nights

Brendan Grady

16507 Registered for Weds.-Thurs. nights

Jim Warren

16508 Registered for Weds. Night only

Thursday - August 11

Spoooner

*All auditors & accompanying staff staying in Spoooner

Best Western American Heritage

Mike Ferrucci

See above

Accreditation #1

See above

Accreditation #2

See above

Jeff Barkley

See above

Ken Symes

See above

JoAnn Hanowski

See above

Brendan Grady

See above

*** This audit will be observed by 2 auditors from ANAB, our accreditation body. Wisconsin DNR has made hotel reservations for two extra rooms as indicated above!**

2011 Wisconsin County Forest Certification Audit Schedule Rev. 7/11/11

WEDNESDAY (August 10)

- (Breakfast Meeting Mike Ferrucci and 2 SFI Oversight auditors 7:15 am, complete by 7:45)
Central Office desk audit and opening meeting, including Multi-site Requirements review
- 8 - 10 AM - Location Spooner DNR Service Center (less than 1/2 mile from the Best Western American Heritage hotel)

Travel time from Spooner to Barron County Forestry office is 42 minutes

Barron County (Auditors: Mike Ferrucci and 2 SFI Oversight auditors)

- **11 AM - Noon** (Barron County Forest office - Barron)
- **Noon to 4:45** (Barron County Forest field audit)
- **4:45** Debrief Meeting
- **5:00** End

Note: Minor changes were suggested to J. Barkley on 7.27.11; these were confirmed on 7.30.11

Iron County (Auditors: JoAnn Hanowski & Brendan Grady)

- 8:30 - 3:00 (Iron county field audit - Meet at Iron County Forestry Dept.- Hurley)
- 3:00 Debrief Meeting
- 3:15 End

THURSDAY (August 11)

Burnett County (Auditors: Mike Ferrucci / SFI Oversight auditor(s)?)

- 8:00 - 9:00 (Burnett County Forestry Dept. - Siren)
- 9:00 - 4:30 (Burnett County Forest field audit)
- 4:30 Debrief Meeting
- 4:45 End

Rusk County (Auditor: JoAnn Hanowski / SFI Oversight auditor(s)?)

- 8:30 -9:30 (Rusk County Forestry Dept. - Ladysmith)
- 9:30 - 4:30 (Rusk County field audit)
- 4:30 Debrief Meeting
- 4:45 End

Sawyer County (Auditor: Brendan Grady)

- 8:00 - 9:00 (Sawyer County Forestry Dept. - Hayward)
- 9:00 - 4:30 (Sawyer County field audit)
- 4:30 Debrief Meeting
- 4:45 End

FRIDAY (August 12)

Washburn County (Auditors: Ferrucci, Hanowski, Grady & 2 SFI Oversight auditors)

- 8:00 - 9:00 (Washburn County Forestry Dept. - Spooner)
- 9:00 - 2:00 (Washburn County field audit)
- Debrief Meeting - 2:00 - 2:15

2011 CFL Audit Closing Meeting - (Agricultural Research Station 1 miles east of Spooner on Hwy. 70.)

- 3:00 - 4:00

Other

Scope:

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

Contact Information:

Jeff Barkley	Cell: 608-264-9217	Jeffrey.Barkley@wisconsin.gov
Ken Symes	Cell: 262 353 2949	Kenneth.Symes@Wisconsin.gov
Mike Ferrucci	Cell: 203-887-9248	mferrucci@iforest.com
JoAnn M. Hanowski	Cell: 802-922-2428	joannhanowski@gmail.com
Brendan Grady		bgrady@scscertified.com

Revised 2011 Counties for audit Approach

Day	County	Mike Ferrucci	JoAnn Hanowski	Brendan Grady
1	Central, Barron	X		
1	Iron		X	X
2	Burnett	X		
2	Rusk		X	
2	Sawyer (FSC focus)			X
3	Washburn	X	X	X

From: JoAnn Hanowski [mailto:joannhanowski@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 10:39 AM

To: pteska@ruskcountywi.us; Michael Ferrucci

Subject: Additional site types for Rusk County

Paul, in addition to the forestry sites that Mike selected, I would like to see sites that fall into "other" category, including:

Recreational sites- ATV trails, ski trails, mtn bike trails

Special sites- heritage protection, wildlife protection, old-growth protection, fisheries protection

It would be best if these sites were located on the way or in between the forestry sites selected.

This would allow us to visit as many sites as possible during the day.

I am looking forward to meeting you and your staff and a visit to Rusk County this week.

JoAnn Hanowski

Mike,

Based on geographical location of the sales I suggest the following order of stops.

#1- Sale # 320 (30th Ave.) Located on the Washburn Co. line in the northeastern portion of the county , this is the furthest from the remaining sales which are clustered in the northwest portion of the county. Easy access off the town rd.

#2 - Sale # 319 (13th St.) Easy drive in access.

#3- Sale # 324 (Tamarack Lk. Access (south unit). Easy drive in or walk-in access.

#4- Sale #330 (Red Head Lk.) Easy walk in or drive in access depending on precipitation received between now and then.

This route would put us a relatively short distance to the remaining sales on the list.

John Cisek, Barron County Forester

Barron County Government Center

330 E. LaSalle Ave.

Barron, WI 54812

715-537-6296

Jeff & Mike,

I have reserved conference room 2151 in the Barron Co. Gov't Center for the Wed. a.m.

meeting. Jeff, I believe you are familiar with its location. (2nd level, S.W corner of the building)

Appendix II



Wisconsin DNR County Forest Program SFI Summary Surveillance Audit Report

The Wisconsin County Forest Program has achieved continuing conformance with and an upgrade to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2010-2014 Edition, according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Process.

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

Wisconsin County Forest Program includes 2.3 million acres of forestland managed by 29 counties in the central and northern portions of Wisconsin. The scope of the SFIS Certification encompasses sustainable forestry activities of participating counties within the Wisconsin County Forest System and land management operations in selected Wisconsin County Forests including 25 counties encompassing 2,193,294 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 15 million board feet and 697,000 cords per year.

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

SFIS Surveillance Audit Process

The audit was performed by NSF-ISR on August 10-12, 2011 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor supported by, and Forest Ecologist and JoAnn Hanowski, Avian Ecologist. FSC Lead Auditor Brendan Grady also supported the team's activities. Audit team members fulfill the qualification criteria for conducting SFIS Certification Audits of "Section 9. SFI 2010-2014 Audit Procedures and Auditor Qualifications and Accreditation" of Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program: Standards, Rules for Label Use, Procedures, and Guidance.

The audit was conducted in conjunction with an FSC audit covering many of the same counties, the same organizational approach, and by the same audit team. The two processes (SFI and FSC) shared audit teams and reviewed much of the same evidence, but each program had a different team leader and audit objectives. This report is intended to describe the SFI portion of the evaluation; information about the FSC annual audit is available from Wisconsin DNR

The objective of the audit was to assess ongoing conformance of the firm's SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2010-2014 Edition. Six counties were reviewed: Barron County, Burnett County, Iron County, Rusk County, Sawyer County, and Washburn County.

Forest practices that were the focus of field inspections included those that have been conducted since January 1, 2009. Selected SFI requirements to promote sustainable forestry practices, to practice sustainable forestry while protecting soil and water resources, and to incorporate continual improvement systems were reexamined during the audit, with a focus on Objectives for land management and Objectives 15, 16, 18, and 20. Multi-site sampling requirements as provided in Section 9 of Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program: Standards, Rules for Label Use, Procedures, and Guidance were also reviewed to ensure conformance.

The requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2010-2014 Edition 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
- Objectives 8 – 13 Procurement Requirements

The review was governed by a detailed audit protocol and plan 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 in advance, and a sample of the available audit evidence was reviewed.

During the audit NSF-ISR reviewed a sample of the written documentation assembled to provide objective evidence of SFIS Conformance. NSF-ISR also selected field sites for inspection based upon the risk of environmental impact, likelihood of occurrence, special features, and other

criteria outlined in the NSF-ISR SFI-SOP. NSF-ISR also selected and interviewed stakeholders such as contract loggers and other interested parties, and interviewed employees within the organization to confirm that the SFI Standard was understood and actively implemented.

The possible findings of the audit included Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, Opportunity for Improvement, and Practices that exceeded the requirements.

Overview of 2011 Audit Findings

Wisconsin County Forest Program's SFI Program was found to be in conformance with the SFIS Standard. There were no non-conformances, and the two Minor Non-conformances from the 2010 Surveillance Audit were resolved as described below.

Closed Minor Non-conformance 2010-01 that related to Performance Measure 2.3 and Indicators 2.3.2, 2.3.4, and 2.3.7 and involved two problematic harvest sites: One site was inspected and pictures from both sites were reviewed. These sites have been remediated to the extent possible. Despite unusually heavy rainfall in the months prior to the audit the 2011 Surveillance Audit Team did not encounter any sites with similar issues or problems.

Closed Transitional Minor Non-conformance SFI-2010-2 which involved managers' knowledge about climate change impacts on the forests they manage: The corrective action plan was fully implemented. Monitoring of information about climate change and impacts is assigned to Wisconsin DNR central office staff. Several documents and emails have been compiled and provided to all of the counties and all of the Liaison Foresters. Foresters and biologists demonstrated strong knowledge of the predicted impacts on climate and one plants and animals.

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

The 2011 OFIs include:

- There is an opportunity to improve the use of the system to document road and trail conditions including planning to address maintenance needs. (SFI Indicator 3.1.1 requires a "Program to implement state or provincial best management practices during all phases of management activities.")
- There is an opportunity to improve the pace at which new information about regeneration is made available to field personnel. (NOTE: The audit team found that the new Oak Regeneration chapter of the Silviculture Manual is not readily available to foresters who should use it.) (SFI Indicator 2.1.3 "Clear criteria to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct understocked areas and achieve acceptable species composition and stocking rates for both planting and natural regeneration..")

Exceptional Practices

Wisconsin County Forest Program was found to exceed the SFI 2010-2014 Standard as follows:

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

(SFI Performance Measure 2.4 “Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.”)

The program significantly exceeds the standard for minimizing clearcut size.

(SFI Indicator 5.2.1 “Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.”)

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

(SFI Performance Measure 5.4 “Program Participants shall support and promote recreational opportunities for the public.”)

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

(SFI Performance Measure 18.1 “Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.”)

The next Surveillance Audit is scheduled for August 8-10, 2012. This will be a recertification audit.

General Description of Evidence of Conformity

NSF's audit team used a variety of evidence to determine conformance. A general description of this evidence is provided below, organized by SFI Objective.

Objective 1. Forest Management Planning - To broaden the implementation of sustainable forestry by ensuring long-term forest productivity and yield based on the use of the best scientific information available.

Summary of Evidence – The forest management plans for Barron, Burnett, Iron, Rusk, Sawyer, and Washburn Counties, supporting documents including WDNR manuals and handbooks, and the county forest inventory reports were the key evidence of conformance.

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

Summary of Evidence – Field observations and associated records were used to confirm practices. There are ongoing programs for reforestation, for protection against insects and diseases and wildfire, and for careful management of activities which could potentially impact soil and long-term productivity.

Objective 3. Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources - To protect water quality in streams, lakes and other water bodies.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations of a range of sites were the key evidence. Auditors visited portions of selected field sites that were closest to water resources.

Objective 4. Conservation of Biological Diversity including Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value To manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape-level measures that promote habitat diversity and the conservation of forest plants and animals, including aquatic species.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations, written plans and policies including the Habitat Conservation Plan for Karner Blue Butterflies, use of college-trained field biologists, availability of specialists, and regular staff involvement in conferences and workshops that cover scientific advances were the evidence used to assess the requirements involved biodiversity conservation.

Objective 5. Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits - To manage the visual impact of forest operations and provide recreational opportunities for the public.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations of completed operations and policies/procedures for visual quality were assessed during the evaluation. Maps of recreation sites as well as field visits, helped confirm a very strong commitment to recreation programs and facilities.

Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites - To manage lands that are ecologically, geologically, or culturally important in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations of completed operations, records of special sites, training records, and written protection plans were all assessed during the evaluation.

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

Summary of Evidence – Field observations of completed operations, contract clauses, inspection reports, and discussions with supervising foresters and with loggers provided the key evidence.

Objectives 8 through 13 are not applicable

Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance -

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

Summary of Evidence – Field reviews of ongoing and completed operations were the most critical evidence. Parts of this requirement were not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.

Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology - To support forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sustainable forest management decisions are based.

Summary of Evidence – Financial records and awareness of predicted climate change impacts were confirmed.

Objective 16. Training and Education -To improve the implementation of sustainable forestry practices through appropriate training and education programs.

Summary of Evidence – Training records of selected personnel, records associated with harvest sites audited, and stakeholder interviews were the key evidence for this objective.

Objective 17. Community Involvement in the Practice of Sustainable Forestry -

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

Summary of Evidence – Most of this Objective was not reviewed during 2011

Objective 18: Public Land Management Responsibilities -

To support and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

Summary of Evidence – Interviews and review of policies were used to confirm the requirements.

Objective 19. Communications and Public Reporting - To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by documenting progress and opportunities for improvement.

Summary of Evidence – Reports filed with SFI Inc. and the SFI website were the key evidence.

Objective 20. Management Review and Continual Improvement - To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry, and to monitor, measure, and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Summary of Evidence – Records of program reviews, agendas and notes from management review meetings, and interviews with personnel from all involved levels in the organization were assessed.

Relevance of Forestry Certification

Third-party certification provides assurance that forests are being managed under the principles of sustainable forestry, which are described in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard as:

1. Sustainable Forestry

To practice sustainable forestry to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by practicing a land stewardship ethic that integrates reforestation and the managing, growing, nurturing and harvesting of trees for useful products and ecosystem services such as the conservation of soil, air and water quality, carbon, biological diversity, wildlife and aquatic habitats, recreation, and aesthetics.

2. Forest Productivity and Health

To provide for regeneration after harvest and maintain the productive capacity of the forest land base, and to protect and maintain long-term forest and soil productivity. In addition, to protect forests from economically or environmentally undesirable levels of wildfire, pests, diseases, invasive exotic plants and animals and other damaging agents and thus maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.

3. Protection of Water Resources

To protect water bodies and riparian zones, and to conform with best management practices to protect water quality.

4. Protection of Biological Diversity

To manage forests in ways that protect and promote biological diversity, including animal and plant species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types.

5. Aesthetics and Recreation

To manage the visual impacts of forest operations, and to provide recreational opportunities for the public.

6. Protection of Special Sites

To manage forests and lands of special significance (ecologically, geologically or culturally important) in a manner that protects their integrity and takes into account their unique qualities.

7. Responsible Fiber Sourcing Practices in North America

To use and promote among other forest landowners sustainable forestry practices that are both scientifically credible and economically, environmentally and socially responsible.

8. Avoidance of Controversial Sources including Illegal Logging in Offshore Fiber Sourcing

To avoid wood fiber from illegally logged forests when procuring fiber outside of North America, and to avoid sourcing fiber from countries without effective social laws.

9. Legal Compliance

To comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws, statutes, and regulations.

10. Research

To support advances in sustainable forest management through forestry research, science and technology.

11. Training and Education

To improve the practice of sustainable forestry through training and education programs.

12. Public Involvement

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry on public lands through community involvement.

13. Transparency

To broaden the understanding of forest certification to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard by documenting certification audits and making the findings publicly available.

14. Continual Improvement

To continually improve the practice of forest management, and to monitor, measure and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Source: Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2010-2014 Edition

For Additional Information Contact:

For More Information Contact:

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

or

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

Appendix III



Audit Matrix

NSF-ISR SFI 2010-2014 MATRIX
Wisconsin DNR County Forestry Program

Findings and Instructions:

C	Conformance
Exr	Exceeds the Requirements
Maj	Major Non-conformance
Min	Minor Non-conformance
OFI	Opportunity for Improvement (can also be in Conformance)
NA	Not Applicable
Likely Gap *	Likely Gap Against 2010-2014 SFIS*
Likely Conf. *	Likely Conformance With 2010-2014 SFIS*
	* formerly used for transition issues; Gap columns retained for use during Baseline Audits.
Auditor	Optional; may be used for audit planning.
10, 11	Date Codes, for example: 11= July 2011; 12=Aug. 2012
Other	Words in <i>italics</i> are defined in the standard.

Objective 1. Forest Management Planning

To broaden the implementation of *sustainable forestry* by ensuring *long-term forest productivity* and yield based on the use of the *best scientific information* available.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1	Program Participants shall ensure that forest management plans include long-term harvest levels that are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth-and-yield models.	MF	11						
Notes	Plans include long term harvest levels, based on area control. These are calculated using data in WISFIRs. Harvest levels have been conservative, slightly below calculated long-term allowable harvest levels. These long-term levels were computed by allocating the “backlog” over a 15-year period; some of the backlog acres are on lowland forest types which are currently not operable except in unusual conditions but are kept in the data in case there is a shift in technology that would change their operability status (or a need to salvage, maybe due to Emerald Ash Borer infestation).								

	2010-2014 Requirement (Performance Measures bold)	Audit or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.1	Forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a long-term resources analysis; b. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; c. a land classification system; d. soils inventory and maps, where available; e. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; f. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system; g. recommended sustainable harvest levels for areas available for harvest; and h. a review of non-timber issues (e.g. recreation, tourism, pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, bioenergy feedstock production, or biological diversity conservation, or to address climate-induced ecosystem change). 	MF	11						

Notes	<p>All 6 county forests selected for review have up-to-date management plans that are based on a common template that includes all of the required components of SFI Indicator 1.1.1. Plans reviewed and their dates are as follows: Barron County 2006-2020 Iron County 2006-2020 Burnett County 2006-2020 Rusk County 2006-2020 Sawyer County 2006-2020 Washburn County 2006-2020</p> <p>Growth projections: silvicultural handbook provides BA growth rates by species or species group. Used to estimate date of next required harvest entry. For example for Red Pine plantations based on stocking immediately post-harvest and estimated growth rates the next harvest might be scheduled in 7 to 10 years. All of the counties use a GIS; support for this GIS is provided by Wisconsin DNR.</p>																																																																
1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan in a manner appropriate to document past and future activities.	MF	11																																																														
Notes	<table border="1" data-bbox="268 651 1281 868"> <thead> <tr> <th>County</th> <th>2010</th> <th>2009</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2006</th> <th>10-Yr.Ave.</th> <th>Long-Term AAC</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Barron County</td> <td>-</td> <td>361</td> <td>222</td> <td>614</td> <td>312</td> <td>378</td> <td>497</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Burnett County</td> <td>2,021</td> <td>2,642</td> <td>4,550</td> <td>2,007</td> <td>1,316</td> <td>2,366</td> <td>2,920</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Iron County</td> <td>4,012</td> <td>3,655</td> <td>3,834</td> <td>3,611</td> <td>2,075</td> <td>2,619</td> <td>5,369</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rusk County</td> <td>2,571</td> <td>2,794</td> <td>2,847</td> <td>2,532</td> <td>3,149</td> <td>3,365</td> <td>3,542</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sawyer County</td> <td>3,265</td> <td>3,554</td> <td>2,699</td> <td>2,733</td> <td>2,076</td> <td>2,830</td> <td>3,581</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Washburn County</td> <td>2,757</td> <td>3557</td> <td>2,766</td> <td>3,423</td> <td>3,022</td> <td>3,067</td> <td>3,615</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Long-term harvest goal takes backlog and apportsions across the 15-year schedule; this is the best way to link to the “Allowable Cut”. The annual goal allows for the adjustment of harvest above or below slightly the long-term harvest goal. Goals are adjusted annually based on updated inventory information, including post-harvest stand adjustments, and also a review of harvest constraints used in scheduling.</p>									County	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	10-Yr.Ave.	Long-Term AAC	Barron County	-	361	222	614	312	378	497	Burnett County	2,021	2,642	4,550	2,007	1,316	2,366	2,920	Iron County	4,012	3,655	3,834	3,611	2,075	2,619	5,369	Rusk County	2,571	2,794	2,847	2,532	3,149	3,365	3,542	Sawyer County	3,265	3,554	2,699	2,733	2,076	2,830	3,581	Washburn County	2,757	3557	2,766	3,423	3,022	3,067	3,615
County	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	10-Yr.Ave.	Long-Term AAC																																																										
Barron County	-	361	222	614	312	378	497																																																										
Burnett County	2,021	2,642	4,550	2,007	1,316	2,366	2,920																																																										
Iron County	4,012	3,655	3,834	3,611	2,075	2,619	5,369																																																										
Rusk County	2,571	2,794	2,847	2,532	3,149	3,365	3,542																																																										
Sawyer County	3,265	3,554	2,699	2,733	2,076	2,830	3,581																																																										
Washburn County	2,757	3557	2,766	3,423	3,022	3,067	3,615																																																										
	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *																																																								
1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth and yield.	MF	11																																																														
Notes	Confirmed a limited portion of the inventory data and its currency by review of several inventory reports generated by the WISFIRs system. Basal area growth rates are used to estimate the number of years it will take to advance treated (thinned or CC) stands to the next treatment target date.																																																																
	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *																																																								

1.1.4	Periodic updates of forest inventory and recalculation of planned harvests to account for changes in growth due to productivity increases or decreases (e.g. improved data, long-term drought, fertilization, climate change, forest land ownership changes, etc.).	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>WISFIRS database, inventory information, was demonstrated to the auditors.</p> <p>Following any major change in inventory WISFIRS planning is to be “run and accepted” at the county level to develop an updated harvest plan. This will occur in the counties affected by the July 2, 2011 windstorm (much pine was blown down) during the partnership meetings to be held in the fall of 2011. This was apparent in the data reports presented on screen at Barron County.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	WISFIRs program is used each year to determine harvest levels (acres) based on the most recent inventory information.								

Objective 2. Forest Productivity.

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1	Program Participants shall promptly reforest after final harvest.								
Notes									

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.1	Designation of all harvest areas for either natural regeneration or by planting.	MF	11						
Notes	2460 Sale Narrative form								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.2	Reforestation, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations or legal requirements, through planting within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.	MF	11						
Notes	Confirmed by field observations.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.3	Clear criteria to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct understocked areas and achieve acceptable species composition and stocking rates for both planting and natural regeneration.	MF	11				11		

<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>There is an opportunity to improve the pace at which new information about regeneration is made available to field personnel.</u></p> <p>Oak chapter in the silviculture handbook has been updated, with significant changes. There have been challenges getting new documents onto the WDNR website in a timely manner, and this document does not appear to have been posted.</p> <p>Special coding is used in WisFIRS for regeneration issues, and list of questionable regeneration sites are annually reviewed to either remove the code (established) or devise a plan to address each situation.</p>								
--------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.4	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species, and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.5	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed by field observations in some sites. One site in Washburn County the forester reported that a considerable amount of the desirable sapling maple trees were damaged during the harvest. This site had large, tall trees and very high stocking which contributed to the challenge of harvesting overstory trees while avoiding damage to smaller trees. Many other sites observed during the audit showed good results in protection of desirable advanced regeneration (pine in red pine thinnings, Jack Pine seedlings in final harvests, for example).								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.6	Planting programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.7	Afforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of the selection and planting of tree species in non-forested landscapes.		NA						

<i>Notes</i>	No afforestation is being conducted.								
--------------	--------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2	Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the environment, including wildlife and aquatic habitats.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Wildlife openings maintained by mowing where possible or by use of Spike when it is difficult to get the mower in. See Indicator 2.2.1 below. Decisions about chemical use are discussed in County Committee meetings.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.1	Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Washburn County: Treat an average of under 100 acres per year (forest is 150,000 acres) The majority of Jack Pine sites have sufficiently sandy sites to allow for mechanical site preparation; only use herbicides for site preparation on the slightly richer sites where Aspen and other hardwoods may be competing but to meet ecological goal of maintaining pine resource need to use chemical treatments. Barron County and Burnett County report no or very little chemical use.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.2	Use of least-toxic and narrowest-spectrum pesticides necessary to achieve management objectives.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Roundup and Garlon are primarily used for site preparation for Jack Pine, the largest chemical use. Spike is used for maintaining some of the less accessible wildlife openings.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.3	Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with label requirements.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.4	Use of integrated pest management where feasible.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state- or provincial-trained or certified applicators.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.6	Use of management practices appropriate to the situation, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. notification of adjoining landowners or nearby residents concerning applications and chemicals used; b. appropriate multilingual signs or oral warnings; c. control of public road access during and immediately after applications; d. designation of streamside and other needed buffer strips; e. use of positive shutoff and minimal-drift spray valves; f. aerial application of forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones to minimize drift; g. monitoring of water quality or safeguards to ensure proper equipment use and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies; h. appropriate storage of chemicals; i. filing of required state or provincial reports; and/or j. use of methods to ensure protection of threatened and endangered species. 	MF	11						

<i>Notes</i>	Lead auditor reviewed chemical records for two treatment sites at Washburn County.
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3	Program Participants shall implement forest management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.	MF, JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Closed Minor Non-conformance 2010-01 that related to Performance measure 2.3 and Indicators 2.3.2, 2.3.4, and 2.3.7. The Iron County site was inspected and pictures from both sites were reviewed; these sites have been remediated to the extent possible. In Iron County the sale administration protocol has been reviewed and the administrator is placing greater emphasis on sale administration. Despite unusually heavy rainfall in the months prior to the audit the 2011 SA did not encounter any sites with similar issues or problems. We observed that loggers were more commonly asked to cease logging activities due to wet soil condition.</p> <p>The county forests reviewed this year are implementing a range of forest management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity. Foresters use soil and topographic maps, habitat type classifications, and/or field reviews as appropriate to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use a variety of methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance, including designation of harvesting only with frozen ground or very dry conditions for all or a portion of a harvest area. Loggers are aware of the need to avoid rutting. More emphasis has been placed on sale administration to monitor site condition and to educate loggers on the new excessive rutting guidelines.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Soils information is located in the GIS; soils descriptions were seen in some of the documentation.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction, and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Wisconsin BMPs specify avoiding excessive rutting; the counties have adopted similar definitions of “excessive”. This approach is being communicated to the logging contractors and is being implemented effectively.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to <i>minimize</i> the loss of soil and site productivity.	MF, JH	11						
Notes	<p>Minor Non-conformance 2010-01 that related to PM 2.3 and Indicators 2.3.2, 2.3.4, and 2.3.7. Iron County site was inspected and pictures from both sites were reviewed; these sites have been remediated to the extent possible. In Iron County the sale administration protocol has been reviewed and the administrator is placing greater emphasis on sale administration. Despite unusually heavy rainfall in the months prior to the audit the 2011 SA did not encounter any sites with similar issues or problems.</p> <p>Erosion control measures related to harvesting are being employed effectively. Some erosion from forest roads and recreational trails was observed, but this appears to be within acceptable limits.</p> <p>ATV trails throughout the county forest system (where allowed) have undergone steadily increasing use, and the size and power of the vehicles are increasing. In Washburn County about 80% of the trails are reported to have been surfaced, which facilitates regular grading and proper drainage. The remaining trails have native material as road surfaces; these surfaces are more challenging to maintain, particularly with respect to providing proper drainage that can greatly reduce erosion and the risk of sedimentation into wetlands or water bodies. It is estimated that about 2% of the trails have drainage issues. The auditors observed some of these drainage and maintenance issues on a short section of ATV trail walked while inspecting the completed harvest at Tract 9-07. The trail surface has eroding sections (sheet and rill) and some drainage structures that are not working as designed (not removing surface water for longer distances than would be recommended for logging roads in the BMP guidelines, which are a reasonable proxy for ATV trail drainage in the absence of guidelines specific to ATV trails). This section of trail was reported to be scheduled for upgrade.</p> <p>Observed several surfaced trails (Burnett County, Washburn County, Iron County, Rusk County,) in excellent condition.</p> <p>The audit team reviewed a project in Washburn County intended to stabilize a steep, deeply-incised trail section that was impacted by a heavy, unexpected rain event during active construction (ditch work incomplete). Remedial work is planned (funds are available); no sedimentation into wetlands occurred.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.4	Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g. limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).	MF, JH	11						
Notes	The audit team concluded that rutting is limited, that sites observed had retained down woody debris, and that skid trails are minimized.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with scientific silvicultural standards for the area.	MF, JH	11						

<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed by field observations.								
--------------	----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.	MF	11						

<i>Notes</i>	<p>Wisconsin BMPs specify avoiding excessive rutting; the counties have adopted similar definitions of “excessive”. This approach is being communicated to the logging contractors and is being implemented effectively.</p> <p>The Washburn County timber harvest contracts specify compliance with Wisconsin BMPs (Clause 26). Their rutting standard is referenced in the timber sale contract and sale prospectus, directing you to the County Forest 15 Yr. Plan. Contractors new to Washburn County receive on-site instructions during pre-sale meeting. Rusk County contracts have a definition of excessive rutting in their contract. Iron County contract defines criteria for suspension of logging operations and has a statement for BMP accordance.</p>								
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.7	Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality.	MF	11						

<i>Notes</i>	Logging road construction is minimal; some sales specify that no roads are to be built. Skid layout observed was appropriate.								
--------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.4	Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents, such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases and invasive exotic plants and animals, to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.	MF		11					

<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>Management efforts and results in terms of forest health are exceptional.</u></p> <p>On July 2, 2011 an extensive straight-line wind event struck northwestern Wisconsin, damaging significant areas of forestland. 6 county forests suffered major damage to trees on a total of over 100 thousand acres. Efforts are underway to salvage this timber before it loses all value to stain or decay, and to attempt to reduce the risk of extremely severe wildfire or insect infestations.</p>								
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.	MF	11						
Notes	<p>Each counties' forest management plan has a section on protection: "600 Protection: Objective: To protect and manage the resources of the forest from preventable losses resulting from fire, insects, diseases and other destructive elements including those caused by people. Protective methods shall include proper silvicultural methods."</p> <p>Wisconsin DNR employs pest control specialists and makes their services readily available to the counties. County foresters interviewed were aware of forest pests, including new or emerging threats, and understand pest control and/or sanitation/salvage options.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.	MF	11						
Notes	<p>All foresters interviewed knew the primary pests of the forest types under their management and the silvicultural methods needed to maintain vigorous stands as well as needed treatments when pests appear. Rotations are set short enough to prevent many pest problems (for example Jack Pine rotations of 50 years or Aspen rotations between 40 and 50 years).</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.	MF	11						
Notes	<p>DNR participates in regional and national fire cooperation compacts; county staff can participate as time allows.</p> <p>Burnett County has a formal MOU with Wisconsin DNR to support and assist with wildfire suppression, including the Area's fire incident management team: Susan Ingalls GIS support, Tory Jeske equipment operator, Jason Nichols, Division Supervisor. Team Leader Bob Hartshorn reported excellent cooperation, as did wildlife biologist Nancy Christel who reported support for RX fire. Burnett County has long-term agreements with WDNR for firebreaks; there are currently two large ones.</p> <p>From 2011Barron 2011 Annual Work Plan: "A majority of the Barron County Forest is in the DNR intensive fire protection zones. The Silver Creek and Hay River Compartments are in non-protective zones. Agreements are in place with the appropriate fire departments. Fire is not normally a problem except during extreme conditions. Barron County has very little conifer type to worry about."</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.5	Program Participants that deploy improved planting stock, including varietal seedlings, shall use sound scientific methods.								
Notes	<p>Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.</p>								

Objective 3. Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1	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 Canadian or U.S. Environmental Protection Agency–approved water quality programs.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial best management practices during all phases of management activities.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	There is a system of County Forest Road Inspection Reports and similar reports for trails. Confirmed the use of the road inspection forms in Burnett County, although the information was quite brief. In Washburn County a trail with some maintenance issues reviewed during the audit had not been entered on the inspection reports.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify conformance to best management practices.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Barron County Clause 11c 3; Burnett County Clause 16a (note 16 b for Invasives and 16 c for Biomass Guidelines); Washburn County Clause 26 Iron County 10.b, 18vi, 25 Rusk County 26 Sawyer County								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.3	Plans that address wet-weather events (e.g. forest inventory systems, wet-weather tracts, definitions of acceptable operating conditions).	MF	11						

<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed by interviews with foresters and review of records that timber harvest planning considers weather events, with some sites on dry sands intended for the wet time of year, other sites identified for only dry weather, and other sites only for frozen ground. For example several sales in Burnett County had seasonal restrictions listed on the sale offering prospectus under “Special Contract Restrictions”; for Barron County the requirement is “no rutting- forest floor and roads must be dry (firm) or frozen...” as specified in the Cutting and Operational Specifications on some sales, or there are seasonal restrictions.
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall best management practices implementation.	MF	11				11		
<i>Notes</i>	<p>There is an opportunity to improve the use of the system to document road and trail conditions including planning to address maintenance needs.</p> <p>All harvests have a designated forester who administers the sale and monitors many aspects of the sale, including BMPs. Sale inspection forms document these inspections, focusing on financial issues and on any issues encountered. The level of detail varies between counties and foresters. Iron County Forestry Sale Inspection Reports include BMP compliance, utilization, reforestation, and other issues in a checklist format; this format encourages more comprehensive documentation.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2	Program Participants shall have or develop, implement and document riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation, ecological function, harvesting system and other applicable factors.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies and riparian zones.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.2	Mapping of rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies as specified in state or provincial best management practices and, where appropriate, identification on the ground.								

<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.4	Identification and protection of non-forested wetlands, including bogs, fens and marshes, and vernal pools of ecological significance.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.5	Where regulations or best management practices do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.								
<i>Notes</i>	NA because BMPs do exist in Wisconsin to protect riparian areas.								

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

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1	Program Participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape-levels.	JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.1	Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats and ecological community types.	JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Counties visited this year participate with the State in the implementation of the Wildlife Action Plan, identification of SNA's and HCVF habitats and forests. County employees have received training on the applicability of the WAP to their properties.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.	JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Burnett County and Washburn County documentation of Karner Blue Butterfly Surveys and/or Lupine Reconnaissance as part of the MOU to participate in the state's HCP. Iron County financially supports and is participating in a study on Pine Marten habitat utilization. A portion of the Rusk County Forest is in an established IBA.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.3	Program to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities also known as Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value. 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.	JH	11						

<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed checks of NHI database as part of sale planning								
--------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.4	Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate best scientific information, to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements such as snags, stumps, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees and nest trees.	JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed by field observations. County personnel employ State wide silvicultural guidelines for retaining structural diversity in even-aged management systems. County personnel attended State wide training to gain understanding and application of the new green tree retention standards.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.5	Program for assessment, conducted either individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and take into account findings in planning and management activities.	JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Conservation Opportunity Areas identified in the State Wildlife Action Plan are recognized and used by the Counties to coordinate and plan management on a landscape scale.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.6	Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.	JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Iron County has conserved future old-growth forest in the Penokee Range.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.7	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.	JH	11						

<i>Notes</i>	Iron and Rusk Counties have a system to identify, map and control invasive species.								
--------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.	JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Counties in the barrens area of Wisconsin use fire to manage for early seral open habitat condition.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.2	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.	JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.2.1	Collection of information on Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value 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 non-proprietary scientific information, time and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.	JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Counties participate with the State of Wisconsin in their SNA and HCFV programs. SNA's and HCFV's are identified, monitored and protected on County Forest property.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

4.2.2	A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.	JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Counties have access to research results, analysis and planning completed by the State of Wisconsin DNR which they incorporate into their forest management decisions.								

Objective 5. Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits.

To manage the visual impact of forest operations and provide recreational opportunities for the public.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.1	Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	All of the management plans include Section 520 “Aesthetic Management Zones”. Some counties visited have visual buffers along major rivers (Burnett County, Washburn County, and Rusk County). Confirmed the program exists by field observations and by discussions with foresters.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.1.2	Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed by field observations.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

5.2	Program Participants shall manage the size, shape and placement of clearcut harvests.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.2.1	Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres (50 hectares), except when necessary to meet regulatory requirements or to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.	MF		11					
<i>Notes</i>	The program significantly exceeds the standard for minimizing clearcut size. Average clearcut size for 2010 was 18.95 acres for the County Forest program.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	2460 Form, GIS, and WisFIRS								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.3	Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.3.1	Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF	11						

<i>Notes</i>	Foresters plan all harvests, and consider green-up and adjacency in planning. Some sale narratives described strategies to divide stands into sections for staggered regeneration treatments that will allow one area to green up before the area behind it is clearcut.								
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.3.2	Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate conformance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Sale maps and GIS; review of adjacent stands during sale set up.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.3.3	Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet (1.5 meters) 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.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed by field observations; no adjacent clearcuts were seen.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.4	Program Participants shall support and promote recreational opportunities for the public.	MF		11					
<i>Notes</i>	The Wisconsin County Forests provide an exemplary array of recreation opportunities; forest management is implemented to enhance these. Further the counties have done an exceptional job of balancing road use with environmental protections so as to provide public road access while having a sustainable road system.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.4.1	Provide recreational opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.	MF		11					

<i>Notes</i>	<p>Barron County has developed a variety of recreation infrastructure including boat landings, 9 miles of snowmobile trails, 4.5 miles of snowshoe trail, a rifle range, portions of the National Ice Age Trail, and horse trails. Barron County has recently developed horse trails in response to public request. The auditor observed the 29th Street parking lot and trail head (including sign) for the “Narrow Gauge Trails”. These were adopted by the Barron County Board in 2010 and captured in a plan amendment being finalized at the time of the audit.</p> <p>Burnett County has 237 miles of Snowmobile trail, 113 miles of winter use and 54 miles of summer use ATV trail, 19 miles of ski trail, and 17 county parks and boat landings.</p> <p>Washburn County Forest 2009-2013 Recreation Plan documents a comprehensive system of developed and undeveloped recreation areas, and plans for their maintenance and recommended improvements.</p> <p>Rusk County has a dedicated ski trail at Blue Hills, four campgrounds, 20 miles of ATV trails and a portion of the Ice Age trail.</p> <p>Iron County has developed a network of ATV and snowmobile trails, several campgrounds and a cross country ski trail.</p>
--------------	---

Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites.

To manage lands that are ecologically, geologically or culturally important in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
6.1	Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.	MF, JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
6.1.1	Use of information such as existing natural heritage data, expert advice or stakeholder consultation in identifying or selecting special sites for protection.	MF, JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Foresters check the Wisconsin NHI and archeology databases as part of planning prior to timber sales and other projects. Sale narratives document any “hits” from the searches of these databases. Foresters then determine protections, consulting specialized expertise as needed. Biologists and botanists interviewed confirmed being consulted.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging and management of identified special sites.	MF, JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed observation that County personnel use the Wisconsin NHI and archeology databases.								

Objective 7.Efficient Use of Forest Resources.

To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>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.	MF, JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed by field observations.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>7.1.1</i>	Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure: a. management of harvest residue (e.g. slash, limbs, tops) considers economic, social and environmental factors (e.g. organic and nutrient value to future forests) and other utilization needs; b. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization; c. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material; d. exploration of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood and alternative markets (e.g. bioenergy markets); or e. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Timber sale contracts include utilization clauses. When foresters inspect harvests they consider utilization issues; some of the harvest notes included utilization comments; some sales are structured as “lump-sum” which provides an incentive to utilize well. Iron County Forestry Sale Inspection Reports include BMP compliance, utilization, reforestation, and other issues in a checklist format; this format encourages more comprehensive documentation.</p> <p>Confirmed by field observations, supplemented by interviews, that utilization goals are tempered by requirements to leave some woody debris.</p> <p>Wisconsin’s Forestland Woody Biomass Harvesting Guidelines WI DNR Pub-FR-435-09 are the basis for CWD retention in biomass harvests.</p>								

Objectives 8 through 13 are not applicable (N.A.)

Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance.

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.1	Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state and local forestry and related social and environmental laws and regulations.								
<i>Notes</i>									

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.1.1	Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Relevant laws and regulations are available on-line. Confirmed manuals in offices of Burnett County.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.1.2	System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state or local laws and regulations.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Trained foresters plan and oversee all projects. More experienced foresters review and approve the projects and consider compliance. Counties must share a minimum of 10% of timber revenues to the towns from which the timber is cut and a 20% severance tax to the state paid if the county has an outstanding loan balance with the State; timber revenues are carefully tracked and payments made annually. A rotating system of audits is in place and functioning to check all counties financial records, including these payments, every three years.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.1.3	Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.2	Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.								
<i>Notes</i>									

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.2.1	Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, anti-discrimination 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.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.2.2	Forestry enterprises will respect the rights of workers and labor representatives in a manner that encompasses the intent of the International Labor Organization (ILO) core conventions.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	No ILO-related complaints were reported. (See SFI Guidance Document; if there is an ILO-related complaint, the CB auditor must inform NSF, and NSF must pass these along to SFI Inc. for evaluation.)								

Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology.

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>15.1</i>	Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners provide in-kind support or funding for forest research to improve forest health, productivity, and sustainable management of forest resources, and the environmental benefits and performance of forest products.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Financial support for Wisconsin’s SFI Implementation Committee and for research is through the WCFA and DNR participation.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>15.1.1</i>	Financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research shall include some of the following issues: a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions; b. chemical efficiency, use rate and integrated pest management; c. water quality and/or effectiveness of best management practices including effectiveness of water quality and best management practices for protecting the quality, diversity and distributions of fish and wildlife habitats; d. wildlife management at stand- and landscape-levels; e. conservation of biological diversity; f. ecological impacts of bioenergy feedstock removals on productivity, wildlife habitat, water quality and other ecosystem functions; g. climate change research for both adaptation and mitigation; h. social issues; i. forest operations efficiencies and economics; j. energy efficiency; k. life cycle assessment; l. avoidance of illegal logging; and m. avoidance of controversial sources.	MF		11					

<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>Wisconsin DNR and the County Forest Program have demonstrated exemplary support for research.</u></p> <p>WDNR funds research on a broad range of issues including the indicators listed above. Funding is both internal and external. Information from the 2010 SFI Progress Report shows funding as follows:</p> <p>Forest health and productivity – \$376,547 (internal) and \$263,690 (external)</p> <p>Water quality – \$61,493 (internal) and \$56,444 (external)</p> <p>Wildlife & Fish – \$85,411 (internal) and \$101,081 (external)</p> <p>Landscape / Ecosystem mgt. and biodiversity – \$57,533 (internal) and \$118,898 (external)</p> <p>*Information from Greg Pils in Research: In addition, the Science Services section in WDNR’s Division of Enforcement and Science houses staff that conduct hands-on research and collaboration with other partners on a number of research initiatives. Individual County Forests participate routinely as sites for data collection. Current examples of such work include the six projects associated with assessing biomass harvesting and Wisconsin’s Biomass Harvest guidelines. Many of these research sites are on the nutrient poor sands on the County Forests in the northwest part of Wisconsin. Additionally, studies on vernal ponds, deer, soil productivity monitoring, and others are ongoing on County Forest land.</p>
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.1.2	Research on genetically engineered trees via forest tree biotechnology shall adhere to all applicable federal, state, and provincial regulations and international protocols.								
<i>Notes</i>	NA, no genetic engineering.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.2	Program Participants shall individually <u>and/or</u> through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners develop or use state, provincial or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicator.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

15.2.1	Participation, individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees and/or associations at the national, state, provincial or regional level, in the development or use of some of the following: a. regeneration assessments; b. growth and drain assessments; c. best management practices implementation and conformance; d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners; and e. social, cultural or economic benefit assessments.	MF	11						
Notes	WDNR provides continual FIA assessments by landowner category (drain, regeneration, growth, cover type, economic assessments) through its Utilization & Marketing section. County Forests make up 99% of the lands encompassed within the "County & Municipal" landowner category.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3	Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners broaden the awareness of climate change impacts on forests, wildlife and biological diversity.	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3.1	Where available, monitor information generated from regional climate models on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.	MF	11						
Notes	The monitoring of information about climate change and impacts is assigned to Wisconsin DNR central office staff. Several documents and emails have been compiled and provided to all of the counties and all of the Liaison Foresters.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3.2	Program Participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs.	MF	11						
Notes	Confirmed by interviews with field personnel in 5 of the 6 counties visited: Barron County, Burnett County, Sawyer County, Rusk County and Washburn County. Did not audit in Iron County.								

Objective 16. Training and Education.

To improve the implementation of sustainable forestry practices through appropriate training and education programs.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>16.1</i>	Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>16.1.1</i>	Written statement of commitment to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to facility and woodland managers, fiber sourcing staff and field foresters.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Commitment at the state level was by means of a proclamation issued by former Gov. Doyle. For the counties this is done by county board resolutions. All personnel encountered during the 2010 SA were aware of the commitment to the SFI standard.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>16.1.2</i>	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Every county and state employee involved in the audit clearly understood their responsibilities. Burnett County primary responsibility is Jason Nichols, County Forest Administrator; all employees have copies of the SFI requirements and training on the SFI program. Other counties audited were similar in approach.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>16.1.3</i>	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF		11					

Notes	<p><u>The Wisconsin County Forest Program, supported by Wisconsin DNR, has demonstrated exceptional results in staff training.</u></p> <p>Foresters and biologists with degrees from SAF-accredited universities are employed to plan, conduct, and/or oversee the work.</p> <p>Barron County: Chris Rucinski, Liaison Forester and John Cisek, County Forest Administrator have degrees. Reviewed training records of the administrator including a summary of training 2009-2011 and some of the backup documentation for training listed in the summary.</p> <p>Burnett County: file maintained for each staff person, reviewed training records for Mark Diesen; Training emphasis past year: Jack Pine Symposium; Wildlife Action plan covered at WC Forestry meetings; Suzie Ingalls has had some storm water related training; informal evaluation of training needs, but mostly ad hoc based on what is being offered. Considerable fire training.</p> <p>Washburn County: Checked the training records for Buck Pettingill, Assistant Administrator and Duran Bjorklund, County Forester. Confirmed records of formal, topic training. Also discussed WDNR-sponsored annual in-service training and WCFA training.</p>
--------------	---

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
16.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF	11						
Notes	Contractors interviewed had the SFI-approved FISTA training; work practices observed were consistent with this training level.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
16.1.5	Forestry enterprises shall have a program for the use of certified logging professionals (where available) and qualified logging professionals.	MF	11						
Notes	All SFI-certified counties require loggers to have at least the SFI-approved FISTA logger training. FISTA has developed a web site database of trained loggers. When sales are being approved a check is made (generally by the county forest administrator) of this FISTA database.								
	Burnett County keeps a listed of trained loggers.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
16.2	Program Participants shall work individually and/or with SFI Implementation Committees, logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.2.1	<p>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI program; b. best management practices, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance and retirement; c. reforestation, invasive exotic plants and animals, forest resource conservation, aesthetics, and special sites; d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat (e.g. Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value); e. logging safety; f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (COHS) regulations, wage and hour rules, and other provincial, state and local employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; i. public policy and outreach; and j. awareness of emerging technologies. 	MF	11						

Notes

Financial support for SIC includes funding for Master Logger scholarships, direct funding for Tree Farm (up to \$5000 annually), payment in kind for FISTA training (primarily Carmen Wagner's time in conducting BMP training).

The County Forest Specialist participates in the Wisconsin SFI Implementation Committee. Jane Severt, Executive Director Wisconsin County Forests Association is on the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin SIC.

The SIC strongly supports the FISTA training program and other landowner outreach and informational efforts. FISTA sponsors a host of safety and resource training programs annually. WDNR has participated directly in a number of 2010 FISTA training sessions (e.g. BMPs for Water Quality – 7 sessions, 4 BMPs for Invasives, 2 Biomass harvesting sessions). BMP courses are part of the core curriculum for logging contractor training. SIC also has supported landowner outreach – WI Tree Farm Committee and Wisconsin Family Forests (\$37,500 in 2010) and Informational Resources – Trees for Tomorrow and LEAF (Learning, Experiences and Activities in Forestry) - \$34,975 in 2010. SIC financed Logger Training & Education - \$137,850 in 2010. WDNR & WCFA are active participants and contributors to SIC decisions through their membership in the SIC.

The Wisconsin SIC supports education and logger training through grant funding. WDNR Certification Specialist Ken Symes and Wisconsin County Forests Association Executive Director Jane Severt both sit on the SIC. County Forest Specialist Jeff Barkley is a backup participant. The Forest Industry Safety Training Alliance (FISTA) is both a supporter and a benefactor of the SIC. Over 60% of the SIC's annual budget supports education and logger training. This training infuses BMPs into most of the classes. As an example, in 2010, WDNR Forest Hydrologist Carmen Hardin presented 7 FISTA BMP's for Water Quality training sessions. In addition, she conducted two, 3-day stream crossing training sessions and another 13 BMP training sessions to consultant foresters and Managed Forest law owner (private landowners) groups.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

16.2.2	<p>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria for recognition of logger certification programs, where they exist, that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. completion of SFI Implementation Committee recognized logger training programs and meeting continuing education requirements of the training program; b. independent in-the-forest verification of conformance with the logger certification program standards; c. compliance with all applicable laws and regulations including responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act and other measures to protect wildlife habitat; d. use of best management practices to protect water quality; e. logging safety; f. compliance with acceptable silviculture and utilization standards; g. aesthetic management techniques employed where applicable; and h. adherence to a management or harvest plan that is site specific and agreed to by the forest landowner. 	MF	11							
Notes	<p>Master Logger training is encouraged (not required) on public land timber sales. The Wisconsin SIC acknowledges and supports a Master Logger Certification program with \$5000 funding annually. Ken Symes, DNR Certification Coordinator and Jane Severt, WCFA Executive Director both sit on the SIC. WDNR County Forest Specialist is a backup in this role. Bob Mather, WDNR Forest Management Bureau Director serves on the Master Logger Certifying Board. WDNR also provides annual funding for a Master Logger Certification Scholarship program to help offset the cost of loggers seeking Master Logger certification. Scholarship funding for this program in 2011 amounts to \$31,080 to date. The WI. Master Logger program requires a 3rd part assessment of logger's performance. Periodic monitoring audits are conducted to ensure that the above indicators are met. Master Logger training encouraged (not required).</p>									

Objective 17. Community Involvement in the Practice of Sustainable Forestry.

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.1</i>	Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state, provincial and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, conservation organizations, indigenous peoples and governments, community groups, sporting organizations, labor, universities, extension agencies, the American Tree Farm System® and/or other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.								
<i>Notes</i>									

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.1.1</i>	Support, including financial, for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Both WDNR and WCFA contribute to the SIC through their time and participation. Participation by Ken Symes, WDNR Forest Certification Specialist, Jane Severt, WCFA Executive Director who sit on the SIC. In addition, Bob Mather, WDNR Forest Management Bureau Director, is part of the Inconsistent Practices review coordinated by SIC and serves on the Master Logger Certifying Board. Neither organization pays an annual fee to the SIC. WDNR's participation and MLC Scholarship support are valued at approximately \$60,000 annually. WDNR does partner in many of the efforts supported by the SIC including Wisconsin Tree Farm system, Wisconsin Family Forests, and LEAF.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>17.1.2</i>	Support for the development of educational materials for use with forest landowners (e.g. information packets, websites, newsletters, workshops, tours, etc.).								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

17.1.3	Support for the development of regional, state or provincial information materials that provide forest landowners with practical approaches for addressing special sites and biological diversity issues, such as invasive exotic plants and animals, specific wildlife habitat, Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value, and threatened and endangered species.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.4	Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of managed forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs such as current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy Program or conservation easements.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.5	Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders and have a program to take into account the results of these efforts in planning.	MF, JH	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Program to “take into account” is the BER Regional Ecologists. Ryan Magana, Ecologist, BER familiar with Wisconsin Species of Greatest Conservation Needs and the action items which are terms Conservation Opportunity Areas (COAs). Not much overlap with Barron County lands, more so with Rusk County (Blue Hills) and with Burnett County (Northwest Sands and various barrens). Burnett County and Washburn County each demonstrated practices which contribute to the goals of the COAs associated with barrens-associated species. Both are emphasizing Jack Pine management where appropriate. Burnett County leases about 5,000 acres to WDNR for barrens management (Namakagen WMA; lease through 2017).								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.2	Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education and involvement related to sustainable forest management.	MF	11						

<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.
--------------	-----------------

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.2.1	Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as a. field tours, seminars, websites, webinars or workshops; b. educational trips; c. self-guided forest management trails; d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets or newsletters; or e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Burnett County has helped with “Log-A-Load for Kids” and the WCFA Summer Tour 2010 for foresters, board members, etc. Rusk County has a self-guided interpretive trail.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.3	Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, <u>unions</u>, the public or other Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.3.1	Support for SFI Implementation Committees (e.g. toll free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	Bob Mather, WDNR Forest Management Bureau Director, is part of the Inconsistent Practices review coordinated by SIC and serves on the Master Logger Certifying Board.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

17.3.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries. SFI Implementation Committees shall submit data annually to SFI Inc. regarding concerns received and responses.								
<i>Notes</i>	Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.								

Objective 18. Public Land Management Responsibilities.

To promote and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.1	Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.	MF		11					
<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>The county forests provide a model for citizen participation through the county forest committees.</u></p> <p>County forests are managed by professional staff under the direction of elected county board members (through a forestry committee that is a subset of the full board). Confirmed through review of planning procedures and records of public meetings that extensive public opportunities for comment are employed. Also see indicators.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.1.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>County and State land planning and management activities are closely coordinated through the use of the DNR Liaison foresters and by incorporating state forest management, private forestry, and county forestry activities within the same administrative line-staff field organization.</p> <p>County forests are run by the citizens of each county; Public members can comment during any monthly county forestry committee meeting.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.1.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal or independent collaboration.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Monthly committee meetings are open to the public. Counties indicate that they attempt to contact local tribes, but there is rarely any response. Both sides are in general agreement that the management practices do not adversely affect tribal gathering rights.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.2	Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicator.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.2.1	Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. understand and respect traditional forest-related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and c. address the use of non-timber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands. 	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Jim Warren, DNR Public Lands & Conservation Services Section Chief, overall tribal contact for the Division of Forestry. Wisconsin DNR has a designated liaison for each tribe.</p> <p>GLIFWC works with Wisconsin DNR on setting fishing and hunting limits. The WCFA has a good working relationship with GLIFWC. St. Croix Band of Chippewa has a presence near Burnett County and Washburn County, and tribal members exercise their treaty gathering rights. Tribal gathering permits are available from these County Forests at no charge. Attempts by individual counties to communicate with tribes are challenging, as the tribes prefer to interact with federal or state agencies/officials.</p>								

Objective 19. Communications and Public Reporting.

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.1	A Certified Program Participant shall provide a summary audit report, prepared by the certification body, to SFI Inc. after the successful completion of a certification, recertification or surveillance audit to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	11						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.1.1	The summary audit report submitted by the <i>Program Participant</i> (one copy must be in English), shall include, at a minimum, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a description of the audit process, <i>objectives</i> and scope; b. a description of substitute <i>indicators</i>, if any, used in the audit and a rationale for each; c. the name of <i>Program Participant</i> that was audited, including its SFI representative; d. a general description of the <i>Program Participant's</i> forestland and manufacturing operations included in the audit; e. the name of the <i>certification body</i> and <i>lead auditor</i> (names of the <i>audit team</i> members, including <i>technical experts</i> may be included at the discretion of the <i>audit team</i> and <i>Program Participant</i>); f. the dates the certification was conducted and completed; g. a summary of the findings, including general descriptions of evidence of conformity and any nonconformities and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and exceptional practices; and h. the certification decision. 	MF	11						
Notes	These items are addressed in the public report.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

19.2	Program Participants shall report annually to SFI Inc. on their conformance with the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	11						
Notes									

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.2.1	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.	MF	11						
Notes	Confirmed with SFI, Inc (Rachel Dierolf).								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.2.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.	MF	11						
Notes	WisFIRs system tracks all harvests; other systems are used to track contributions, etc.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.2.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	11						
Notes	SFI Reporting Form provided to NSF Lead Auditor when requested.								

Objective 20. Management Review and Continual Improvement.

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

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
20.1	Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.	MF	11						
Notes	<p>The management review system has been strengthened over the past year in response to the SFI OFI, a related FSC Non-conformance, and information provided by NSF on the multi-site sampling requirements. Notable changes include the development of an Internal CAR Report form, the development an internal audit form for SFI and its testing on the internal audit of Marathon County, and revisions to the Group Administration section of the Public Forest Lands Handbook.</p> <p>NSF’s Lead Auditor conducted a review of the program’s efforts against the alternate approach listed in the Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program: Standards, Rules for Label Use, Procedures, and Guidance in Section 9, “Appendix 1: Audits Of Multi-Site Organizations”; see below.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
20.1.1	System to review commitments, programs and procedures to evaluate effectiveness. (Also see Multi-site Checklist.)	MF	11						
Notes	<p>By law and agreement DNR is responsible for reviewing the county forestry programs to ensure compliance and effectiveness. The Public Forest Lands Handbook describes a four-pronged approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A DNR Liaison Forester is assigned to each county and must complete a minimum number of hours of oversight and direct assistance. These foresters are the front line staff for assisting county forestry departments to achieve certification. Interviewed the DNR Liaison Forester for each audited county; 2. Annual Partnership meetings are held and include a review of certification CARS and OFIs; reviewed results in the form of “Annual Work Plans” and minutes from Annual Partnership meetings; 3. A certification component in the regularly scheduled DNR audits of the county forests (see 230-10) includes not only review of local progress on CARS / OFIs but also a detailed checklist incorporating review of all facets of SFI 2010-2014 standard; 4. County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plans that statutorily govern the long term management for each forest address compliance to certification and document management that is aligned with the certification standards; and 5. In addition, the DNR County Forest Specialist works jointly with the WCFA Certification / Legislative Committee to address certification issues and facilitate their implementation and effectiveness amongst all county forests. 								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
20.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives and performance measures.	MF	11						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>WCFA Legislative/Forest Certification Committee: met Oct. 2010, Nov 2010, March 2011, June 2011 plus Internal Audit Subcommittee meetings (minutes provided)</p> <p>Annual partnership meetings are also an important part of the system. These Annual Partnership meetings include certification compliance and follow through. Results from these annual meetings, termed Annual Work Plans, are submitted by each County and reviewed and approved by DNR. These are routed through Jeff Barkley to upper level DNR Management. The Annual Work Plans were reviewed by the Lead Auditor... Annual partnership meetings do not look at certification requirements beyond recent Minor Non-conformances or OFIs, but there is movement towards broadening beyond the current focus on past third-party Non-conformances and OFIs.</p> <p>Management plan requirements pertaining to annual reporting are listed in management plans as follows “3100 ANNUAL ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORTS: A copy of an annual accomplishment report shall be prepared and provided to members of the County Board and to official copyholders of this Plan for inclusion into this chapter. This report shall include, at a minimum, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timber sale accomplishments including gross and net sale receipts and harvest goals achieved. Timber stand improvement accomplishments. Recreation development and maintenance accomplishments including recreation revenues and expenses. Wildlife management accomplishments including revenues and expenses. Fisheries management accomplishments including revenues and expenses. Other accomplishments identified as “needs” in Chapter 1000.” <p>DNR's internal group compliance includes internal audits every 3 yrs. and forest certification compliance and follow through is incorporated into those audits. New checklist for internal audits has been developed and is being rolled out as a once every three years requirement. Only one county has been audited using this checklist as part of the 3-year audit by the forestry specialist. Considering also using the SFI Internal Audit Checklist informally (by Liaison Forester and County Forest Administrator) each year during the annual partnership meeting.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
20.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	11						

<i>Notes</i>	<p>Confirmed “Agenda for the County Forest – Annual Certification Review, August 5, 2011” and attendees: Darrell Zastrow – Deputy Chief State Forester, Division of Forestry, Bob Mather – Director, Bureau of Forest Management, Jim Warren – Chief, Public Lands and Conservation Services Section in Bureau of Forest Management, Jane Severt – Executive Director – Wisconsin County Forests Association, Teague Prichard – State Forest Specialist, Jeff Barkley – DNR County Forest Specialist, Ken Symes – DNR Forest Certification Coordinator. Also confirmed pre-meeting detailed notes which serve, in part, as minutes of the meeting.</p> <p>Also see responses to this topic in the Multi-Site Checklist below.</p>
--------------	---

Detailed Notes for Indicator 1.1.2

COUNTY FORESTS - LONG TERM HARVEST GOALS VS. HARVEST ESTABLISHMENT ACRES 2001-2010

#	County	² 2011 Long Term Harvest Goals							¹ Deferred Acres	<u>Total Accomp. - Estab. ± Deferred</u>	<u>% as compared to 2011 Long Term goal</u>
			2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	<u>5 yr AVG</u>			
300	Barron	497	312	614	221	361	0	302	64	366	74%
700	Burnett	3,030	1,316	2,077	4,550	2,642	2,021	2,521	785	3,306	109%
2600	Iron	5,369	2,075	3,611	3,834	3,655	4,012	3,437	346	3,783	70%
5500	Rusk	3,542	3,149	2,532	2,847	2,794	2,571	2,779	1,028	3,807	107%
5800	Sawyer	3,581	2,076	2,733	2,699	3,554	3,265	2,865	411	3,276	91%
6600	Washburn	3,615	3,022	3,423	2,766	3,557	2,757	3,105	520	3,625	100%

¹ Deferred Acres are averaged from 2008-2010 (not tracked as consistently previous to that time frame)

² Long Term goals apportion out any backlog over 15 years. This figure changes slightly every year as Planning is run.

Annual goals, which put all the backlog in the first year of regulation, define the limits a property can establish in any one year. All counties are within those limits.

Multi-site Certification – Two Options

A multi-site organization is defined as an organization having an identified central function (hereafter referred to as a central office – but not necessarily the headquarters of the organization) at which certain activities are planned, controlled or managed and a network of local offices or branches (sites) at which such activities are fully or partially carried out.

Organization does **NOT** meet the definition above; the remaining questions do not apply and all remaining portions of the multi-site checklists may be deleted from the report.

Option 1: Alternate Approach to Multi-site Certification Sampling based on the Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program, Section 9, Part 5.1 & Appendix 1

- a) What specific activities are planned, controlled or managed at the central office?
- Approval of all timber sales and any short-range and long-range plans
 - Record of each timber sale and of overall inventory through WISFIRs
 - Development of policies, procedures
 - Support for Wisconsin SFI Implementation Committee
 - Research Support
 - Climate Change requirements
- b) For each activity, provide evidence:
See main checklist

General Eligibility Criteria:

A legal or contractual link shall exist between all sites.

Yes No Evidence County Forestry Program: The partnership is codified in Wisconsin statutes 28.10 & 28.11. Order of entry is issued for each participating county; there are provisions for withdrawal of tracts; complete withdrawal would not be politically feasible. SFI Group: By resolution done by each County Forestry Committee; formal process in the public lands handbook.

The scope and scale of activities carried out by participating sites shall be similar.

Yes No Evidence Common framework for inventory, management plans, timber sales, projects, etc. State law and regulations.

The management system framework shall be consistent across all sites (allowing for site level procedures to reflect variable local factors).

Yes No Evidence Procedures, with local ordinances for land use and customized county timber sale contracts, with many common elements; variation is mostly regarding timber sale payments.

Central Function Requirements:

Provide a commitment on behalf of the whole multi-site organization to establish and maintain practices and procedures in accordance with the requirements of the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence County resolution county by county. Audit team leader previously confirmed a document from Gov. Doyle providing direction for forest certification at county forest level.

Provide all the sites with information and guidance needed for effective implementation and maintenance of practices and procedures in accordance with the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence: Many documents were provided and reviewed, including minutes of partnership meetings, WCFA meetings, emails, and briefing documents provided.

Team Leaders coordinate discussion of CARs and OFIs at annual local meetings; Every three years visit each county forest for a more formal internal audit including financial, operational, and forest certification; WCFA organization including certification focus at most of the three annual meetings.

Maintain the organizational or contractual connection with all sites covered by the multisite Organization including the right of the Central Function to exclude any site from participation In the certification in case of serious non-conformities with the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence Public lands handbook describes the process for removing a county from the group, in a section titled "Landowner Entry and Departure from the Group Organization(s)".

Keep a register of all the sites of the multi-site organization, including (for SFI 2010-2014 Standard) the forest area associated with each participating site.

Yes No Evidence Public Forest Lands Handbook, Group Administration section describes process for maintaining group records, including "Lists and acreages of FSC and SFI group members".

Maintain an internal audit or monitoring program sufficient to provide annual performance data on overall organizational conformance with the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence Public Forest Lands Handbook, Group Administration section describes Internal Review & Monitoring as having four components:

Liaison foresters assist with sale administration.

County forestry administrator and Liaison foresters monitor implementation of projects of all kinds. DNR disciplines review recreation projects prior to grants.

Annual work planning is often combined with partnership meetings.

Maintain an internal audit or monitoring program sufficient to provide periodic performance data on overall organizational conformance with the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence Every three years visit each county forest for a more formal internal audit including financial, operational, and forest certification. Internal audit checklist was developed and tested in Marathon County.

Public Forest Lands Handbook, Internal Corrective Action Requests section: "For deviations from the forest certification standards, an Internal Corrective Action Request (CAR) may be issued. Internal CARs are documented on an Internal CAR form. and may be issued by DNR Team Leaders, Internal DNR Auditors, or the Group manager. It is expected that prior to the issuance of any internal CAR their will be communication between the County Forest Administrator, Liaison forester, Team Leader and Group Manager. Internal CARs shall be submitted to the County Forest Administrator with CC's to the Liaison, Team Leader, Group Manager, Chair of the respective County Forest committee, and the WCFA Executive Director. The County Forest Administrator will be responsible for addressing any internal CARs on behalf of the Group Member county. Internal CARs will be brought forth to the WCFA Certification / Legislative Committee for discussion. The Group Manager shall be responsible for monitoring follow-through on Internal CARs."

Operate a review of the conformity of sites based on results of internal audit and/or monitoring data sufficient to assess Organizational performance as a whole rather than at the individual site level.

Yes No Evidence

Confirmed "Agenda for the County Forest – Annual Certification Review, August 5, 2011" and attendees: Darrell Zastrow – Deputy Chief State Forester, Division of Forestry, Bob Mather – Director, Bureau of Forest Management, Jim Warren – Chief, Public Lands and Conservation Services Section in Bureau of Forest Management, Jane Severt – Executive Director – Wisconsin County Forests Association, Teague

Prichard – State Forest Specialist, Jeff Barkley – DNR County Forest Specialist, Ken Symes – DNR Forest Certification Coordinator. Also confirmed pre-meeting detailed notes which serve, in part, as minutes of the meeting.

Interviewed these participants in the overall annual management review: Darrell Zastrow, Jim Warren, Ken Symes, Certification Coordinator, Jane Severt, and Jeff Barkley. Not interviewed: Bob Mather, Director for Forest Management, and Teague Prichard, State Forest Specialist

Establish corrective and preventive measures if required and evaluate the effectiveness of corrective actions taken.

Yes No Evidence Confirmed new CAR form has been developed and a process for its use has been developed. The County Liaison foresters do not write the CAR; done by Team Leaders, Area Leaders or County Forest Specialist. Next use will be on September 7 in Barron County.

Establish procedures for inclusion of new sites within the multi-site organization including an internal assessment of conformity with the standard, implementation of corrective and preventive measures and a requirement to inform the relevant certification body of changes in participation prior to including the sites within the scope of the certification.

Yes No Evidence Public Forest Lands Handbook, Group Administration section describes the process for designation of new group members.

Individual Site Functions and Responsibilities

Sites implement and maintain the requirements of the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence Interviews and field audits, 6 counties in 2011; see main checklist.

Sites respond effectively to all requests from the Central Function or certification body for relevant data, documentation or other information whether in connection with formal audits or reviews or otherwise.

Yes No Evidence Annual work plans include certification topic.

Sites provide full co-operation and assistance in respect of the satisfactory completion of internal audits, reviews, monitoring, relevant routine enquiries or corrective actions.

Yes No Evidence Audit revealed a high level of cooperation between state and county personnel.

Sites implement relevant corrective and preventive actions established by the central office.

Yes No Evidence: Changes in the program over the past few years have moved into practice quickly in the counties. Third-party CARs have been the focus; internal changes have been less formal but still appear effective.

Option 2: NSF-ISR Multi-site Certification Justification based on MD1: 2007 N.A., remaining checklist items deleted.

End of Multi-site Checklists

Overview of responsibilities:

State:

- Approval of all timber sales and any short-range and long-range plans
- Record of each timber sale and of overall inventory through WISFIRs
- DNR Liaison foresters and DNR forestry team leaders for all counties
- Time-standards review every 3 to 4 years
- Interest-free loans available; review process; repayment through stumpage assessment
- Direct payments nearly \$6 million annually
- WCFA (Jane Severt, Executive Director) helps with communication and compliance; meets 3 times annually, Forestry Cert. Subcommittee meets 5-6 times per year

Counties:

- Program originated late 1920's; current format since 1963
- County Forestry Boards responsible for direct implementation, through Forestry Committee

Changes Since 2010 audit:

- Filled Forest Certification Coordinator position, Ken Symes
- New governor, new DNR Secretary, Deputy Secretary; kept same state forester
- Budget for forestry did well (75 forestry vacancies); recent forestry hiring notice; 28 of 29 DNR Liaison forester positions are in place; covered by the DNR Team Leader Pete Wisdom in Sawyer county
- Two-thirds completed with DNR Forestry Strategic Direction for the Division of Forestry (tiered off the Wisconsin Statewide Forestry Plan) path forward / work plan for the 9 programs in the DoF.
- Revised BMPs for water quality, minor tweaks, some training occurred
- Completed revision to the forest management guidelines

Wednesday (August 10)
Barron County (Auditor: Mike Ferrucci)

Participants

Jeff Barkley, WDNR County Forest Specialist
Ken Symes, WDNR Forestry Certification Coordinator
John Cisek, Barron County Forest Administrator
Brad Johnson, WDNR Team Leader
Chris Rucihski, WDNR Forester
Kevin Morgan, Wildlife Biologist
Ryan Magana, WDNR Regional Ecologist

Sites

1. Sale #320, 30th Avenue Sale: Completed thinning harvested fall/winter 2009-2010
2. Bear Lake and Narrow Gauge Blocks, Demonstration Forest Tour Site: drove by several, stopped at Tour Site #C10, Red Pine Plantation
3. Sale #317, Deer Camp Sale: Completed thinning; also recreation access road into Kelly Lake
4. 29th Street parking lot and trail head (including sign) for the "Narrow Gauge Trails" horse trails
5. Sale #319, 13th Street Sale: Completed thinning and aspen patch clearcuts.
6. Sale #324: Completed harvest including pine thinning and aspen clearcut

Iron County (Auditors: JoAnn Hanowski & Brendan Grady)

Participants

Tyler Wicklund, Forester, Iron County Forestry
Tara Stuhr, Office Manager, Iron County Forestry
Jim Warren, WDNR
C.E. Zinsmaster, WDNR Liaison
Joe Vairus, Forest Administrator, Iron County Forestry
Karl Linnemanstons, Forester Iron County Forestry
Gary Glonek, Forester, Iron County Forestry
Heather Berklund, Forester, WDNR
Colleen Matula, NOR Ecologist/ Silviculture
Jay Gallagher, WDNR
Todd Waas, WDNR – Ashland
Joe Schmidt, WDNR – Mellon
Carmen Hardin, WDNR – Rhinelander, Forest Hydrologist

Sites

1. Schonber Campground. Campground at the trail head of an ATV trail.
2. Revisit site from 2010. Mitigation of rutting was completed on the site by placing slash perpendicular to the slope of the skid trail.
3. Sale #2458. Aspen regeneration harvest with conifer retention by prescription. Considered visual aesthetics due to adjacency to highway and left a filter strip along the adjacent bog.
4. Sale #2424. Aspen regeneration harvest with a 100-200 foot buffer along the Turtle River. Mix of species and sizes of trees for retention.
5. Shay Dam Picnic Area. County owned/maintained dam and picnic area.
6. No number, marked sale in northern hardwood stand. Goal is to create canopy gaps around selected mast trees to create a multi-aged stand.
7. Sale #2368. This site is in the Pine Marten habitat study area and followed harvest guidelines for that species. All hemlock was left on site as well as a higher basal area. Harvest was primarily red maple.
8. Sale #2391. Aspen regeneration harvest with tamarack island and scattered residuals. Cedar/spruce lowland pockets were not harvested.

Thursday (August 11)

Burnett County (Auditors: Mike Ferrucci / SFI Oversight auditor(s)?)

Participants

Jeff Barkley, WDNR County Forestry Program
Jason Nichols, Burnett County Forestry Program Administrator
Mark Diesen, Burnett County Forestry Program Assistant Administrator
Tory Jeske, Burnett County Forestry Technician
Susan Ingalls, Burnett County Recreation Coordinator
Bob Hartshorn, WDNR Team Leader
Kyle Young, WDNR Liaison Forester
Nancy Crystal, Wisconsin DNR Biologist
Ryan Magana, WDNR Regional Ecologist

Sites

1. Sale #2975-11 Aspen CC with retention, active whole – tree chipping harvest as storm salvage; Interviewed Greg Litke- FISTA trained, had first aid kits and spill kit.
2. Sale #2931-10 Aspen CC and Red Pine Row Thinning; detailed discussion of landscape context and biodiversity benefits of the Burnett County timber program
3. Trail 41: ATV-only summer, snowmobile and ATV winter; graveled in May, ATV club grooms trails weekly
4. Tract 1-10 (not sold) Scrub oak CC with retention; adequate wildlife retention provided in sale specs.
5. Balsam Fire Lane and ATV Route: graded twice annually, mow edges every two year; confirmed County Forest Road Inspection Reports in Burnett County
6. Sale #2957-11 Planned Jack Pine CC, Aspen CC, RP Thinning; JP portion has been scarified; regen goal 500 tpa, track regeneration by year required inspections using paper system
7. Sale #2914-09 70 acre Jack Pine CC completed 2010, some portion scarified for natural regen
8. Dee Lake Fuels Break – burned or mowed every few years; maintained by WDNR
9. Sale #2976-11: Active salvage being conducted by Randy Crank, Crank Logging; JP had been thinned fall 2010 but July 2011 windstorm damaged significantly.
10. Sale #2894-09 73 acre JP thinning impacted by July 2011 storm, will need to salvage
11. Jack Pine Stand successfully regenerated mostly JP some oak with incomplete canopy closure 12 years post-harvest; biologists like habitat conditions including Big Bluestem and other open lands plants; this habitat supports the more intensively managed brush and barrens landscape
12. Tract 41-11 (not sold) Red pine stand thinned previously, slight to moderate damage from July 2011 windstorm, being salvaged. Interviewed Dwane Hamann and Dave Shadrick, both FISTA-trained.
13. Sale #2896-09: Aspen and JP CC with retention scarified most areas pre-harvest; walked parts of 2 of 7 blocks, JP seedlings starting to develop
14. Sale #2888-09 Completed Red Pine Thinning; logger select every third tree, looked good

Rusk County (Auditor: JoAnn Hanowski)

Participants

JoAnn Hanowski, SFI Audit Team, Paul Teska, Rusk County Forest Administrator, Jane Severt, WCFA Exec. Director, Rover Svoma, Rusk County Forestry Comm., Mark Schmidt, DNR Wildlife Biologist, Andrew Noth, Rusk County Forester, Jim Warren, DNR, Terry Tappan, DNR County Forest Liaison, Patrick Zimmer, Asst. Admin, Rusk County.

Sites

- 1) Blue Hills Ski Trail, County owned, but maintained by a local ski club. County does some mowing and help secure funds to build a warming building.

- 2) Harvest site 2361- uneven-aged management of hardwoods. County has a large block of this habitat that has been identified as a COA and an IBA. Removed timber to 80-90ba to attain goal of a multi-aged, more diverse stand.
- 3) Blue Hills Interpretive Hiking Trail- self guided 1.5 mile nature trail with maps and signs.
- 4) Perch Lake Boat Landing-new engineered landing that replaced old landing that was encouraging water and sediment flow into the lake. Design appears to be sound and will hold up to traffic.
- 5) Audie Lake Campground-one of 4 campgrounds in the County, this one also has a boat landing.
- 6) Timber sale 2334-clearing and widening of an existing logging road for use as an ATV trail. County hire engineering firm to design the trail and obtained appropriate permits to site the trail. Part of a 20 mile network of ATV trails in the County.
- 7) Timber sale 2357-one part of the sale was an aspen clearcut with residuals, with 100ft RMZ along hemlock creek. No harvesting is planned within the RMZ. Hardwood management goal is to promote a multi-aged stand while maintaining important wildlife features like snags, den trees, and mast trees. Harvest on this site was stopped due to rutting-one area of excessive rutting was mitigated by the logger (graded).
- 8) Ice Age Trail Pavilion-nice picnic area and log building at the trail head for the Ice Age trail.
- 9) Murphy Flowage campground, dam, and boat landing.
- 10) Active harvest 2364- another hardwood thinning with goal of achieving regulated stand. Spoke with Justin Krier, owner and operator and also a Master Logger.
- 11) Timber sale 2377- completed harvest in an oak stand. Goal is to maintain oak in the stand with even aged management. Rotation age goal is 120-140 years. Nice job with no visible damage to residual trees.
- 12) Timber sale 2368- a partially completed harvest in an oak stand. Harvest was shut down twice due to unfavorable soil conditions (once in winter and once in summer).
- 13) Timber sale 2316- one harvest in a spruce plantation that was originally planted under an aspen canopy. Aspen and spruce were removed and the management will initially favor spruce and later will likely return to an aspen dominated stand. Another portion of the site was an aspen clearcut and another hardwoods thinning with similar goals and objectives of previously visited sites.

Sawyer County (Auditor: Brendan Grady)

Participants

Ken Symes, WDNR Forestry Certification Coordinator
 LaineStowell, WDNR
 Jeff Steidel, Forester, Sawyer County Forestry
 Pete Sievert, Assistant Forest Administrator, Sawyer County Forestry
 David Todus, Forester, Sawyer County Forestry
 Colleen Matula, NOR Ecologist/ Silviculture
 Pete Wisdom, WDNR – Hayward
 Dolores Dobilas, Secretary/Bookkeeper, Sawyer County Forestry
 Greg Peterson, County Forest Administrator, Sawyer County Forestry

Sawyer County Forestry Office – daily opening meeting, staff interviews, reviewed harvest rates, inventory system, sustainable harvest calculations. Discussed recreation opportunities on the county forest, interactions with recreational stakeholders, Inspected staff training records, Discussed training for BMPs. Reviewed logging contracts for required language.

Sites

- 1) Sale #2694-11 – Even aged regeneration of aspen, selection harvest of mixed hardwoods. Sale set up prior to green-tree retention guidelines going into effect, but clumps of non-aspen were left in the even-aged harvest, especially around a vernal pool. Silt fencing was installed on roads in order to protect small wetlands and streams. Active logging occurring, interviewed contractor and discussed safety protocols. Reviewed chain-of-custody procedures, inspected truck tickets.
- 2) Sale #2528-07 – Even-aged regeneration of aspen. Harvest had occurred in 2009, site showed strong regeneration. Discussed road maintenance issues en route to site, use of fords rather than culverts. Logging

was done as whole-tree harvesting and chipping. Discussed nutrient cycling and guidelines on where whole-tree can occur. Large Riparian Management Zone in place next to Thornapple River. Single harvest unit was 168 acres, original stand had arisen after straight-line wind event. Discussed how future harvests would be smaller parcels to create more diversity on the landscape.

- 3) Sale 2672-10 – Uneven-aged hardwood stand. Silvicultural method was selective thinning, designed to accelerate creation of uneven-aged stand. Strong age class of regeneration existed from previous thin 10 years prior, trees were marked in order to open this up. Discussed selection of wildlife and legacy trees. Retained trees showed little damage from harvesting. Had been an active site until recently. Soil required operation only in frozen or dry conditions, contractor had pulled out the prior week after summer rains made the site too wet to work. Minor rutting was observed on skid trails, but not enough to trigger a violation of the BMPs.
- 4) Sale 2539-08 – mix of treatments: Aspen even-aged cut, hardwood selective thin, experiment in tamarack area. Harvest completed in 2009. Discussed road maintenance issues, small culvert on logging road had been overtopped since the site had been closed after the harvest. Culvert was still allowing water to flow. Site had already been identified and marked as a road maintenance issue to be remedied as part of transportation access plan. Even aged areas showed strong regeneration. Selective harvests showed minor amounts of damage. Experimental harvest of hardwoods in bog area adjacent to tamarack designed to increase population of tamarack, not showing signs of success yet. Tamarack trees showed mortality after harvest. Discussed method for sharing silvicultural experiments like this one.
- 5) Sale 2653-10 – Mix of treatments – clearcut with retention in Aspen stand, shelterwood harvest in black ash stand, selection harvest in northern hardwood stand.. Harvest area set up but not yet cut, an initial acre had been done, and then closed down due to wet conditions. Harvest blocks were adjacent to beaver pond, discussed new BMPs for wetlands. Discussed marking guidelines, and choosing retention trees in selection harvest stands.

Friday (August 12)

Washburn County (Auditors: Mike Ferrucci, Brendan Grady, and JoAnn Hanowski)

Mike Peterson, Washburn County Administrator
Buck Pettingill, Assistant Administrator
Jim Pearson, Liaison Forester
Nancy Crystal, Wildlife Biologist
Tom Duke, Regional Forestry Leader, WDNR
Carmen Hardin, Forest Hydrologist
Colleen Matula, NOR Ecologist/ Silviculture
Brad Johnson, Forestry Team Leader
Jeff Barkley, WDNR County Forest Specialist
Ken Symes, WDNR Forestry Certification Coordinator

Sites

1. Tract 44-09: Partially completed including Aspen CC and Oak shelterwood, good coarse woody debris and retention, some forwarder ruts
2. Tract 9-07: Completed oak thinning and aspen CC with retention; walked ATV trail used during harvest, some minor erosion
3. Tract 32-08 Completed oak shelterwood, discussed regeneration methods and follow-up; ATV trail with gravel surface and a steep, recently upgraded section damaged by heavy rains, will be repaired again
4. Campground (lunch)
5. Tract 5-04 All-aged regeneration thinning; reviewed selection methods including gap creation, discussed loss of many saplings during logging due to large trees removed, adequate ash and some oak regeneration observed, but currently no maple and significant amounts of herbaceous vegetation, discussed regeneration challenges.

Appendix IV



SFI Reporting Form (not needed, no changes)