

Opportunities for Improvement; Practices that Exceed Expectations; and Auditor Notes

Opportunities for Improvement (OFI):

1. There is an opportunity to improve information systems for forest fiber resources including: improved growth monitoring to better understand long-term implications of silvicultural systems, calculate growth and update volumes; updating reconnaissance data in a timely manner; taking appropriate advantage of detailed information on tree quality collected during recon; and conducting trend analysis using growth and drain data for specific forests or forest cover types. (4.1.1.1.1 CI 2; 4.1.1.1.4 CI 3 & 4)
2. There is an opportunity to improve the clarity of regeneration targets for all types. (4.1.2.1.1 CI 3)
3. There is an opportunity to improve chemical training for responsible person, not just when restricted use pesticides are applied and not just for the contracted applicator. (4.1.2.1.3 CI 8 Designated state-trained or certified applicators supervise forest chemical applications.)
4. There is an opportunity to improve documentation of chemical trials, using existing database developed by Colleen Matula or other mechanisms that would ensure that this information is available to other interested forest managers. (4.1.2.1.3 CI 10)
5. There is an opportunity to improve the consistent definition of excessive rutting and to better understand the long-term effects of compaction and rutting. (4.1.2.1.4 CI 5.)
6. There is an opportunity to clarify the policy for use of genetically improved trees. (4.1.2.1.6 CI 1)
7. There is an opportunity to improve monitoring of BMPs for all phases of operations, for example road building, chemical applications, site preparation. (4.1.3.1.1 CI 7).
8. There is an opportunity to improve riparian and other protections (4.1.3.1.2 CI 3) and BMP implementation to protect water quality (4.1.3.1.4 CI 1) by having individual counties encourage and support logger training (4.2.1.1.2 CI 1) in order to improve the understanding of forest protection measures in timber sales (currently DNR Madison staff are primarily responsible for meeting these SFI requirements).
9. There is an opportunity to improve protections for vernal pools & other small wetlands. (4.1.3.1.1 CI 4.)
10. There is an opportunity to improve training or education for field foresters in endangered species identification and protection and in identifying and conserving rare and unique biological communities (4.1.4.1.1 CI 4 & 4.1.4.1.3 CI 2) & identification of culturally or historically significant sites (4.1.6.1.1 CI 3) and to use the best available information sources (state archaeologist).
11. There is an opportunity to improve quantitative guidelines for stand level retention (e.g. coarse woody debris, den trees, snags) to ensure more consistent implementation. (4.1.4.1.1 CI 5)
12. There is an opportunity to improve the process for calculating the average clearcut size. (4.1.5.1.2 CI 3)
13. There is an opportunity to clarify the policy of not placing clearcuts adjacent unless already “green” meaning 3 years old or 5 feet high. (4.1.5.1.3 CI 1)
14. There is an opportunity to improve management review specific to SFI.

Exceptional Practices (summary)

- 4.1.1.1.3 “provide recreation and education opportunities for the public”
- 4.1.5.1.1 “policies to manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.”
- 4.2.1.1.1 “encourage landowners to reforest following harvest and to use Best Management Practices”
- 4.2.1.1.6 “support and promote efforts ... to educate and assist forest landowners”
- 4.3.2.1.1 “support and promote public outreach, education & involvement related to forest management”

Summary of Minor-Nonconformances (CARs)

(CA-2004-1)

4.1.1.1.1 *A written policy for implementing and achieving SFIS Objectives and Performance Measures.*

4.2.1.1.5 *Program Participants shall ensure that their commitment to the SFIS Principles is communicated throughout their organization. CI 1 Written policy statement of commitment to the SFIS that is communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement operations and field foresters.*

Findings: Although they have indicated a strong willingness to participate, most counties have not yet committed to the SFI Program. The general SFI principles are being followed in all county programs, but have not been identified or communicated as a specific commitment to the SFI Standard.

(CA-2004-2)

4.1.2.1.4 *Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity. CI 6 Field observations indicate that, where practicing partial harvesting, vigorous trees are retained consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.*

Findings: On several sites visited in one forest, silviculture guidelines for northern hardwoods were not being followed. Although uneven-aged management was specified and basal area was maintained above 70 square feet per acre, there was limited effort to maintain larger trees or to remove smaller trees to attain targeted diameter distributions. The most vigorous trees were often targeted for removal.

(CA-2004-3)

4.1.3.1.1 *Program Participants shall meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency approved state water quality programs and meet or exceed all applicable state water quality laws & regulations & the requirements of the federal Clean Water Act. CI 2 Field staff and contractors trained in water quality laws and state BMPs
CI 5 Contract provisions specify BMP compliance
CI 7 Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.*

Findings: CI 2: Not all road building/road maintenance personnel have received BMP training. Training records for county staff are not complete in some cases, making it difficult for managers to be certain that all field staff are trained. New foresters may not have received adequate formal BMP training in school, and some delay may occur before they receive BMP training while employed.

CI 5: Confirmed in contracts in 5 of 7 county forests visited. Where not specified in contract the programs clearly do include BMPs in design of projects, and have provisions some BMP issues.

CI 7: OFI 9 "... improve monitoring of BMPs for all phases of operations ..."

(CA-2004-4)

4.1.3.1.4 *Program Participants shall require BMP training for employees in forest management and wood procurement operations and shall encourage training for forest management and harvesting contractors. CI 2 BMP training sessions for employees are required and documented and similar sessions are encouraged and documented for contractors.*

Findings: BMP training is not documented for contractors, although this information is available from FISTA. Training records for county field staff vary widely in their comprehensiveness. All WI DNR staff have training records maintained, although there are some gaps in computerized versions of these records, particularly for BMP training sessions held during the mid 1990s. Training sessions for BMPs for county employees are not always recorded.

NSF-ISR auditors shall use this document to record their findings for each SFIS Performance Measure and Core Indicator. Where a non-conformance is found, the auditor shall fully document the reasons for the nonconformity on the Corrective Action Request (CAR) form. If the Performance Measure does not apply, place (N/A) in the appropriate Auditor “Responsible” section.

Objective 1: Broaden the implementation of sustainable forestry by employing an array of economically, environmentally and socially sound practices in the conservation of forests including appropriate protection, growth, harvest and use of those forests using the best scientific information available.

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.1.1.1 | <i>Program Participants shall have policies to implement and achieve the Sustainable Forestry Standard Principles and Objectives.</i> | MF | | | | X | 1 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | A written <i>policy</i> for implementing and achieving SFIS <i>Objectives</i> and <i>Performance Measures</i> . | Reviewed Wisconsin 2003 Assembly Joint Resolution of support for sustainable forestry, SFI & FSC. Reviewed Wisconsin Statute 28.04 a legal mandate for sustainable forestry. Also Chapter 28.11, Wisconsin Statutes for County Forests. None provide the needed SFI-specific policy. Governor’s Council and DRN Advisory Panel have both confirmed support for SFI Program. Statement of sustainable forestry policy will be in template for new management plans. | | X | |
| CI 2 | A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a <i>land classification</i> system; c. soils <i>inventory</i> and maps, where available; d. access to <i>growth and yield modeling</i> capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or <i>GIS</i> ; f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of non-timber issues. | Interviews with DNR specialists and many county forestry personnel, examination of documents, and review of information systems confirmed that all required elements are included, with particularly strong programs for items b, c, e, and g. However the system is oriented to area control, so that items a, d, and f are adequate with respect to volumes but generally robust when viewed from an area-control perspective. There is access to growth and yield modeling, but it is not an important element of the system. OFI 1: There is an opportunity to improve the forest inventory. See also 4.1.1.1.4 | | | X |
| CI 3 | Staff roles and responsibilities for achieving SFIS <i>Objectives</i> are assigned and fully understood. | Jeff Barkley, County Forestry Specialist, has overall responsibility within the DNR. There are currently no SFI-specific delegated assignments in place within individual county forest management programs. Instead the entire staff, including Forest Administrators and field foresters, is involved in most aspects of certification. Special committees composed of representative of DNR and County staff are working on specific aspects of SFI Objectives. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 4 | Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations. | Confirmed in field offices: Lists and contents of regulations available at all offices with Intranet - intranet access at county offices or Binders with WI DNR manuals (administrative regulations) in field offices. Rely on WI DNR for federal compliance. | X | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.1.1.2 | Program Participants shall (individually, through cooperative efforts or through associations) provide funding for forest research to improve the health, productivity and management of all forests. | MF | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Current financial or in-kind support of research to address <i>forest health</i> and <i>productivity</i> . | WI DNR responsibility. Confirmed during State Forest Certification Audit. Field research trials are common in counties- some examples: Washburn County: observed Silvicultural Field Trials and documentation in F.M. Plan 810.1.9 page 800-10. Oneida: Aspen thinning trials and work with 2-aged aspen Marinette County: trials of jack pine chain scarification | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | | | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.1.1.3 | Program Participants shall provide recreation and education opportunities for the public where they are consistent with their forest management objectives. | DW | | X | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---------------|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> describing public recreation and education efforts, consistent with forest management objectives. | Reviewed County Management Plans sec 130.3 recreation development and Sec. 7 road use plans, recreation maps and brochures for all counties visited. Conducted field inspections of over 15 sites. All counties demonstrated extensive recreational use and facilities, impressive current and past investments in trails, campgrounds, picnic areas, boat launches, scenic vistas, etc., ongoing maintenance, and promotion of recreational opportunities to potential visitors within and outside of their counties. Staff interviews also confirmed community involvement of the staff in a variety of activities including forestry and conservation education for youth | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | Field Observations of Recreation Programs such as Camp Newood Park & Campground in Lincoln County, Birchwood Canoe Units in Washburn County and Coon Creek Park & Campground in Eau Claire County. | X | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.1.1.4 | <i>Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and yield models and written plans.</i> | MF | X | | | | 2 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Recommended sustainable harvest levels. | Allowable harvest based on area control–acres of each type cut each year. Mgmt Plans provide calculated maximum (see notes for 41111). | X | | |
| CI 2 | Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to sustainable forest management plan. | Annual harvest trend information is available from the recon computer system. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 3 | A forest <i>inventory</i> system and a method to calculate growth. | State-wide Forest Inventory & Analysis is used to calculate growth and yield by cover type. This rolling forest inventory system does not easily provide current aggregated volume information (by forest). Forest inventory system and stand projections oriented towards silvicultural conditions, not products. WI-DNR has several times requested increased funding for CFI in their budget, but not received this yet. OFI 2: There is an opportunity to improve the clarity of growth and drain, methods to calculate and update growth, and the timeliness of inventory updates in the recon system. More data is collected during recon than is actually used. | | | X |
| CI 4 | Periodic updates of <i>inventory</i> and recalculation of planned harvests. | Recon surveys on event basis-up to 15 years old. Linked to site classification system-growth and yield information. OFI2 (see above). | | | X |
| CI 5 | Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, thinning, etc.), consistent with assumptions in harvest plans. | County Forestry Program Specialist Jeff Barkley tracks all public lands harvests. Each DNR County Forest Liaison tracks practices. Recon computer system provides information. Information recorded on 2460 Form "Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report" and collected systematically by County Forestry Specialist. Confirmed appropriate level of investment in site preparation, planting, release from brush, and periodic high-quality thinning treatments in all counties visited. | X | | |

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

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.2.1.1 | <i>Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest by planting or direct seeding within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.</i> | DP | X | | | | 1 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> specifying the time frame for <i>reforestation</i> . | WI DNR responsibility to review reforestation. Silviculture handbook has been revised to specify 5-year target for successful natural regeneration. Field visits confirmed that barriers to regeneration are understood and measures are taken to overcome them. Successful reforestation within required time limits is nearly always achieved. An exception to the 2-year limit for planting pine is appropriate due to the need to avoid pine beetle infestation. | X | | |
| CI 2 | Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration. | “NR Adm. Code 1.24” specifies this policy, and designation is recorded on 2460 form. Foresters make regeneration decisions (during reconnaissance and while writing prescriptions) based on Silviculture & Forest Aesthetics Handbook (MC 2210). | X | | |
| CI 3 | Clear criteria to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct under-stocked areas. | Regeneration method and type (plant or natural) are provided on 2460 Form “Timber Sale Notice and Cutting Report” for all sites visited. Reviewed Silviculture & Forest Aesthetics Handbook (MC 2210) and confirmed that it has comprehensive and detailed procedures for regeneration harvests for all forest types and for surveying regeneration, with ties to habitat typing. Criteria exist for some (e.g. Aspen) but not all (e.g. Hemlock-Hardwood) types. OFI 2: There is an opportunity to improve the clarity of regeneration targets for all types. | | | X |
| CI 4 | Compliance with applicable state laws and regulations mandating successful <i>reforestation</i> . | Field observations confirmed that successful reforestation nearly always achieved quickly, and regeneration delays are rare. Handbook methods for regeneration are strictly followed. | X | | |
| CI 5 | Plantings of exotic tree species are <i>minimized</i> . | Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited in County Forests that exotic species are not planted. | X | | |
| CI 6 | Research documentation is available that <i>exotic tree species</i> , planted operationally, pose minimal risk. | No exotics are planted- confirmed by field observations at all sites visited. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 7 | Protection of desirable or planned advanced <i>natural regeneration during harvest</i> . | Field observations at all sites visited confirmed very consistent high levels of regeneration protection through use of appropriate logging equipment, well-planned harvest road and trail systems, frozen-ground logging, and contract enforcement by regular and thorough inspections during active harvests. | X | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.2.1.2 | Program Participants shall promote state-level reporting of the overall rates of reforestation success and afforestation. | MF | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | A system to accurately report <i>reforestation</i> information for the SFI annual report and, where applicable, State Implementation Committee reports. | 2460 Form “Harvest Plan Timbersale Notice”, Plantation reports and recon system provide such a system. Accomplishment reporting system reviewed in Jeff Barkley’s office. | X | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.2.1.3 | Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment. | DP | X | | | | 2 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> for the appropriate application and handling of forest chemicals, including legal compliance, storage, transport, spills, drift, signage, public notification and information, restriction of access and retention of records. | Reviewed manual codes: 4221.1 Hazardous Materials use and storage, 4230.1 Pesticide use and Storage | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 2 | Minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives. | Reviewed AR NR50. Actual volumes of chemical use shown on "Plantation and Cultural Report". Interviewed Jane Cummings Carlson, Forest Health Specialist: confirmed consultations for pest man. Prescriptions. | X | | |
| CI 3 | Use of narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective. | Interviewed Jane Cummings Carlson, Forest Health Specialist: Other than herbicides, forests chemicals rarely used: for gypsy moth use: BTK, Gypcheck (viral) which are low toxicity and generally narrow. For brush control Accord is used where it is known to be effective, and Tordon or Garlon is used for more persistent species (hazel, Buckthorn). | X | | |
| CI 4 | Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible. | Interviewed Jane Cummings Carlson, Forest Health Specialist Reviewed Silviculture Handbook. Field observations at all sites visited indicate that forest management methods generally do not rely heavily on forest chemicals, and many counties do not use any pesticides. Use is generally confined to problems with brush control during plantation establishment (hazel brush). Observed many examples of mechanical approaches to site preparation (bulldozer scarification, chain dragging, requirements for pole-skidding or summer logging) to avoid need for chemical use. Stands kept in healthy, vigorous condition. | X | | |
| CI 5 | System to achieve continuing compliance with applicable regulatory requirements. | Regulatory compliance is the major WI DNR responsibility, with strong oversight through County Forestry Liaisons in all counties. Confirmed procedures through interviews and document review. | X | | |
| CI 6 | Available regulatory action information demonstrates a commitment to legal compliance. | Confirmed by telephone interview with David Fredrickson, Director of Investigation and Compliance Department of Agriculture Trade and Consumer Protection that there are no violations or complaints against WI DNR or the county forest system. | X | | |
| CI 7 | All persons involved in forest chemical application are required to have appropriate training. | Although people involved had training in past, some have not maintained certification when only using general use pesticides. Foresters in counties with more extensive planting programs have certified applicators. See OFI below. | X | | |
| CI 8 | Designated state-trained or certified applicators supervise forest chemical applications. | Although people involved had training in past, some have not maintained certification when only using general use pesticides. Foresters in counties with more extensive planting programs have certified applicators. OFI 3: There is an opportunity to improve chemical training for responsible person, not just when restricted use pesticides are applied and not just for the contracted applicator. | | | X |
| CI 9 | Relevant copies of state and federal laws for forest chemical use are accessible at appropriate locations. | Confirmed availability of regulations and copies of MSDS sheets. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 10 | Participation in research projects to: a. increase efficiency; b. reduce chemical use rates; and c. Apply Integrated Pest Management where feasible. | Operational experimentation with timing do occur, and some counties have trials to test reduced use of chemicals or alternative approaches such as mechanical scarification. OFI 4: There is an opportunity to improve documentation of chemical trials, using existing database developed by Colleen Matula or other mechanisms that would ensure that this information is available to other interested forest managers. | | | X |
| CI 11 | Chemicals applied using <i>Best Management Practices</i> appropriate to the situation; for example: a. compliance with label instructions and requirements; b. adjoining landowners or nearby residents notified of applications and chemicals used; c. appropriate multi-lingual signs or oral warnings used; d. public road access controlled during and after applications; e. streamside and other needed buffer strips appropriately designated; f. positive shut-off and minimal drift spray valves used; g. drift minimized by aerially applying forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones; h. water quality monitored or other methods used to assure proper equipment use and stream protection; i. granular formulations and spot or strip applications used appropriately; j. chemicals stored at appropriate locations, or k. state reports filed as required. | Confirmed at all counties visited where chemicals are used more than sporadically by interviews, review of documents and some field observations. Items a, b, c, d, e, f, g, j, and k a strong component of the program. Item h water quality monitoring is not a part of the program, but treatments are generally buffered widely from streams. Observed backpack sprayers in shops or chemical storage outbuildings. Item I is a strength, in that most counties that use chemicals extensively have the ability to use spot or ground application. | X | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.2.1.4 | Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity. | DP, MF | | | | X | 2 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity. | Management Plan Sections 500 and 700 specify BMP policy. Confirmed that WI Statutes 28.04 include this policy. State developed comprehensive BMPs. Policies exist for training and monitoring. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 2 | Soils maps used where available. | Confirmed by reviewing GIS (Washburn) or reviewing Form 2460 “Harvest Plan Timbersale Notice” in selected counties. Habitat type system extensively employed – this provides equivalent guidance. | X | | |
| CI 3 | A process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance. | Confirmed in selected counties by asking field foresters how they use soils information to avoid excessive soil disturbance: experience and knowledge of land base, soil texture, habitat type. Habitat type system extensively employed – this provides guidance regarding soil moisture class and potential for compaction. Form 2460 or harvest requirements (listed in bid package and then appended to sale contract) included dry season or winter logging designation when appropriate. Foresters inspect ongoing harvests at least once weekly, and more often when conditions are suspect. Contract provisions allow foresters to halt operations. | X | | |
| CI 4 | Use of erosion control measures to <i>minimize</i> the loss of soil and site <i>productivity</i> . | Field observations confirmed that erosion control measures including planning, implementation, and post-harvest techniques were appropriately employed. Erosion appears quite uncommon. | X | | |
| CI 5 | Field observations indicate that post harvest conditions are conducive to maintaining site <i>productivity</i> (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, <i>minimized skid trails</i> , etc.). | Field observations showed proper locations of skid trails, substantial retention of woody debris on site, and generally limited rutting. However, some sites showed modest levels of ruts and soil compaction which, if repeated in future harvest entries, could contribute to cumulative effects on soil productivity. OFI 5: There is an opportunity to improve the consistent definition of excessive rutting and to better understand the long-term effects of compaction and rutting. | | | X |
| CI 6 | Field observations indicate that, where practicing partial harvesting, vigorous trees are retained consistent with silvicultural norms for the area. | Field Observations at most sites showed that vigorous trees are normally retained consistent with recommended silvicultural practices guidelines. Marked sales visited further confirmed that the best quality and most vigorous trees are retained and the least healthy trees removed, with limited exceptions. Two sites visited during the certification audit had more large vigorous trees removed than indicated by Silviculture guidelines, and thus fewer small, poor quality trees removed in order to meet target for minimum basal area (75 square feet per acre). Even in this case some residual trees were vigorous, but average strand vigor was reduced. | | X | |
| CI 7 | Criteria to address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil <i>productivity</i> in place. | Confirmed timber sale contract allows foresters to stop jobs. BMPs used as general guide, but criteria for excessive rutting are quite varied from forester to forester. One contract uses “consistent 6 inch rutting” as criteria, others use 12 inches, and allowable length of these ruts varied from “a few feet” to 25 feet. Position within sale (main skid trail vs. secondary trails) is also a factor. See OFI 5 in CI 5 above. | | | X |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 8 | Road construction is kept to the <i>minimum</i> necessary to meet management <i>objectives</i> efficiently. | Road mileage is tracked and “certified” by County Forestry Program Specialist. Road systems are configured to allow efficient access for forest management, fire protection, and recreation. | X | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.2.1.5 | <i>Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.</i> | DP | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> to protect forests from damaging agents. | Section 600 of County Management Plans contains subsections for forest health and protection including fire control, pest control, and theft. Chapter 26.30 of Wisconsin state statutes provide state’s policy. | X | | |
| CI 2 | Forests managed in a healthy and productive condition to <i>minimize</i> susceptibility to damaging agents. | Confirmed by field observations at most sites visited. Reviewed “2002 Forest Health Condition” annual report. Excellent residual stands at all nearly all sites visited during the baseline and Certification Audits (exception noted under 4.1.2.1.4, CI 6 above.) | X | | |
| CI 3 | Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs. | WI DNR responsibility. Interviewed Jane Cummings Carlson, Forest Health Supervisor. Confirmed extensive DNR fire and pest control programs. Confirmed that field foresters receive, read, retain, and utilize pest control bulletins and annual pest reports. DNR field staff and county staff participate extensively in fire training and provide manpower for fire-fighting crews that are dispatched to other states, gaining invaluable experience. Extensive fire break system observed in one county where fire risk for pine plantations is quite high. | X | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.2.1.6 | Program Participants that utilize genetically improved seedlings, including those derived through biotechnology, shall use sound scientific methods and follow all appropriate federal and state regulations and other internationally applicable protocols. | MF | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of <i>genetically improved seedlings</i> . | Reviewed WI forest and tree improvement plan, which describes seed zone approach and general tree improvement approaches. OFI 6: There is an opportunity to clarify the policy for use of genetically improved trees. | X | | |
| CI 2 | All applicable federal and state regulations and international protocols followed for research and deployment of trees derived from <i>genetic tree improvement</i> and <i>biotechnology</i> . | None currently exist | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | Seed zones used | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

Objective 3: Protect the water quality in streams, lakes and other waterbodies.

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.3.1.1 | Program Participants shall meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved state water quality programs and meet or exceed all applicable state water quality laws and regulations and the requirements of the federal Clean Water Act. | DP, MF | | | | X | 1 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> to implement state BMPs during all phases of management activities. | State developed comprehensive BMPs. Management Plan Sections 500 and 700 specify BMP policy. | X | | |
| CI 2 | Field staff and contractors trained in water quality laws and state <i>BMPs</i> . | Confirmed WI DNR and FISTA training by interviews and review of training records for selected foresters. Not all road building/road maintenance personnel have received BMP training. Training records for county staff are not complete in some cases, making it difficult for managers to be certain that all field staff are trained. New foresters may not have received much formal BMP training in school, and some delay may occur before they receive BMP training while employed. | | X | |
| CI 3 | A system to achieve continuing compliance with applicable regulatory requirements. | WI DNR responsibility: confirmed strong oversight role through County Forestry Liaisons. System: training-timber sale prescriptions-contracts-inspections-closeout. Liaison foresters approve of all key phases. | X | | |
| CI 4 | <i>Available regulatory action information</i> demonstrates a commitment to legal compliance. | Confirmed with wetlands regulators | X | | |
| CI 5 | Contract provisions specify <i>BMP</i> compliance. | Confirmed in contracts in 6 of 7 county forests visited. Not Taylor, although Taylor does include BMPs in design of projects | | X | |
| CI 6 | Plans are in place to address wet weather <i>events</i> (e.g., <i>inventory</i> systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc.). | Field observations and interviews with foresters confirmed in county forests visited. Form 2460 often included dry season or winter logging designation. Contracts have wet weather shut-down clause. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 7 | Monitoring of overall <i>BMP</i> implementation. | Reviewed two documents that report on BMP monitoring: a. “The 2002 State-wide BMP Monitoring Report. By Wisconsin’s Forestry BMPs for Water Quality; “The 1995-1997 BMP Monitoring Report” Both reports indicate good to excellent BMP conformance and effectiveness. These efforts focus on BMPs related to water quality, with a focus on riparian zones. Likewise, regular timber sale inspections, both during and at the completion of harvests, tend to focus on the same issues, with less manager attention being paid to the broad set of forestry BMPs. OFI 7: There is an opportunity to improve monitoring of BMPs for all phases of operations (e.g. road building, chemical applications, site preparation). | | | X |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.3.1.2 | <i>Program Participant shall develop (where they do not currently exist), implement and document riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.</i> | DP | X | | | | 2 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> addressing management and <i>protection</i> of waterbody and <i>riparian</i> zones. | Confirmed that WI Statutes 28.04 include this policy. Management plans & 2460s combined comprise relevant management & protection policies. Strong BMPs and shore land zoning policy (NR 115) confirmed. | X | | |
| CI 2 | Perennial streams, lakes and other <i>riparian</i> zones mapped as specified in state <i>BMPs</i> and, where appropriate, identified on the ground. | Confirmed in county forests visited. Confirmed GIS layer for these features in Washburn County. Lincoln and Eau Claire provided paper maps with riparian features identified. Confirmed RMZ paint at Field TS sites, with limited exceptions. | X | | |
| CI 3 | Field observations indicate that waterbody and <i>riparian</i> zone management and <i>protection</i> plans are implemented. | Confirmed in county forests visited. Riparian zones are generally painted onto trees prior to starting harvests, and these zones are nearly universally respected, though one example of “logger error” was observed. OFI 8: There is an opportunity to improve riparian and other protections and BMP implementation to protect water quality by having individual counties encourage and support logger training in order to improve the understanding of forest protection measures in timber sales (currently DNR Madison staff are primarily responsible for meeting these SFI requirements). | | | X |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 4 | <i>Non-forested wetlands</i> , including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size, are identified and protected. | Major non-forested wetlands are identified in Master Plans, and BMPs require their protection. Smaller wetland areas within stands are protected on many but not all timber sales inspected. OFI 9: There is an opportunity to improve protections for vernal pools and other small wetlands. | | | X |
| CI 5 | A system in place to achieve continuing compliance with applicable regulatory requirements. | WI DNR responsibility: confirmed strong oversight role through County Forestry Liaisons. System: training-timber sale prescriptions-contracts-inspections-closeout. Liaison foresters approve of all key phases. Good comprehensive system, although in some cases DNR foresters may be reluctant to reject timber sales. | X | | |
| CI 6 | <i>Available regulatory action information</i> demonstrates a commitment to legal compliance. | Confirmed with wetlands regulators. | X | | |
| CI 7 | Where regulations or <i>BMPs</i> do not currently exist to protect <i>riparian</i> areas, experts are involved in identifying appropriate <i>protection</i> measures. | Regulations and BMPs exist. | NA | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.3.1.3 | Program Participants shall, individually, through cooperative efforts, or through AF&PA, provide funding for water quality research. | MF | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Current financial or in-kind support for research. | WI DNR responsible for such support-extensive research programs discussed in Madison. Confirmed extensive support for research by State of Wisconsin university system, with some direct funding by DNR (The 2002 State-wide BMP Monitoring Report, Wisconsin's Forestry BMPs for Water Quality). Confirmed participation by WI DNR in cooperative research and pilot project of USFS by observing work in field and interviewing a monitoring team on the FRSF. | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | Evidence of county forest use for specific research projects was provided. OFI: Access to and documentation of this research could be improved. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.3.1.4 | Program Participants shall require BMP training for employees in forest management and wood procurement operations and shall encourage training for forest management and harvesting contractors. | MF | | | | X | 1 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> to train those employees and operators responsible for implementing <i>BMPs</i> to protect water quality. | WI DNR actively involved in development and implementation of logger training. OFI 8: There is an opportunity to improve riparian and other protections (4.1.3.1.2 CI 3.) and BMP implementation to protect water quality (4.1.3.1.4 CI 1) by having individual counties encourage and support logger training in order to improve the understanding of forest protection measures in timber sales (currently DNR Madison staff are primarily responsible for meeting these SFI requirements). | | | X |
| CI 2 | <i>BMP</i> training sessions for employees are required and documented and similar sessions are encouraged and documented for contractors. | Although available from the training organization, BMP training is not documented for contractors and training records for county field staff vary widely in their comprehensiveness. All WI DNR staff have training records maintained, although there are some gaps in computerized versions of these records, particularly for BMP training sessions held during the mid 1990s. Training sessions for BMPs for employees are not always recorded. | | X | |
| | Other Indicators | | | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

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

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.4.1.1 | <i>Program participants shall have policies to promote habitat diversity at stand- and landscape- levels.</i> | GZ | X | | | | 2 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> to promote wildlife <i>habitat</i> diversity, forest types, ecological or natural community types and the <i>conservation of biological diversity</i> . | Management Plan Section 500 Wildlife Management includes provisions that cover these policies. Management Plan Section 800 Integrated Resource Management includes additional provisions at cutting edge of practice (not all counties have these). Guidelines in DNR Manual Codes including Guidelines for Defining Forest-Wildlife Habitat Management (2112) Forest Opening Maintenance and Construction (2112.1) Deeryard Improvement Program (2112.2). Silviculture guide includes wildlife provisions, and ecological landscape guide is being developed. | X | | |
| CI 2 | Programs to protect federally listed threatened and endangered species. | State endangered species law listing process. Interviewed Rebecca Schroeder, Bureau of Endangered Resources. Management Plans Section 500 Wildlife Management. NHI Process for information on known. Karner Blue Butterfly programs exist at County level. Observed on the ground site management and protection for wolf, Karner Blue Butterfly, raptors. | X | | |
| CI 3 | Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of <i>critically imperiled and imperiled species</i> and communities. Plans for <i>protection</i> may be developed independently or collaboratively, and may include <i>Program Participant</i> management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges or other conservation strategies. | NHI Process: Bureau of Endangered Resources can query the Heritage Database for G1 and G2 species and communities. These sites are listed in Mgmt Plans, and protection plans included. Most hits aquatic, and thus well protected by riparian buffer & protection practices. DNR Biologists in the regions (counties) are consulted for location, management, & protection advice. Conservation plans are being implemented (wolf, Karner Blue Butterfly) | X | | |
| CI 4 | Training or education for appropriate personnel in endangered species identification and <i>protection</i> , and <i>critically imperiled and imperiled species</i> and communities. | Counties generally rely on DNR Biologists in the regions. Confirmed through interviews and review of selected training records that these biologists are very well trained and experienced in these issues. OFI 10: There is an opportunity to improve training or education for field personnel in endangered species identification and protection and in identifying and conserving rare and unique biological communities. | | | X |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 5 | <i>Policy</i> or plan that sets criteria for <i>stand-level wildlife</i> habitat elements to be retained (<i>e.g.</i> , snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, nest trees). | Retention done well in most stands visited. State guidance documents and management plans are limited (<i>e.g.</i> Silviculture Handbook recommends 2 to 4 snags per acre). Few harvest plans provide additional details. Concerns from counties about leaving snags (OSHA). OFI 11: There is an opportunity to improve quantitative guidelines for stand level retention to ensure more consistent implementation. | | | X |
| CI 6 | System to achieve continual compliance with applicable regulatory requirements. | WI DNR responsibility – strong oversight role through County Forestry Liaisons. Core indicators, taken collectively, comprise such a system. | X | | |
| CI 7 | <i>Available regulatory action information</i> demonstrates a commitment to legal compliance. | There have been no regulatory actions for RTE issues against DNR or individual counties. | X | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.4.1.2 | <i>Program participants shall, individually, through cooperative efforts or through AF&PA, provide funding for research to improve the science and understanding of wildlife management at stand- or landscape- levels, ecosystem functions and the conservation of biological diversity.</i> | GZ | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Current financial or in-kind support for direct or cooperative research. | Research projects at county level include: Balsam fir Project, Iron County; Permanent Hardwood Plots, Iron County; Pennsylvania Sedge Study, Oneida County. WI DNR responsible for such support: WI DNR provides \$80,000 per year as a portion of the base salary of Dr. David Mladenoff, UW Madison Landscape Ecologist. In house research by Forest Wildlife Research group and research on old growth.. | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | | | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.4.1.3 | <i>Program participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.</i> | GZ | X | | | | 1 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Collection of information on <i>critically imperiled</i> and <i>imperiled species</i> and communities and other biodiversity-related data through forest <i>inventory</i> 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. | NHI databases used throughout county system. Interviewed Rebecca Schroeder, Bureau of Endangered Resources to confirm that programs and personnel exist to accomplish required tasks. Confirmed collection and ready availability of such information by querying database through Janelle Schlagen. Interviewed Randy Hoffman, BER who has conducted preliminary work on 2/3 of counties, and some counties have had more intensive work, with several completely surveyed. | X | | |
| CI 2 | Training or education for appropriate personnel in identifying and conserving rare and unique biological communities. | Counties generally rely on DNR Biologists in the regions, and these biologists are very knowledgeable. OFI 10: There is an opportunity to improve training or education for field foresters in endangered species identification and protection and in identifying and conserving rare and unique biological communities. | | | X |
| CI 3 | A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions. | Each county in the program has an assigned WI DNR biologist who meets at least annually, and for special projects. Extent of involvement varies by county (for example Oneida County has developed pre-sale checklist which gets biologist input ahead of activities. | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | The Bureau of Science provides this service (keeping current). Reviewed an extraordinary number of handbooks and guidelines. Wisconsin Bird Conservation Initiative (keep common birds common) is led by Clark County forester as the WCFA liaison. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

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

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.5.1.1 | <i>Program Participants shall have policies to manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.</i> | MF, DP | | X | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> to address <i>visual quality</i> management. | Confirmed by reviewing: NR44 Master plan rule Silviculture Handbook-2nd half is aesthetics. Management Plan Section 500 Aesthetic Management provides policies based on several zones. | X | | |
| CI 2 | Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern. | Confirmed by field observations at all locations visited . All timber harvest sites were managed with care to maintain visual quality, with focus on sites near roads and recreation sites. A variety of methods were used, including harvest unit size and layout, retention of individual and clumps of live trees, varying silvicultural methods, and attention of slash and landing appearance. | X | | |
| CI 3 | Foresters trained in principles of landscape architecture or <i>visual quality management</i> . | Interviewed field foresters in each county visited. Foresters interviewed do have such training (as part of Society of American Forester accredited forestry training). Most foresters have degrees from either UW Madison or Stevens Point, where training in these areas is part of standard forestry training. | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | | | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.5.1.2 | <i>Program Participants shall develop and adopt appropriate policies for managing the size, shape and placement of clearcut harvests.</i> | MF | X | | | | 1 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> to monitor and report on clearcut size and number. | Harvest unit sizes are monitored and recorded. Several clearcuts often included in single unit if they are located within the same forest type (stand). Note: Most stand types are not managed using clearcut harvests. Aspen and jack pine regenerated through clearcuts. | X | | |
| CI 2 | Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to <i>forest health</i> emergencies or other natural catastrophes. | Confirmed in field visits to all counties that average clearcut sizes are quite small, estimated at under 30 acres. Average sale size is small, 58 acres, and many sales that involve clearcuts have divided the clearcuts into smaller patches separated by wide zones where partial or no harvests occur. | X | | |
| CI 3 | Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating the average size. | The system used to determine average clearcut size is the timber sale notice and approval process, which is designed to meet multiple goals. System is not able to discriminate patches within silvicultural treatment blocks. Several clearcuts often included in single unit if they are within the same forest type (stand). Thus reports of clearcut size are currently overestimates. OFI12: There is an opportunity to improve the process for calculating the average size of clearcuts. | | | X |
| CI 4 | Access to state laws regulating clearcut size and arrangement at appropriate locations. | No such state-wide laws exist. Handbook provisions are followed. | NA | | |
| CI 5 | System to achieve continual compliance with applicable regulatory requirements. | No such requirements exist. | NA | | |
| CI 6 | <i>Available regulatory action information</i> demonstrates a commitment to legal compliance. | No regulatory requirements exist. | NA | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.5.1.3 | Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or other, more comprehensive methods that provide age, habitat, and aesthetic diversity. | MF | X | | | | 1 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written policy implementing the green-up requirement. | SFI-specific policy is not in place. Current policies and practices for diversity are quite strong, and lead to excellent visual performance. OFI 13: There is an opportunity to clarify the policy of not placing clearcuts adjacent unless already “green” meaning 3 years old or 5 feet high. | | | X |
| CI 2 | Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement. | GIS or paper maps combined with Recon system (preharvest or compartment exams) provide tracking system. Field observations indicate universal compliance. | X | | |
| CI 3 | Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clearcut, or a more comprehensive method to reach the performance measure exists. | Confirmed universal compliance at all sites in field visits to all counties visited. Average sale size is low, under 50 acres, and most clearcuts are half that size or smaller. Regeneration on most clearcuts (aspen sprouts) is 5 feet tall in one or two growing seasons. | X | | |
| CI 4 | Copies of state laws requiring green-up are on file at appropriate locations, where applicable. | No such laws exist | NA | | |
| CI 5 | A system to achieve continual compliance with applicable regulatory requirements. | No such requirements exist. | NA | | |
| CI 6 | Available regulatory action information demonstrates a commitment to legal compliance. | No regulatory requirements exist. | NA | | |
| | Other Indicators | | | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.5.1.4 | <i>Program Participants shall use harvest methods, age classes and judicious placement of harvest units to promote diversity across the forest landscape.</i> | MF | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written policy to promote diversity of forest cover across the <i>landscape</i> . | A variety of policies are in place which promote and provide for diversity of forest cover including: Forest Management Plan Sections for Visual Management Zones and for Wildlife Habitat Diversity; Guidelines in DNR Manual Codes including Guidelines for Defining Forest-Wildlife Habitat Management (2112) Forest Opening Maintenance and Construction (2112.1) Deeryard Improvement Program (2112.2) and Public Forest Lands Handbook (2460.5); and Forest Aesthetics section of the Silvicultural Handbook (2431.5). | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | Confirmed by extensive observations made in substantial cross-sections of all county forests visited. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

Objective 6: Manage Program Participant lands of ecologic, geologic, cultural or historic significance in a manner that recognizes their special qualities.

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.6.1.1 | <i>Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.</i> | DW | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> to identify, map and manage special sites. | Management Plan Section 500 (including misc. subsections) contents vary by county but could include a wide variety of recreation sites (parks, various trails, campsites), protected or habitat management areas, and historic sites. | X | | |
| CI 2 | Obtain existing natural heritage data and cooperate with those with expertise in identifying or selecting sites for <i>protection</i> of significant ecologic, geologic, <i>cultural</i> or historic qualities. | Consultation is done through the NHI Process: Bureau of Endangered Resources and with the State Historic Preservation Officer | X | | |
| CI 3 | Map and catalogue existing sites. | GIS system layer or maps include: Archaeological Sites, and Natural Heritage Inventory hits. State archaeologist has better data than NHI layer. OFI 10: There is an opportunity to improve training or education for field foresters in identification of culturally or historically significant sites, and to utilize the best readily available information (state archaeologist). | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | Management plans, programs, and protections for special sites were strong in all counties visited. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

Objective 7: Promote the efficient use of forest resources.

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.1.7.1.1 | <i>Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology, in-woods manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of trees harvested, where consistent with other SFIS objectives.</i> | DP | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> to address efficient utilization of trees. | Contracts include utilization requirements, which vary from 3.5” to 4” d.i.b. for pulpwood. Some have detailed timber and boltwood specifications as well. | X | | |
| CI 2 | Auditing or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization. | Timber sale inspection field forms include some utilization comments. WI DNR Liaison Foresters often perform sale “close out process” and have oversight responsibility. Inspection forms are included in the review (monitoring) system for each timber sale. | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | Confirmed in most sites visited that utilization is very good. Occasional high stumps and some small but merchantable material was observed, but this later item must be balanced against the need to retain coarse woody debris. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

Objective 8: Broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by cooperating with forest landowners, wood producers, consulting foresters and Program Participants employees who have responsibility in wood procurement and landowner assistance programs.

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.2.1.1.1 | <i>Program Participants shall encourage landowners to reforest following harvest and to use Best Management Practices.</i> | MF | | X | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> to supply information or services to forest landowners. | This is the responsibility of the WI DNR, which has a significant program of promotion and forestry support to forest landowners in a range of areas, including marketing and utilization, forest protection, Silviculture and reforestation, wildlife habitat protection, and endangered species protection. Reviewed “Forest Management Guidelines”, which are designed to provide a full range of information to landowners. MFL program provides services. | X | | |
| CI 2 | Support for the development of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners. | Forest Management Guidelines have been developed by WI DNR. The publication has won a national award for quality. | X | | |
| CI 3 | <i>BMP</i> or regeneration training courses, as appropriate, provided for <i>procurement</i> staff. | | NA | | |
| CI 4 | A verifiable auditing or monitoring system in place to evaluate the results of promoting <i>reforestation</i> and use of <i>Best Management Practices</i> within wood supply systems, and the use of that information to set goals for continual improvement. | | NA | | |
| CI 5 | Cooperation with federal, state or regional government <i>resource assessments</i> . | Forest Health Monitoring is led by WI DNR. Reviewed two documents that report on BMP monitoring: “The 2002 State-wide BMP Monitoring Report by Wisconsin’s Forestry BMPs for Water Quality”; & “The 1995-1997 BMP Monitoring Report”. Both reports indicate good to excellent BMP conformance and effectiveness. | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | | | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.2.1.1.2 | Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies and others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers. | MF | X | | | | 1 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> promoting professional training of wood producers. | OFI 8: There is an opportunity to improve riparian and other protections and BMP implementation to protect water quality by having individual counties encourage and support logger training in order to improve the understanding of forest protection measures in timber sales (currently DNR Madison staff are primarily responsible for meeting these SFI requirements). | | | X |
| CI 2 | Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees in the development and administration of wood producer training courses that include: a. awareness of <i>sustainable forestry principles</i> ; b. <i>Best Management Practices</i> , including road construction and retirement, site preparation, streamside management, etc.; c. regeneration, forest resource <i>conservation</i> and aesthetics; d. awareness of responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act and other measures to protect wildlife <i>habitat</i> ; e. logging safety; f. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and wage and hour rules; g. transportation issues; h. business management; and i. public policy and outreach. | Colette Matthews, Executive Director of the Wisconsin County Forests Association is a member of the Wisconsin SFI State Implementation Committee and is involved in a number of organizations that provide such training, including FISTA and the Master Logger Program. Paul Pingrey, DNR Forest Certification – Private Forestry Specialist and Darrell Zastrow are involved as well. FISTA provides comprehensive training, and WI DNR supports FISTA training with speakers and technical content. This was confirmed by interview with Barb Henderson, Executive Director FISTA-Forest Industry Safety and Training Alliance: | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | | | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.2.1.1.3 | Program Participants shall annually report relevant information. | MF | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Maintenance of a system to report information annually including: a. the number of landowners who receive information about the SFI program, forest regeneration, <i>BMPs</i> , and wildlife <i>habitat</i> management from contractors, company employees and others; and b. the percentage of wood delivered by qualified logging professionals. | a. Cooperative Forestry Mgmt/Landowner Assistance National Association of State Foresters, State Forestry Statistics Questionnaire 2002 Number of landowner contacts per year -13,355 b. Not applicable | X | | |
| CI 2 | Support of SFI Implementation Committee efforts to collect and report appropriate information. | Colette Matthews, Executive Director of the Wisconsin County Forests Association, is on S.I.C. Paul Pingrey, DNR Forest Certification – Private Forestry Specialist and Darrell Zastrow are involved as well. | X | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.2.1.1.4 | Program Participants shall encourage landowners to utilize the services of qualified resource professionals and qualified logging professionals in applying principles of sustainable forest management on their lands. | MF | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> to promote the use of <i>qualified resource</i> and logging professionals. | Forest Management Guidelines and considerable advice are provided to a large number of landowners. This includes a program of cooperating consultants and suggestions on timber sale administration. DNR program responsible, and policy changes are in progress. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 2 | List of qualified logging professionals maintained. | Reviewed 2003 Directory of Foresters. Master Logger Program is receiving increasing emphasis and support in Wisconsin. There is no current list of trained loggers to provide to landowners, although the training status of individual loggers can be determined by contacting FISTA or industrial landowners. "DNR foresters do, however, encourage landowners who have a plan that prescribes a harvest to contact the WI Dept. of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection for complaints against loggers and to check references." Thus the combination of the bidders list and the opportunity to check on complaints and training provide the ability to direct landowners to qualitative loggers. | X | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.2.1.1.5 | Program Participants shall ensure that their commitment to the SFIS Principles is communicated throughout their organization. | MF | | | | X | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Written <i>policy</i> statement of commitment to the SFIS that is communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood <i>procurement</i> operations and field foresters. | The individual counties and the WI DNR have not committed to the implementation of SFI as yet. The same general principles are being followed as the basis of the entire program. However no specific policy exists at this time. | | X | |
| CI 2 | Participation in training programs for appropriate personnel. | SIC participation by Colette Matthews, Executive Director of the Wisconsin County Forests Association and extensive involvement in certification process by Jeff Barkley and other Madison central office staff and selected DNR and County field staff. There have been several SFI-specific training or informational sessions for county foresters and/or their representatives. | X | | |
| CI 3 | The number of staff completing training programs is documented and reported. | There are not training records consistently maintained for county employees in all counties (see CA-2004-03). However the DNR Forest Certification and/or County Forestry Specialists have compiled records of SFI specific training and meetings that include staff and county foresters who participated. | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | | | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.2.1.1.6 | Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups and programs like the American Tree Farm System, to educate and assist forest landowners, and to encourage them to apply principles of sustainable forest management. | MF | | X | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Support for efforts of SFI Program Implementation Committees. | Colette Matthews, Executive Director of the Wisconsin County Forests Association, is on S.I.C. Paul Pingrey, DNR Forest Certification – Private Forestry Specialist and Darrell Zastrow are involved in SIC activities and attend meetings. DNR employees interact with SIC members regularly on educational issues, and provide substantial leadership and funding for efforts to encourage sustainable forestry. | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | Foresters in counties, both DNR and County Foresters, are involved in a wide variety of educational and outreach activities including the American Tree Farm System, programs in schools, field tours and hands-on learning activities for school and youth groups. | X | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.2.1.1.7 | Program Participants shall clearly define and implement their own policies to ensure that mill inventories and procurement practices do not compromise adherence to the Principles of Sustainable Forestry. | NA | | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---------------|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | <i>Procurement policy</i> in place for the purchase of raw material from qualified logging professionals, wood producers and <i>other wood suppliers</i> . | NA | | | |
| CI 2 | Policies in place to address adverse weather conditions. | NA | | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.2.1.1.8 | <i>Procurement practices contribute to protection of legally designated conservation areas.</i> | NA | | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|---------------|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | <i>Procurement policies in place that contribute to elimination of illegal logging.</i> | NA | | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.2.1.1.9 | <i>Procurement policies promote conservation of biodiversity hotspots and major tropical wilderness areas.</i> | NA | | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|---------------|-----------|----|-------------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | <i>Procurement policies that promote conservation of forests in areas outside of North America identified as biodiversity hotspots and major tropical wilderness areas.</i> | NA | | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

Objective 9: Publicly report Program Participants progress in fulfilling their commitment to sustainable forestry.

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.3.1.1.1 | Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI program on their compliance with the SFIS. | MF | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Record keeping tracks all the categories of information needed for annual progress reports. | Reviewed record-keeping database with Jeff Barkley and confirmed the records are comprehensive and current | X | | |
| CI 2 | Prompt response to the annual SFI survey questionnaire. | Although no surveys have yet been conducted, a system is in place. Darrell Zastrow facilitates information for state committee | NA | | |
| CI 3 | Copies of past reports maintained to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFIS. | WI DNR joined program after most recently survey period, so there are no past reports. | NA | | |
| | Other Indicators | | | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

Objective 10: Provide opportunities for the public and the forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry.

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.3.2.1.1 | <i>Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education and involvement related to forest management.</i> | MF | | X | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education and technical assistance (e.g., 800 numbers, environmental education, or private and public sector technical assistance programs). | Colette Matthews, Executive Director of the Wisconsin County Forests Association, is on S.I.C. in Wisconsin. Paul Pingrey, DNR Forest Certification–Private Forestry Specialist and Darrell Zastrow are involved as well. DNR employees interact with SIC members regularly on educational issues, and provide substantial leadership and funding for efforts to encourage sustainable forestry. For example Forest Management Guidelines document was published and considerable advice is provided to many landowners through the Managed Forest Law program. This includes a program of cooperating consultants and suggestions on timber sale administration. | X | | |
| | Other Indicators | County Forestry Committees and County Boards are an excellent mechanism for public involvement. Foresters in counties, both DNR and County Foresters, are involved in a wide variety of educational and outreach activities including the American Tree Farm System, programs in schools, field tours and hands-on learning activities for school and youth groups. | X | | |

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.3.2.1.2 | <i>Program Participants shall establish, at the state, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public or Program Participants regarding practices that appear to be inconsistent with the SFIS Principles and Objectives.</i> | MF | X | | | | |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | Support for SFI State Implementation Committee efforts to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, <i>Program Participants</i> and the public. | Colette Matthews, Executive Director of the Wisconsin County Forests Association, is on S.I.C. Paul Pingrey, DNR Forest Certification – Private Forestry Specialist and Darrell Zastrow are involved as well. | X | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement

Objective 11: Promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry and monitor, measure and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

| Performance Measure | | Auditor Responsible | ----- Check Only One ----- | | | | Total OFI |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.4.4.1.1 | <i>Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI program and policies, to make appropriate improvements in policies, and to inform their employees of changes.</i> | MF | X | | | | 1 |

| Core Indicators | | Auditor Notes | Effective | | OFI (marginally effective) |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| CI 1 | A system to review commitments, <i>policies</i> and procedures to evaluate effectiveness. | Existing state-wide audit of county forest system is not specific to SFI and generally focuses on financial issues. Record-keeping system excellent, and has formed a critical part of a systematic management review process for certification issues. The County Forest Certification Committee, an outreach of the Legislative Committee of the WCFA, and the Public Lands Certification Working Group are an integral part of the review process as well. Staff assignments in the Madison office are a major part of the system (see below). DNR and county personnel are kept well-informed, in part by the involvement of Colette Matthews in all aspects of forest certification. | X | | |
| CI 2 | A system for collecting, reviewing and reporting information to senior management regarding progress in achieving SFI <i>Objectives</i> and <i>Performance Measures</i> . | Existing state-wide management review system is not specific to SFI. However the designation of a Forest Certification Specialist (part of the duties of a very experienced Madison staff person) and the assignment of duties to members of the Public Lands Certification Working Group comprise a good start in this direction. Approaches to clarify responsibilities are continuing to evolve, confirmed by interviews and document review. Other OFIs indirectly pertain here. | X | | |
| CI 3 | Senior management annually reviews progress and determines what changes and improvements are necessary to continue achieving SFI conformance. | Confirmed that the existing state-wide management review system is functional through interviews, review of meeting documentation, and participation in gap-analysis and certification. There is ongoing high-level attention to certification. Changes to SFI system must be communicated to all appropriate personnel at state and county levels. OFI 14: There is an opportunity to improve management review specific to SFI. | | | X |
| | Other Indicators | | | | |

FC = Full Conformance EXR = Exceeds Requirements Major = Major Nonconformance Minor = Minor Nonconformance OFI = Opportunity for Improvement