



June 30, 2011

Ken Symes
Forestry Division Effectiveness and Outreach Section
Bureau of Forestry Business Services, WDNR
101 South Webster St Fr/4
Madison, WI 53703

Re: Draft ATFS Certification Audit Report

Dear Mr. Symes,

The NSF Audit Team is recommending pending certification to the American Tree Farm Program's requirements for the Wisconsin Manager Forest Law Tree Farm Group subject to approval by the Certification Board Reviewer assigned by NSF. This draft report provides a description of the audit process and findings, including the required "Public Report".

Please review this report for factual accuracy and provide corrections and suggested edits within two weeks. Also please provide any outstanding Corrective Action Plans in response to Corrective Action Requests (CARs) issued during the audit. Your CAR Plans should be provided through your NSF On-line Interface. Any questions should be directed to DeMarrion Boles - Phone: 734-827-5634 or Dboles@nsf-isr.org

Sincerely,

Norman Boatwright

Norman Boatwright
Co-Lead Auditor

ATFS Audit Report

American Tree Farm System Group Certification



for

Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group

June 30, 2011

Norman Boatwright

NSF-ISR

789 North Dixboro Road

Ann Arbor, MI 48105

888-NSF-9000

www.nsf-isr.org

ATFS Public Audit Report

The ATFS Program of the Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group has achieved conformance with the AFF 2010-2015 Standards of Sustainability for Forest Certification of Private Lands, according to the NSF-ISR ATFS Certification Audit Process.

The Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group was initially certified in 2005. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources manages a Group Certification program for non-industrial forestland enrolled in the Managed Forest Law (MFL). MFL Group Certification focuses on DNR's administration of the group and quality of management on member land. There are approximately 35,444 tree farms included in this certification that total approximately 2,397,229 acres (January 2011). These tree farms are scattered across the state.

The audit was performed by NSF-ISR on June 6-10, 2011 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci and Norman Boatwright, Co-Lead Auditor. Audit team members fulfill the qualification criteria for conducting ATFS Certification Audits contained in the AFF requirements. The objective of the audit was to assess conformance to the requirements of the American Tree Farm Program.

The scope of the ATFS Audit included the enrolled Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Program members that elected to take part in the certification. Forest practices that were the focus of field inspections included those that have been under active management over the planning period of the past 5 years. In addition practices conducted earlier were also reviewed as appropriate (regeneration and BMP issues, for example). The management obligations of the group were also reviewed.

Some of the ATFS requirements were outside of the scope of Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group's ATFS program and were excluded from the scope of the ATFS Certification Audit as follows:

- Performance Measure 4.3 - When used, prescribed fire must conform with forest owner's objectives, the forest management plan and pre-fire planning. Prescribed fire is not generally used in central and northern hardwood management.

No indicators were modified.

ATFS Audit Process

NSF-ISR initiated the ATFS audit process with a Readiness Review to confirm the scope of the audit, review the ATFS Indicators and evidence to be used to assess conformance, verify that Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group was prepared to proceed to the ATFS Certification Audit, and to prepare a detailed audit plan. NSF then conducted the ATFS Re-Certification Audit of conformance to the ATFS Standard. A report was prepared and final approval was done by an independent Certification Board Member assigned by NSF. Follow-up or Surveillance Audits are required. The initial Surveillance Audit is scheduled for May 21, 2012.

The actual NSF-ISR ATFS Re-Certification Audit was governed by a detailed Audit Plan designed to enable the audit team to determine conformance with the applicable ATFS requirements. The plan included detailed provisions for the assembly and review of audit evidence consisting of documents, interviews, and on-site inspections of ongoing or completed forest practices.

During the audit NSF-ISR reviewed a sample of the written documentation assembled to provide objective evidence of ATFS Conformance. NSF-ISR also selected field sites for inspection based upon the risk of environmental impact, likelihood of occurrence, special features, and other criteria outlined in the NSF-ISR ATFS-SOP. NSF-ISR also selected and interviewed stakeholders such as contract loggers, landowners and

other interested parties, and interviewed employees within the organization to confirm that the ATFS Standard was understood and actively implemented.

The possible findings of the audit included Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, and Opportunities for Improvement.

Overview of Audit Findings

Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group's ATFS Program was found to be in full conformance with the ATFS Standard. The NSF-ISR ATFS Certification Audit Process determined that there 2 minor non-conformances that are described herein:

1. **1.1b and 1.1b.1 Group Organization must identify Group Members' category and Group Organization *must* document the group member category.** WDNR has not assigned or documented Group Members' category.
2. **3.1b IMG Inspectors of the Group Organization conducting internal monitoring *must* have completed the current ATFS Tree Farm Inspector training course.** WDNR's policy is that all county foresters have current ATFS Tree Farm Inspector training. Approximately ½ of the county foresters have not taken the mandatory new ATF online training. This finding was originally classified as a major non-conformance. WDNR responded to the CAR by submitting a corrective action plan indicating that only trained foresters would inspect the tree farms and that everyone would be required to obtain the training within a specified time frame. The major non-conformance was closed and a minor opened in order to track adherence to the corrective action plan.

Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group has developed a corrective action plan to address these issues and the Co-Lead Auditor has approved them. Progress in implementing this corrective action plans will be reviewed in subsequent surveillance audits.

For addition information contact:

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

Ken Symes
608-267-0547 kenneth.symes@wi.gov

END OF SUMMARY REPORT

Other Required Information

Note: The remaining portions of this ATFS Audit Report are not part of the Public Report and may be kept confidential at the discretion of the ATFS Program Participant. This additional information is required by ATFS protocols.

Audit Team

The audit team is fully qualified to conduct the ATFS Certification Audit, with an understanding of the forest industry, certification requirements of the ATFS Standard, and of sustainable forestry practices within your region. Qualifications of audit team members are described in the Audit Plan (attached as Section A).

Confidentiality

NSF requires all auditors to adhere to strict agreements regarding confidentiality and prohibiting consulting during audits. A copy of this agreement is available from NSF on request.

Scope of Audit

The scope statement to appear on the certificate is as follows:

Enrolled Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Program members.
The ATFS Certificate Number is NSF-ATFP-1Y941.

NSF-ISR ATFS Audit Process and Reporting

The NSF-ISR Audit Report consists of all documents used in the audit process, including the Readiness Review, the Tentative Audit Plan, and the Re-Certification Audit documents. The findings of the Readiness Review Report including the Document Review were provided previously.

The actual NSF-ISR ATFS Re-Certification Audit was governed by a detailed Audit Plan that was prepared specifically for your ATFS Audit. The Audit Plan is included here as Section A (with various Attachments). The Audit Plan was focused on helping the audit team determine whether there were any deficiencies and inconsistencies between your ATFS Program and the ATFS requirements that apply to your organization.

As described in the Audit Plan, the objective of the audit was to assess conformance of your ATFS Program to the requirements of the AFF 2010-2015 Standards of Sustainability for Forest Certification of Private Lands. The possible findings of the audit included Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, and Opportunities for Improvement. The detailed spreadsheets addressing the above findings are contained in the ATFS Re-Certification Audit Checklists (Section B). Any non-conformances were fully documented and reported using the NSF-ISR Corrective Action Request forms (Section C).

Completion of Certification Process

This complete Final Report is the sole property of your organization and will be treated with the utmost confidentiality and privacy. The report is intended for use by your organization in understanding your conformance with the ATFS Standard and for purposes of improving your ATFS Program. NSF may provide copies of the report to audit team members.

The Public Audit Report section provides a summary of the audit results intended for public disclosure. If necessary, NSF's ATFS Program Manager can work with your designee to modify the summary, consistent with ATFS requirements, to meet your needs. Organizations must follow ATFS annual reporting requirements, including providing a summary of the audit report that is appropriate for public distribution.

The Co-Lead Auditor may, at your direction, provide a copy of the final ATFS Public Report to AFF. NSF must also provide the ATFS Reporting Form (Section D) to AFF; the data from the form are posted on various certification-tracking websites.

You are responsible for informing NSF immediately regarding any change to your program or ownership that would affect the accuracy of the certificate. NSF will work with you to accommodate these changes.

Within 4 to 8 weeks NSF-ISR will issue a formal Certificate of Conformance to the ATFS Standard to your organization. The Certificate includes the NSF-ISR Logo, your organization's name, the standard certified to, the date of the certification, and signatures of responsible authorities.

Follow-up or Surveillance Audits are required by the ATFS. The initial Surveillance Audit is scheduled for May 21, 2012. The assigned lead auditor will contact you 2 months prior to this date to reconfirm and begin preparations for the audit.

Certification Report Sections:

- Section A Corrective Action Requests
- Section B Audit Plan
- Section C ATFS Audit Checklists and Agendas
- Section D ATFS Reporting Form



Section A
Corrective Action Requests

Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)

Company/Location: Wisconsin DNR – Forestry Division	Date: June 17, 2011 FRS # 1Y942
Auditor: Norman Boatwright	CAR Number: NIB20111
Location of Finding: Central Off ice Madison, WI	Previous CAR Number/Date: _____
Discussed with: Kathy Nelson, Ken Symes and Mark Heye	Nonconformance Type (underline): Major <u>Minor</u>

AUDITOR FINDING: Standard Number and Clause: **1.1b and 1.1b.1 Group Organization must identify Group Members’ category and Group Organization *must* document the group member category.**

Description: WDNR has not assigned or documented Group Members’ category.

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

1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY–Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

This is a new standard/requirement.

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

Attached is the language that will be added to the **MANAGED FOREST LAW CERTIFIED GROUP** Chapter of the Forest Tax Law Handbook (2450.5). The added language is highlighted in yellow in the Group Members section of the chapter.

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

The language will remain in the handbook.

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S PLAN:

Plan is adequate to address the issue. Group Members Category will be reviewed at the next annual surveillance audit.

STATUS: OPEN _____ AUDITOR/DATE: NB 6/30/2011 _____

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S COMPLETED ACTION:

STATUS: _____ AUDITOR/DATE: _____

STATUS LEGEND:

OPEN = CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED** = CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)

Company/Location: Wisconsin DNR – Forestry Division	Date: June 17, 2011 FRS # 1Y942
Auditor: Norman Boatwright	CAR Number: NIB20112
Location of Finding: Central Office Madison, WI	Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>NIB20111 June 17, 2011</u>
Discussed with: Kathy Nelson, Ken Symes and Mark Heyde	Nonconformance Type (underline): <u>Major</u> Minor

AUDITOR FINDING: Standard Number and Clause: **3.1b IMG Inspectors of the Group Organization conducting internal monitoring *must* have completed the current ATFS Tree Farm Inspector training course.**
 Description: All of the WDNR tree farm inspectors have not completed the current ATFS Tree Farm Inspector training course.

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

1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY—Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

Foresters were not informed of the need to keep their Tree Farm Inspector certification current. In addition, it was not clear who was tracking the certification status of DNR foresters in the central office.

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

Only foresters who are current with their Tree Farm Inspector certification will be allowed to approve MFL management plans and MFL cutting notices/reports.

Direction will be given for all foresters who have taken the initial training to take the online refresher training and pass the quiz before approving MFL management plans and/or MFL cutting notices/reports. A deadline of July 31st will be given for this training to be completed.

Foresters who have not had the initial training will be required to attend Tree Farm Inspector training classes tentatively to be held in September of 2011.

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

The DNR Private Forestry Specialist will annually request the Tree Farm Inspector list to determine if any foresters are in danger of losing their Tree Farm Inspector certification. The DNR Private Forestry Specialist will contact that forester to request the forester take the online refresher training.

New hire foresters will have the Tree Farm Inspector Certification training as a component of their 18 month training regime.

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S PLAN:

Plan adequately addresses the issue. This CAR will be closed and reopened as a minor so that implementation can be tracked at the next annual surveillance audit.

STATUS: CLOSED _____ AUDITOR/DATE: July 1, 2011

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S COMPLETED ACTION:

STATUS: _____ AUDITOR/DATE: _____

STATUS LEGEND:

OPEN = CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED** = CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

Company/Location: Wisconsin DNR – Forestry Division Auditor: Norman Boatwright Location of Finding: Central Office Madison, WI Discussed with: Kathy Nelson, Ken Symes and Mark Heyde	Date: July 1, 2011 FRS # 1Y942 CAR Number: NIB20113 Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>NIB20112 June 17, 2011</u> Nonconformance Type (underline): Major Minor
--	---

AUDITOR FINDING: Standard Number and Clause: **3.1b IMG Inspectors of the Group Organization conducting internal monitoring *must* have completed the current ATFS Tree Farm Inspector training course.**
Description: All of the WDNR tree farm inspectors have not completed the current ATFS Tree Farm Inspector training course.

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

1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY–Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

Foresters were not informed of the need to keep their Tree Farm Inspector certification current. In addition, it was not clear who was tracking the certification status of DNR foresters in the central office.

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

Only foresters who are current with their Tree Farm Inspector certification will be allowed to approve MFL management plans and MFL cutting notices/reports.

Direction will be given for all foresters who have taken the initial training to take the online refresher training and pass the quiz before approving MFL management plans and/or MFL cutting notices/reports. A deadline of July 31st will be given for this training to be completed.

Foresters who have not had the initial training will be required to attend Tree Farm Inspector training classes tentatively to be held in September of 2011.

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

The DNR Private Forestry Specialist will annually request the Tree Farm Inspector list to determine if any foresters are in danger of losing their Tree Farm Inspector certification. The DNR Private Forestry Specialist will contact that forester to request the forester take the online refresher training.

New hire foresters will have the Tree Farm Inspector Certification training as a component of their 18 month training regime.

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S PLAN:

Plan adequately addresses the issue. Implementation will be checked at the next surveillance audit.

STATUS: OPEN _____ AUDITOR/DATE: July 1, 2011

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S COMPLETED ACTION:

STATUS: _____ AUDITOR/DATE: _____



Section B
Audit Plan



Tentative Audit Plan for the Wisconsin DNR MFL Tree Farm Group

FRS#1Y942

Group Manager: Wisconsin DNR

Ken Symes, Forest Certification Coordinator
Forestry Division Effectiveness and Outreach Section
Bureau of Forestry Business Services, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
608-267-0547 fax: 608-266-8576 kenneth.symes@dnr.state.wi.us

Audit Team:

Norman Boatwright	Cell: 843-229-1851	boatwright@millikenforestry.com
Mike Ferrucci	Cell: 203-887-9248	mferrucci@iforest.com
Tucker Watts	Cell: 601-622-6487	jtwatts1@gmail.com
Anne Marie Kittredge	Cell: 413-230-0465	amkittredge@gmail.com

Audit Dates: June 13-17, 2011

Opening meeting

- 101 S Webster Street - FR/4, Madison WI 53703
- Monday June 13, 2011 8 am to Noon
- Participants: Norman Boatwright, Ken Symes, others from Wisconsin DNR

Certification Objectives:

1. Determine whether the Group Organization's administration and management is in conformance with the requirements of ATFS Independently Managed Group Certification Requirements (2010-2015) ATFS Document Number: ATFS-IMG- 01.
2. Determine whether the forest management of the Group Members is in conformance with the AFF Standards, Core Performance Measures and Primary Indicators.

Audit Scope:

The scope of the audit, to appear on the certificate, will be as follows:
Enrolled Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Program members.
The ATFS Certificate Number is NSF-ATFP-1Y941.

Performance Measures & Indicators:

ATFS-IMG- 01: ATFS Independently Managed Group Certification Requirements (2010-2015)
AFF STANDARDS (2010 – 2015) Monitoring Checklist

Overview

A four-person audit team from NSF will assess the members of the Wisconsin MFL Tree Farm Group (all MFL enrollees who have not opted out) against the current requirements of the Tree Farm Program. The Forestry Division of Wisconsin DNR serves as the "Group Manager"; the program will also be assessed against the requirements for Independently Managed Groups. Mike Ferrucci is leading the audit planning and Norman Boatwright will lead the actual audit and prepare the audit report. Anne Marie Kittredge and Tucker Watts will serve as Team Auditors. Each of these four auditors will visit tree farms in 2 counties, for a total

of eight offices. Norman Boatwright will also review the group manager. Preliminary results will be presented in Madison on June 17 at 4 pm.

Information on the field tours, including final sites, maps, and itineraries, will be provided by Wisconsin DNR representatives on the first morning of the audits (June 13). Wisconsin DNR representative will reserve hotels for the auditors and will provide locations to meet each day.

Sample methodology and preliminary sample size & configuration:

Sample procedures for ATFS Independent Managed Groups is contained in Accreditation Rule 27, Annex 2, as amended by the “ATFS Sampling Procedures for Regional Groups, IMGs and Individual Certificate holders, Proposed Revisions 2010.”

For this recertification audit (year 1) AR 27 specifies the number of sites (county offices) as 0.8 times the square root of the total number of sites. Thus 8 county offices would be visited. The rule specifies 2.5 days per office, but up to 20% of our audit time can be in document review, planning, and reporting. On that basis, and considering field days expected to be somewhat longer than 8 hours, we would spend 2 days at each county reviewing MFL properties. We would deploy 4 qualified auditors so that the 8 selected county offices would all be audited during the same week.

Norman Boatwright, the Co-Lead Auditor, would review the central administration prior to auditing his two counties. This auditor would then be auditing Monday through Friday the same week as the other three “team” auditors. Team auditors would conduct their county audits Monday through Thursday, allowing them to transmit their findings to the lead in time for a Friday afternoon exit briefing.

Mike Ferrucci, the other Co-Lead Auditor, is responsible for working with you to plan the audits and develop the audit sample. When selecting properties to audit the lead auditor is expected to factor in harvesting schedules and shall sample a mixture of land owners who are in harvest or have harvested within the past year as well as landowners who have not harvested within the past year. In addition the following criteria should be reflected in the final audit sample:

- Risk Sites that pose higher environmental risk to water, soil and wildlife resources;
- Range Sites that represent forest management practices across the ownership;
- Richness Sites that allow for concurrent auditing of different ATFS Performance Measures;
- Location Sites that cover an appropriate range of administrative units;
- Active harvests Sites that are currently being harvested or have been recently; and
- Special features Sites containing T&E species, special management areas, and visual considerations.

Selection of Tree Farms for Site Visits:

1. WDNR provided list of counties and number of farms in each
2. Ferrucci selects 1 county in each region randomly, 1 more nearby
3. Selected counties provided to WDNR to develop spreadsheet for selected counties
4. MF to select one TF randomly for each morning and each afternoon
5. WDNR to confirm these “backbone” selections
6. WDNR to build remaining selections around location of random selection
7. WDNR to develop schedules and field routes/timing

Please ensure that the selections meet the size distribution requirements. The following description of the selection process is based on an email provided earlier, and matches the discussion on this topic during the May 19, 2011 “Kickoff Audit Planning Phone Call”.

For each county four Tree Farms were selected, with one to three alternates. These initial selections (primary and alternate) are Tree Farms with records of recent harvests. These four selections represent the core parcels for “tours” of three field audits to be conducted in a morning, or in an afternoon (add two more TFs to each core parcel to total three per tour). Thus we would seek to visit 12 TFs for each county.

Please verify these core TFs first, thus developing a framework for the two-days of audits for each county. Once this is done please pick the remaining two TFs for each group based on proximity and on the required size distribution.

Size Category	# TFs	Ratio	Percentage	# of sample
Up to 100 ac.	30535	0.8615	83-86%	80-83
101-500 ac.	4784	0.1350	12-15%	11-14
501-1000 ac.	95	0.0027	1%	1-2
1001 acres+	32	0.0009	1%	1-2

Based on the large numbers of Tree Farms involved you will be close to the required ranges (based on probabilities). My suggestion would be to start by selecting at least one Tree Farm that is over 1,000 acres, and one tree farm that is from 501 to 1000 acres. If a couple of other larger tree farms come up in the adjacent selections that would be ok.

Factors to emphasize in selecting the additional Tree Farms (in order of importance)

1. Adjacency to core selections
2. Tree Farm owner known to or likely to be available on site during the visit
3. Recent management activity
4. Other factors from the criteria on the previous page (risk, range, risk, location, special features)

Each county should ultimately develop four half-day “tours” for a total of 12 selections per county. The “tours” that include the larger (over 500 acre) selections might need to be reduced to 2 visits per half day, leaving the total for a county at less than 12. It would be useful to have 1 or 2 backups for each county also; backups could be owners known well to the foresters (perhaps someone who doesn’t mind if we do or don’t visit their Tree Farm).

Sampling Plan County Selections and Auditor Assignments:

4 regions: north, northeast, west, south.

- Anne Marie Kittredge - West
- Norman Boatwright - South
- Mike Ferrucci - Northeast
- Tucker Watts - North

	County	Number of MFL Orders	Total Acres
West	Wood	691	37,650.363
West	Portage	988	45,761.151
South	Jefferson	185	5,559.325
South	Iowa	965	46,212.438
North	Langlade	1,194	94,376.855
North	Oneida	1,063	73,047.765
Northeast	Winnebago	88	2,251.889
Northeast	Green lake	63	2,133.513

Documentation Requested

Background material on the MFL and on the “Certified Plan Writer Program” has already been requested.

On the first day of the audits please provide each auditor with the following for the selected tree farms:

- Daily agendas including starting time and location and list of Tree Farms selected (Note: The names of landowners and foresters we are expected to meet would be helpful but not critical to have in advance.)
- Management plans
- Example timber harvest contracts (not all selections; can be provided when we meet owners)
- List of activities known by Wisconsin DNR
- Copies of the most recent inspection forms

In addition the auditors may request to review the management plan and other pertinent files of a small number of other tree farms not within the sample selected using the above protocol. This may be arranged by one or more of the NSF Auditors, and will be worked out with local personnel during the audit.

Report & Certificate Timeline:

The lead auditor will provide the Draft Final and Public Summary reports within 2 weeks of the closing meeting for a review of factual accuracy. You should submit any comments to the lead auditor within two weeks of the date the draft report is provided. If more time is needed then the total time for reporting will be adjusted. Within one week of receiving any comments from the group representative, the lead auditor will make any necessary changes and send on for NSF-ISR CB review. CB review will be completed within one week. Certificates will be issued within 4 weeks of receiving all necessary reports.

Final & Summary Report Content:

Final Report	Public Summary Report
1.1 The certification audit scope and objectives;	1.1 The Public Report contents shall include, at a minimum:
1.2 A general description of the group’s operations and overall membership;	1.2 A description of the audit process, objectives, and scope;

1.3 A description of the audit process used, including time period;	1.3 The name of group that was audited, including its ATFS representative;
1.4 Identification of the group manager and audit team personnel (later are normally listed in audit plan);	1.4 A general description of the group’s operations and overall membership;
1.5 Audit findings and conclusions, including a general description of any nonconformances and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and exceptional practices;	1.5 The name of the audit firm and lead auditor;
1.6 A schedule for surveillance and recertification audits;	1.6 The dates the certification was conducted and completed;
1.7 The distribution and confidential nature of the Final Report; and	1.7 A summary of the findings, including general descriptions of any nonconformances and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and exceptional practices; and
1.8 Appendices as follows;	1.8 The certification recommendation.
1.8.1 Audit Plan;	
1.8.2 ATFS Certification Checklists;	
1.8.3 NSF-ISR Corrective Action Request (CAR) form(s), including corrective action plans developed by the group’s representative (which may be contained on additional pages). Note: This section should include documentation of all CARs, even those that were closed prior to the Certification Audit; and Reporting form for ATFS Certification.	

Confidentiality and non-disclosure:

Evidence and information collected by the audit team will remain confidential and discussed only with the Group manager or NSF-ISR. Unless stated below and discussed with Group manager and NSF-ISR Forestry Program Manager, no member of the audit team have provided any consulting, appraisal services, brokerage services, or advice within the past two years.

Dispute Resolution Process:

In the event that there is a dispute between the lead auditor and the group’s representative over any issues involved in the certification audit, the first step is for the group’s management representative to call the Audit Manager (888-NSF-9000) to resolve the dispute.

- o If the dispute continues, the dispute resolution processes of NSF-ISR will be followed (Dispute Resolution Process in NSF-ISR Policies for Management Systems Registration AESOP 4876).
- o Disputes or appeals between an external party and a group’s representative are governed by the provisions of “P&P-09 – ATFS: National Interpretation And Dispute Resolution, American Tree Farm System” which states
 - o “The National Standards Interpretation Committee (NSIC) is a committee subordinate and reporting to the Center for Family Forests Operating Committee (CFF COC) (see P&P-03, Governance). The NSIC role is to provide appropriate interpretations of the American Forest Foundation (AFF) Standards of Sustainability. It will also serve in an advisory role in handling disputes between an IMG Organization and Certification Bodies related to interpretations of the AFF Standards and SOP-01.”

Summary of Auditors’ Background and Qualifications

Co-Team Leader Mike Ferrucci (Northford, CT)

Mike Ferrucci is the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. He is qualified as a Lead Auditor to conduct Chain of Custody, Procurement System or Sustainable Forest Management audits under the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® (SFI), the Forest Stewardship Program (FSC), and the Tree Farm Group Certification programs. Mike is also credentialed as a Lead Auditor under RAB-QSA (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems).

Mike meets all of the requirements as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and has participated in several Tree Farm Group audits including the original scoping audit for the Wisconsin MFL program. Mike developed the NSF procedures for ATFS audits. Over the past ten years he has conducted Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews on lands throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)

certification projects in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Maryland, Maine, and Connecticut and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-lead the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest. He is qualified as a RAB EMS Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor, as an FSC Team Leader.

Mike has also led Chain of Custody audits for all segments of the forest products industry, including corrugated and box producers, integrated paper companies, paper distributors, solid wood mills, engineered wood products facilities, brokers, and distributors. In audits with pulp mills, corrugated producers, and box plants Mike has addressed the issues involving recycled content.

Mike Ferrucci has 31 years of forest industry experience. His expertise is in forest certification, in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed; in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. He has also developed expertise in the conservation of forest biodiversity at multiple spatial scales through his involvement in the founding and administration of The Conservation Forestry Network and through his work with the Northern Forest Protection Fund.

Co-Team Leader Norman Boatwright, ATFS & SFI Lead Auditor (Columbia, SC)

Norman Boatwright currently manages the Environmental Services Division of Milliken Forestry Services that handles Phase I Environmental Site Assessments, Forest Soil Mapping, Wetland Delineation, and other Biological Services. He has over fifteen years' experience in intensive forest management and ten years' experience in environmental services. He has conducted Phase I Assessments on over one hundred and fifty projects covering 967,000 acres, ESA and Endangered Species Assessment on timberland across the South, and managed soil mapping projects over 1.3 million acres. From 1985-1999, he was Division Manager at Canal Forest Resources, Inc. and was responsible for all forest management activities on about 90,000 acres of timberland in eastern South Carolina. Duties included budgeting and implementing land and timber sales, site preparation, planting, best management practices, road construction, etc. Norman is a Qualified Lead Auditor under the ATFS Program with extensive experience auditing procurement and land management organizations. He has experience with ATFS Group Certification, both as the field auditor for the West Virginia audits under the main Tree Farm Program and as an owner of Milliken Forestry which as a certified IMG.

Audit Team Members (total 4 including Co-Lead Auditors)

Tucker Watts, ATFS, SFI, FSC Forestry and Chain of Custody Lead Auditor (Mississippi)

Tucker Watts has over 30 years' experience in forest management, primarily in the southern U.S. He worked for many years for International Paper Company, first as a land management and procurement forester, then as an analyst, and finally as an environmental manager with considerable involvement in forest certification. Tucker has a BS in Forestry from Louisiana Tech, and MS in Forestry from Mississippi State University, and an MBA from Centenary College. He has participated in many forestry organizations, notably as a Trainer in the Louisiana Master Logger Program, as a team member for "Recommended Forestry Best Management Practices for Louisiana" and on various SFI State Implementation Committees. Tucker is trained as a Tree Farm Group Certification Auditor and has experience in SFI and FSC auditing from both sides, as an auditor and as the management representative of an organization being audited. Audit experience includes audits of pulp and paper mills, container and box companies, printers, distributors, and audits of recovered fiber and recycled content.

Anne Marie Kittredge, ATFS, SFI, FSC Forestry & Chain of Custody Lead Auditor (Mass.)

Anne Marie is an SAF Certified Forester (# 60) with more than 20 years of experience in traditional forest management, wildlife habitat management, marketing and utilization and state (MA) forest cutting practices regulations. Anne Marie's experience as a state forester in Massachusetts focused on management of FSC certified forest lands, forest cutting practice enforcement on > 20,000 acres of private and public timber sales as well as private landowner assistance within 16 rural towns (78% forested) including supervision of > 300 private landowner current use certificates and 1 to 1 individual landowner assistance. Relative to forest certification, Anne Marie has experience from both sides of the audit table; as an auditor and as a landowner. Anne Marie earned her MS and BS in Forestry from the University of Massachusetts.

Anne Marie is an Acting Lead Auditor and also conducts Lead Auditor Chain of Custody audits under the SFI, PEFC and FSC Standards with experience conducting hundreds of COC audits for printers, converters, distributors, recovered fiber and recycled content facilities, plywood mills and sawmills.

Proposed Report Reviewer: Jerry Grossman, ATFS and SFI Lead Auditor (Michigan)

Gerald Grossman, ACF & CF, is a SFI and a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor for NSF – International Strategic Registrations. Gerald has led or participated in over 40 Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certifications throughout the Eastern United States. Gerald has a B.S. in Forestry from the University of Michigan and a M.S in Forestry & M.B.A. from Michigan

State University. He has been President of Grossman Forestry Company, a full service consulting forestry firm located in the Eastern Upper Peninsula of Michigan, since 1990. The Grossman Forestry Company employs 7 full time foresters and manages over 260,000 acres of timberland for a wide variety of landowners.

Gerald is a member of numerous forestry and conservation organizations, and has served in leadership positions in many including the Michigan Society of American Foresters. He has received numerous awards in recognition of his professional and volunteer accomplishments.



Section C
ATFS Certification Audit Checklists
And Agendas



ATFS Audit Report Checklist

Based on

- American Tree Farm System Standards of Sustainability For Forest Certification, Including Performance Measures and Field Indicators (2010 – 2015 AFF Standard)
- Standard Operating Procedures (SOP-01) for Independently Managed Groups (Group Organizations, Group Managers & Group Members)
- PEFC Annex 6, Certification and Accreditation Procedures

Group Organization’s Name: Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group

Group Manager’s Name: Ken Symes

NSF Lead Auditor’s Name: Norman Boatwright

Date: June 30, 2011

Check one: Full Review Partial Review (Surveillance Audit)
 Check one: Regional Groups (RG) Independent Management Groups (IMG)

Yes No N.A. Logo use requirements under ATFS are met.
 Audit Notes: Not applicable for new certifications.

Yes No N.A. Information from external parties about this program was reviewed by auditor.
 Audit Notes: Lead Auditor searched the web for information from external parties. No significant findings were observed.

Yes No N.A. For IMGs only: Program categorized group member into one of 3 categories for types of group members.
 Audit Notes: The group administrator failed to do this – see CAR.

Attach Supplemental Checklists

- ATFS IMG Individually Managed Group Checklist
- AFF Standards (2010-2015) Monitoring Checklist

IMG SOP 2010 – 2015

Group Manager Requirements Checklist

Generally, the Group Organization administers the overall functions of the Group and coordinates certain activities, such as:

- ensuring conformance to the AFF Standards,
- administering entry to and departure,
- maintaining records and reporting,
- conducting ongoing monitoring
- managing the group certification process.

Section Number	Group Manager Responsibility	Conformance
1.1a	Group Organization is a legal entity	The WDNR Division of Forestry is a legal entity created state legislature.
1.1b	Group Organization must identify Group Members' category	Not done – This is a minor non-conformance.
1.1b.1	Group Organization <i>must</i> document the group member category (see above section on Group Member types).	Not done see above.
1.1b.2	Group Organization <i>must</i> describe rolls and responsibilities of the Group Manager and Group Members with respect to forest management decisions and actions with respect to the implementation of the AFF Standards (e.g. plan development, harvesting, monitoring, etc.)	<p>WDNR oversees all aspects of maintaining group certification. The DNR administration of the program includes the Division of Forestry, the supervisory hierarchy of the DNR regions, the DNR service foresters and technicians, and the cooperating foresters providing private landowner assistance. The Department determines eligibility and membership requirements of the group.</p> <p>The Division of Forestry Forest Tax Law Section Chief is designated as the group manager who administers the affairs of the MFL Certified Group. More broadly, the group manager may delegate authority to the WDNR Sustainable Forest Certification Coordinator, other central office staff, regional staff and cooperating foresters.</p>
1.1b.3	Group Organization <i>must</i> have a written commitment to sustainable forestry and conformance to the AFF Standards.	As documented in the <i>Forest Law Handbook</i> , DNR is committed to conform to ATFS and FSC principles, criteria and performance measures in the administration of the Managed Forest Law. MFL participants who elect not to depart from the MFL Certified Group also agree to conform to ATFS and FSC standards.
1.2a	Group Organization must adhere to ATFS eligibility requirements and may further define membership parameters for their Group, if desired.	WDNR has further defined its group membership parameters as follows: It consists of at least 10 contiguous acres, except as provided in this subdivision. The fact that a lake, river, stream or flowage, a public or private road or a railroad or utility right-of-way separates any part of the land from any other part does not render a parcel of land

		<p>noncontiguous. If a part of a parcel of at least 10 contiguous acres is separated from another part of that parcel by a public road, that part of the parcel may be enrolled in the program, even if that part is less than 10 acres, if that part meets the requirement under subd. 2. and is not ineligible under ar. (b).</p> <p>2. At least 80% of the parcel must be producing or capable of producing a minimum of 20 cubic feet of merchantable timber per acre per year.</p> <p>(b) The following land is not eligible for designation as managed forest land:</p> <p>1. A parcel of which more than 20% consists of land that is unsuitable for producing merchantable timber, including water, marsh, muskeg, bog, rock outcrops, sand dunes, farmland, roadway or railroad and utility rights-of-way.</p> <p>2. A parcel that is developed for commercial recreation, for industry or for any other use determined by the department to be incompatible with the practice of forestry.</p> <p>3. A parcel that is developed for a human residence. (bn) For purposes of par. (b) 3., the department by rule shall define “human residence” to include a residence of the applicant regardless of whether it is the applicant’s primary residence. The definition may also include up to one acre surrounding the residence for a residence that is not the applicant’s primary residence.</p> <p>(c) In addition to the requirements under pars. (a) and (b), for land subject to an application under sub. (4m), all forest croplands owned by the applicant on the date on which the application is filed that are located in the municipality or municipalities for which the application is filed shall be included in the application.</p>
1.2b	Group Organization must designate a Group Manager(s) that is responsible for overseeing all of the administrative details of ATFS Group Certification and for ensuring compliance with all applicable requirements.	The Division of Forestry Forest Tax Law Section Chief is designated as the group manager who administers the affairs of the MFL Certified Group. More broadly, the group manager may delegate authority to the WDNR Sustainable Forest Certification Coordinator, other central office staff, regional staff and cooperating foresters.
1.3a	Group Organization must inform Group Members of any and all fees associated with administration of the Group, if any, when they join the group organization.	WDNR does not charge any fees associated with the administration of the Group.
1.3b	Group Organization <i>must</i> hold the ATFS Certificate on behalf of the Group Members.	WDNR does hold the Certificate.
1.3c	Group Organization <i>must</i> follow the ATFS logo use guidelines and ensure proper use of promotional claims about the Group Certification.	WDNR is aware of the ATFS logo use guidelines and ensures proper use of promotional claims about group certification. (Note: WDNR has not removed the ATF logo from its MLF Group Forest Certification website – also has paragraph that describes the ATF certification.)
1.3d	Group Organization <i>must</i> have a document issued to each Group Member that confirms the Group Member participation and coverage by the scope of the third-party certificate.	The application for enrollement in the MLF program has a declaration that contains: I/we understand that participation in the MFL program will automatically result in membership in the MFL Certified Group

		<p>unless MFL Certified Group Departure Request is submitted.</p> <p>Material given to potential members includes the document “Wisconsin’s Managed Forest Law – a program summary” that includes this language: “An independent certification body verifies that MFL Group lands are managed in conformance with American Tree Farm System (ATFS) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) standards of responsible forestry.”</p>
1.4a	<p>Group Organization <i>must</i> ensure that Group Members are notified that they are subject to all of the requirements and privileges of membership in the American Tree Farm System. Under this requirement, <u>category 1 Group Members must be notified to the individual landowner level and category 2 Group Members must be notified to the portfolio level.</u></p>	<p>The application for enrollement in the MLF program has a declaration that contains: I/we understand that participation in the MFL program will automatically result in membership in the MFL Certified Group unless MFL Certified Group Departure Request is submitted.</p> <p>Material given to potential members includes the document “Wisconsin’s Managed Forest Law – a program summary” that includes this language: “An independent certification body verifies that MFL Group lands are managed in conformance with American Tree Farm System (ATFS) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) standards of responsible forestry.”</p>
1.4b	<p>Group Organization <i>must</i> define and administer a procedure for admitting Group Members.</p>	<p>Procedures for admitting group members are the same as for admittance into MLF. These procedures are extensive and found in various portions of the “Tax Law Handbook”.</p>
1.4c	<p>Group Organization <i>must</i> maintain a procedure for expelling Group Members if they do not meet the requirements of the AFF Standard, and are not willing or able to take appropriate corrective action.</p>	<p>MFL Certified Group membership for an MFL Order may be deactivated under any of the following circumstances following appropriate procedures as outlined in Chapter 60 on Enforcement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voluntary withdrawal from MFL 2. Involuntary MFL declassification 3. MFL order expiration 4. Use of an FSC prohibited, highly hazardous pesticide 5. Planting FSC-prohibited Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) in a forest 6. Mixing forest products harvested from non-MFL Group land with MFL Group wood to falsely claim the non-MFL products under the MFL Chain of Custody certification. 7. Willful or blatant violations of Wisconsin Forestry Best Management Practices 8. Refusal to allow forest certification auditors or DNR staff onto the property for the purpose of conformance reviews. 9. Deliberate or repeated violations of federal, state or local laws and regulations applicable to forest management.. 10. Inappropriate use of certification logos or trademarks 11. Deliberate or manifest nonconformance with other forest certification indicators
1.4d	<p>Group Organization <i>must</i> maintain and update the membership list and ATFS database to reflect entries and departures of Group Members from the Group Organization.</p>	<p>WDNR maintains a database that contains all required information about current members. Information about departures are maintained in the History database.</p>
1.5a	<p>Group Organization <i>must</i> have a procedure for</p>	<p>The Forest Tax Law Handbook has a section titled</p>

	addressing and resolving disputes regarding conformance with the AFF Standards between and among the Group Members and the Group Organization pertaining to Tree Farm certification.	:Enforcement and Dispute Resolution Process.
1.5b	Group Organization <i>must</i> follow and conform to the AFF Dispute Resolution Policy and assist ATFS in resolving any such complaints.	WDNR’s dispute resolution process conforms to the AFF Policy.
1.6a	Group Organization <i>must</i> maintain internal Group Member records and provide updated information on a regular basis to the ATFS Database.	WDNR maintains a database that contains all required information about current members. Information is provided to ATFS on an annual basis as requested by ATFS.
W		
2.1a	Group Organization must make the AFF Standards of Sustainability for Forest Certification accessible to Group Members.	Confirmed the Standards are accessible via external links on WDNR’s website.
2.2a	Group organization must have a procedure for evaluating conformance with AFF Standards prior to property enrollment under the group certificate.	Procedures for admitting group members are the same as for admittance into MLF. These procedures are extensive and found in various portions of the “Tax Law Handbook”.
2.2b	The Group Organization must ensure that each Group Member either has an individual management plan or is covered by a larger group management plan where responsibility for management has been delegated to a Category 2 with a qualified natural resource professional.	WDNR requires that each group member have a current management plan. DNR provides potential group members with a list of Certified Plan Writer. DNR will write the plan if a Certified Plan Writer cannot be located.
2.3a	Group Organization must have a procedure for evaluating eligibility according to the ATFS Eligibility Requirements prior to property enrollment under the group certificate.	Procedures for admitting group members are the same as for admittance into MLF. These procedures are extensive and found in various portions of the “Tax Law Handbook”.
3.1a	Group Organization <i>must</i> establish and maintain a procedure and schedule for conducting ongoing monitoring of conformance with the AFF Standards.	DNR has a unique system to monitor conformance. Certified Plan Writers complete a Land Exam and Practices Report for new members in conjunction with developing the management plan. This report contains stand level data as well as management prescriptions. This data is entered into Plan Trac which sends alerts to the DNR district foresters who notify the landowners of the prescriptions that need to be done. District foresters confirm the prescription is done and indicate this in Plan Trac.
3.1b	IMG Inspectors of the Group Organization conducting internal monitoring <i>must</i> have completed the current ATFS Tree Farm Inspector training course.	WDNR’s policy is that all county foresters have current ATFS Tree Farm Inspector training. Approximately ½ of the county foresters have not taken the mandatory new ATF online training. This is a major non-conformance.
3.1c	Group Organization <i>must</i> review conformance to the AFF Standards and document the relevant findings.	WDNR has a unique system to monitor conformance. Certified Plan Writers complete a Land Exam and Practices Report for new members in conjunction with developing the management plan. This report contains stand level data as well as management prescriptions. This data is entered into Plan Trac which sends alerts to the DNR district foresters who notify the landowners of the prescriptions that need to be done. District foresters confirm the prescription is done and indicate this in Plan Trac.
3.1d	Where a non-conformance is identified during ongoing monitoring, the Group Organization must document the non-conformity and work with the Group Member and other appropriate parties to take corrective action.	WDNR has a detailed procedure for working with Group Members with a non-conformity found in the Forest Tax Law Handbook, Section 60 which includes: multiple meetings and correspondence with the member, fines and finally, expulsion.
3.1e	Group Organization <i>must</i> ensure implementation of the corrective action and monitor conformity as	Forest Tax Law Handbook contains procedures to ensure conformities are resolved.

	part of the regular schedule of internal monitoring.	
3.2a	Group Organization <i>must</i> adhere to the annual reporting requirements as defined by ATFS and maintain copies of past annual reports.	Confirmed via review of Group Certification Annual reporting for excel spreadsheet that the annual reporting requirements are met and copies of past reports maintained.
4.1a	Group Organization <i>must</i> contract with an accredited Certification Body to conduct the independent certification. Accredited Certification Body is required to conduct the audit according to accreditation rule under ANSI – American National Accreditation Body or the Standards Council of Canada.	WDNR has contracted with NSF to conduct an independent certification according to the ANSI accreditation rules.
4.1b	Group Organization <i>must</i> coordinate the independent audit procedure to ensure the Certification Body has access to sufficient information and Group Member properties to determine conformance to the AFF Standard and ATFS Group Certification Standard.	All auditors were provided with all the information they requested.
4.1c	If the certification audit results in a non-conformity, the Group Organization <i>must</i> work with all appropriate parties take corrective action and ensure timely implementation.	WDNR is aware of this requirement.
4.1d	Group Organization <i>must</i> submit a copy of the ATFS Certificate and a summary of the audit report that is appropriate for public distribution to ATFS.	WDNR is aware of this requirement.
4.1e	Group Organization <i>must</i> keep the Group Organization’s program up-to-date and in ongoing conformance with the AFF Standard.	Review of DNR Group Program indicates it is up-to-date.

AFF STANDARDS (2010 – 2015) MONITORING CHECKLIST

Group Organization’s Name: Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group
Group Member’s Tree Farm Name: West Central Region: Wood County, Portage County
Auditor: Anne Marie Kittredge
Audit Dates: June 13-16, 2011

This document is provided as a tool to IMGs to record and document objective evidence and findings for each AFF Standards Core Performance Measure and Primary Indicator. A narrative description of the objective evidence should be provided indicating what documents were reviewed, personnel interviewed, or field sites inspected. A check Mark (X) should be placed in the correct column indicating Conformance (Conform), Major Non-conformance (Major), Minor Non-conformance (Minor), and Opportunity for Improvement (OFI). Where a major or minor non-conformance is found, the internal auditor should fully document the rationale for the non-conformance on a Corrective Action Request (CAR) form (GO-06). Indicate (N/A) if the Core Performance Measure and/or Primary Indicators is not applicable under Objective Evidence. (Note that conformance is measured to the Core Performance Measures and Primary Indicators. Performance Measures and Indicators with the term Must are considered Core and Primary, respectively).

AFF Standards Requirements	<u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u>	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
Standard 1: Commitment to Practicing Sustainable Forestry Forest owner demonstrates commitment to forest vitality by developing and implementing a sustainable forest management plan.					
Performance Measure 1.1 Forest owner must have and implement a written forest management plan consistent with the size of the forest and the scale and intensity of the forest activities.	<u>All properties audited had written plans that were consistent with forest size and objectives. Management plans were presented and reviewed before, during and after the on-site audits.</u>	<u>11</u>			

AFF Standards Requirements	<u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u>	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
<p>Indicator 1.1.1 Management plan must be active, adaptive, and embody the landowner’s current objectives, remain appropriate for the land certified, and reflect the current state of knowledge about forestry and natural resource management.</p>	<p><u>Plans are updated at the time a harvest or practice is implemented, at the end of the contract period, or at other times as needed when determined by WDNR Foresters.</u></p> <p><u>For example, as confirmed during a review of the Keuntjes’ 80 acre property and plans, the older 1987 has been replaced by an approved 2012 plan. This updated plan as well as others (for example Ebacher) includes the most current information relative to presences or threats from invasive plants and insects (Gypsy moth) as well as RTEs.</u></p>	<u>11</u>			
<p>Indicator 1.1.2 Management plans must: clearly state landowner’s objectives, describe desired forest condition, include management activities aimed at reaching the desired forest condition and landowner’s objectives, document a feasible strategy for activity implementation, and include a tract map accurately depicting significant forest related resources.</p> <p>Where present, and relevant to the property, the plan must address the following resource elements: forest health, soil, water, wood and fiber production, threatened and endangered species, special sites, invasive species, integrated pest management, and high conservation value forests.</p> <p>Where present, relevant to the property, and consistent with landowner’s objectives, the plan preparer may consider, describe and evaluate the following resource elements: fire, wetlands, desired species (fish, wildlife and plant), recreation, aesthetic quality, biomass and carbon.</p>	<p><u>All plans clearly state objectives, describe stand conditions and prescriptions for achieving implied desired conditions, include lists of actions and maps. The strategy for implementation is clear in the recently-written plans but not as clear in the older ones.</u></p> <p><u>For example as confirmed through a review of each management plan and associated stand maps, the Stelzers effectively manage for wood products and habitat; the Husers have implemented management for timber, game species and aesthetics; and the Laskas management regime has enhanced timber, wildlife and recreation resources.</u></p> <p><u>Where present and relevant for example, the most recent plan for the Shultz property addresses gypsy moth treatments, the Kaiser plan includes a descriptions of invasive plant threats and all plans address wood and fiber production.</u></p>	<u>11</u>			

AFF Standards Requirements	<u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u>	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
<p>Indicator 1.1.3*</p> <p>Forest owner should monitor for changes that could interfere with the management objectives as stated in management plan (e.g., presence of invasive species, pest outbreaks, and indications of trespass). When problems are found, reasonable actions are taken.</p>	<p><u>Owners, supported by consulting foresters and by WDNR foresters, are generally quite involved with their lands. Several examples of actions taken to deal with changed conditions were observed.</u></p> <p><u>For example, according to management plan and interviews with DNR staff and a procurement forester, invasive plants were identified prior to implementation of harvest practices on the Globe Conservation Club. The club will treat those sections of the property during this growing season. Gypsy moth monitoring was mentioned in a variety of plans. In addition, at least 2 properties were affected by a May 2011 tornado and in each case salvage operations were witnessed and nearly complete at the time of this audit.</u></p>	11			
<p>Standard 2: Compliance With Laws</p> <p>Forest management activities comply with all relevant federal, state and local laws, regulations and ordinances.</p>					
<p>Performance Measure 2.1</p> <p>Forest owner must comply with all relevant federal, state, county, and municipal laws, regulations, and ordinances.</p>	<p><u>No evidence of non-compliance with laws.</u></p> <p><u>Evidence of compliance includes implemented mandatory forest practices as confirmed on all audited sites and RTE review prior to active management projects on all sites.</u></p>	11			
<p>Indicator 2.1.1</p> <p>Forest owner must comply with all relevant laws, regulations and ordinances and will correct conditions that led to adverse regulatory actions, if any.</p>	<p><u>Foresters are involved in planning all harvests and major silvicultural treatments; these foresters help owners comply.</u></p> <p><u>Evidence of compliance includes implemented mandatory forest practices as confirmed through plan review and on-site inspections of all audited sites and RTE review by WDNR prior to active management projects as documented by DNR for all sites.</u></p>	11			

AFF Standards Requirements	<u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u>	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
<p>Indicator 2.1.2 Forest owner should obtain advice from appropriate professionals, or contractors who are trained in, and familiar with, relevant laws, regulations and ordinances.</p>	<p><u>All owners are working with Wisconsin DNR foresters, and many are working with private consulting foresters as well. Many of the loggers are FISTA (SFI) trained.</u></p> <p><u>As confirmed through interviews with a FISTA trained logger on the Bollig property, and a variety of consulting foresters and DNR foresters itemized elsewhere in this report each of whom were able to describe the local requirements.</u></p>	11			
<p>Standard 3: Reforestation and Afforestation Forest owner completes timely restocking of desired species of trees on harvested sites and non-stocked areas where tree growing is consistent with land use practices and the forest owner's management objectives.</p>					
<p>Performance Measure 3.1 Reforestation or afforestation must be achieved by a suitable process that ensures adequate stocking levels.</p>	<p><u>Timely reforestation and afforestation is assured by WDNR MFL provisions; several examples were seen of challenging planting projects wherein significant and sustained efforts have or continue to be made to ensure proper stocking.</u></p> <p><u>Planting regimes generally produced desired outcomes as confirmed for example on the properties of Bell, Wierzba, Boudry, Turner and Armao.</u></p>	11			
<p>Indicator 3.1.1 Harvested forest land must achieve adequate stocking of desired species reflecting the forest owner's management objectives, within five years after harvest, or within a time interval as specified by applicable regulation.</p>	<p><u>The MFL program tracks all regeneration harvests and schedules a "mandatory practice" inspection five years after such harvests to ensure adequate stocking is achieved; observed in field.</u></p> <p><u>Timber harvest projects generally resulted in adequate stocking as confirmed for example on the properties of Bell, Wierzba, Boudry, Turner and Armao.</u></p>	11			

AFF Standards Requirements	<u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u>	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
Standard 4: Air, Water and Soil Protection Forest management practices maintain or enhance the environment and ecosystems, including air, water, soil and site quality.					
Performance Measure 4.1 Forest owner must meet or exceed practices prescribed by State Forestry Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are applicable to the property.	<u>BMP compliance was observed on all 95 forests inspected.</u> <u>Winter harvest (timing) specifically protected the soil and water resources of the Stelzer, Huser and Gumz properties.</u>	<u>11</u>			
Indicator 4.1.1 Forest owner must implement specific BMPs that are applicable to the property.	<u>BMP compliance was observed on all 95 forests inspected.</u> <u>Winter harvest (timing) specifically protected the soil and water resources of the Stelzer, Huser and Gumz properties.</u>	<u>11</u>			
Indicator 4.1.2 Forest owner must minimize road construction and other disturbances within riparian zones and wetlands.	Properties inspected had well-designed and maintained roads that avoided and therefore minimized impacts in riparian zones. For example as confirmed during the on-site audit of the Gumz property, harvesting equipment did not enter the riparian zone. Winter harvesting on the Kostuch property including a previously established ford of a small stream and associated winter roads through wet soils, eliminating the need for new road construction. In most cases, main roads pre-exist the most recent timber harvest. In all cases, roads are well maintained.	<u>11</u>			

AFF Standards Requirements	<u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u>	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
<p>Performance Measure 4.2 Forest owner must consider integrated pest management to control pests, pathogens and unwanted vegetation.</p>	<p><u>Efforts are made to deal with invasive plants, but more could be done.</u></p> <p><u>For example, according to management plan and interviews with DNR staff and a procurement forester, invasive plants were identified prior to implementation of harvest practices on the Globe Conservation Club. The club will treat those sections of the property during this growing season. More could be accomplished for example on the Cranmoor Coop which is expected as part of the anticipated 2013 management plan.</u></p> <p><u>In addition, oak wilt was effectively treated (by tree removal) on the Wierzba, Shultz, and Laska properties. Pocket decline was effectively treated (by tree removal) on the properties owned by Bollig, Turner and Armao.</u></p>	<u>11</u>			
<p>Indicator 4.2.1 Forest owner should evaluate alternatives to manage pest, pathogens and unwanted vegetation to achieve specific management objectives.</p>	<p><u>Interviews showed that most forest owners use chemical measures only if there is no effective alternative.</u></p> <p><u>For example, oak wilt was effectively treated (by tree removal) on the Wierzba, Shultz, and Laska properties. Pocket decline was effectively treated (by tree removal) on the properties owned by Bollig, Turner and Armao.</u></p>	<u>11</u>			
<p>Indicator 4.2.2 Pesticides used must be EPA-approved.</p>	<p><u>Interviews confirmed that chemicals are applied as per label. For example, interviews with DNR staff and a procurement forester relative to invasive plant treatments on the Globe Conservation Club included chemical and label details which are EPA-approved.</u></p>	<u>11</u>			

AFF Standards Requirements	<u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u>	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
Indicator 4.2.3 Pesticides must be applied, stored and disposed of in accordance with EPA-approved labels and by persons appropriately trained, licensed and supervised.	<u>Most pesticide use is by the owners, who are applying over-the-counter chemicals (glyphosate primarily).</u>	<u>11</u>			
Performance Measure 4.3 When used, prescribed fire must conform with forest owner's objectives, the forest management plan and pre-fire planning.	<u>N.A. Fire is not generally used in central and northern hardwood management.</u>	<u>NA</u>			
Indicator 4.3.1 Prescribed fire must conform with the management plan and state and local laws and regulations.	<u>N.A. Fire is not generally used in central and northern hardwood management.</u>	<u>NA</u>			
Standard 5: Fish, Wildlife and Biodiversity Forest management activities contribute to the conservation of biodiversity.					
Performance Measure 5.1 Forest management activities must maintain or enhance habitat for threatened or endangered communities and species.	<u>Management plans were presented and reviewed before during and after the on-site audits and include provisions for the management of a variety of habitat including game, non-game as well as RT&E species.</u>	<u>11</u>			
Indicator 5.1.1 Forest owner must confer with natural resource agencies, state natural resource heritage programs or review other sources of information to determine occurrences of threatened and endangered species on the property and their habitat requirements.	<u>Cutting Notice and Report of Wood Products from Forest Crop and Managed Forest Lands requires check of the Wisconsin NHI database.</u>	<u>11</u>			
Indicator 5.1.2 Forest management activities must incorporate measures to protect identified threatened and endangered species.	<u>While NHI hits were confirmed (for gray wolf, prairie chicken and cricket frog for example) on a few of the properties, mitigating measures were not needed primarily because the habitat feature could not be located on the property (wetland or grassland, etc) or because the timber harvest did not cross or impact the habitat feature.</u>	<u>11</u>			

AFF Standards Requirements	<u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u>	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
Performance Measure 5.2 Forest owner should address the desired species (fish, aquatic, wildlife, and plant) and/or desired forest communities in the management plan and forest management activities.	<u>Owner's wildlife objectives were often general in nature, although often included deer (a generalist). Management activities consistently provided a variety of habitat features including retention of snags, dens, a variety of tree size categories and a diverse variety of food sources as observed for example on the properties of Shultz, Kaiser and Huser.</u>	11			
Indicator 5.2.1 Forest owner should consult available and accessible information on management of the forest for desired species (fish, aquatic, wildlife, and plant) and/or forest communities and integrate it into forest management.	<u>Foresters are involved in all plans and all harvests; information on management for desired species is provided through these foresters; occasionally supplemented by specialist information.</u>	11			
Performance Measure 5.3 Forest owner should make practical efforts to prevent, eradicate or otherwise control invasive species.	<u>Some owners make substantial efforts; others could do more. For example, according to management plan and interviews with DNR staff and a procurement forester, invasive plants were identified prior to implementation of harvest practices on the Globe Conservation Club. The club will treat those sections of the property during this growing season. More could be accomplished for example on the Cranmoor Coop which is expected as part of the anticipated 2013 management plan.</u>	11			

AFF Standards Requirements	<u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u>	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
<p>Indicator 5.3.1 Forest owner should make practical efforts to prevent, eradicate or otherwise control invasive species using a range of integrated pest management methods.</p>	<p><u>Some owners make substantial efforts; others could do more. For example, according to management plan and interviews with DNR staff and a procurement forester, invasive plants were identified prior to implementation of harvest practices on the Globe Conservation Club. The club will treat those sections of the property during this growing season. More could be accomplished for example on the Cranmoor Coop property which is expected as part of the anticipated 2013 management plan.</u></p>	11			
<p>Performance Measure 5.4 Forest management activities should maintain or enhance rare species and high conservation value forests.</p>	<p><u>While NHI hits were confirmed (for gray wolf, prairie chicken and cricket frog for example) on a few of the properties, mitigating measures were not needed primarily because the habitat feature could not be located on the property (wetland or grassland, etc) or because the timber harvest did not cross or impact the habitat feature.</u></p>	11			
<p>Indicator 5.4.1 Appropriate to the scale and intensity of the situation, forest management activities should incorporate measures to protect or mitigate impacts on rare species and identified high conservation value forests.</p>	<p><u>While NHI hits were confirmed by WDNR staff (for gray wolf, prairie chicken and cricket frog for example) on a few of the properties, mitigating measures were not needed primarily because the habitat feature could not be located on the property (wetland or grassland, etc) or because the timber harvest did not cross or impact the habitat feature.</u></p>	11			
<p>Standard 6: Forest Aesthetics Forest management plans and management activities recognize the value of forest aesthetics.</p>					
<p>Performance Measure 6.1 Forest owner should manage the visual impacts of forest management activities consistent with the size of the forest, the scale and intensity of forest management activities and the location of the property.</p>	<p><u>Harvests and forests observed were managed with concern for visual impacts as confirmed through field observations for example on all properties and especially on the properties owned by Kaiser, Bollig, Bucholz and Shultz.</u></p>	11			

AFF Standards Requirements	<u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u>	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
<p>Indicator 6.1.1 Forest management activities should apply visual quality measures compatible with appropriate silvicultural practices.</p>	<p><u>Harvests had good utilization and green retention which helped manage appearance. Most harvests were conservative in volume removed and volume retained. Properties with heavier harvest activities or larger harvest acreages (Bucholz) effectively used measures such as shape of treatment area, location on the landscape and visual buffers to manage the visual quality.</u></p>	11			
<p>Standard 7: Protect Special Sites Special sites are managed in ways that recognize their unique historical, archaeological, cultural, geological, biological or ecological characteristics.</p>					
<p>Performance Measure 7.1 Forest management activities must maintain special sites.</p>	<p><u>The few special (generally historic) sites present were buffered from management activities. For example old home site and stone walls located on the Wenzel property were adequately protected.</u></p>	11			
<p>Indicator 7.1.1 Forest owner must make a reasonable effort to locate and protect special sites appropriate for the size of the forest and the scale and intensity of forest management activities.</p>	<p><u>During management planning, particularly for harvests or other mandatory practices, there is a check of heritage and historical/archaeological databases.</u></p> <p><u>Each of the WDNR foresters itemized elsewhere in this report were aware of and implement this process.</u></p>	11			
<p>Standard 8: Forest Product Harvests and Other Activities Forest product harvests and other management activities are conducted in accordance with the management plan and consider other forest values.</p>					
<p>Performance Measure 8.1 Forest owner should use qualified natural resource professionals and qualified contractors when contracting for services.</p>	<p><u>All forest owners work with qualified foresters and logging contractors. See below.</u></p>	11			

AFF Standards Requirements	<u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u>	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
<p>Indicator 8.1.1 Forest owner should seek qualified natural resource professionals and qualified contractors.</p>	<p><u>All forest owners work with qualified foresters and most of the harvesting is conducted by FISTA-trained (SFI) contractors.</u></p> <p><u>For example, as confirmed during the interviews with the logger at the Bollig property and foresters at the Kostuch, Keuntjes, Cranmoor and Shultz properties, these individuals are well-trained and meet the requirements of this standard. Each understood operational and safety requirements and could readily identify common native and invasive plants and pathogens.</u></p>	<u>11</u>			
<p>Indicator 8.1.2* Forest owner should engage contractors that carry appropriate insurance and comply with appropriate federal, state and local safety and fair labor rules, regulations and standard practices .</p>	<p><u>Insurance provisions are included in logging contracts.</u></p> <p><u>For example logging contracts were reviewed with the procurement foresters for the properties of Globe Conservation Club and Shultz.</u></p>	<u>11</u>			
<p>Indicator 8.1.3 Forest owner should retain appropriate contracts for forest product harvests and other management activities to demonstrate conformance to the AFF Standards.</p>	<p><u>Landowner stumpage contracts were reviewed and meet this requirement,</u></p>	<u>11</u>			
<p>Performance Measure 8.2 Forest owner must monitor forest product harvests and other management activities to ensure they conform to the management plan objectives.</p>	<p><u>Harvests are monitored by consulting foresters and/or by WDNR foresters. The Wisconsin DNR foresters monitor management plans and notifies forest owners when planned activities are scheduled. The prescription for the activity must be reviewed and approve by the Wisconsin DNR prior to implementation. During implementation the activity is monitored. Following the completion of the activity the Wisconsin DNR visits the site to evaluate if the implemented activity meets the planned activity.</u></p>	<u>11</u>			

AFF Standards Requirements	<u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u>	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
<p>Indicator 8.2.1 Harvest, utilization, removal and other management activities must be conducted in compliance with the management plan and maintain the potential of the property to produce forest products and other benefits sustainably.</p>	<p><u>Observations during on-site audits confirm that utilization standards are high in this region probably due to the local paper mills and other markets for small diameter materials. The high attention to detail related to the presence and control of pathogens and invasive plants for example on the Globe Conservation Club and Shultz property and for post- tornado salvage on the properties of Bollig and Ebacher and the presence on all properties of fully stocked stands and fully implemented BMPs ensure the continued ability of these properties to sustainably produce benefits in the future.</u></p>	<u>11</u>			

Northeast Region

Auditor: Mike Ferrucci mferrucci@iforest.com
CO Contact: Ken Symes (608) 267-0547 (desk), (262) 353-2949 (cell)

Sunday

Evening Flight arrival

Travel to Oshkosh
Hotel: AmericInn Hotel (920) 232-0300

Monday Green Lake County (Forester Scott Sullivan)

7:30 AM Meeting at Ranger Station
363 Church Street
Montello WI 53949

8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Tuesday Green Lake County (Forester Scott Sullivan)

7:30 AM Meeting at Ranger Station
363 Church Street
Montello WI 53949

8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Wednesday Winnebago County (Forester Tom Vanden Elzen)

7:30 AM Meeting at Oshkosh Service Center
625 E County Road Y, Suite 700
Oshkosh WI 54901

8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Thursday Winnebago County (Forester Tom Vanden Elzen)

7:30 AM Meeting at Oshkosh Service Center
625 E County Road Y, Suite 700
Oshkosh WI 54901

8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Evening Travel to Appleton

Flight Departure

Monday June 13, 2011 Green Lake County (Forester Scott Sullivan)

1. Gale Holloway, Kingston, 32 acres.
2. Norman Tabbert, Kingston, 47 acres
3. Tim Tabbert, Kingston, 62 acres
4. Marvin Wagner, Manchester, 40 acres
5. Brian Zimmerman, Marquette, 70 acres
6. Smitts Brothers, Princeton, 16 acres

Tuesday June 14, 2011 Green Lake County (Forester Scott Sullivan)

1. Lee Moss, Princeton, 73 acres
2. Michael Loughrin, Princeton, 64 acres
3. Vicki Pulvermacher, Princeton, 56 acres
4. Fred Ransome , Princeton, 47 acres
5. Joel Baranowski and Keith Thrasher, Brooklyn, 80 acres
6. Larry and Betsey Miller, Brooklyn, 23 acres

Wednesday June 15, 2011 Winnebago County

Tom Vanden Elzen, Forester Winnebago County

Ken Symes, Wisconsin DNR

Bill Ruff, Forester Dorr County

1. Earl Busse, Omro, 20 acres, 1994 plan
2. Jeffrey Deppe, Winnecone, 27 acres, 2004 plan
3. Jerry Hunter, Winchester, 11 acres
4. Gary Rubbert, Clayton, 15 acres
5. Mike and Cynthia Madsen, Clayton, 15 acres, 1996 plan
6. Barbara Eckstein, Wolf River, 33 acres, 2004 plan
7. John Judy, Wolf River, 25 acres, 2001 plan
8. Curtis Johnson, Wolf River, 38 acres, 1991 plan
9. Ed Esselman, Wolf River, 53 acres, 1998 plan

Thursday June 16, 2011 Winnebago County

Tom Vanden Elzen, Forester Winnebago County

Ken Symes, Wisconsin DNR

1. Ruben and Lois Olson, Wolf River, 62 acresw, 1990 plan
2. Steven and Beth Edwards, Wolf River, 75 acres, 2005 plan
3. Philip Neuschafer, Wolf River, 59 acres, 1995 plan

Northern Region

Auditor: Tucker Watts jt watts1@gmail.com
CO Contact: Jerry Crow (715) 453-2188 x1260 (desk), (715) 612-0980 (cell)
Area Contact: Mike Lietz (715) 539-3624

Sunday

Evening Flight arrival

Travel to Rhinelander
Hotel: AmericInn Hotel (715) 369-9600

Monday **Oneida County (Foresters Jake Bonack and John Gillen)**

7:30 AM Meeting at Ranger Station
511 Hanson Lake Road
Rhinelander WI 54501

8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Tuesday **Oneida County (Foresters Jake Bonack and John Gillen)**

7:30 AM Meeting at Ranger Station
511 Hanson Lake Road
Rhinelander WI 54501

8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Evening Travel to Antigo

Hotel: Super8 (715) 623-4188

Wednesday **Langlade County (Foresters Pam Freeman Gillen, Ron Zalewski, Terry Trapp)**

7:30 AM Meeting at Antigo Service Center
223 E Steinfest Road
Antigo WI 54409

8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Thursday **Langlade County (Foresters Pam Freeman Gillen, Ron Zalewski, Terry Trapp)**

7:30 AM Meeting at Antigo Service Center
223 E Steinfest Road
Antigo WI 54409

8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Evening Travel to Wausau

Hotel: Best Western Midway Hotel (715) 842-1616

Friday

AM Flight Departure

Monday **Oneida County (Foresters Jake Bonack and John Gillen)**

1. Peter Bergman, Pelican, 280 acres
2. Hodag Sports Club, Inc., Pine Lake, 78 acres
3. O'Melia, Inc., Three Lakes, 526 acres
4. Robin Lavender, Sr., Three Lakes, 40 acres
5. Williston Rev. Trust – East, Sugar Camp, 160 acres
6. Florence P. Barker, Newbold, 475 acres

Tuesday **Oneida County (Foresters Jake Bonack and John Gillen)**

1. David Gremban, etal, Hazelhurst, 70 acres
2. Michael J. Lietz, etal, Hazelhurst, 59 acres
3. Roger T. Soletske, Hazelhurst, 40 acres
4. Puchter Venison & Timber, Inc., Hazelhurst, 72 acres
5. Rocky Run Acres, Hazelhurst, 117 acres
6. Harvey Hoy, Woodruff, 14 acres

Wednesday Langlade County (Foresters Pam Freeman Gillen, Ron Zalewski, Terry Trapp)

1. V. Fredrick Nast Revocable Trust, Price, 600 acres
2. Gary Flak, etal, Polar, 66 acres
3. Philip H. Spengler, Polar, 120 acres
4. Braun Woodlands, LLC, Polar, 80 acres
5. Rex Bowen, Langlade, 40 acres
6. Mork Land, LLC, Ainsworth, 60 acres
7. Raymond Venn, Elcho, 120 acres

Thursday Langlade County (Foresters Pam Freeman Gillen, Ron Zalewski)

1. Wildwood Acres, LTD., Summit, 76 acres
2. Richard J. & Kathleen M. McCarthy, Summit, 80 acres
3. Patrick L. & Alyssa Marcell, Summit, 40 acres
4. Dan Bothke, Summit, 50 acres
5. Dale Boedeker, Summit, 80 acres

South Region

Auditor: Norman Boatwright boatwright@millikenforestry.com
CO Contact: Kathy Nelson (608) 266-3545 (desk), (608) 219-3683 (cell)

Sunday

Evening Flight arrival
Hotel Shuttle
Hotel: The Edgewater Hotel (608) 256-9071

Monday – Central Office and Jefferson County (Foresters Randy Stampfl, Nicholas Koltz and Mary Anne Buenzow)

7:45 AM Meeting at GEF 2
101 S. Webster St
Madison, WI 53703
8:00 AM Opening Meeting
Noon Travel to Jefferson County Courthouse
320 S. Main St.
Room 112
Jefferson WI 53549
12:45 PM Arrive at Jefferson County Courthouse

Tuesday – Jefferson County (Foresters Randy Stampfl, Nicholas Koltz and Mary Anne Buenzow)

7:30 AM Meeting at Jefferson County Courthouse
320 S. Main St.
Room 112
Jefferson WI 53549
8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Wednesday – Iowa County (Jason Sable and Bill Carlson)

7:30 AM Meeting at Dodgeville Service Center
1500 N Johns Street
Dodgeville WI 53533
8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Thursday – Iowa County (Jason Sable and Bill Carlson)

7:30 AM Meeting at Dodgeville Service Center
1500 N Johns Street
Dodgeville WI 53533
8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Friday - Jefferson County (Foresters Randy Stampfl, Nicholas Koltz and Mary Anne Buenzow)

7:30 AM Meeting at Jefferson County Courthouse

320 S. Main St.

Room 112

Jefferson WI 53549

Noon Travel to Madison

1:00 Exit Meeting Preparation

2:00 Exit Meeting GEF 2 Room 428

4:00 Adjourn

Saturday

AM Flight Departure

Tree Farms Visited

Monday June 13, 2011

Jefferson County

1. George Edenharder, et al, Jefferson, 40 acres. Interview w/George Edenharder.
2. Alois Krzykowski, Hebron, 22 acres. Interview w/ Carlton Stryzewski – new owner.
3. Frank Luther, Hebron, 20 acres. Interview w/ Frank Luther.

Tuesday June 14, 2011

Jefferson County

1. Gordon & Stanley Schmidt, 10 acres, Ixonia.
2. Stanley Hlaban, 10 acres, Ixonia. Interview with Stanley Hlaban.
3. Avia Sheridan, 33 acres, Ixonia. Interview w/ Avis Sheridan.
4. James Miller, 16 acres, Aztalan, Interview w/ Jim Miller.
5. Victor & Harriet Gennerman, 15 acres, Milford. Interview w/Victor Gennerman.
6. Lloyd Lenius, 69 acres, Milford.

Wednesday June 15, 2011

Iowa County

1. Russell Moody, 36 acres, Linden. Interview w/Russ Moody.

2. Bruse & Kristine Amborn, 74 acres, Pulaski.
3. Stanley Statz, 33 acres, Pulaski.
4. Sally Leong Family Trust, 112 acres, Clyde.
5. Gerald Opennorth, 55 acres, Wyoming. Interview Jim Widder – consultant.
6. Mary Lou Edwards, 19 acres, Dodgeville.

Thursday June 16, 2011 Iowa County

1. Rock Ridge Community, 80 acres, Dodgeville.
2. Homer Griffiths, 21 acres, Dodgeville.
3. Pleasant Ridge Cattle Co., 89 acres, Dodgeville. Interview w/ Joe and Virginia Miess.
4. Indian Springs Farm III, LLC, 77 acres, Brigham.
5. Glenn Fisher, 37 acres, Arena. Interview w/ Glenn Fisher.
6. Carten Partners, LLC, 55 acres, Brigham.

Friday June 17, 2011 Jefferson County

1. Chris Rude, 26 acres, Sumner.
2. Carol Breunig, 20 acres, Waterloo.
3. Gary & Debra Wilke, 16 acres, Waterloo.

West Central Region

Auditor: Anne Marie Kittredge amkittredge@gmail.com
CO Contact: Mark Heyde 608-267-0565
Area Contact: Steve Courtney 715-421-7851

Sunday

Evening Flight arrival

Travel to Wisconsin Rapids
Hotel: Mead 715-423-1500

Monday

Wood County (Forester Kris Wimme)

7:30 AM Meeting at Wisconsin Rapids Service Center
473 Griffith Avenue
Wisconsin Rapids WI 54494

8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Tuesday

Wood County (Forester Kris Wimme)

7:30 AM Meeting at Wisconsin Rapids Service Center
473 Griffith Avenue
Wisconsin Rapids WI 54494

8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Wednesday

Portage County (Forester Kent Glazer)

7:30 AM Meeting at Whiting Ranger Station
301 Cedar Street West
Stevens Point WI 54481

8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Thursday

Portage County (Forester Kent Glazer)

7:30 AM Meeting at Whiting Ranger Station
301 Cedar Street West
Stevens Point WI 54481

8:00 AM Arrive at first property

Evening Travel to Mosinee

Rental Car Return

Monday June 13, 2011 Wood County (Forester Kris Wimme)

Mark Heyde, Wisconsin DNR

Steve Courtney, Wisconsin DNR

Mike Warnkey, Wisconsin DNR

Don Bollig, Landowner, Logger (stop #1)

Rick Mahringer, Consulting Forester (stop #2)

Kevin & Theresa Kostuch, Landowners (stop #3)

Steve Gress, Consulting Forester (stops # 3, 4, and 5)

7. Joseph Bollig & Sons, Inc., 37 acres, 1997 plan
8. Ronnie Gumz, 71 acres, 1995 plan
9. Kostuch Family Trust, 118 acres, 2006 plan
10. Jeffrey Keuntjes and others, 80 acres, 1987 and 2012 plans
11. Cranmoor Coop, **1062 acres**, 1987 plan(s)

Tuesday June 14, 2011 Wood County (Forester Kris Wimme)

Mark Heyde, Wisconsin DNR

Dan Petersen, NewPage Forester (stop # 2)

7. Kathleen Ebacher and others, 160 acres, 2007 plan
8. John Schultz, 114 acres, 2009 plan
9. Patricia & Robert Tomlinson, 39 acres, 1995 plan
10. John Kaiser and others, 30 acres, 1987 and 2012 plans
11. Ronald Stelzer, 80 acres, 1987 plan
12. Eugene Huser, 80 acres, 2004 plan

Wednesday June 15, 2011

Portage County (Forester Kent Glazer)

Lyle Eiden, DNR Forester (Portage County)

Mark Heyde, Wisconsin DNR

Steve Courtney, Wisconsin DNR

Myron (Mike) Laska, Landowner (stop # 1)

10. Myron Laska, 230 acres, 1987, 2003 and 2012 plans
11. Robert Gill, 12 acres, 1988 plan
12. Rudolph Wanserski and others, 60 acres, 1991 plan
13. Richard & Beverly Wenzel, 40 acres, 2005 plan
14. Thomas Bell and others, 34 acres, 2005 plan
15. Thomas Wierzba and others, 28 acres, 1990 plan

Thursday June 16, 2011

Portage County (Forester Kent Glazer)

Lyle Eiden, DNR Forester (Portage County)

Mark Heyde, Wisconsin DNR

Bethany Palcholski, Procurement Forester (stop #1)

Shirley Bargager, Wisconsin DNR (stops, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

4. Globe Conservation Club, Inc., 150 acres, 1987 and 2007 plans
5. Shirley Boudry, 80 acres, 1996 plan
6. Roger & Yvonne Turner, 19 acres, 2004 plan
7. Ricky Armao and others, 23 acres, 1997 plan
8. Bucholz, 200 acres
9. DeLloyd Trzebiatowski, 40 acres



Section D
ATFS Reporting Form

ATFS Audit Reporting Form

Note: This form is to be started by the Lead Auditor with assistance from the group's management representative. It is to be included as the final page of the ATFS Audit Report. After the final report is approved by the NSF CB Reviewer, the form is completed by the NSF Certification Services Specialist (CSS). The CSS will submit the form to:

Victoria Lockhart, Certification Manager, American Tree Farm System
 American Forest Foundation, 1111 19th St., NW, Washington, DC 20036
 (T) 202 463 2738 (F) 202 463 2461 vlockhart@forestfoundation.org



American Tree Farm System

Form for Reporting a Forest Management Certificate

For groups certified in conformance to the American Forest Foundation Standards of Sustainability for Forest Management 2004-2009

CERTIFICATE INFORMATION

Certificate Holder Name	Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group
Certification Body Name	
Certificate Number	
Certification Date	
Certificate Expiry Date	
Number of Properties Certified	
Number of Landowners Enrolled When Certification Issued	

CERTIFIED FOREST INFORMATION

Forest Area (to which certification applies)	2,397,229 acres
Listing by State [if certificate covers forestland located in more than one state – for accounting purposes]	NA all in WI
Land Ownership Type	Private
Is this same area certified to another forest management standard?	Yes - FSC

GROUP ENTITY CONTACT INFORMATION

Contact Name	Ken Symes
--------------	-----------

Street, No.	101 South Webster St Fr/4
City, State	Madison, WI
Zip Code	53703
Telephone	6082670547
E-mail	Kenneth.symes@wi.gov
Fax	6082668576
Web Address	

CERTIFICATION BODY CONTACT INFORMATION

Contact Name	
Street, No.	
City, State	
Zip Code	
Telephone	
E-mail	
Fax	
Web Address	

Reporting Guidelines for Forest Management Certificates

Changes to Certification Status

Certification bodies are asked to report certifications and decertifications as they become aware of this status. In the case of a change in ownership, the new entity’s certification will only be included when a certificate is issued in the new organization’s name by an accredited certification body.

Reporting Frequency

Certification bodies are responsible for completing the American Tree Farm System Certificate Reporting Form at the time of the certification audit, surveillance audit, and recertification audit.

Reporting Improvement

Certification bodies are welcome to propose a new reporting guidelines or change to the existing guidelines that they feel will benefit the transparency and consistency of reporting. All suggestions are welcome and will be considered. If an organization becomes aware of a certification that was reported incorrectly, please bring it to AFF staffs’ attention.