

# **ATFS Audit Report**

**American Tree Farm System Group Recertification**



**for**

**Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group**

**June 28, 2014**

**Norman Boatwright**

**NSF**

**789 North Dixboro Road**

**Ann Arbor, MI 48105**

**888-NSF-9000**

**[www.nsf-isr.org](http://www.nsf-isr.org)**



## **ATFS Public Audit Report**

The ATFS Program of the Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group has not achieved conformance with the AFF 2010-2015 Standards of Sustainability for Forest Certification of Private Lands, according to the NSF ATFS Certification Audit Process.

The Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group was initially certified in 2005 and recertified in 2011. 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 46,879 orders included in this certification that total approximately 2,544,239 acres (January 2014). These tree farms are scattered across the state.

The audit was performed by NSF on June 9-13, 2014 by an audit team headed by Norman Boatwright (ATFS Lead) and Kyle Meister (FSC Lead) with Tucker Watts and Anne Marie Kittredge as Team Auditors. 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 to 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 initiated the ATFS audit process with a planning call and extensive follow up relative to site selection and to prepare a detailed audit plan. NSF then conducted the ATFS Recertification 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 next Surveillance Audit is tentatively scheduled for the week of June 8, 2015.

The actual NSFATFS Recertification 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 reviewed a sample of the written documentation assembled to provide objective evidence of ATFS Conformance. NSF also selected field sites for inspection based upon the risk of environmental impact, likelihood of occurrence, special features, and other criteria outlined in the NSFATFS-SOP. NSF 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 not found to be in full conformance with the ATFS Standard. The NSF ATFS Certification Audit Process determined that there are 2 major non-conformances that are described herein:

#### **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.....**

This was a minor CAR issued during the 2013 audit with an approved corrective action plan that was not fully implemented, resulting in this upgrade to a Major CAR. The main component of the plan involves training DNR foresters. The corrective action plan indicated the training would occur during routine training sessions conducted January through March 2014. The DNR decided that the training should occur through a series of training videos. The development of the video training took longer than expected and made it impossible for DNR to carry out its corrective action plan in the required timeframe and the majority of employees requiring the training have not received it. Some progress has been made and includes a Cooperator Training event in March 2014 that was attended by 35 DNR employees. The training videos and supporting material are in the final stages of development and are expected to be finished soon.

#### **4.1.1 Forest owner must implement specific BMPs that are applicable to the property.**

As with the CAR listed above, this was a minor CAR issued during the 2013 audit with an approved corrective action plan that was not fully implemented, resulting in this upgrade to a Major CAR. The main component of the plan involves training DNR foresters. The corrective action plan indicated the training would occur during routine training sessions conducted January through March 2014. The DNR decided that the training should occur through a series of training videos. The development of the video training took longer than expected and made it impossible for DNR to carry out its corrective action plan in the required timeframe and the majority of employees requiring the training have not received it. Some progress has been made with a Cooperator Training event in March 2014 that was attended by 35 DNR employees. The training videos and supporting material are in the final stages of development and are expected to be finished soon.

The Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group is developing corrective action plans to address these issues. These CARs must be closed before recertification can be granted. The current certificate expires on August 7, 2014.

An Opportunity for Improvement was also identified:

**1.1.2** A review of several pre and post-Land Exam and Practices Reports (post were in the new system) indicates that the post-volume and stocking information is not being updated in the system consistently.

**For addition information contact:**

Norman Boatwright, Forestry Program Manager NSF

Mark Heyde, Forest Certification  
Manager (608) 267-0565

Office and Mobile: 843.229.1851 [nboatwright12@gmail.com](mailto:nboatwright12@gmail.com)

[mark.heyde@wisconsin.gov](mailto:mark.heyde@wisconsin.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-1Y942.**

### **NSF ATFS Audit Process and Reporting**

The NSF Audit Report consists of all documents used in the audit process, including the Audit Plan and Recertification Audit documents.

The actual NSF ATFS Recertification 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 Recertification Audit Checklists (Section B). Any non-conformances were fully documented in the Public Audit Report and uploaded into NSF's online interface.

### **Completion of Recertification 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 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 business days after receiving verification that the corrective action plans for the two (2) major CARs have been implemented, NSF will issue a formal Certificate of Conformance to the ATFS Standard to your organization. The Certificate includes the NSF 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 the week of June 8, 2015. 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	Audit Plan
Section B	ATFS Audit Checklists and Agendas
Section C	ATFS Reporting Form
Section D	Site Visit Documentation
Section E	Opening and Closing Meeting Attendees



## **Section A**

### **Audit Plan**



May 18, 2014

**Tentative Audit Plan**  
**for the Wisconsin DNR MFL Tree Farm Group**  
**2014 Audit**  
**Recertification Audit for ATFS**  
**Surveillance Audit for FSC**  
FRS#1Y942

**Certification Coordinator: Wisconsin DNR**

Mark A. Heyde, Forest Certification Coordinator  
Public and Private Forestry Section, Bureau of Forest Management  
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources  
phone: (608) 267-0565 cell: (608) 220-9780  
[mark.heyde@wisconsin.gov](mailto:mark.heyde@wisconsin.gov)

**Group Manager: Wisconsin DNR**

Kathryn J. Nelson, Forest Tax Program and Policy Chief  
Private and Community Forest Section, Bureau of Forest Management  
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources  
phone: (608) 266-3545 cell: (608) 219-3683  
[kathryn.nelson@wisconsin.gov](mailto:kathryn.nelson@wisconsin.gov)

**Audit Team:**

Norman Boatwright <a href="#">ATFS Lead Auditor</a>	Cell: 843-229-1851 <a href="mailto:nboatwri12@gmail.com">nboatwri12@gmail.com</a>
Anne Marie Kittredge	Cell: 413-230-0465 <a href="mailto:amkittredge@gmail.com">amkittredge@gmail.com</a>
Tucker Watts	Cell: 601-622-6487 <a href="mailto:jtwatts1@gmail.com">jtwatts1@gmail.com</a>
Kyle Meister FSC Lead Auditor for SCS	Cell: 503.758.7768 <a href="mailto:kmeister@scsglobalservices.com">kmeister@scsglobalservices.com</a>

**Audit Dates:** June 9-13, 2014, 2013

See [schedules](#) at the end of this document.

**Opening meetings**

- Monday morning June 9: For the Northern Team, 9:30 AM at the Wautoma Ranger Station. For the Southern Team 8:45 at the Pike Lake State Park Office.
- Participants: Northern Team – Norman Boatwright and Tucker Watts (auditors), DNR Lead Jerry Crow and local DNR staff. Southern Team – Kyle Meister and Anne Marie Kittredge (auditors), DNR Lead Kathy Nelson and local DNR staff.

## **Certification Objectives:**

### **ATFS:**

1. Determine whether the Group Organization's administration and management remains 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.

### **FSC:**

1. Determine conformance of MFL Program with FSC US Forest Management Standard V1.0 (Family Forest Indicators); v FSC-STD-30-005 FM Group Evaluation, and SCS FM Chain-of-Custody Indicators.

### **ATFS 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

### **FSC Audit Scope:**

State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Managed Forest Law Program

### **Performance Measures & Indicators:**

FSC US Forest Management Standard V1.0 (Family Forest Indicators); FSC-STD-30-005 FM Group Evaluation, and SCS FM Chain-of-Custody Indicators

## **Overview**

A four-person audit team from NSF (including one auditor from SCS) will assess a sample of 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 and FSC requirements. The Forestry Division of Wisconsin DNR serves as the "Group Manager"; the program will also be assessed against the requirements for Independently Managed Groups. Norman Boatwright is leading the audit ATFS and Kyle Meister is leading the audit for FSC. Tucker Watts and Anne Marie Kittredge will serve as Team Auditors for both standards. A total of eight (8) counties will be visited. Preliminary results will be presented in a closing session on Friday June 13<sup>th</sup> at 12:00 PM.

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

## **Sampling Plan County Selections and Auditor Assignments:**

County	Auditor	Dates	
Waushara	Norman Boatwright	June 9-10	
Outagamie	Norman Boatwright	June 11-12	
Kewaunee	Tucker Watts	June 9-10	
Brown	Tucker Watts	June 11-12	



Ozaukee	Kyle Meister	June 9-10	
Green	Kyle Meister	June 11-12	
Waukesha	Anne Marie Kittredge	June 9-10	
Rock	Anne Marie Kittredge	June 11-12	

### **Sample methodology and preliminary sample size & configuration:**

Sample procedures for ATFS Independent Managed Groups are 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 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 ATFS 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 the process of conducting a 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.

All auditors will conduct their county audits Monday through Thursday and Norman (at the Green Bay Service Center) and Kyle (at the Madison HQ) will review their respective central office functions Friday morning and will consolidate findings via phone call from 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM. The opening meeting for the FSC audit will occur Monday morning around 8:45 AM at the Pike Lake State Park Office. The opening meeting for the ATFS audit will occur Monday morning at 9:30 AM at the Wautoma Ranger Station. The exit briefing is scheduled for Friday afternoon at 12:00 PM via phone (should last about an hour).

### **Selection of Tree Farms for Site Visits:**

- ☒ Norman/Kyle select previously unaudited counties randomly, 1 more nearby
- ☒ WDNR provides spreadsheet of TF sites with activity in selected counties
- ☒ Norman/Kyle randomly select 4 TF for each county (attached)
- ☐ WDNR to make additional selections (total 5 per county) near random selections
- ☐ WDNR provides updated table with number of Tree Farms in each county
- ☐ WDNR to develop schedules and field routes/timing

For each county, four (4) Tree Farms were selected. These four selections represent the core parcels for “tours” of nine (9) field audits to be conducted for each county over a four (4) day period.

Please verify these four (4) core Tree Farm selections first, thus developing a framework for the two-days of audits for each county. Once this is done please pick the remaining five (5) TFs associated with the random

selections (to total nine (9) tracts for each county) based mostly on proximity to random selections. The completed selections are derived from 2013 data which is expected to remain sufficiently accurate:

2014 WI MFL Recertification Audit Sample Approach						
Selected Counties						
Required # Offices to sample	8					
Required # Tree Farms per office	9					
Total # Tree Farms to visit	72					
Acres Category	Acres in Category	Number of MFL Group Members in Category	Number of MFL Orders in Category	% Group Members in Category	Required # Tree Farms to visit	Required # Tree Farms to visit rounded up
0-100	1,555,252	32,075	35,337	0.851744649	61.32561474	62
101-500	866,264	5,453	10,689	0.144803229	10.42583249	11
501-1,000	61,437	94	438	0.00249615	0.179722768	1
1,001-1,0000	63,303	36	418	0.000955972	0.068829996	1
10,100+	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>MFL Certified Group Roster Total</b>	<b>2,546,256</b>	<b>37,658</b>	<b>46,882</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>75</b>
# Tree Farms by Category						
County	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4	Category 5	Total
Brown	125	2	0	0	0	127
Green	220	1	0	0	0	221
Kewaunee	263	6	0	0	0	269
Menominee	0	0	1	0	0	1
Monroe	813	58	0	0	0	871
Outagamie	515	15	0	0	0	530
Ozaukee	72	0	0	0	0	72
Rock	201	0	0	0	0	201
Waukesha	79	0	0	0	0	79
Waushara	952	20	0	0	0	972
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3,240</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,343</b>

County Selections are based on: 1) Counties not audited previously and 2) Logical grouping - Menominee and Monroe will be picked up next year. The acreage category sample requirement will not be met for categories 2-5. This is considered acceptable because the counties handle the on-the-ground administration (an extremely important function) and the acreage category requirements for 2-5 are extremely small.

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 provided above (risk, range, risk, location, special features)

Each county should ultimately develop two (2) full day “tours” for a total of nine (9) selections per county (five (5) one day and four (4) the next). 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 is flexible regarding our visit to their property).

### **Documentation Requested**

Background material on the MFL and on the “Certified Plan Writer Program” was provided in 2012. Please update this information if there have been any changes.

On the first day in each county please provide each auditor the following for the selected sites:

- Daily agendas including starting time and location
- 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 for the selected tracts
- Example timber harvest contracts (not required for all selections; a sample can be provided when we meet owners)
- Copies of the most recent inspection forms for the selected tracts

### **Report & Certificate Timeline:**

For the ATFS Audit, 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. If needed a revised certificate will be issued within 4 weeks of receiving all necessary reports.

### **MFL Final & Summary Report Content:**

<b>Final Report</b>	<b>Public Summary Report</b>
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;	
1.4 Identification of the group manager and audit team personnel (later are normally listed in audit plan);	1.3 The name of group that was audited, including its ATFS representative;
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;	1.4 A general description of the group's operations and overall membership;
1.6 A schedule for surveillance and recertification audits;	1.5 The name of the audit firm and lead auditor;
1.7 The distribution and confidential nature of the Final Report; and	1.6 The dates the certification was conducted and completed;
1.8 Appendices as follows;	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
1.8.1 Audit Plan;	1.8 The certification recommendation.
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.

- 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).
- 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
  - "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 NSF/SCS Auditors' Background and Qualifications**

### Team Auditor: Tucker Watts

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.

### ATFS Lead Auditor: Norman Boatwright

Norman Boatwright is the president of Boatwright Consulting Services, LLC located in Florence, South Carolina. BCS handles typical forestry consulting, SFI, ATF and FSC Audits, Phase I Environmental Site Assessments, Forest Soil Mapping, Wetland Delineation, and other Biological Services. Norman has over twenty-nine years' experience in intensive forest management, eighteen years' experience in environmental services and ten years' experience in forest certification auditing. He has conducted Phase I Assessments on over three hundred and fifty projects covering 3,000,000 acres, Endangered Species Assessments on timberland across the South, and managed soil mapping projects on 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 RABQSA Qualified Lead Auditor with extensive experience auditing SFI, procurement and land management organizations and American Tree Farm Group Certification Programs. He is also a Lead Auditor for Chain of Custody Audits under SFI, PEFC, and FSC.

### Team Auditor: Anne Marie Kittredge

Anne Marie Kittredge is a Forest Management Lead Auditor with experience conducting audits for large and small private and public landowners. Anne Marie also conducts Lead Auditor Chain of Custody audits under the SFI, FSC and PEFC Standards, is qualified as a Lead Auditor (ISO 19011) and has authored >500 reports for a broad range of landowners, manufacturers, distributors and brokers. Anne Marie has > 20 years of experience in traditional forest management, wildlife habitat management, marketing and utilization and forest cutting practices regulations. Anne Marie's experience as a state forester in Massachusetts focused on management of FSC certified state-owned forest lands, forest cutting practice regulation enforcement as well as private landowner assistance and current use certification administration. Anne Marie earned both MS and BS in Forestry from the University of Massachusetts in Amherst.

### FSC Lead Auditor: Kyle Meister

Kyle Meister is a Certification Forester with Scientific Certification Systems. He has been with SCS since 2008 and has conducted FSC FM pre-assessments, evaluations, and surveillance audits in Brazil, Panama, Mexico, Costa Rica, Bolivia, Indonesia, India, Japan, New Zealand, Spain, and all major forest producing regions of the United States. He has conducted COC assessments in Oregon, Pennsylvania, and California. Mr. Meister has successfully completed CAR Lead Verifier, ISO 9001:2008 Lead Auditor, and SA8000 Social Systems Introduction and Basic Auditor Training Courses. He holds a B.S. in Natural

Resource Ecology and Management and a B.A. in Spanish from the University of Michigan; and a Master of Forestry from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.

Mike Ferrucci is the proposed CB Reviewer.

**Random Selections (see “Selection of Tree Farms for Site Visits” above)**

County	Primary Owner	Order Number	Legal Description Acreage	Invoice Number	Payment Cost
BROWN	LEMKE, PAUL	05-002-2000	14.000	FY47362	\$319.14
BROWN	POSEY, GARY	05-005-2002	39.607	FY49749	\$181.73
BROWN	NOVOTNY, PETER ETAL	05-008-1993	18.000	FY47363	\$161.55
BROWN	WILLIQUETTE, MICHAEL	05-009-1995	48.928	FY53857	\$330.42
GREEN	STOEHR, JOHN	23-001-2000	29.000	FY50865	\$99.75
GREEN	KLOSTERMAN, LARRY	23-003-1997	80.000	FY51890	\$1,227.79
GREEN	LIENHARDT, ALFRED	23-005-2003	20.000	FY53789	\$207.99
GREEN	KIEL, ALAN	23-007-1995	61.000	FY48425	\$293.61
KEWAUNEE	GROVOGEL, THOMAS	31-002-2010	40.000	EXEMPT	\$0.00
KEWAUNEE	DEBAUCHE, DANIEL	31-003-2004	86.160	FY52216	\$77.90
KEWAUNEE	STEPANEK, MYRON	31-010-1997	61.000	FY53000	\$544.54
KEWAUNEE	PECO OAKS	31-013-1992	38.730	FY49849	\$438.18
OUTAGAMIE	TACKMAN, JOHN	45-007-2008	29.770	FY52867	\$543.70
OUTAGAMIE	HALLAM, NANCY	45-014-2002	40.000	FY47093	\$398.57
OUTAGAMIE	WOLF, BRUCE	45-015-2000	40.000	FY47094	\$266.68
OUTAGAMIE	LATHROP, TED	45-027-1994	32.000	FY53517	\$546.54
OZAUKEE	GERNER JOINT LIVING TRUST	46-004-1998	37.000	FY49370	\$101.46
OZAUKEE	WELCOME HOME INC	46-007-1995	13.000	FY47098	\$35.56
OZAUKEE	SMALLISH, KATHRYN	46-010-1993	13.000	FY48272	\$91.93
ROCK	HAEGELE, JOSEPH	54-005-2004	36.000	FY46563	\$1,783.26
ROCK	YATES, STEPHEN	54-011-1996	20.000	FY45713	\$1,018.28
ROCK	MORGAN, DAVID	54-013-1993	14.000	FY47508	\$1,450.79
ROCK	KNIGHT, WILLIAM	54-015-1995	11.000	FY47152	\$153.69
WAUKESHA	HARPSTER, RICHARD	68-002-2003	19.000	FY50967	\$62.49
WAUKESHA	STEINBAUER, MICHAEL	68-003-1992	17.000	FY52320	\$57.15
WAUKESHA	DUNN, WALLACE	68-004-1995	32.000	FY48552	\$116.05
WAUKESHA	WAUKESHA LAND CONSERVANCY INC	68-006-1999	39.000	FY48313	\$256.15
WAUSHARA	BLOMQUIST TREE FARM L L C	70-001-2012	62.660	FY52103	\$557.66
WAUSHARA	BROWN, STEPHEN	70-009-2004	80.000	FY47752	\$3,986.18
WAUSHARA	JOHNSON, ANNA	70-010-2004	40.000	FY47753	\$1,786.95
WAUSHARA	BERG, RAYMOND	70-011-2005	80.000	FY49077	\$1,028.37

## Detailed Daily Schedules

**Southern team – Meister and Kittredge** (Green, Rock, Waukesha, and Ozaukee Counties); **DNR lead Kathy Nelson.** *Note: need one district host*

Sunday June 8 fly into Dane County Regional Airport, Madison, WI and drive to Staybridge Suites, Oconomowoc, WI ~ 50 minute drive.

Monday – Auditor 1 Ozaukee County – Pike Lake State Park Office (Julie Peltier) ~ 38 minutes (Hartford, WI)  
Auditor 2 Waukesha County – Southern Kettle Moraine SF (Mike Sieger) ~ 21 minutes (Eagle, WI)  
Return to Staybridge Suites overnight (Oconomowoc)

Tuesday – Auditor 1 Ozaukee County day 2  
Auditor 2 Waukesha County day 2  
Overnight Quality Inn & Suites, Madison, WI ~ 60 minutes from Oconomowoc to Madison

Wednesday – Auditor 1 Green County – Fish Hatchery Office Fitchburg, WI (Cory Secher) ~ 1 minute from Quality Inn & Suites, Fitchburg, WI  
Auditor 2 Rock County - 2514 Morse Street, Janesville WI (Nick Koltz) ~ 46 minutes via US 14 or 37 minutes via I-90 (possible rush hour issues)

Overnight at the Quality Inn & Suites, Madison, WI

Thursday – Auditor 1 Green County day 2

Thursday – Auditor 2 Rock County day 2

Meister overnight at the Quality Inn & Suites, Madison, WI; Kittredge afternoon/evening departure from Dane Co. Regional Airport

Friday - Audit central office systems, State Natural Resources Offices 101 S. Webster St, Madison, WI ~12 minute drive from Quality Inn and Suites

Closing meeting at DNR offices and by conference 12:00-1:30

PM Departure from Dane County Regional Airport

**Northeast team – Boatwright and Watts** (Brown, Kewaunee, Outagamie, and Waushara Counties); **DNR lead Gerald (Jerry) Crow.** *Note: need an additional district host*

Sunday June 8 fly into Green Bay with Norman & Tucker on same flight. Take rental car to Comfort Suites Appleton Airport Appleton, WI ~32 drive from Austin Straubel International Airport

Monday, June 9 – Auditor 1 (Boatwright) Waushara County – Wautoma Ranger Station (Rod Glaman, Jeff Nyquist) ~ 1+ hr. drive; Jerry Crow host

Auditor 2 (Watts) Kewaunee County – Meet at field sites (Chris Plzak) ~ 1+ hr. drive; *District host TBD*

Overnight Appleton Comfort Suites Airport Hotel

Tues, June 10- Auditor 1 (Boatwright) Waushara County day 2; Crow

Auditor 2 (Watts) Kewaunee County day 2; *host TBD*

Overnight at Appleton Comfort Suites Airport Hotel

Wed, June 11 - Auditor 1 (Boatwright) Outagamie County (Frank Kirschling) Appleton DNR office ~ 5 minutes from hotel; Jerry Crow

Auditor 2 (Watts) Brown County (Stephen Kaufman) DNR Green Bay Service Center ~ 35 minutes from hotel;

*host TBD*

Thursday - Auditor 1 (Boatwright) Outagamie County day 2

Auditor 2 (Watts) Brown County day 2; *host TBD*

Boatwright overnight at Hampton Inn Green Bay; Watts departs early Friday morning Austin Straubel

International Airport

Friday - Closing meeting at the Green Bay Service Center and by conference 12:00-1:30

PM departure from the Austin Straubel International Airport



**2014 MFL Tree Farm/FSC Field Audit Schedule (June 9 - 13)**  
**(Final Version Updated 6-6-14)**

<b>Sunday June 8</b>		<b>Sunday June 8</b>	
Auditors and J. Crow overnight at Comfort Suites, Appleton		Auditors, K. Nelson, J. Nielsen overnight at Staybridge Suites, Oconomowoc	
<b>Monday June 9</b>		<b>Monday June 9</b>	
<b>North Team</b>		<b>South Team</b>	
<b>Waushara County</b> N. Boatwright, Jerry Crow Foresters - Rod Glaman, Jeff Nyquist, Joe Tucker	<b>Kewaunee County</b> T. Watts, John Lubbers Forester - Chris Plzak, Bill Ruff	<b>Ozaukee County</b> Anne Marie Kittredge; John Nielsen Forester - Julie Peltier	<b>Waukesha County</b> Kyle Meister; Kathy Nelson Forester - Michael Sieger
<b>Meet 8 AM at Wautoma Ranger Station</b>	<b>Meet 8 AM at Francis Gilson property</b>	<b>Meet 8 AM at Pike Lake Unit of Kettle Moraine State Forest</b>	<b>Meet 8 AM at Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest Office</b>
Brown, Stephen Johnson, Anna (Reed) Clark, Kevin Ertenberg, Jerome Leusink, Harlan	Gilson, Francis Grovoegel, Thomas Nell, Eric Heim, Ray and Wayne Stepanek, Myron Debauche, Dan - <b>File review only</b>	Riordan, John Poull, Bob Giese, Mark Buser, Dale Luft, Keith	Hotter Family Limited Partnership Harpster, Richard Magnor, Thomas J. Leesley & Joan Hardy Living Trust Dunn, Wallace
Auditors & Crow overnight at Comfort Suites, Appleton		Auditors, Nelson, & Nielsen Overnight at Staybridge Suites, Oconomowoc	
<b>Tuesday June 10</b>		<b>Tuesday June 10</b>	
<b>North Team</b>		<b>South Team</b>	
<b>Waushara County</b> N. Boatwright, J. Crow Foresters - Rod Glaman, Jeff Nyquist, Joe Tucker	<b>Kewaunee County</b> T. Watts, J. Lubbers Foresters- Chris Plzak, Bill Ruff	<b>Ozaukee County</b> Anne Marie Kittredge; J. Nielsen Forester - Julie Peltier	<b>Waukesha County</b> Kyle Meister, K. Nelson Forester - Michael Sieger
<b>Meet 8 AM at location TBD</b>	<b>Meet 8 AM at location TBD</b>	<b>Meet 8 AM at location TBD</b>	<b>Meet 8 AM at location TBD</b>
Campbell, Terry Blomquist Tree Farm Bird, Joe Berg, Ray BJV Holdings	Jerabek, Cheryl Peco Oaks Jandrain, Donna Steffel, Jim Steffel, Alvin	Mohr, Shirley Smallish, Kate Welcome Home, Inc. Gerner Joint Trust Jonas, Glenn	Ashborune LTD Corp. Eschweiler, Thomas Eschweiler, Gabrielle Steinbauer, Michael
Auditors & Crow overnight at Comfort Suites, Appleton		Auditors and Nelson overnight at Quality Inn & Suites, Madison	
<b>Wednesday June 11</b>		<b>Wednesday June 11</b>	
<b>North Team</b>		<b>South Team</b>	
<b>Outagamie County</b> N. Boatwright, J. Crow Forester - Frank Kirschling	<b>Brown County</b> T. Watts, J. Lubbers Forester - Steve Kaufmann	<b>Green County</b> Anne Marie Kittredge; Mary Ann Buenzow Forester - Cory Secher	<b>Rock County</b> Kyle Meister; K. Nelson Forester - Nick Koltz
<b>Meet 8 AM at Appleton DNR Office</b>	<b>Meet 8 AM at Peter Novotny property</b>	<b>Meet 8 AM at Fitchburg Fish Hatchery office</b> Fish Hatchery office	<b>Meet 8 AM at Janesville DNR Service Center</b>
Baumgart, Wayne Boettcher, Debbie & Kurt Brooks, Bill Zwiers, Roger Westphall, Bill Hallam, Nancy - <b>File Review Only</b>	Novotny, Peter et al. Rabas, Francis Rau, Clint Michiels, James (Extra site if time) Kuffel, John	Ginner, Keith Gelbach, Dan Stoehr, John Huschitt, Erik Kiel, Alan	Haegele, Joseph Yates, Stephen Knight, William Morgan, David Larson, Garry et al.
Auditors & Crow overnight at Comfort Suites, Appleton		Auditors and Nelson overnight at Quality Inn & Suites, Madison	
<b>Thursday June 12</b>		<b>Thursday June 12</b>	
<b>North Team</b>		<b>South Team</b>	
<b>Outagamie County</b> N. Boatwright, J. Crow Forester - Frank Kirschling	<b>Brown County</b> T. Watts, J. Lubbers Forester - Steve Kaufmann	<b>Green County</b> Anne Marie Kittredge; M. A. Buenzow Forester - Cory Secher	<b>Rock County</b> Kyle Meister; K. Nelson Forester - Nick Koltz
<b>Meet 8AM at location TBD</b>	<b>Meet 8AM at Green Bay Service Center</b>	<b>Meet 8AM at location TBD</b>	<b>Meet 8AM at location TBD</b>
Wolf, Bruce Ring, Steve Tackman, Jack Lathrop, Ted Schiessl, Terry & Jeff	Williquette, Michael Posey, Gary Posey, Gary Williams, Ronald Lemke, Paul - <b>File Review Only</b>	Lienhardt, Alfred Bergman, Bob Schiller, Jim Klosterman, Larry	Maco, Ann Marshall, Mary Woods, Ronald Melaas, Wilbur
Auditors & Crow overnight at Comfort Suites, Green Bay		Meister, Nelson overnight at Quality Inn & Suites, Madison Kittredge departing afternoon/evening	
<b>Friday June 13</b>		<b>Friday June 13</b>	
<b>12 Noon - 2 PM:</b> Closing meeting/Call in the Fox River Room at Green Bay Service Center Auditors and staff* (not required of field staff but all welcome to participate) Call in: 1-855-947-8255. Passcode: 6687 760#		<b>12 Noon - 2PM:</b> Closing Meeting/Call in Room 413, GEFI Auditors and staff* (not required of field staff but all welcome to participate) Call in: 1-855-947-8255. Passcode: 6687 760#	



**Section B**  
**ATFS Recertification Audit Checklists**

# WISCONSIN 2014 ATFS RECERTIFICATION AUDIT

## AFF STANDARDS (2010 – 2015) MONITORING CHECKLIST

**Group Organization's Name:** Wisconsin DNR Managed Forest Law Program

**Group Member's Tree Farm Name:** Several located in Brown, Green, Kewaunee, Outagamie, Ozaukee, Rock, Waukesha and Waushara Counties, WI

**Auditors:** Norman Boatwright – Lead, Tucker Watts and Anne Marie Kittredge - Team

**Audit Dates:** June 9-13, 2014

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>
<b>Standard 1: Commitment to Practicing Sustainable Forestry</b> 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.	All properties audited had written plans that were consistent with forest size and objectives.	14			

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>Plans are updated at the time a harvest (on the Cutting Notice) or practice is implemented, at the end of the order period, or at other times as needed when determined by WDNR Foresters. WisFIRS System is now fully implemented. This system will automatically update Management Plans following an activity. A GIS module is being tested on public lands. This should be available for private lands in 2 years. A module for the automatic development of the Cutting Notice and generation of bill following cutting is being developed.</p>	<p><b>14</b></p>			

AFF Standards Requirements	Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)	<u>Conform</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Minor</u>	<u>OFI</u>
<p>Indicator 1.1.2</p> <p>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>All plans clearly state objectives, describe stand conditions and prescriptions for achieving implied desired conditions, include and include lists of actions and maps. The strategy for implementation is clear in the recently-written plans but not the older ones. A review of a new management plan written for Richard Grassy (70-010-2015), indicates the plan was very well written, contained all of the required components and accurately reflected conditions on the property.</p> <p><b>Major Non-Conformance</b></p> <p>This was a minor CAR issued during the 2013 audit with an approved corrective action plan that was not fully implemented, resulting in this upgrade to a Major CAR. The main component of the plan involves training DNR foresters. The corrective action plan indicated the training would occur during routine training sessions conducted January through March 2014. The DNR decided that the training should occur through a series of training videos. The development of the video training took longer than expected and made it impossible for DNR to carry out its corrective action plan in the required timeframe and the majority of employees requiring the training have not received it. Some progress has been made and includes a Cooperator Training event in March 2014 that was attended by 35 DNR employees. The training videos and supporting material are in the final stages of development and are expected to be finished soon.</p> <p><b>Opportunity for Improvement</b></p> <p><u>A review of several pre and post-Land Exam and Practices Reports (post were in the new system) indicates that the post-volume and stocking information is not being updated in the system consistently.</u></p>		14		14

<b>AFF Standards Requirements</b>	<b><u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u></b>	<b><u>Conform</u></b>	<b><u>Major</u></b>	<b><u>Minor</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>
<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>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.</p> <p>An example are the wind damage salvage operations conducted on the Bird 70-008-2007, Berg 70-011-2005 and Lathrop 45-027-1994 tree farms and a change in the harvest plan on the Zwiers 45-019-2005 tree farm to include an aspen regeneration harvest.</p>	<b>14</b>			
<p><b>Standard 2: Compliance With Laws</b></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>The audit did not identify any evidence of non-compliance with laws.</u></p>	<b>14</b>			
<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>Foresters are involved in planning all harvests and major silvicultural treatments; these foresters help owners comply.</p>	<b>14</b>			
<p>Indicator 2.1.2</p> <p>Forest owner should obtain advice from appropriate professionals, or contractors who are trained in, and familiar with, relevant laws, regulations and ordinances.</p>	<p>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. Many consulting foresters are becoming certified to DNR's Cooperative Forester Program. Requirements are defined by DNR. CEU are required to maintain certification. Some CEUs are provided by DNR.</p>	<b>14</b>			
<p><b>Standard 3: Reforestation and Afforestation</b></p> <p>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>					

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 3.1 Reforestation or afforestation must be achieved by a suitable process that ensures adequate stocking levels.</p>	<p>Timely reforestation and afforestation is assured by WDNR MFL provisions, with the exception of areas with very high deer populations. This appears to be an emerging problem, particularly given recent changes to deer management policies and laws. Trends in deer populations and changes in deer population management may impact forest sustainability.</p> <p><u>Northern hardwood stands managed using selection silviculture are particularly susceptible to regeneration delays or failure when deer populations are high. Thus far the stocking levels in the majority of stands are within the standards prescribed in the silvicultural guidelines, but this issue should be carefully monitored in future audits.</u></p>	14			

AFF Standards Requirements	Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)	Conform	Major	Minor	OFI
<p>Indicator 3.1.1</p> <p>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>The MFL program tracks all regeneration harvests. Foresters may schedule a "mandatory practice" inspection five years after such harvests to ensure adequate stocking is achieved.</p> <p>Natural regeneration is visually monitored by foresters when assessing each ownership. The MFL program has the capability to track regeneration harvests and schedule a "mandatory practice" inspection five years after such harvests in even-aged types to ensure adequate stocking is achieved. When natural regeneration may not provide adequate stocking (high risk sites), the ownership is identified in the database for a surveillance visit to monitor regeneration. This was identified and discussed for several situations during the site visits.</p> <p>Confirmed by review of stand level regeneration stocking count data for the following tree farms: Stephen Brown 70-009-2004, Jerry Ertenberg 70-002-2008 and Eric Nell 31-009-2001.</p>	14			
<p><b>Standard 4: Air, Water and Soil Protection</b></p> <p>Forest management practices maintain or enhance the environment and ecosystems, including air, water, soil and site quality.</p>					
<p>Performance Measure 4.1</p> <p>Forest owner must meet or exceed practices prescribed by State Forestry Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are applicable to the property.</p>	<p>BMP compliance was observed on <u>the tree farms inspected and road construction appeared reasonable and not excessive.</u></p>	14			



AFF Standards Requirements	Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)	Conform	Major	Minor	OFI
Indicator 4.1.1 Forest owner must implement specific BMPs that are applicable to the property.	<p>BMP compliance was observed on <u>the tree farms inspected and road construction appeared reasonable and not excessive.</u></p> <p><b>Major non-conformance</b> This was a minor CAR issued during the 2013 audit with an approved corrective action plan that was not fully implemented, resulting in this upgrade to a Major CAR. The main component of the plan involves training DNR foresters. The corrective action plan indicated the training would occur during routine training sessions conducted January through March 2014. The DNR decided that the training should occur through a series of training videos. The development of the video training took longer than expected and made it impossible for DNR to carry out its corrective action plan in the required timeframe and the majority of employees requiring the training have not received it. Some progress has been made with a Cooperator Training event in March 2014 that was attended by 35 DNR employees. The training videos and supporting material are in the final stages of development and are expected to be finished soon.</p>		14		
Indicator 4.1.2 Forest owner must minimize road construction and other disturbances within riparian zones and wetlands.	<p>Properties inspected had well-designed and maintained roads (often mowed) that respected <u>(minimized impacts in) riparian zones. Roads on some properties were seeded to control soil movement. Culverts were stabilized using rip rap, silt fences, and seeding.</u></p>	14			
Performance Measure 4.2 Forest owner must consider integrated pest management to control pests, pathogens and unwanted vegetation.	<p>Foresters encourage proper stocking. Efforts are <u>made to deal with invasive plants, but more could be done.</u></p>	14			

AFF Standards Requirements	Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)	Conform	Major	Minor	OFI
Indicator 4.2.1 Forest owner should evaluate alternatives to manage pest, pathogens and unwanted vegetation to achieve specific management objectives.	Interviews showed that most forest owners use chemical measures only if there is no effective <u>alternative</u> . Confirmed by observation of the successful black locust chemical control on Bird 70-008-2007 and chemical use to control weeds on Eric Nell 31-009-2001. Review of several management plans and cutting notices indicate they specify the timing of harvest in oak stands to discourage oak wilt.	14			
Indicator 4.2.2 Pesticides used must be EPA-approved.	Interviews confirmed that chemicals are applied <u>as per label and on-site visits did not identify any issues</u> .	14			
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.	Interviews confirmed that chemicals are applied <u>as per label and on-site visits did not identify any issues</u> .	14			
Performance Measure 4.3 When used, prescribed fire must conform with forest owner's objectives, the forest management plan and pre-fire planning.	<u>NA</u>				
Indicator 4.3.1 Prescribed fire must conform with the management plan and state and local laws and regulations.	<u>NA</u>				
<b>Standard 5: Fish, Wildlife and Biodiversity</b> 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 provides a variety of habitat. Updated management plans and cutting notices address wildlife habitat and T/E issues.</u>	14			

<b>AFF Standards Requirements</b>	<b><u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u></b>	<b><u>Conform</u></b>	<b><u>Major</u></b>	<b><u>Minor</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>
<p>Indicator 5.1.1</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Cutting Notice and Report of Wood Products from Forest Crop and Managed Forest Lands requires a check of the Wisconsin NHI database by the plan author and WIDNR approving forester.</p> <p>The new management plan format also requires a search of the NHI plan writer.</p> <p>Review of cutting notices and management plans in the new format indicate the NHI database searches are being conducted.</p>	<b>14</b>			
<p>Indicator 5.1.2</p> <p>Forest management activities must incorporate measures to protect identified threatened and endangered species.</p>	<p>Review of the Peco Oaks 31-013-1992 property indicated the habitat exists for a NHI species but none were identified. A Review of the Donna Jandrain 31-019-1992 property indicated the database search identified a T/E plant on-site but a harvest during frozen ground requirement prevented impact to the plant.</p>	<b>14</b>			
<p>Performance Measure 5.2</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Owner's wildlife objectives were general in nature, although often included deer and turkey (a generalist). <u>Management was consistent with providing a variety of habitat. Grouse, turkey and bear were also included.</u></p>	<b>14</b>			
<p>Indicator 5.2.1</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Foresters involved in all plans and all harvests; information on management for desired species is provided through these foresters; occasionally supplemented by specialist information.</p> <p>DNR Wildlife Staff is working with landowners to incorporate habitat diversity to provide habitat for Grouse, Woodcock, Golden Warbler, and other birds with the Young Forest Initiative.</p> <p><u>Cooperating Forester Program involves CEU for these topics.</u></p>	<b>14</b>			
<p>Performance Measure 5.3</p> <p>Forest owner should make practical efforts to prevent, eradicate or otherwise control invasive species.</p>	<p><u>Some owners make substantial efforts; others could do more.</u></p>	<b>14</b>			

AFF Standards Requirements	Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)	Conform	Major	Minor	OFI
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.	Confirmed by observation of the successful black locust chemical control on Bird 70-008-2007 and chemical use to control weeds on Eric Nell 31-009-2001.	14			
Performance Measure 5.4 Forest management activities should maintain or enhance rare species and high conservation value forests.	<u>As indicated in Indicator 5 above, MFL procedures require that T/E species and high conservation value habitats be maintained.</u>	14			
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.	<u>No such rare species or high conservation value forests were present on the sites visited.</u>	14			
<b>Standard 6: Forest Aesthetics</b> Forest management plans and management activities recognize the value of forest aesthetics.					
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.	Harvests and forests observed were managed <u>with concern for visual impacts. Buffer strips along water and roads were witnessed and discussed during site visits.</u>	14			
Indicator 6.1.1 Forest management activities should apply visual quality measures compatible with appropriate silvicultural practices.	Harvests had good utilization and green retention <u>which helped manage appearance. In all practices the Wisconsin DNR applies visual quality measures to manage visual quality management of silvicultural practices by using irregular stand lines for cutting boundaries, leave trees, and groups of trees in their cutting prescriptions.</u>	14			
<b>Standard 7: Protect Special Sites</b> Special sites are managed in ways that recognize their unique historical, archaeological, cultural, geological, biological or ecological characteristics.					

<b>AFF Standards Requirements</b>	<b><u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u></b>	<b><u>Conform</u></b>	<b><u>Major</u></b>	<b><u>Minor</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>
Performance Measure 7.1 Forest management activities must maintain special sites.	Special sites are reviewed during the development of the Cutting Notice. The few special (generally historic) sites present were buffered from management activities.	14			
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.	During management planning, particularly for harvests or other mandatory practices, there is a check of heritage and historical/archaeological databases. This is done during management plan development for new plans and during Cutting Notice development for properties with older management plans. Special sites were identified on site visits, including cemeteries and a Native American site.	14			
<b>Standard 8: Forest Product Harvests and Other Activities</b> Forest product harvests and other management activities are conducted in accordance with the management plan and consider other forest values.					
Performance Measure 8.1 Forest owner should use qualified natural resource professionals and qualified contractors when contracting for services.	All forest owners work with qualified foresters at both the management plan development and prescription stages.	14			
Indicator 8.1.1 Forest owner should seek qualified natural resource professionals and qualified contractors.	All forest owners work with qualified foresters and most of the harvesting is conducted by FISTA-trained (SFI) contractors. Wisconsin DNR has developed a Cooperating Forester Program to assist forest owners. The Wisconsin DNR provides forest owners with lists of qualified natural resource professionals and qualified contractors. This list may be requested or downloaded from their website.	14			
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 .	Insurance provisions are contained in the logging contract provided by WI DNR to forest owners.	14			

<b>AFF Standards Requirements</b>	<b><u>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</u></b>	<b><u>Conform</u></b>	<b><u>Major</u></b>	<b><u>Minor</u></b>	<b><u>OFI</u></b>
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.	Contracts are located in landowner files. A sample contract is provided to forest owners with the letter from Wisconsin DNR for scheduled activity.	<b>14</b>			
Performance Measure 8.2 Forest owner must monitor forest product harvests and other management activities to ensure they conform to the management plan objectives.	Harvests are monitored by consulting foresters and/or by WDNR foresters. The Wisconsin DNR foresters monitor management plans and notify forest owners when planned activities are scheduled. The prescription for the activity must be reviewed and approved by the Wisconsin DNR prior to implementation. <u>During implementation the activity may be monitored. Following the completion of the activity the Wisconsin DNR visits the site to evaluate if the implemented activity meets the planned activity.</u>	<b>14</b>			
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.	Following the completion of the activity the Wisconsin DNR foresters visit the site to evaluate if the implemented activity meets the planned activity. Observations of utilization confirmed that harvested trees are generally fully utilized. Notes in files for several landowners documented action taken by Wisconsin DNR for delays in scheduled activities. Scheduled activities are monitored closely. Discussions also indicated that properties have been dropped from the program when the activities cause the site to not meet the productivity requirements of the MFL program. WDNR foresters employ several quite effective techniques to assure a very high <u>level of compliance with the program, and members who delay implementing mandatory practices are given additional time and support to enable them to come into compliance if they are willing.</u>	<b>14</b>			

# Wisconsin DNR MFL Tree Farm Group, FRS #1Y942

Date of audit: June 10-14, 2013

## Section 1. Group Organization Administration

### 1.1 Legal and General Requirements

a. The Group Organization must be a legal entity competent to sign agreements with Group Members and to enter into binding contracts with Certification Bodies and other outside entities.

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N.A. Audit Notes: The WDNR Division of Forestry is a legal entity created by the state legislature.

b. The Group Organization must identify Group Members' category.

I. The Group Organization *must* document the group member category (see above section on Group Member types).

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N.A. Audit Notes: Group member category is declared in the revised Forest Tax Law Handbook, Chapter 21 p21-2 as Group 1.

II. The Group Organization *must* describe roles 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.)

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N.A. Audit Notes: 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 districts, the DNR service foresters and technicians, and the cooperating foresters providing private landowner assistance. The Department determines eligibility and membership requirements of the group.

The Division of Forestry Forest Tax Law Program and Policy 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.

III. The Group Organization *must* have a written commitment to sustainable forestry and conformance to the AFF Standards.

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N.A. Audit Notes: As documented in the *Forest Law Handbook*, 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.

### 1.2 Roles & Responsibilities

a. The Group Organization must adhere to ATFS eligibility requirements and may further define membership parameters for their Group, if desired.

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N.A. Audit Notes: 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 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).

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.

(b) The following land is not eligible for designation as managed forest land:

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.
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.
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.

(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.

b. The 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.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: The Division of Forestry Forest Tax Law Program and Policy 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.

### 1.3 Group Membership

a. The 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.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: WDNR does not charge any fees associated with the administration of the Group.

b. The Group Organization must hold the ATFS Certificate on behalf of the Group Members

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: WDNR does hold the Certificate.

c. The Group Organization must follow the ATFS logo use guidelines and ensure proper use of promotional claims about the Group Certification.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: WDNR is aware of the ATFS logo use guidelines and ensures proper use of promotional claims about group certification. The logo is correctly used on the website. Site visits indicated ATF signs were used appropriately.

d. The Group Organization must have a document issued to each Group Member that confirms the Group Member participation and coverage by the scope of the third-party certificate.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: The application for enrollment in the MFL 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.



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.”

#### **1.4 Group Member Entry & Departure from the Group Organization**

a. The Group Organization must 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, category 1 Group Members must be notified to the individual landowner level and category 2 Group Members must be notified to the portfolio level.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: The application for enrollment 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.

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.”

b. The Group Organization must define and administer a procedure for admitting Group Members.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: 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”. WDNR admits members into the group in January of each year. For 2014, 2,162 orders were admitted totaling 134,363 acres.

c. The Group Organization must 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.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: 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:

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

Data review and interviews with staff indicate members expire, withdraw or are occasionally expelled. This is done on an annual basis. 1,433 orders totaling 78,569 acres were removed on January 2014.

Most were withdrawals of expirations.

d. The Group Organization must maintain and update the membership list and ATFS database to reflect entries and departures of Group Members from the Group Organization.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: WDNR maintains a database that contains all required information about current members. Information about departures is maintained in the History database.

### **1.5 Dispute Resolution**

a. The Group Organization must have a procedure for 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.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: The Forest Tax Law Handbook has a section titled: Enforcement and Dispute Resolution Process.

b. The Group Organization must follow and conform to the AFF Dispute Resolution Policy and assist ATFS in resolving any such complaints.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: WDNR's dispute resolution process conforms to the AFF Policy.

### **1.6 Maintaining Records of Group Member**

a. The Group Organization must maintain internal Group Member records and provide updated information on a regular basis to the ATFS Database.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: 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.

## **Section 2. Requirements of Participation in the American Tree Farm System**

### **2.1 Access to the AFF Standards**

a. The Group Organization must make the AFF Standards of Sustainability for Forest Certification accessible to Group Members.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: Confirmed the Standards are accessible via external links on WDNR's website.

### **2.2 Conformance with AFF Standards**

a. The group organization must have a procedure for evaluating conformance with AFF Standards prior to property enrollment under the group certificate.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: Procedures for admitting group members are the same as for admittance into MFL. These procedures are extensive and found in various portions of the "Tax Law Handbook".

b. Management Plan:

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.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: WDNR requires that each group member have a current management plan. DNR provides potential group members with a list of Certified Plan Writers. DNR will write the plan if a Certified Plan Writer cannot be located.

### **2.3 Eligibility**

a. The Group Organization must have a procedure for evaluating eligibility according to the ATFS Eligibility Requirements prior to property enrollment under the group certificate.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: Procedures for admitting group members are the same as for admittance into MFL. These procedures are extensive and found in various portions of the "Tax Law Handbook".

## **Section 3. Internal Monitoring and Reporting**

### **3.1 Ongoing Monitoring**

a. The Group Organization must establish and maintain a procedure and schedule for conducting ongoing monitoring of conformance with the AFF Standards.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: For landowners, 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 WisFIRS 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 WisFIRS. The data transfer from the old system, Plan Trac, has been completed.

For overall Group Management, WDNR conducts annual internal audits. The report for the 2014 internal audit is not complete and potential findings include a minor non-conformance and an opportunity for improvement.

b. IMG Inspectors of the Group Organization conducting internal monitoring must have completed the current ATFS Tree Farm Inspector training course.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: Review of the DNR training database indicates inspectors have taken the most recent training.

c. The Group Organization must review conformance to the AFF Standards and document the relevant findings.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: 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 WisFIRS 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 WisFIRS.

d. 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.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: 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. These activities are documented on the Management Recommendation Records completed by the foresters.

e. The Group Organization must ensure implementation of the corrective action and monitor conformity as part of the regular schedule of internal monitoring.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: Forest Tax Law Handbook contains procedures to ensure conformities are resolved. This is documented on the Management Recommendation Records completed by the foresters. Review of the 2013 internal audit (report completed 6/21/2013) indicated 2 observations were issued. Review of DNR response to non-conformances related to the 2012 internal indicates the response was timely and appropriate.

### **3.2 Annual Reporting to the American Tree Farm System**

a. The Group Organization must adhere to the annual reporting requirements as defined by ATFS and maintain copies of past annual reports.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: Confirmed via review of Group Certification Annual report that it was submitted to national.

## **Section 4. Independent Audit**

### **4.1 Managing the Group Certification Process**

a. The Group Organization must 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.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: WDNR has contracted with NSF to conduct an independent certification according to the ANSI accreditation rules.

b. The Group Organization must 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.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: All auditors were provided with all the information they requested.

c. If the certification audit results in a non-conformity, the Group Organization must work with all appropriate parties take corrective action and ensure timely implementation.

☐ **Yes** ☒ **No** ☐ **N.A.** Audit Notes: The corrective action plans for two (2) minor non-conformances identified in the 2013 audit were approved and involved training of field foresters as a major component. The training implementation was not done in the required timeline and the minors are elevated to majors.

d. The Group Organization must submit a copy of the ATFS Certificate and a summary of the audit report that is appropriate for public distribution to ATFS.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.**    Audit Notes: Interview with ATFS Certification Manager indicates the report was submitted.

- e. The Group Organization must keep the Group Organization's program up-to-date and in ongoing conformance with the AFF Standard.

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **N.A.**    Audit Notes: Review of DNR Group Program indicates it is up-to-date.



**Section C**  
**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:

American Forest Foundation, 1111 19th St., NW, Washington, DC 20036

(T) 202 463 2738 (F) 202 463 2461



## **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	<b>Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group</b>
Certification Body Name	<b>NSF</b>
Certificate Number	<b>1Y942-FC1</b>
Certification Date	<b>8-Aug-11</b>
Certificate Expiry Date	<b>7-Aug-14</b>
Number of Properties Certified	<b>46,879</b>
Number of Landowners Enrolled When Certification Issued	

#### **CERTIFIED FOREST INFORMATION**

Forest Area (to which certification applies)	<b>2,544,239</b>
Listing by State [if certificate covers forestland located in more than one state – for accounting purposes]	<b>WI</b>
Land Ownership Type	<b>Cat 1</b>
Is this same area certified to another forest	<b>FSC</b>

**GROUP ENTITY CONTACT INFORMATION**

Contact Name	<b>Kathy Nelson</b>
Street, No.	<b>101 South Webster St Fr/4</b>
City, State	<b>Madison, WI</b>
Zip Code	<b>53703</b>
Telephone	<b>(608) 266-3545</b>
E-mail	<b>Kathy.nelson@wisconsin.gov</b>
Fax	<b>(608) 266-8576</b>
Web Address	<a href="http://www.dnr.wi.gov">www.dnr.wi.gov</a>

**CERTIFICATION BODY CONTACT INFORMATION**

Contact Name	<b>Dan Freeman</b>
Street, No.	<b>789 N. Dixboro Road</b>
City, State	<b>Ann Arbor, MI</b>
Zip Code	<b>48105</b>
Telephone	<b>734-214-6228</b>
E-mail	<a href="mailto:dfreeman@nsf.org">dfreeman@nsf.org</a>
Fax	<b>734-827-7102</b>
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.





**Section D**  
**Site Visit Documentation**

**2014**  
**Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group**  
**Norman Boatwright Field Notes**  
**Northeast Team**

**Waushara County (June 9 – 10)**

**Participants**

- Jerry Crowe – DNR Host
- R.J. Wickham – DNR
- Joe Tucker – DNR
- Rod Glaman – DNR
- Marcia Frost Vahradian – DNR (semi-retired)
- Jeff Nyquist – DNR
- Jason Hennes - DNR
- Sam Johnson - Adjoining Landowner
- Juris Respa – Consultant
- Kevin Clark – Landowner
- Frank Brey – Landowner – Blomquist
- Joe & Carrie Bird – Landowners
- Aaron Burrmeister – Logger Wilson Tract

**Monday June 9th**

**Stephen Brown 70-009-2004**

Marked thinning of 65 year old white and red pine done in 2011. Emphasis in removing red pine as it was showing signs of decline. A wind storm in the fall of 2011 necessitated a salvage sale. All weather site (very sandy) with no issues. The cut rows have regenerated with white pine. These areas are overstocked and DNR is working to determine the best management prescription. Management plan and cutting notices completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

**Anna Johnson 70-010-2004**

Across the road from the Brown tract with the exact same conditions. Interviewed the adjoining landowner, Sam Johnson, and his consultant, Juris Respa. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

**Jerry Ertenberg 70-002-2008**

Former overgrown scotch pine tree farm plantation was mulched and planted with red, white and some jack pine. This is a very sandy site and the farm was inter-planted twice. File contained evidence of stocking measurements and cost share requests.

**Kevin Clark 70-011-2002**

Well managed tree farm with a very active landowner. Observed a 1<sup>st</sup> thin in a young white pine stand done by Mr. Clark. He also was in the process of pruning the residuals. Also observed an older oak release cut. Adequate regeneration was present as well as adequate oak single tree retention. Sandy site with no issues. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

**Harlan Leusink 70-010-2009**

2 treatments: #1 Oak overstory removal regeneration harvest with single tree retention marked by DNR. Excellent advanced regeneration not disturbed by the harvest operation. #2 Intermediate thinning in a red/white pine stand. Good residual stocking with little damage to residuals. Management plan and cutting notices completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

**Richard Grassy 70-010-2015 (added site)**

This tract was visited because it had a new, unapproved, management plan. The plan was very well written, contained all of the required components and accurately reflected conditions on the property.

**Tuesday June 10<sup>th</sup>**

**BJV Holdings 70-001-2008**

Recent activity includes a 2013 oak overstory removal (2<sup>nd</sup> cut of the shelterwood regeneration system) in a stand with significant advanced oak regeneration that was not destroyed during the harvesting operation. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

**Terry Campbell – Herdeman Trust 70-051-1994**

Oak overstory and aspen regeneration cut done in 2009 has good oak/cherry regen and adequate single tree retention. Recent activity includes a marked 4<sup>th</sup> thin in a red/white pine stand. Good marking leaving 120-140 sqft BA/acre. Cutting notice not yet submitted. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

**Blomquist 70-001-2012**

#3<sup>rd</sup> thin in a red/white pine stand removing a portion with red pine decline. Good stocking with little damage to residuals. Oak overstory removal combined with a shelterwood cut where advanced regeneration was not sufficient. Good oak regeneration with little damage and single tree retention. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

**Bird 70-008-2007**

2011 salvage cut and thin in red/white pine and red pine stands with adequate stocking and little damage to residuals. 2013 1<sup>st</sup> thin with good stocking and little damage to residuals. Observed successful treatment of a black locust stand that will be planted next year. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

**Wilson 70-068, 069, 070-1995 (added site)**

Active logging job in red pine marked by a consultant in 3 ways: typical marked thin, typical row thin and a clearcut in an area with red pine decline. Logger using a processor and forwarder. Good marking and logging jobs with no damage to the residuals. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

**Berg 70-011-2005**

Stands 1, 2, 4 and P5 were scheduled for a thin in 2014. A wind storm in 2011 caused some damage so all stands were salvaged and thinned. There were some wet areas but no rutting. Single tree retention was left where possible in the wind damaged areas. Observed little damage to residuals. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

## Outagamie County (June 11 – 12)

### **Participants**

- Jerry Crowe – DNR Host
- R.J. Wickham – DNR
- Frank Kirschling – DNR
- Ryan Severson – DNR
- Aaron Burrmeister – Logger Wilson Tract
- George Howlett – Consultant
- Debbie Boettcher – Landowner
- Roger Zwiers - Landowner
- Steve Ring – Landowner
- Jack Tackman – Landowner
- Tom Lathrop – Father of landowner

### **Wednesday June 11th**

#### **Baumgart 45-019-2000**

Older sale in what was called a northern hardwood stand that contains a significant component of swamp hardwood. Marked by a consultant. Observed good stocking and little damage to residuals. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

#### **Boettcher 45-005-2010**

Northern hardwood sale marked by consultant and cut in 2012. Sale included some small openings to encourage oak regeneration. Observed little damage to residuals. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

#### **Bill Brooks 45-005-2011**

2013 Aspen regeneration cut leaving buffers around vernal pools. No issues. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record.

#### **Zwiers 45-019-2005**

Bottomland hardwood sale marked by consultant and cut in 2013. A change in sale plans, aspen regeneration cut on the north side, was well documented by the DNR forester. Observed good stocking and little damage to residuals. Management plan completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record. Cutting notice did not identify stand #.

#### **Wolf 45-015-2000**

Northern Hardwood thinning and aspen regeneration cut. Observed good stocking and little damage to residuals. Management plan completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record. Cutting notice did not identify stand #.

#### **Westphal 45-008-1996**

Bottomland hardwood intermediate cut completed in 2013. Observed good stocking and little damage to residuals. Management plan completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record. No issues.

#### **Ring 45-010-2006**

Oak and northern hardwood intermediate cut completed in 2013. Observed good stocking and little damage to residuals. Mr. Ring cut the aspen out of a red pine stand in 2011 with no issues. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record. Cut in the winter.

**Tackman 45-009-1990**

Intermediate thinning red/white pine completed in 2014. Observed good stocking and little damage to residuals. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record. No issues.

**Lathrop 45-027-1994**

A thinning in several pine stands (red, white and some jack) was completed in August 2012. A tornado struck the property in August 2013 and the salvage has just been completed. Logger did a good job in a difficult situation. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record. No issues.

**Schiesl 45-017-1990**

An intermediate cut was done in 2012 in a stand of northern/swamp hardwood. Observed good stocking and little damage to residuals. Management plan and cutting notice completed adequately and all activities well documented on the Management Recommendations Record. No issues.

**Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group  
Tucker Watts Field Notes**

**Kewaunee County (June 9 – 10)**

**Participants**

- John Lubbers – DNR
- Chris Plzak – DNR
- Bill Ruff – DNR
- Shelly Wrzochalski – DNR
- Jon Simonar - Landowner

**Francis Gilson 31-010-2012**

Marked thinning of Northern Hardwoods. Harvesting during frozen conditions. Limited harvesting for oak wilt. Endangered bird found through NHI search. Harvesting during frozen conditions will meet conditions of both findings. Additional marking was required prior to Cutting Notice approval. No issues identified.

**Thomas Grovogel 31-002-2010**

Combination of coppice cut for aspen, row thinning for spruce and marked thinning of Northern Hardwood. Muck swamp required frozen conditions. No issues.

**Eric Nell 31-009-2001**

Thinning and coppice regeneration of Aspen and White Birch. Cutting plan followed. No issues. Planting on adjacent MFL property of Eric Nell was witnessed during entrance to property. CRP planting was conducted for 3 seasons due to deer browse. Documentation of monitoring and prescription for re-planting witnessed in file. Chemical release has been used to control weeds. Mowing conducted between rows. Monitored at time of planting and at age 5. Good survival at present.

**Ray and Wayne Heim 31-006-2000**

Thinning of hardwood. Frozen conditions required and used. Canopy gaps used for regeneration and diversity. Limited regeneration in gaps. Letter sent to landowner for possible damage from riding 4-wheeler. No damage identified during site visit. No issues.

**Myron Stepanek 31-010-1997**

Single tree selection thinning. Wildlife tree retention marked in blue. Harvesting during frozen conditions. RMZ along creek beds provided by marking. Gaps created with marking. No issues.

**Cheryl Jerabek 31-003-1996**

Intermediate thinning with aspen clearcuts. Row thinning of pine marked. Harvesting during frozen conditions. No issues identified.

**Peco Oaks 31-013-1992**

Single tree selection thinning. Aspen regeneration. Diversity created with Aspen clearcut. Harvesting restricted to frozen conditions to prevent oak wilt and protect water quality. Habitat for NHI species exists although none identified. Harvesting during frozen conditions protected habitat. No issues identified with harvesting. Boundaries clearly identified. Landowner is tapping maple trees for personal consumption syrup. No issues identified.

**Donna Jandrain 31-019-1992**

Harvesting of mature Aspen. Minimal information provided on Cutting Notice. Cutting Notice was submitted during transition of DNR Forester and was automatically approved after 30 days. Harvesting was conducted during frozen conditions. A NHI plant species was identified during the search, but harvesting during frozen conditions will not impact the plant. No issue was identified, although the approval process was not adequately completed.

**Jim Steffel 31-012-1996**

Intermediate thinning with gaps for regeneration. Retention of dead trees. No issues identified.

**Alvin Steffel 31-002-2002**

Intermediate thinning with gaps for regeneration. No marking across Jambo Creek due to low stocking. No issues identified.

**Robert G. and Scott J Hendricks 31-003-2004 (File Only)**

Cutting Notice matches the Forest Management Plan. Documentation of the management of the MFL Program is witnessed from notification of mandatory practices to Notice of Investigation and follow-up activities. No issues identified.

**Brown County (June 11 – 12)**

**Participants**

- John Lubbers – DNR
- Steve Kaufmann – DNR
- Shelly Wrzochalski – DNR
- Chuck Barnowsky – Lakeshore Forest Products (Pete Novotny Property)
- Chris Gergens – Lakeshore Forest Products (Peter Novotny Property)
- Fancis Rabas – Landowner
- Ray Perry – Cooperating Forester (Francis Rabas Property)
- Dan Hanson – Logger (Michael Williquette Property)
- Ron Williams - Landowner

**Peter Novotny 05-008-1993**

Salvage Sale 2010 & 2013 from tornado. Regeneration after salvage is goal. Gaps marked for cleaning and regeneration. Sensitive area for BMP implementation and NHI concerns along rock ledge. No issues identified.

Logger interview (Chuck Barnowsky) – Completed SFI logger training. Is not FSC COC certified. Timber was not cut as FSC product.

**Francis Rabas 05-003-2004**

Thinning in bottomland hardwood. Black Walnut has been planted along river. Field stone has been placed along river for erosion control. Prickly Ash and Thornapple have been removed. Permit was obtained for adding culvert along walk-way. River was not crossed during harvesting. Retention of snag and legacy trees. No issues identified.

**Clint Rau 05-007-2013**

No cutting has taken place. Marked for cutting. Retention trees identified. Cutting limited for oak wilt. Permits required for crossing of Twin Hill Creek. Snails, fish, and snails habitat identified on property. Compliance with BMPs will protect species. No issues. Sale included MFL and non-MFL property. Harvests was segregated for yield tax.

**James Michiels 05-004-2014**

No cutting has taken place. Marked for cutting. Coppice regeneration of aspen and thinning. No NHI. Harvest during frozen conditions. No issues identified.

**John Kuffel 05-007-2001**

No cutting has taken place. Marked for cutting. Regeneration of aspen and thinning. RMZ along stream witnessed. No issues. NHI species identified on property outside harvesting area will not be impacted.

**Michael Williquette 05-009-1995**

Non-MFL and MFL sold. Discussed segregation with logger. Segregated on log deck and identified on Scale Ticket for yield tax. Thinning and clearcut of aspen areas. Ditch and stream protected by RMZ. Logging conducted during frozen conditions. Notice of Investigation for failure to comply with mandatory practices scheduled in 2009 witnessed. Notes and documentation in file provided steps in notification process. Decision on penalty was decided by municipality.

**Gary Posey 05-005-2002**

Marked thinning in Northern Hardwoods. NHI identified Wood Turtle. Harvesting conducted during frozen conditions to minimize soil disturbance and for oak wilt. Wildlife retention trees identified. No harvesting across creek. Creek was not crossed. Additional marking was required following initial submission of Cutting Notice. Documentation of rejection witnessed and discussed.

**Gary Posey 05-010-1995**

CRP land. First thinning of Red Pine by 3<sup>rd</sup> row and marked between. NHI identified Wood Turtle. Archeological site identified. Harvesting conducted during frozen conditions to minimize soil disturbance. Additional marking was required following initial submission of Cutting Notice. Documentation of rejection witnessed and discussed.

**Ronald Williams 05-007-1996**

Thinning of Red Pine plantation. Permit obtained for crossing of Suamico River. Crossed during frozen conditions. No issues identified with crossing. Wood Turtle identified on site during marking. Harvesting during frozen conditions will meet requirements for protection. Wood Turtle not identified in NHI database. No issues witnessed.

**Paul Lemke 05-002-2000 (File Only)**

Thinning of Northern Hardwood in 2009. Documented in Land Exam and Practices Report. No issues identified.



## Kyle Meister and Anne Marie Kittredge Field Notes

<b>8 – June – 2014</b>	
<b>FMU/Location/ sites visited</b>	<b>Activities/ notes</b>
Opening meeting Southern team – Meister (Auditor 1) and Kittredge (Auditor 2)	Auditor 1 and 2: Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review audit scope, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards and protocols,
<b>9 – June – 2014</b>	
<b>FMU/Location/ sites visited</b>	<b>Activities/ notes</b>
Southern team – Meister (Auditor 1) and Kittredge (Auditor 2)	Auditor 1: Introductions, Waukesha County – Southern Kettle Moraine SF (MFL Order #s 68-005-1999, 68-002-2003, 68-001-2001, 68-012-1993, and 68-004-1995); and review of open CARs/OBS.
	Harvest types reviewed included conifer thinnings, shelterwood removal, group selection, and single-tree selection. Other management practices reviewed included riparian protection measures, property boundary maintenance, road BMPs, prescribed burns, invasive species control, and understory planting.
	Auditor 2 Ozaukee County – Pike Lake Unit of KTSF (MFL Order #s 46-002-1994, 46-005-1995, 46-002-2007, 46-002-2013&46-002-2013, 46-010-1996); and review of open CARs/OBS.  Harvest types reviewed included conifer thinnings, group selection, single-tree selection, salvage and pre-salvage (for EAB and Larch pathogen). Other management practices reviewed included riparian protection measures, RTE protection, archeological site protection, wildlife habitat enhancement prescriptions, property boundary maintenance, road BMPs, prescribed burns and fire breaks, invasive species control, walnut stand management, recreation and planting and supplemental understory planting. Discussions included the use of out-of-date Cutting Notice forms, archeological sites not yet documented in the management plans, the requirement for mapping wetland resource areas and the need to more completely describe and implement NHI mitigation measures.
Northeast team – Boatwright (Auditor 1) and Watts (Auditor 2)	Auditor 1 Waushara County – Wautoma Ranger Station
	Auditor 2 Kewaunee County
<b>10 – June – 2014</b>	
<b>FMU/Location/ sites visited*</b>	<b>Activities/ notes</b>
Southern team – Meister and Kittredge	Auditor 1 Waukesha County day 2 (MFL Order #s 68-001-2002, 68-003-2007, 68-002-2007, and 68-003-1992). Harvest types reviewed included conifer thinnings. Other management practices reviewed included prescribed burns, invasive species

	control, property boundary maintenance, walnut stand management, and recreation. After site visits were completed, all plans for sites visited in Waukesha County were reviewed on WisFRS (data and project management system). Discussions included the use of out-of-date Cutting Notice forms, the need to more completely describe and implement NHI mitigation measures.
	Auditor 2 Ozaukee County day 2 (MFL Order #s 46-007-1999, 46-010-1993, 46-007-1995, 46-004-1998, 46-008-1994).
	Harvest types reviewed included conifer thinnings, hardwood thinnings, TSI, crop tree release, group selection, single-tree selection, salvage and pre-salvage (for EAB). Other management practices reviewed included riparian protection measures, RTE protection, wildlife enhancement prescriptions, property boundary maintenance, road BMPs, invasive species control, walnut stand management, recreation and understory planting.

#### 11 – June – 2014

FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
Southern team – Meister and Kittredge	<p>Auditor 1 Rock County – (MFL Order #s 54-005-2004, 54-011-1996, 54-015-1995, 54-013-1993).</p> <p>Harvests types reviewed included single-tree selection and single-tree selection with removal of overstory and midstory ash, basswood and elm to free growing space for desirable species of oak and walnut. After site visits were completed, plans for sites visited on day one in Rock County were reviewed on WisFRS (data and project management system). Other management activities reviewed included property boundary maintenance. Discussions held on high-grading and heavy removal of merchantable volumes without first securing regeneration.</p> <p>Auditor 2 Green County – Fish Hatchery Office Fitchburg, WI (MFL Order #s 23-001-2012, 23-007-1992, 23-001-2000, 23-006-2002, 23-007-1995); and review of open CARs/OBS.</p> <p>Harvest types reviewed included conifer thinnings, group selection, single-tree selection, salvage and pre-salvage (for EAB and Larch pathogen). Other management practices reviewed included riparian protection measures, RTE protection, archeological site protection, wildlife habitat enhancement prescriptions, property boundary maintenance, road BMPs, invasive species control, walnut stand management, recreation and planting and supplemental understory planting. Discussions included the use of out-of-date Cutting Notice forms, the requirement to more completely describe and implement NHI mitigation measures.</p>

#### 12 – June – 2014

FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
Southern team – Meister and	Auditor 1 Rock County day 2 (MFL Order# 54-010-1993, 54-

Kittredge	011-2000, 54-006-1998, 54-020-2001, and 54-006-2005). Harvest types reviewed included group selection, single-tree selection, and thinning. Other management activities reviewed included property boundary maintenance, sugarbush management, and invasive species control. Discussions held on high-grading and heavy removal of merchantable volumes without first securing regeneration.
	Auditor 2 Green County day 2 (MFL Order #s 23-005-2003, 23-001-2007, 23-027-1994, 23-006-2002, 23-003-1997); and review of open CARs/OBS.  Harvest types reviewed included conifer thinnings, hardwood things, group selection, single-tree selection, shelterwood removal, TSI, salvage and pre-salvage (for EAB and Larch pathogen). Other management practices reviewed included riparian protection measures, RTE protection, archeological site protection, wildlife habitat enhancement prescriptions, property boundary maintenance, road BMPs, invasive species control, walnut stand management, recreation, planting and supplemental understory planting. Discussions included the use of out-of-date Cutting Notice forms, the need to more completely describe and implement NHI mitigation measures.
<b>13 – June – 2014</b>	
<b>FMU/Location/ sites visited*</b>	<b>Activities/ notes</b>
Southern team – Meister	Audit central office systems, State Natural Resources Offices 101 S. Webster St, Madison, WI Closing Meeting Preparation: Auditor(s) take time to consolidate notes and confirm audit findings Closing Meeting and Review of Findings: Convene with all relevant staff to summarize audit findings, potential non-conformities and next steps



**Section E**  
**Opening & Closing Meeting Attendees**

**Opening Meeting Attendees:****Wautoma Ranger Station**

- Norman Boatwright – Lead Auditor
- Jerry Crowe – DNR Host
- R.J. Wickham – DNR
- Joe Tucker – DNR
- Rod Glaman – DNR
- Marcia Frost Vahradian – DNR (semi-retired)
- Jeff Nyquist – DNR
- Jason Hennes – DNR

**Closing Meeting Attendees:****Green Bay Service Center (via conference call)**

- Norman Boatwright – Lead Auditor
- Jerry Crowe – DNR Host
- John Lubbers – DNR
- Steve Kaufman - DNR
- Madison GEFII: Mark Heyde, John Nielsen, Kathy Nelson, Bob Mather, Chris Martin, Jim Warren, Kristin Lambert
- By phone: Kyle Meister, Nicole Potvin, Marcia Frost-Vahradian, Frank Kirschling, Jeff Weatherly, Ryan Severson, Bill Ruff, Shelley Wrzochalski