Surveillance Audit Report
American Tree Farm System Group Certification
Date June 27, 2013

A. Name: Wisconsin DNR MFL Tree Farm Group FRS #: 1Y942

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

☐ No Change
☐ Changed (see Section H, revised scope statement noted on FRS)

C. NSF Audit Team:
Lead Auditor: Norman Boatwright Auditors: Mike Ferrucci & Tucker Watts

D. Audit Dates: June 10-14, 2013

E. Reference Documentation:
Company ATFS Documentation: Forest Tax Law Handbook Date Revised: November 2011

F. Audit Results: Based on the results at this visit, the auditor concluded
☐ Acceptable with no nonconformances; or
☒ Acceptable with two minor nonconformance that should be corrected before the next regularly scheduled surveillance visit;
☐ Not acceptable with one or two major nonconformances - corrective action required;
☐ Several major nonconformances - the certification may be canceled unless immediate action is taken

G. Changes to Operations or to the ATFS Standard:
Are there any significant changes in operations, procedures, specifications, FRS, etc. from the previous visit? ☐Yes ☒No
If yes, provide brief description of the changes:
H. Other Issues Reviewed:
- Yes  No
- Yes  No  N.A.
Public report from previous audit(s) is posted on AFF web site.
ATFS and other relevant logos or labels are utilized correctly.
If no, document on CAR forms. Label is used correctly on the website.

I. Corrective Action Requests:
Corrective Action Requests issued this visit (through NSF’s on-line OASIS audit tool):

1. (List with very brief description, for example “2011-1 Stand Level Retention”…)
   - Corrective Action Plan is not required.
   - Corrective Action Plan is required within thirty days of this report (for Minor Nonconformances). CARs will be verified during the next Surveillance Audit.
   - Corrective Action Plan is required within thirty days of this visit (for Major Nonconformances). The auditor will make arrangements to verify the corrective action has been effectively implemented. All major nonconformance(s) must be closed by the auditor prior to the next scheduled surveillance audit by a special verification visit or by desk review if possible, or the certificate may be withdrawn.

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

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

H. Future Audit Schedule:
Follow-up or Surveillance Audits are required. The next Surveillance Audit is scheduled for June 9, 2014. The assigned lead auditor will contact you 2-3 months prior to this date to reconfirm and begin preparations. Recertification must be completed before August 7, 2014.

Appendices:
Appendix I:  Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule
Appendix II:  Public Surveillance Audit Report
Appendix III:  Audit Matrix and Group Checklist
Appendix IV:  ATFS Audit Reporting Form
Appendix V:  Site Visit Notes
Appendix I

Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule
Tentative Audit Plan
for the Wisconsin DNR MFL Tree Farm Group
2013 Audit
Surveillance Audit for ATFS
Recertification 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

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

Audit Team:
Norman Boatwright Cell: 843-229-1851 nboatwrigh12@gmail.com
ATFS Lead Auditor
Mike Ferrucci Cell: 203-887-9248 mferrucci@iforest.com
Tucker Watts Cell: 601-622-6487 jtatts1@gmail.com
Dave Wagner Cell: 406 493-1490 dave@wisriverforestry.com
FSC Lead Auditor for SCS

Audit Dates: June 10-14, 2013
See schedules at the end of this document.

Opening meeting
• Monday June 10, 9 AM for FSC at the Madison office and at 2:30 PM for ATFS via phone (auditor will
call conference call from the Baldwin office. The opening meeting will be followed by an audit of the central
office/group manager functions).
• Participants: Dave Wager 9 AM with others from Wisconsin DNR; Norman Boatwright 2:30 PM with
Mark Heyde and others from Wisconsin DNR.
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); 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:**


**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 Dave Wager is leading the audit for FSC. Tucker Watts and Mike Ferrucci will serve as Team Auditors for both standards. A total of seven (7) counties will be visited. Preliminary results will be presented in a closing session on Friday June 14th at 1 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:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Auditor</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnett</td>
<td>Norman Boatwright</td>
<td>June 10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk ½</td>
<td>Norman Boatwright</td>
<td>June 10-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 surveillance audit AR 27 specifies the number of sites (county offices) as 0.6 times the square root of the total number of sites. Thus 6 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 6 selected county offices would all be audited during the same week. We have also selected an additional county, Dodge, (total = 3) for a FSC focused review.

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.

Tucker will conduct his county audits Monday through Thursday and Norman, Dave and Mike will conduct their county audits Tuesday through Thursday. The opening meeting for the FSC audit will occur Monday morning 9:00 AM at the Madison office followed by a review of the FSC central office functions. The opening meeting for the ATFS audit will occur Monday afternoon at 2:30 PM via phone followed by a review of the ATFS central office functions. The exit briefing is scheduled for Friday afternoon at 1:00 PM with Dave participating at the Madison office and Norman via phone (should last about an hour).

**Selection of Tree Farms for Site Visits:**
1. ☒ Norman/Dave select previously unaudited counties randomly, 1 more nearby
2. ☒ WDNR provides spreadsheet of TF sites with activity in selected counties
3. ☒ Norman/Dave randomly select 4 TF for each county (attached)
4. ☐ WDNR to make additional selections (total 5 per county) near random selections
5. ☐ WDNR provides updated table with number of Tree Farms in each county
6. ☐ WDNR to develop schedules and field routes/timing
For each county, four (4) Tree Farms were selected, with some alternates in case there are issues with the primary selections. These initial selections (primary and alternate) are Tree Farms with records of recent harvests. These four selections represent the core parcels for “tours” of nine (9) field audits to be conducted for each county over a two to four (2-4) day period. Dave is picking ALL of the tree farms for Dodge County.

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 should meet the size distribution requirements, derived from 2012 data which is expected to remain sufficiently accurate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Category</th>
<th># MLF Orders (tracts)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th># of Samples Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 100 ac.</td>
<td>42,848</td>
<td>93.21%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-500 ac.</td>
<td>3,065</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1,000 ac.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001+ ac.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45,968</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assume 6 counties with 9 tree farms each = 54 total

I realize there are no 1001+ acre tree farms in the counties that we randomly selected. Please add this tree farm sample to any other category. Also, there is only a single tree farm from our county sample in the 501-1,000 acre range that is located in Florence County. Please be sure to include this one. In addition, Dave has requested that, if possible, you pick a single tree farm for each of the selected counties that were added to the MFL program in the past twelve (12) months.

Based on the large numbers of Tree Farms involved you will be close to the required ranges without much effort (based on probabilities). My suggestion would be to start by selecting at least one Tree Farm that is 101-500 acres.

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 four (4) half-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).

Exception for Dodge County: Dave has selected all of the site visits.

Mike and I are splitting Polk County and I realize that it might strain your manpower resources if we do it on the same day so it may make sense for Mike and I to do our portions of Polk on separate days.
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

For the FSC re-certification evaluation a separate information request was made by Victoria Solbert on 4/11/13.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Report</th>
<th>Public Summary Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 The certification audit scope and objectives;</td>
<td>1.1 The Public Report contents shall include, at a minimum:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 A general description of the group’s operations and overall membership;</td>
<td>1.2 A description of the audit process, objectives, and scope;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 A description of the audit process used, including time period;</td>
<td>1.3 The name of group that was audited, including its ATFS representative;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Identification of the group manager and audit team personnel (later are</td>
<td>1.4 A general description of the group’s operations and overall membership;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normally listed in audit plan);</td>
<td>1.5 The name of the audit firm and lead auditor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Audit findings and conclusions, including a general description of any</td>
<td>1.6 The dates the certification was conducted and completed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonconformances and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities</td>
<td>1.7 A summary of the findings, including general descriptions of any nonconformances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for improvement, and exceptional practices;</td>
<td>and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 A schedule for surveillance and recertification audits;</td>
<td>exceptional practices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 The distribution and confidential nature of the Final Report; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Appendices as follows;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.1 Audit Plan;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.2 ATFS Certification Checklists;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

1.8 The certification recommendation.

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: Mike Ferrucci (Northford, CT)

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

Mike meets all of the requirements as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and has participated in several Tree Farm Group audits including the original scoping audit for the Wisconsin MFL program. Mike developed the NSF procedures for ATFS audits. Over the past ten years he has conducted Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews on lands throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Maryland, Maine, and Connecticut and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-led the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest. He is qualified as a RAB EMS Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor, as an FSC Team Leader.

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

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

ATFS Lead Auditor: Norman Boatwright (Florence, SC)

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

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

FSC Lead Auditor: Dave Wager (Missoula, Montana)

Dave Wager is a FSC Lead Auditor for Forest Management and Chain-of-Custody Certification. As Forest Management Director for SCS, Dave spent ten years managing and/or leading Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) endorsed certification assessments on more than 100 forest management operations covering over 25 million acres of forestland across 16 countries. As a certification practitioner, Dave Wager has led FSC forest management and chain-of-custody assessments on a range of private and public operations across North America, Asia, and Latin America. Dave has 18 years’ experience working in forestry and the environmental field. He has expertise in forest ecology and business (B.S. business, Skidmore College; M.S. Forest Resources, Utah State University).

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

Gerald Grossman, ACF & CF, is a SFI and a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor for NSF – International Strategic Registrations. Gerald has led or participated in over 40 Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certifications throughout the Eastern United States. Gerald has a B.S. in Forestry from the University of Michigan and a M.S in Forestry & M.B.A. from Michigan State University. He has been President of Grossman Forestry Company, a full service consulting forestry firm located in the Eastern Upper Peninsula of Michigan, since 1990. The Grossman Forestry Company employees 7 full time foresters and manages over 260,000 acres of timberland for a wide variety of landowners.

Gerald is a member of numerous forestry and conservation organizations, and has served in leadership positions in many including the Michigan Society of American Foresters. He has received numerous awards in recognition of his professional and volunteer accomplishments.
Random Selections (see “Selection of Tree Farms for Site Visits” above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Municipality (T)</th>
<th>Order Number</th>
<th>Date Certified</th>
<th>Primary Landowner Name</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURNETT</td>
<td>ANDERSON (T)</td>
<td>07-022-1998</td>
<td>12-Jul-12</td>
<td>DALE PETELINSEK</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19W</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNETT</td>
<td>DEWEY (T)</td>
<td>07-010-1989</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>DONN PAULIN</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14W</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNETT</td>
<td>LA FOLLETTE (T)</td>
<td>07-017-2003</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>EDWARD GREVER</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15W</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNETT</td>
<td>OAKLAND (T)</td>
<td>07-007-1993</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>ELLEN SWEDBERG</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16W</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNETT</td>
<td>SWISS (T)</td>
<td>07-004-1998</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>DOUGLAS MEASNER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15W</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DODGE</td>
<td>ASHIPPUN (T)</td>
<td>14-006-2000</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>RBT D WIEDENHOEFER 1998 REV TRUST</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DODGE</td>
<td>HUSTISFORD (T)</td>
<td>14-002-2006</td>
<td>1-Jan-06</td>
<td>JOHN D &amp; PATRICIA R UNSER TRUST</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16E</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DODGE</td>
<td>LEBANON (T)</td>
<td>14-010-1999</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>JAMES ZIEBELL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE</td>
<td>COMMONWEALTH (T)</td>
<td>19-229-2000</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>PATRICIA BOVEE</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18E</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE</td>
<td>FENCE (T)</td>
<td>19-228-1996</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>WILLIAM BORDEN</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16E</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE</td>
<td>FLORENCE (T)</td>
<td>19-011-2006</td>
<td>1-Jan-06</td>
<td>GERALDINE TIMMRECK TRUST</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16E</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE</td>
<td>HOMESTEAD (T)</td>
<td>19-007-2002</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>JEROME PAULSON</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18E</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE</td>
<td>LONG LAKE (T)</td>
<td>19-012-1989</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>FAY LAKE FOREST ASSOC</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15E</td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFAYETTE</td>
<td>BELMONT (T)</td>
<td>33-005-2003</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>FRED OOMENS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>01E</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFAYETTE</td>
<td>BLANCHARD (T)</td>
<td>33-017-1999</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>PATRICIA KANE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>05E</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFAYETTE</td>
<td>BLANCHARD (T)</td>
<td>33-001-2003</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>HOVDA AND RAMSEYER TRUST A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>05E</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFAYETTE</td>
<td>WILLOW SPRINGS (T)</td>
<td>33-016-1995</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>SILENT SPRINGS LTD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>03E</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARINETTE</td>
<td>ATHELSTANE (T)</td>
<td>38-099-2003</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>MARK MULLINS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARINETTE</td>
<td>BEAVER (T)</td>
<td>38-013-2007</td>
<td>1-Jan-07</td>
<td>JEANETTE A PERRAULT REV TRUST</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19E</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARINETTE</td>
<td>LAKE (T)</td>
<td>38-052-2007</td>
<td>1-Jan-07</td>
<td>LINDA TARMANN</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21E</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARINETTE</td>
<td>SILVER CLIFF (T)</td>
<td>38-291-2000</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>SCOTT ELBE</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARINETTE</td>
<td>STEPHENSON (T)</td>
<td>38-086-2005</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>LEON POPP</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19E</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLK</td>
<td>BLACK BROOK (T)</td>
<td>49-020-2012</td>
<td>1-Jan-12</td>
<td>HOWARD STINDELE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16E</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLK</td>
<td>CLEAR LAKE (T)</td>
<td>49-031-2007</td>
<td>1-Jan-07</td>
<td>DAVID LOGUIDICE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15W</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLK</td>
<td>JOHNTOWN (T)</td>
<td>49-054-2004</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>JOY SEVERSON</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15W</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLK</td>
<td>MCKINLEY (T)</td>
<td>49-003-1989</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>ROBERT DEMASTER</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15W</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLK</td>
<td>WEST SWEDEN (T)</td>
<td>49-034-2005</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>HARLIN OWENS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17W</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAINT CROIX</td>
<td>EAU GALLE (T)</td>
<td>56-007-1992</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>DANE RASMUSSEN</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16W</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAINT CROIX</td>
<td>GLENWOOD (T)</td>
<td>56-010-2007</td>
<td>1-Jan-07</td>
<td>MICHAEL &amp; KAY DORWIN LIVING TRUST</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15W</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAINT CROIX</td>
<td>HUDSON (T)</td>
<td>56-018-1999</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>HUDSON ROD GUN &amp; ARCHERY</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19W</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAINT CROIX</td>
<td>SOMERSET (T)</td>
<td>56-020-1995</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>JOEL LAMIRANDE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19W</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAINT CROIX</td>
<td>SPRINGFIELD (T)</td>
<td>56-023-1989</td>
<td>24-May-05</td>
<td>JOHN LARSON</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15W</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternate
Detailed Daily Schedules

Norman Boatwright:

DNR Forester – Paul Heimstead 715-485-3518 (office) 715-554-7386 (personal cell)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>Meet at DNR office in Balsam Lake Ag Service Center, 941 Mallard Lane.</td>
<td>Review itinerary and receive documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 am</td>
<td>Pick up lunch at Subway and travel to site #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 am</td>
<td>Site #1 DeMaster – 36-15-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>Site #2 Miller – 36-15-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>Lunch at Largon Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 pm</td>
<td>Site #3 Severson – 35-15-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>Site #4 Filkins – 35-15-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>Daily debrief at last site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2013 Burnett County Audit Plan

June 12th

8:00-8:30  Meet near first site (Donn Paulin) Junction of County Road B and H Dewey township.
8:30-12:00 Roosevelt Township - visit Paulin, Pine Valley Farms
12:00-12:30 Lunch Subs provided
12:30-4:30 Rusk and La Follette townships -Field Visit Danberry/Perkins, Grever, Imme.
4:30 Auditors travel back to lodging in Turtle Lake

June 13th

8:00  Meet at the Webster Ranger Station 26387 Lakeland Ave South, Webster, WI 54893.
8:30-12:00 Travel to Blaine Township and visit Carlson, Measner
12:00-12:45 Lunch at the Log Cabin Store
12:45-2:30 Field Visit Bahner, Swedberg
2:30-4:30 Travel to Anderson Township and visit Petelinsek, Hansen

Contact Information:
Mark Gossman    Office:715-866-3691  Cell:  218-255-0140

Mike Ferrucci:

**Tuesday June 11, 2013 – Southern Polk County Audit**
DNR Forester: Janette Cain / office phone # 715-485— 3518
(Back-up Forester: Chris Rucinski / office phone # 715-637-6865)

8am – Meet at Balsam Lake DNR Office (715-485-3518)
941 Mallard Lane #104, Balsam Lake, WI 54810

9am – Property 1- Sherwood Johnston MFL (Black Brook Township sec. 34)
Corner of 5th Ave and 85th Ave – access off of 85th Ave

10:30am – Property 2 – Glen Clausen (Black Brook Township sec. 9)
432 St. Road 46, Amery, WI - access at this address

Noon – Lunch – Pizzeria in Amery
325 Keller Ave. N, Amery WI

1pm – Property 3 – Howard Stindle (Black Brook Township sec. 2)
571 Cty Rd F – this is the access to landing – other ownership drive

2:30pm – Property 4 – David Loguidice (Clear Lake Township sec. 22)
240 25th Ave, Clear Lake, WI – access through owner’s non-MFL property

**ST. CROIX COUNTY 2013 FSC AUDIT –JUNE 12-13**

**DAY 1**

7:45 AM   Meet at the DNR Baldwin office
8:00      Pick lunch and Depart for the field
8:10      Site A at Rasmussen’s
9:30      Site B at Betty Monicken’s
11:00     Site C at Larson’s
12:15 Lunch
1:20 Site D at Emerald’s
2:30 Site E at Logan’s
4.00 pm Daily debrief

**DAY 2**

8:00 Pick up lunch
8:15 Meet at the Holiday Gas Station at the junction of 64 and 46
8:30 Site F at Peller’s
9:45 Site G at Quinn
11:00 Site H LaMirande
12:15 Lunch
1:00 Site I at Hudson Rod’s
2:45 Site J at Blaiser’s
4:00 Daily debrief and farewell

**Tucker Watts:**
Marinette County MFL Certification Audit
**Day 1: Monday, June 10th**

8:00 AM – 8:15 AM Meet at DNR Peshtigo Service Center
101 N. Ogden Road, Peshtigo, WI (use north employee entrance)
Bring your own lunch – a Subway is located by the hotel in Marinette and also on the west side of Peshtigo.

8:15 AM – 9:30 AM Site 1: Gary & Barbara Grom (MFL #38-053-2007)
SWNE, NESW,NWSE, Section 26, T31N R22E, Town of Porterfield
Established by Cooperating Forester Tom Jacobs, Trees & Trails Forestry Consul.

9:30 AM – 10:45 AM Site 2: Linda Tarmann (MFL #38-052-2007)
SWNW, Section 27 and NENE, SENE Section 28, T32N R21E, Town of Lake
Established by Cooperating Forester Tom Jacobs, Trees & Trails Forestry Consul.

10:45 AM – 12:00 PM Site 3: Mary Ann DalSanto (MFL #38-104-2004)
SENW, Section 18, T31N R21E, Town of Lake
Marked by a logger, re-marked for approval by DNR Foresters.

12:00 PM – 12:45 PM Lunch (Bring your own)
Parking Area/Landing at the Peshtigo River (off CTH P)

12:45 PM – 2:00 PM Site 4: Jerry Kotecki (MFL #38-016-1994)
NENE, NWNE, Section 12, T31N R19E, Town of Beaver
Established by a Marinette County Forester. Upon landowner and logger request, DNR Foresters re-marked a few areas during harvesting.
2:00 PM – 3:15 PM  Site 5:  Jeannette Perrault Trust  (MFL #38-013-2007)  
SWNE, NWSE, NESE, SWSE, Section 06, T31N R19E, Town of Beaver  
Established by Cooperating Forester Todd McCourt, Wild Rivers Forestry, Inc.

3:15 PM  Daily Debriefing

Marinette County MFL Certification Audit  
Day 2:  Tuesday, June 11th

8:00 AM – 8:15 AM  Meet at Wausaukee Ranger Station  
West of Hwy 141 on CTH C, on the north side of Wausaukee  
Bring your own lunch – Subway restaurants are located en-route to the Wausaukee station in both Crivitz and Wausaukee

8:15 AM – 9:45 AM  Site 6:  Joseph & Linda Charlier Trust  (MFL# 38-076-1993)  
NENE, Section 6, T33N R20E – Town of Wausaukee  
Established by Cooperating Forester Tom Jacobs, Trees & Trails Forestry Consul.

Adjacent is Lynn Mullins  (MFL# 38-032-2003)  
NWSE, SWSE, Section 10, T34N R19E, Town of Athelstane  
Established by Cooperating Forester Tom Jacobs, Trees & Trails Forestry Consul.

Reduced time planned due to proximity to Site 7  
NESW, SESW, Section 11, T34N R19E – Town of Athelstane  
Established by Cooperating Forester Todd McCourt, Wild Rivers Forestry, Inc.

12:15 PM – 1:00 PM  Lunch  (Bring your own)  
Location TBD – depending on optional site visit or travel to Site 8

1:00 PM – 2:30 PM  Site 8:  Helen Drake Muirhead Living Trust  (MFL# 38-036-2007)  
Numerous legal descriptions, Section 35, T34N R19E, Town of Athelstane  
Established by Cooperating Forester Jesse Sebero, Pomeroy Forest Products.

2:30 PM – 4:00 PM  Site 9:  Leon Popp & Rebecca Hoyda  (MFL#38-086-2005)  
SESE, Section 19, and SWSW, Section 20, T33N R19E, Town of Stephenson  
Established by Cooperating Forester Jesse Sebero, Pomeroy Forest Products.

4:00 PM  Daily Debriefing  (Can return to the DNR Wausaukee if desired)

Marinette County MFL Certified Group Audit Contact Information

DNR Division of Forestry Host:  
- Jerry Crow – 715-612-0980 (cell)

Local Marinette County DNR Primary Contacts:
DNR Staff Attending:
- Steve Kaufman, DNR Forester – Mischicot – (920) 755-4984  formerly Wausaukee
- Curt Wilson, District Forestry Leader – Green Bay – (920) 662-5126
- Derek Nellis, DNR Forester – Peshtigo – (715) 582-5037 recent hire
- Joe Tucker, DNR Forester – Wausaukee – (715) 856-9157 recent hire
- Lucas Vold, DNR Forester – Peshtigo River SF – (715) 757-3965 recent hire

Cooperating Foresters Attending:
- Tom Jacobs, Leslyn Jacobs – (715) 856-6340
  Trees & Trails Forestry Consultants LLC
- Todd McCourt – (715) 927-7555, (920) 846-3061
  Wild Rivers Forestry Inc., McCourt Forestry Services
- Jesse Sebero – (715) 927-2077
  Pomeroy Forest Products

Landowners Participating (potential):
- Site 1:  Gary Grom – (715) 732-0617
- Site 2:  Linda Tarmann – (715) 927-7899
- Site 3:  Mary Ann Dalsanto – (715) 89-2294
- Site 4:  Jerry Kotecki – (715) 582-9017
- Site 5:  Jeanette Perrault (Roger Perrault) – (715) 854-7779, (920) 855-6739
- Site 6:  Joseph & Linda Charlier – (920) 621-7170
- Site 7:  Mark & Lynn Mullins – (920) 498-1327
  OPTIONAL Site:  Steve Sansone – (718) 471-2964  OPTIONAL
- Site 8:  Helen Muirhead – (415) 435-1837
- Site 9:  Leon Popp – (715) 757-3511


Attendees: FSC & Tree Farm Auditor Tucker Watts, WDNR FTP Representative Jerry Crow, WDNR Field Staff: Forester Henry Sullivan; Forester Tyler Wood; Forester Todd Pulvermacher; Forestry Staff Specialist Brian Spencer; Area Wildlife Mgr. Chuck McCullough, Cooperating Consultant Foresters, Various Landowners.

Sites to Visit:
Core Selections
Additional Samples

8:00 a.m., Wednesday, June 12, 2013

Meet in front parking lot of the Florence Natural Resources/Visitor Center. Quarter mile west of Florence at the intersection of US Hwy 2 and US Hwys 70/101. Introductions and quick review of agenda for the day.
**8:15 am** Leave traveling west on Hwy 70 and south on Hwy 139 to first site visit. Fay Lake Association. Arrive at intersection of Lindle Spur road and Fay Lake boat landing at **8:45 a.m.** to meet with Association’s forestry agent: John Force.

---

**Landowner:** Fay Lake Forest Assoc. and associated L.L.C.’s  
**Contract Forester:** John Force  
**Available on site (Y/N): Y**  
**Acreage:**  
- Fay Lake Forest Assoc. MFL: 259.99 acres (OPEN)  
- Fay Lake Forest Assoc. **Non-Tax:** 55 acres  
- Timberdoodle Woods LLC, MFL: 142.47 acres (CLOSED)  
- Loon Haven LLC, MFL: 140.56 acres (CLOSED)  
- Ridgecrest LLC, MFL: **81.18 acres** (CLOSED)  
**Total:** 679.20 acres **(624.2 acres tax law)**

**Legal Description:** Section 8 & 9, T39N-R15E, Town of Long Lake.  
**MFL Order Number:** **19-012-1989** (Fay Lake Forest Assoc.)

---

**Landowner:** Timberdoodle Woods LLC  
**Contract Forester:** John Force  
**Available on site (Y/N): Y**  
**Legal Description:** Section 9, T39N-R15E, Town of Long Lake.  
**MFL Order Number:** **19-025-2007**

---

**Landowner:** Ridgecrest LLC  
**Contract Forester:** John Force  
**Available on site (Y/N): Y**  
**Legal Description:** Section 8, T39N-R15E, Town of Long Lake.  
**MFL Order Number:** **19-007-2008**

---

**Landowner:** Loon Haven, LLC  
**Contract Forester:** John Force  
**Available on site (Y/N): Y**  
**Legal Description:** Section 9, T39N-R15E, Town of Long Lake.  
**MFL Order Number:** **19-006-2008**
**10:15 a.m.** Depart for next site visit. William Borden. Travel south Hwy 139 through Long Lake to Morgan Lake Rd. to Rock Creek Road. Arrive at gate to Borden’s at about **10:45 a.m.**

**11:00 a.m.** Arrive at Bordens

**Landowner:** William Borden  **Contract Forester:** Pat Smith  **Available on site (Y/N):** Y

**Legal Description:** NESE, Section 31, T38N-R16E, Town of Fence. MFL Acreage: 40 acres OPEN.

**MFL Order Number:** [19-228-1996](#)

**Landowner:** Thomas Borden  **Contract Forester:** Pat Smith  **Available on site (Y/N):** Y

**Legal Description:** SENW, Section 31, T38N-R16E, Town of Fence. MFL Acreage: 40 acres CLOSED.

**MFL Order Number:** [19-002-2008](#)

**12:00 noon** Depart Borden property travel to Popple River Bridge for lunch.

**Sack Lunch at Bridge 12:15 to 12:45 p.m.**

**12:45 p.m.** Depart for Timmrech Trust, north on Hwy 101, west Patten Lake Rd., north Hummingbird Ln.

**1:15 p.m.** Arrive Timmreck Trust

**Landowner:** Geraldine Timmreck Trust  **Contract Forester:** New Page  **Available on site (Y/N):** N

**Legal Description:** NWNE, NENW, Section 24, T39N-R16E, Town of Florence. MFL Acreage: 78 CLOSED.

**MFL Order Number:** [10-011-2006](#)

**2:15 p.m.** Depart Timmreck, south on Hummingbird Ln, west on Patten Lake Rd.

**2:30 p.m.** Arrive Schafer’s

**Landowner:** Albert Schafer, Marylyn Malinowski  **Contract Forester:** Dennis Eskritt/New Page

**Available on site (Y/N):** N

**Legal Description:** NWNW, Section 24, T39N-R16E. Town of Florence. MFL Acreage: 40 CLOSED.

**MFL Order Number:** [19-002-2013 (original 19-022-1988)](#)
Landowner: Albert Schafer, Marylyn Malinowski  Contract Forester: Dennis Eskritt/New Page

Available on site (Y/N): N

Legal Description: SWNW, Section 24, T39N-R16E. Town of Florence. MFL Acreage: 39 CLOSED.

MFL Order Number: 19-015-2001 (original WTL 20597-1986)

3:30 p.m. Depart Schafer’s back to Florence Natural Resource Center. West Patten Lake Rd., north Hwy 101.

4:00 p.m. Arrive Florence Natural Resource Center

END OF DAY ONE

8:00 a.m., Thursday, June 13, 2013 Meet in front parking lot of the Florence Natural Resources/Visitor Center. Quarter mile west of Florence at the intersection of US Hwy 2 and US Hwys 70/101. Introductions and quick review of agenda for the day.

8:15 a.m. Travel east on Montgomery Lake Rd and north through Steber Farms

8:30 a.m. Arrive Walker’s along Menominee River.

Landowner: Alan Walker  Contract Forester: Available on site (Y/N): Landowner Available

Legal Description: Govt Lots 3 & 4, Section 18, T40N-R19E. Town of Florence. MFL Acreage: 30 CLOSED.

MFL Order Number: 19-029-2004

9:30 a.m. Depart Walker’s east on Montgomery Lake Rd.

9:45 a.m. Arrive Kemp’s

9:30 a.m. Depart Walker’s east on Montgomery Lake Rd.

Landowner: Albert Kemp, Keith Kemp  Contract Forester: Available on site (Y/N): Possibly Landowner

Legal Description: NENE, Section 26, T40N-R18E. Town of Florence. MFL Acreage: 40 CLOSED.

MFL Order Number: 19-013-1994

10:45 a.m. Depart Kemp’s south on Cross Cut Rd.
If time allows tentative stop at Penberthy for discussion on northern hardwood management

11:00 a.m. Depart Penberthy

11:15 a.m. Arrive Boardman’s east on Hwy 2.

Landowner: Dan Boardman  Contract Forester: Available on site (Y/N): N
Legal Description: NESE pt.of., Section 26, T40N-R18E. Town of Florence. MFL Acreage: 39.97 CLOSED.
MFL Order Number: 19-011-1989

12:15 a.m. Depart Boardman’s travel west into Florence.

Lunch: Local Restaurant Order off menu.

1:30 p.m. Depart for Bovee. South on county highway “N”

1:45 p.m. Arrive Bovee’s

Landowner: Patricia Bovee  Available on site (Y/N): Possibly Landowner
Legal Description: S1/2 SE1/4, Section 16, T39N-R18E, Town of Commonwealth.

2:45 p.m. Depart Bovee’s south on Hwy N, east on Westman Rd.

3:00 p.m. Arrive Paulson’s

Landowner: Jerome & Brenda Paulson  Available on site (Y/N): Landowner Available
Legal Description: N1/2NE1/4, Section 2, T38N-R18E, Town of Homestead.
MFL Order Number: 19-007-2002. MFL acreage: 72 CLOSED.

4:30 p.m. Depart Paulson’s
END OF DAY TWO
The ATFS Program of the Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group has achieved continuing conformance with the AFF 2010-2015 Standards of Sustainability for Forest Certification of Private Lands, according to the NSF-ISR ATFS Certification Audit Process.

The Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group was initially certified in 2005. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources manages a Group Certification program for non-industrial forestland enrolled in the Managed Forest Law (MFL). MFL Group Certification focuses on DNR’s administration of the group and quality of management on member land. There are approximately 36,912 group members that own 45,972 tree farms included in this certification that total approximately 2,495,439 acres (January 2013). These tree farms are scattered across the state.

The audit was performed by NSF-ISR on June 10-14, 2013 by an audit team headed by Norman Boatwright, Lead Auditor and Mike Ferrucci and Tucker Watts – 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-ISR initiated the ATFS surveillance audit process with a phone call to confirm the scope of the audit and schedule the audit.
The actual NSF-ISR ATFS Surveillance Audit was governed by a detailed Audit Plan designed to enable the audit team to determine conformance with the applicable ATFS requirements. The plan included detailed provisions for the assembly and review of audit evidence consisting of documents, interviews, and on-site inspections of ongoing or completed forest practices.

During the audit NSF-ISR reviewed a sample of the written documentation assembled to provide objective evidence of ATFS Conformance. NSF-ISR also selected field sites for inspection based upon the risk of environmental impact, likelihood of occurrence, special features, and other criteria outlined in the NSF-ISR ATFS-SOP. The Counties were randomly selected from a list of those not yet audited. In addition, Four (4) tree farms in each county were randomly selected with the remaining being selected by the WIDNR. NSF-ISR also selected and interviewed stakeholders such as contract loggers, landowners and other interested parties, and interviewed employees within the organization to confirm that the ATFS Standard was understood and actively implemented.

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

**Overview of Audit Findings**

Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group’s ATFS Program was found to be in full conformance with the ATFS Standard. The NSF-ISR ATFS Surveillance Audit Process determined there are two (2) minor 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…..** Management plans for harvest activities are updated by the landowner, consultant or timber buyer using a Cutting Notice, which includes the additional items required by the current standard (water quality, invasives, T/E and special sites). This Cutting Notice is then approved by DNR. Auditors noted that, except in rare occasions, the additional items on the Cutting Notice were not being addressed adequately or consistently across area offices.

4.1.1 **Forest owner must implement specific BMPs that are applicable to the property.** Two (2) site visits identified a BMP/Water Quality issue. Both involved clear cutting the RMZs along intermittent streams. Wisconsin BMPs for Water Quality (2010) specify a one hundred (100) foot RMZ on each side. BMPs provide for narrower (but some width) RMZ when adjacent area is not-sloping, has undisturbed soil, and is well-vegetated, which is the case here, but there is no documentation of a decision to have a smaller or no RMZ.

Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group will develop a corrective action plan to address these issues. Progress in implementing this corrective action plan will be reviewed in subsequent surveillance audits.

**For additional information contact:**

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

Mark Heyde
(608) 267-0565 mark.heyde@wisconsin.gov

END OF SUMMARY REPORT
Appendix III

Audit Matrix & Group Checklist
AFF STANDARDS (2010 – 2015) MONITORING CHECKLIST

Group Organization’s Name: Wisconsin DNR Managed Forest Law Program
Group Member’s Tree Farm Name: Burnett County, Polk County, St. Croix County, Marinette County and Florence County
Auditors: Norman Boatwright – Lead, Tucker Watts and Mike Ferrucci - Team
Audit Dates: June 10-14, 2013

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFF Standards Requirements</th>
<th>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</th>
<th>Conform</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>OFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1: Commitment to Practicing Sustainable Forestry</td>
<td>Forest owner demonstrates commitment to forest vitality by developing and implementing a sustainable forest management plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 1.1</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>All properties audited had written plans that were consistent with forest size and objectives.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF Standards Requirements</td>
<td>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>OFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1.1</td>
<td>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 will be implemented this summer for the development of Management Plans. The WisFIRS 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 planned.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1.2</td>
<td>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. Minor non-conformance: Management plans for harvest activities are updated by the landowner, consultant or timber buyer using a Cutting Notice, which includes the additional items required by the current standard (water quality, invasives, T/E and special sites). This Cutting Notice is then approved by DNR. Auditors noted that, except in rare occasions, the additional items on the Cutting Notice were not being addressed adequately or consistently across area offices.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF Standards Requirements</td>
<td>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>OFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1.3*</td>
<td>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. 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.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 2: Compliance With Laws</strong></td>
<td>Forest management activities comply with all relevant federal, state and local laws, regulations and ordinances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 2.1</td>
<td>Forest owner must comply with all relevant federal, state, county, and municipal laws, regulations, and ordinances. No evidence of non-compliance with laws.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.1.1</td>
<td>Forest owner must comply with all relevant laws, regulations and ordinances and will correct conditions that led to adverse regulatory actions, if any. Foresters are involved in planning all harvests and major silvicultural treatments; these foresters help owners comply.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.1.2</td>
<td>Forest owner should obtain advice from appropriate professionals, or contractors who are trained in, and familiar with, relevant laws, regulations and ordinances. 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.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 3: Reforestation and Afforestation</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF Standards Requirements</td>
<td>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>OFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 3.1</td>
<td>Timely reforestation and afforestation must be achieved by a suitable process that ensures adequate stocking levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reforestation or afforestation must be achieved by a suitable process that ensures adequate stocking levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF Standards Requirements</td>
<td>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>OFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3.1.1</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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. There is an opportunity to improve the regeneration of forest stands in selection harvests, including numerical targets for regeneration in northern hardwood types. 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. For selection silviculture routine selection entries (note that all selection entries are expected to provide regeneration) do not trigger a regeneration check. Auditors noticed in several instances, on the updated Land Exam and Practices Report, where a note to check stocking in three years was entered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AFF Standards Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 4: Air, Water and Soil Protection</th>
<th>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</th>
<th>Conform</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>OFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forest management practices maintain or enhance the environment and ecosystems, including air, water, soil and site quality.</strong></td>
<td>Reasonable BMP compliance was observed on the majority of forests inspected. Some harvest (yarding) roads and trails located on moderate slopes were observed to have fewer waterbars or less surface stabilization measures than recommended in the Wisconsin BMP guidelines, but in most cases the sites were stabilizing without such measures. Road construction appeared to be reasonable and not excessive.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 4.1.1</td>
<td>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>OFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest owner must implement specific BMPs that are applicable to the property.</td>
<td>Reasonable BMP compliance was observed on the majority of forests inspected. Some harvest (yarding) roads and trails located on moderate slopes were observed to have fewer waterbars or less surface stabilization measures than recommended in the Wisconsin BMP guidelines, but in most cases the sites were stabilizing without such measures. <strong>Minor non-conformance:</strong> The site visit to the Emerald Land, Inc. tree farm located in St. Croix County identified a BMP/Water Quality issue. A 26-acre clearcut has a three to five-foot wide intermittent stream (Hutton Creek) with a nearly 1,000 foot long section in the clearcut. There is no riparian buffer; the clearcut was done to the stream edge on both sides. Wisconsin BMPs for Water Quality (2010) specify a 100 foot RMZ on each side. BMPs provide for narrower (but some width) RMZ when adjacent area is not-sloping, has undisturbed soil, and is well-vegetated, which is the case here, but there is no documentation of a decision to have a smaller or no RMZ. The site is rapidly reforesting with hardwood trees, including Aspen which are 6 to 8 foot tall already. The site visit to the Mullins tree farm in Marinette County identified a BMP/Water Quality issue. An aspen clearcut included cutting the RMZ along a 30 ‘ section of intermittent stream with no documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF Standards Requirements</td>
<td>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>OFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 4.1.2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Forest owner must minimize road construction and other disturbances within riparian zones and wetlands.</td>
<td>Properties inspected had well-designed and maintained roads (often mowed) that respected (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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Measure 4.2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Forest owner must consider integrated pest management to control pests, pathogens and unwanted vegetation.</td>
<td>Foresters encourage proper stocking. Efforts are made to deal with invasive plants, but more could be done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 4.2.1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Forest owner should evaluate alternatives to manage pest, pathogens and unwanted vegetation to achieve specific management objectives.</td>
<td>Interviews showed that most forest owners use chemical measures only if there is no effective alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 4.2.2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Pesticides used must be EPA-approved.</td>
<td>Interviews confirmed that chemicals are applied as per label. Site inspections included a visit to the Svedberg tree farm where a wind salvage red pine site had been herbicided, trenched and planted with red pine. Herbicides used included 2 quarts/acre Garlon XT+. 1 ½ quarts/acre Rodeo and 10 oz/acre Entry, which are EPA approved and a file review indicated they were applied by a licensed contractor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF Standards Requirements</td>
<td>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>OFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Interviews confirmed that chemicals are applied as per label.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 4.3 When used, prescribed fire must conform with/to forest owner’s objectives, the forest management plan and pre-fire planning.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 4.3.1 Prescribed fire must conform with/to the management plan and state and local laws and regulations.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 5: Fish, Wildlife and Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td>Forest management activities contribute to the conservation of biodiversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 5.1 Forest management activities must maintain or enhance habitat for threatened or endangered communities and species.</td>
<td>Management provides a variety of habitat. Updated management plans and cutting notices address T/E issues.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 5.1.1 Forest owner must confer with natural resource agencies, state natural resource heritage programs or review other sources of information to determine occurrences of threatened and endangered species on the property and their habitat requirements.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF Standards Requirements</td>
<td>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>OFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 5.1.2 Forest management activities must incorporate measures to protect identified threatened and endangered species.</td>
<td>Measner property cutting notice had a Natural Heritage Inventory “hit” for a wolf territory; with a recommendation to contact DNR is the den is found. This cutting notice also indicated that a T/E butterfly had been seen within one mile of the property and that the harvesting activity may improve habitat for this species.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 5.2 Forest owner should address the desired species (fish, aquatic, wildlife, and plant) and/or desired forest communities in the management plan and forest management activities.</td>
<td>Owner’s wildlife objectives were general in nature, although often included deer and turkey (a generalist). Management was consistent with providing a variety of habitat. Grouse, turkey and bear were also included.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 5.2.1 Forest owner should consult available and accessible information on management of the forest for desired species (fish, aquatic, wildlife, and plant) and/or forest communities and integrate it into forest management.</td>
<td>Forrester involved in all plans and all harvests; information on management for desired species is provided through these foresters; occasionally supplemented by specialist information. 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.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 5.3 Forest owner should make practical efforts to prevent, eradicate or otherwise control invasive species.</td>
<td>Some owners make substantial efforts; others could do more.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Some owners make substantial efforts; others could do more.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 5.4 Forest management activities should maintain or enhance rare species and high conservation value forests.</td>
<td>No such forests were present on the 24 sites.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF Standards Requirements</td>
<td>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>OFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 5.4.1</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>No such rare species or high conservation value forests were present on the 24 sites.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 6: Forest Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td>Forest management plans and management activities recognize the value of forest aesthetics.</td>
<td>Harvests and forests observed were managed with concern for visual impacts. Buffer strips along water and roads were witnessed and discussed during site visits.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 6.1</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Harvests had good utilization and green retention 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.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 6.1.1</td>
<td>Forest management activities should apply visual quality measures compatible with appropriate silvicultural practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 7: Protect Special Sites</strong></td>
<td>Special sites are managed in ways that recognize their unique historical, archaeological, cultural, geological, biological or ecological characteristics.</td>
<td>Special sites are reviewed during the development of the Cutting Notice. The few special (generally historic) sites present were buffered from management activities.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 7.1</td>
<td>Forest management activities must maintain special sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 7.1.1</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>During management planning, particularly for harvests or other mandatory practices, there is a check of heritage and historical/archaeological databases. Development of the Cutting Notice was witnessed during site visits.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF Standards Requirements</td>
<td>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>OFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 8: Forest Product Harvests and Other Activities</strong>&lt;br&gt;Forest product harvests and other management activities are conducted in accordance with the management plan and consider other forest values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 8.1&lt;br&gt;Forest owner should use qualified natural resource professionals and qualified contractors when contracting for services.</td>
<td>All forest owners work with qualified foresters. See below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 8.1.1&lt;br&gt;Forest owner should seek qualified natural resource professionals and qualified contractors.</td>
<td>All forest owners work with qualified foresters and most of the harvesting is conducted by FISTA-trained (SFI) contractors. Wisconsin DNR has developed a Cooperaing 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 8.1.2*&lt;br&gt;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.</td>
<td>Insurance provisions in logging contract provided by Wisconsin DNR to forest owners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 8.1.3&lt;br&gt;Forest owner should retain appropriate contracts for forest product harvests and other management activities to demonstrate conformance to the AFF Standards.</td>
<td>Contracts in landowner files. A sample contract is provided to forest owners with the letter from Wisconsin DNR for scheduled activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFF Standards Requirements</th>
<th>Briefly Described the Objective Evidence of Conformance (Documents Reviewed, Personnel Interviewed, Sites Visited)</th>
<th>Conform</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>OFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure 8.2</td>
<td>Forest owner must monitor forest product harvests and other management activities to ensure they conform to the management plan objectives.</td>
<td>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. 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.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 8.2.1</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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 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.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. The revision is pending final review. This was a minor non-conformance in 2011.

   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 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.”

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”.

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 decertification
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 are occasionally expelled. 49 members were expelled in 2012, compared to 53 in 2011;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Withdrawals/Successful NOI Resolution</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Resolved</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10 acres</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split in ownership</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsound Forestry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Implement Practices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to File a Transfer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 80% productive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20% unsuitable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction Orders</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      | 53   | 49   |

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.
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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Audit Notes: DNR has a unique system to monitor conformance. Certified Plan Writers complete a Land Exam and Practices Report for new members in conjunction with developing the
management plan. This report contains stand level data as well as management prescriptions. This data is entered into Plan Trac which sends alerts to the DNR district foresters who notify the landowners of the prescriptions that need to be done. District foresters confirm the prescription is done and indicate this in Plan Trac.

New members information is entered into WisFIRS system and old members are being converted into the new system. Approximately 4,300 plans are now in this system. Complete integration of all members into the new system is expected to occur late this summer.

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. Mark Heyde and Paul Pingrey conducted the Group internal audits and both have had the required 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 Plan Trac which sends alerts to the DNR district foresters who notify the landowners of the prescriptions that need to be done. District foresters confirm the prescription is done and indicate this in Plan Trac.

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.
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 non-conformity and an observation identified in the 2012 audit were adequately addressed.

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.
Appendix IV

ATFS Audit 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate Holder Name</th>
<th>Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Tree Farm Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certification Body Name</td>
<td>NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Number</td>
<td>1Y942-FC1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Date</td>
<td>8-Aug-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Expiry Date</td>
<td>7-Aug-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Properties Certified</td>
<td>36,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Landowners Enrolled When Certification Issued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CERTIFIED FOREST INFORMATION

| Forest Area (to which certification applies) | 2,495,439 |
| Listing by State [if certificate covers forestland located in more than one state – for accounting purposes] | WI |
| Land Ownership Type | Cat 1 |
| Is this same area certified to another forest | FSC |
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.
Appendix V

Site Visit Notes
Monday June 10, 2013 3:30 pm – Opening Meeting and Group Manager Requirements Audit

Participants:
Norman Boatwright – ATFS Lead Auditor, NSF-ISR
Mark Heyde – WIDNR Forest Certification Coordinator
Sue Crowley – WIDNR Mississippi River Area Leader
Dahn Borh – WIDNR Forester Baldwin County
Dave Wager – FSC Lead Auditor, SCS
Aaron Young – WIDNR Dodgeville Area Forestry Leader
Jim Warren – WIDNR Public & Private Forestry Section Chief
Brain Spenser – WIDNR Woodruff Area Forestry Staff Specialist
Nicole Potvin - WIDNR Private Forestry Team Leader

Tuesday June 11, 2013 – Northern Polk County

Participants:
Norman Boatwright, Lead Auditor, NSF-ISR
Mark Heyde – WIDNR Forest Certification Coordinator
Paul Heimstead – WIDNR Forester (CFL) Balsam Lake
Bob Hartshorn – WIDNR Burnett/Polk Team Leader
Jay Riewestahl – WIDNR Forester Grantsburg
Mark Grossman – WIDNR Forester Burnett
Jim Ulmaniec – WIDNR Tech Grantsburg
Aaron Wallace - WIDNR Forestry Tech Webster
John Furr – WIDNR Forester Webster
Jim Becker – WIDNR Forestry Tech Webster

DeMaster Order # 49-003-1989  80 acres Closed
Northern hardwood (NH) timber stand improvement harvest favoring oak, completed winter 2012. Paperwork includes a 1988 management plan, an updated Land Exam and Practices Report, a Cutting Notice with minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues. Interview with timber buyer Jeff Norris/New Page.

Miller Order # 49-019-1993  38 acres Open
Northern hardwood (NH) timber stand improvement harvest favoring oak, completed winter 2012. Paperwork includes a 1992 management plan, an updated Land Exam and Practices Report, a Cutting Notice with minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.
**Severson Order # 49-054-2004  38 acres Closed**
Consultant sale - Northern hardwood (NH) timber stand improvement harvest, aspen regeneration harvest and white pine release completed winter/spring/summer 2012. Paperwork includes a 2009 management plan, an updated Land Exam and Practices Report, a Cutting Notice with a better description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues and a very healthy mosquito population.

**Filkins Order # 49-014-2011  40 acres Open**
Consultant sale - Northern hardwood (NH) timber stand improvement harvest, aspen regeneration harvest and white pine release completed winter 2012. Paperwork includes a 2011 management plan, an updated Land Exam and Practices Report, a Cutting Notice with better description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.

**Wednesday  June 12, 2013 – Burnett County**

**Participants:**
Norman Boatwright, Lead Auditor, NSF-ISR
Mark Heyde – WIDNR Forest Certification Coordinator
Paul Heimstead – WIDNR Forester (CFL) Balsam Lake
Bob Hartshorn – WIDNR Burnett/Polk Team Leader
Jay Riewestahl – WIDNR Forester Grantsburg
Mark Grossman – WIDNR Forestry Burnett
Jim Ulmaniec – WIDNR Tech Grantsburg
Aaron Wallace  - WIDNR Forestry Tech Webster
John Furr – WIDNR Forester Webster
Jim Becker – WIDNR Forestry Tech Webster

**Paulin Order # 07-010-1989  21 acres Open**
Consultant sale - Northern hardwood (NH) timber stand improvement harvest completed winter 2013. Paperwork includes a 1988 management plan and a Cutting Notice with minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues. This MFL expires in 2013 – reviewed the new management plan and it contained all the required elements. Interview landowner, Donn Paulin.

**Pine Valley Farm Order # 07-022-2012  160 acres Closed**
Consultant sale – Aspen clearcut and red pine thin completed August 2012. Paperwork includes a 2011 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a better description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues. The harvest included a temporary intermittent stream crossing which was removed.

**Danberry Order # 07-005-2010  115 acres Closed**
Consultant sale – Aspen clearcut leaving oaks and red pine, complete winter 2012. Paperwork includes a 2010 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.
Perkins Order # 07-004-2010  133 acres Closed
Consultant sale – Aspen clearcut leaving oaks, complete winter 2012. Paperwork includes a 2010 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.

Grever Order # 07-017-2003  170 acres Open
Northern hardwood (NH) timber stand improvement harvest with small aspen regeneration cuts completed winter 2013. Very wet stand. Paperwork includes a 2002 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.

Thursday June 13, 2013 – Burnett County

Participants:
Norman Boatwright, Lead Auditor, NSF-ISER
Mark Heyde – WIDNR Forest Certification Coordinator
Bob Hartshorn – WIDNR Burnett/Polk Team Leader
Jay Riewestahl – WIDNR Forester Grantsburg
Mark Grossman – WIDNR Forestry Burnett
Jim Ulmaniec – WIDNR Tech Grantsburg
Aaron Wallace - WIDNR Forestry Tech Webster
John Furr – WIDNR Forester Webster
Jim Becker – WIDNR Forestry Tech Webster

Carlson Order # 07-008-2010  106 acres Closed
Straight line wind salvage of white and red pine, aspen and oak completed winter 2012 with good aspen regen. Paperwork includes a 2010 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with no BMP issues.

Measner Order # 07-004-1998  40 acres Open
Straight line wind salvage of jack pine and aspen, completed winter 2012 with good aspen regen. Paperwork includes a 1997 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements (except for NHI which had a good write up). Good harvest with no BMP issues.

Imme Order # 07-002-2012  82 acres Closed
Aspen/birch clearcut leaving oaks, complete winter 2012. Good aspen/oak/maple regen. Paperwork includes a 2010 management plan and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.

Swedberg Order # 07-007-1993  71 acres Closed
Straight line wind salvage of red pine plantation and, completed summer 2012. Red pine plantation area was sprayed, trenched and planted with cost share funding. Herbicides used included 2 quarts/acre Garlon XT+. 1 ½ quarts/acre Rodeo and 10 oz/acre Entry. Paperwork includes a 2013 management plan which contains all of the required elements and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with no BMP issues. Interview with landowner Ellen Swedberg.
Petelinsek Order # 07-022-1998  80 acres Closed
Red pine plantation thin, complete winter 2012. Paperwork includes a 2013 management plan which contains all of the required elements and a Cutting Notice with a minimal description of the new required elements. Good harvest with minimal damage to residuals or BMP issues.

Mike Ferrucci

Tuesday June 11, 2013 – Southern Polk County Audit

Participants:
Mike Ferrucci, Auditor, NSF-ISR
Sue Crowley, Mississippi River Area Forestry Leader
Janette Cain, DNR Forester Polk and Baron Counties office phone # 715-485—3518
Lynn Erickson, Procurement Forester, Park Falls Hardwoods – A Midwest Hardwood Company
Glen and Bobbie Clausen, MFL Property Owners, Amery, Wisconsin
Geoff Morris, Procurement Forester, New Page

8am – Balsam Lake DNR Office (715-485-3518) 941 Mallard Lane #104, Balsam Lake, WI

9am – Property 1- Sherwood Johnston MFL (Black Brook Township sec. 34)
Selection harvest, hardwoods, completed December 2012 by Jeff Nordby Logging. Harvested on frozen, snow-covered ground. Good utilization and no observed damage to residual stand.

10:30am – Property 2 – Glen Clausen (Black Brook Township sec. 9)
Landowners present. 38-year old red pine plantation thinned in 2010. Stand was marked by consulting forester to a target basal area of 100 square feet of basal area per acre, and then checked by DNR forester. Contract used; good results. Property has considerable buckthorn and some non-native honeysuckle. Owners regularly treat by cutting and treating the stumps with Tordon, but it appears that the buckthorn in particular is spreading and increasing.

1pm – Property 3 – Howard Stindle (Black Brook Township sec. 2)
48 acres of plantation thinning (red pine, white spruce, some white pine) row thinned in 2012. Geoff Morris, New Page procurement forester bought the wood and set up the sale. Reviewed contract, which includes requirements to follow BMPs and to use a FISTA-trained logger. Good quality harvest including utilization and residual stand. New Page uses following: Pre-harvest environmental plan; Timbersale Checklist; Timber Harvest Inspection form. Site has many buckthorn seedlings, mostly quite small, but a problem is developing.

2:30pm – Property 4 – David Loguidice (Clear Lake Township sec. 22)
Completed two-aged regeneration harvest in an Aspen/swamp hardwood stand. Harvested on frozen, snow-covered ground winter of 2010-2011; no site impacts. Cut birch and Aspen over 5 inches dbh and left small aspen and all other hardwoods, in part to avoid flooding the site. Aspen suckering sufficient in numbers to regenerate the site is present and vigorous. Also a small area of selective thinning in an oak-dominated stand.

3:30 pm – Property 5 – Janet Krueger (Black Brook Township sec 16)
Partially completed harvest. Selection portion completed, but regeneration in declining Aspen stand and thinning in a 3-acre Red Pine plantation have not been done, and DNR is concerned that the logger may not be
willing to return to complete the project. Utilization of large hardwood tops for pulpwood is not very good, but otherwise logging quality is good.

**Wednesday June 12, 2013 – St. Croix County Audit**

**Participants:**
Mike Ferrucci, Auditor, NSF-ISR
Sue Crowley, Mississippi River Area Forestry Leader
Don Moore, St. Croix Forester
Keith Krajueski, Private Lands Forester, Pepin County
Sara Deterbille, Procurement Forester, New Page
Brad Bautch, Harvester Operator, Chad Summit Logging
Dane Rasmussen, MFL Property Owner

Site Z: Herman and Delores Heinbuch, Pleasant Valley, St. Croix County, Section 5,6; 10 acres.  
Active Red Pine thinning, Chad Summit Logging, New Page set up harvest and is buying the wood. Prescribed thinning to 100 square feet of basal area per acre, but many of the red pine trees have significant browning foliage and some have died. DNR has obtained agreement of landowner for heavier harvest, will follow-up with a letter and will update in the “Plan Track” system. Owner and operator of JD tracked harvester have FISTA training. Issue: There are 14 empty chemical drums in the stand, mostly 55-gallon size. At least three were labeled “pendimethalin” assumed to be an agricultural herbicide; the owner is a commercial farmer and the stand is surrounded by farmland; the other drums were empty oil drums. There was also a pile of scrap metal nearby.

Site A: Dane Rasmussen, T28, R 17 Eau Galle, Section 19, 22 acres  
Completed selection harvest in a 14-acre northern hardwood/mixed wood stand in the winter of 2011-2012. Aspen was the primary species removed, mostly in pockets, and it has re-sprouted. Small pond well-buffered from harvest. Owner Dale Rasmussen interviewed regarding boundaries, land tenure, etc. He has cleaned up very minor dumping. Land is open for hunting in MFL but position of house and outbuildings makes it unattractive for outsiders.

Site B: Betty Monicken, Eau Galle, T28, R16, Section 16, 10 acres  
10-acre Northern hardwood stand harvested winter 2011-2012. DNR checked NHI portal and cultural/archeological database; no hits. This is a textbook example of uneven-aged northern hardwood management. Harvest meets handbook prescription (gaps, varied sizes of trees, multiple age classes) and there is ample sugar maple regeneration.

Site C: Larson, Raash, Bakke, Springfield T29, R15, Section 24, 20 acres  
First harvest in a white pine plantation and second harvest in a small spruce plantation completed during 2011-2012 winter. Serious, on-going legal dispute between landowner and logger over volumes and products harvested and payments made. Logger wasted some timber and cut some not prescribed in the MFL Management Plan.

Site D: Emerald Land, Inc., T30N, R15W, Sections 17 & 18, 26 acres (plan sold and divided, properly documented. MFL Order 56-004-2007  
Delayed but completed November 2011 regeneration harvest in a 26-acre Aspen stand. Harvested on frozen ground according to DNR. Some scattered retention of large-crowned oaks. Harvest was set up in November, 2010, prior to the august 3, 2011 email describing a more robust retention policy for MFL harvests. Hutton Creek was protected by multiple corduroy crossings, but the wood has not yet been removed (DNR is tracking}
this; logger awaiting suitable ground conditions). BMP Issue: A 26-acre clearcut has a three to five-foot wide intermittent stream (Hutton Creek) with a nearly 1,000 foot long section in the clearcut. There is no riparian buffer; the clearcut was done to the stream edge on both sides. Wisconsin BMPs for Water Quality (2010) specify a 100 foot RMZ on each side. BMPs provide for narrower (but some width) RMZ when adjacent area is not-sloping, has undisturbed soil, and is well-vegetated, which is the case here, but there is no documentation of a decision to have a smaller or no RMZ. The site is rapidly reforesting with hardwood trees, including Aspen which are 6 to 8 foot tall already.

Site E at Logan et al, T31N, R15W, Section 5, 64 acres
Selection harvest with overstory removal patches and third-row thinning in an irregularly-stocked white pine stand. MFL plan prescribed harvests in stands 1 and P3, but not 2. Harvest included some portions of Stand 2.

**Thursday June 13, 2013 – St. Croix County Audit**

**Participants:**
Mike Ferrucci, Auditor, NSF-ISR
Steve Courtney, West-Central District Forestry Leader
Don Moore, St. Croix Forester
Jeff Schmidt and Brian Brynne, Timber buyers, Schmidt Timber Corporation
Lorraine Peller, Landowner
Don Simpson, Treasurer, Hudson Rod, Gun, and Archery Club
Michael and Rebecca Blaiser, Landowner

Site F1 and F2 (two separate orders): Robert and Lorraine Peller, T31N, R19W, Section 13; 12/19 acres. Interviewed Landowner Lorraine Peller who confirmed no issues with boundaries/tenure. In 2012 completed row thinning in 3 plantations of varied ages and species mixtures. Approved pine thinning not done, as is generally the case unless cost-share funding is available.

Site G: Elaine Quinn, T31N, R19W, Section 12
Completed harvest in mature, declining Oak stand that has oak wilt. Patch cuts removing Aspen or to regenerate oak and selection thinning also to promote oak, which can be a challenge. DNR forester keeps a list of such challenging regeneration treatments for follow-up review about 5 years following harvest. Also reviewed Aspen/pine stand prescribed for treatment in 2015; heavily-stocked but decision to allow more time for growth to improve merchantability is valid.

Site H: Joel LaMirande, T30N, R19W, Section 1, 40 acres
Marked group selection set up and harvested January 2012 on frozen ground by Schmidt Timber Corporation. Timber buyers Jeff Schmidt and Brian Brynne confirmed safety program including FISTA-trained loggers. Targeted oak wilt pockets for removal. Oak stumps sprouting but being browsed back; DNR forester will monitor. Little need for BMPs on this well-drained, gently-rolling site, but roads were graded post-harvest. Equipment cleaned before and after job.

Site I: Hudson Rod, Gun, and Archery Club, T29N, R19W, Section 18
Interviewed Don Simpson, Treasurer. Property has a high-quality modern survey and many monuments have been set, is posted, and is monitored by members. Neighbors are allowed to use lands when ranges are closed. Harvested challenging declining Oak stands along with helpful biomass harvest of dense invasive Buckthorn understory.

Site J: Michael and Rebecca Blaiser, T29N, R19W, Section 18
Interviewed landowners who confirmed no issues with boundaries/tenure but were not fully satisfied with logging done to meet planned harvest; may not reenroll lands in MFL when order expires in 2014. Reported boundary issues in nearby Willow State Park. Selection harvest targeted large, mature trees.

**Tucker Watts**

**Marinette County**

**Gary & Barbara Grom (MFL #38-053-2007)** - SWNE, NESW,NWSE, Section 26, T31N R22E, Town of Porterfield. Established by Cooperating Forester Tom Jacobs, Trees & Trails Forestry Consulting. Met Tom Jacobs on tract. Bids for sale required logger training, roads groomed, Winter harvest only. 35 acres cut. Insurance and bond required from logger with 10% down – Workman’s Comp. and Contractor’s Liability. Contract includes BMPs, protection of residual stand, and requirements of bid. Logger training includes first aid and PPE. Payment is made on consultants scale as wood leaves site. Property lines flagged. Gravel placed on haul road where intersects public road for aesthetics and stabilization. Sale lines flagged. Logger was fit to job needed – Ponzi crew. Good job. No issues.


Florence County

Fay Lake Forestry Association (MFL#19-012-1989) - Section 8 & 9, T39N. R15E, Town of Long Lake. Established by Cooperating Forester John Force. Met John Force. (Several LLC’s in association)


Ridgcrest LLC (MFL# 19-007-2008) - Section 8, T39N, R15E, Town of Long Lake. Established by Cooperating Forester John Force.

Loon Haven, LLC (MFL# 19-006-20008) - Section 9, T39N, R15E, Town of Long Lake. Established by Cooperating Forester John Force. Properties adjacent to member’s lots on Fay Lake. Several hundred members of association. Forestry Committee works with John Force to manage forest. Road maintenance budget $20,000/yr. No issues found with road maintenance. Selection cut in Northern Hardwood. DNR contract used with logger. Includes BMP language. Harvesting by Master Loggers. Aesthetics practiced by lopping tops to ground. Small logging decks located off roads.

William Borden (MFL# 19-228-1996) - NESE Section 31, T38N, R16E, Town of Fence. Established by Cooperating Forester Pat Smith

Thomas Borden (MFL# 19-002-2008) - SENW Section 31, T38N, R16E, Town of Fence. Established by Cooperating Forester Pat Smith. (Adjoining sites view together. No issues)


