2015 ATFS Grants Program
Project Reports

For questions about specific projects or detailed budget explanation, please contact the project’s primary contact listed on each report or Sara Anrrich at sanrich@forestfoundation.org.
State: Alabama
Submitted By: Leigh Peters
Email: lpeters@alaforestry.org

Project Title: Database Improvement Project
Grant Amount Awarded: $10000
Number of individuals participating: 10
Estimated number of work-hours: 560
Co-Sponsors: Alabama Forest Foundation

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.

1. Contact and request a response of 100% of Alabama Tree Farmers to validate and update Tree Farm/Farmer information via direct mail solicitation. 100% of Alabama Tree Farmers were contacted twice during 2015. This project was successful with over 575 responses via phone, email, and direct mail. The responses were entered in the ATFS database and included updates to Tree Farm and contact information, requests for information, and decertifications.

2. Call 100% of Tree Farmers who own >=1,000 acres to validate and update Tree Farm/Farmer information (~559 Tree Farms). This project was successful and very time-consuming. Additional follow up will be continued. Responses from this project indicate that the workload of updating contact information i.e. phone numbers and management plans, break-up of non-contiguous parcels, and identifying non-forested acres will be ongoing in 2016. 153 (27%) phone calls resulted in no follow up needed at this time. Additional time and resources will improve database integrity in advance of the next Tree Farm Assessment.

3. Conduct a land records review of mass enrolled Tree Farmers owning 600 - 999 acres (~100 Tree Farms). This project was largely unsuccessful. The land records database was a small experiment with a small subset of Tree Farmers. The idea was to search tax records (most Alabama counties have tax record databases and maps that can be queried) and compare those findings to the Tree Farm database. This project proved ineffective for two main reasons. 1) Names of landowners in the land records database and the Tree Farm database may not match (i.e. Sr. and Jr. both listed in one but only first/last name listed in the other, or duplicate first/last name listing in land record). This made some comparisons impossible. 2) Landowners with landholdings larger that the Tree Farm database or multiple parcels (i.e. acreage less in Tree Farm database than land records). This was a common occurrence with no way to decipher which parcel the Tree Farm was located.

4. Publish an advertisement with return form to validate and update Tree Farm/Farmer information in all issues (four) of "Alabama Forests" magazine. This magazine is mailed to 100% of Alabama Tree Farmers. This project was successful. A database ad was placed in all 4 issues of Alabama Forests magazine. This resulted in 20 direct mail responses updating information and additional phone calls to update information. This project was successful in informing Alabama Tree Farmers of the need to keep their Tree Farm and contact information up-to-date.
Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.

1. Contact and request a response of 100% of Alabama Tree Farmers to validate and update Tree Farm/Farmer information via direct mail solicitation. 100% of Alabama Tree Farmers were contacted twice during 2015.

Letters were sent to 100% of Tree Farmers via direct mail twice in 2015. The first mailing listed the Tree Farmers current Tree Farm and contact information and requested that any updates be returned. 453 Responses from those communications have been updated in the ATFS database. Of those responses, 238 (53%) were to update contact information (name, address, phone number, email), 71 (16%) updates to Tree Farm data (acre correction, non-contiguous parcels), 16 (4%) required decertification (land sales, owner deceased), 72 (15%) required no data correction (other inquiries, signage, etc), and 56 (12%) were postmarked Return to Sender.

The second mailing also requested changes/updates to Tree Farm or contact information and resulted in 122 responses. Of those responses 53 (43%) were to update contact information, 35 (28%) were posted marked Return to Sender, 12 (10%) required decertification, 22 (18%) were to update contact information.

2. Call 100% of Tree Farmers who own >=1,000 acres to validate and update Tree Farm/Farmer information (~559 Tree Farms). This project was successful and very time-consuming. Additional follow up will be continued.

A focused effort was made in 2015 to make direct phone contact with all Tree Farmers who own more than 1000 acres (~559 farms). Responses from this project indicate that the workload of updating contact information i.e. phone numbers- 276 (49%) and management plans -113 (20%) , break-up of non-contiguous parcels-14 (3%) , and identifying non-forested acres-3 (<1%) will be ongoing in 2016. 153 (27%) phone calls resulted in no follow up needed at this time. Additional time and resources will improve database integrity in advance of the next Tree Farm Assessment.

3. Conduct a land records review of mass enrolled Tree Farmers owning 600 - 999 acres (~100 Tree Farms).

This project was largely unsuccessful. The land records database was a small experiment with a small subset of Tree Farmers. The idea was to search tax records (most Alabama counties have tax record databases and maps that can be queried) and compare those findings to the Tree Farm database. This project proved ineffective for two main reasons. 1) Names of landowners in the land records database and the Tree Farm database may not match (i.e. Sr. and Jr. both listed in one but only first/last name listed in the other, or duplicate first/last name listing in land record). This made some comparisons impossible. 2) Landowners with landholdings larger that the Tree Farm database or multiple parcels (i.e. acreage less in Tree Farm database than land records). This was a common occurrence with no way to decipher which parcel the Tree Farm was located.

4. Publish an advertisement with return form to validate and update Tree Farm/Farmer information in all issues (four) of "Alabama Forests" magazine. This magazine is mailed to 100% of Alabama Tree Farmers.

A database ad was placed in all 4 issues of Alabama Forests magazine. This resulted in 20 direct mail responses updating information and additional phone calls to update information. This project was successful in informing Alabama Tree Farmers of the need to keep their Tree Farm and contact information up-to-date.
What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

Overall the Database Improvement Project was a great success, but we still have a long way to go to ensure the complete accuracy of our database. In 2016 the Alabama Tree Farm Committee will continue direct mail-outs (2) to 100% of Alabama Tree Farmers, direct phone calls to various subsets, and ad placement in Alabama Forests magazine requesting information updates. The most effective and most time consuming communication is one-on-one between Tree Farmers and inspectors, either on the phone or in person.

What are the next steps for this project?
In 2016, the Alabama Tree Farm Program will make a focused effort to continue to address these issues and improve their database integrity by developing a contact/response database maintenance protocol. This project will more fully engage current Tree Farm Inspectors, make them aware of database issues, and help them prevent and/or solve database issues while performing various types of inspections or writing/reviewing management plans. Also in 2016, as part of the Program's strategic plan, Alabama Tree Farm will begin re-inspecting Tree Farms that have a previous inspection more than 5 years old. The large size of Alabama's Tree Farm Program (3845 Tree Farms consisting of 2,429,670 acres), results in additional complexity improving and maintaining database integrity. This ongoing project will allow the Program to be more efficient and cost effective by disseminating information to correct addresses/emails and improving the usefulness of the database internally and to the companies who use it to validate Tree Farm certified fiber.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $22054
Total Match: $15363
Additional Budget Explanations:
Dear (NAME):

Thank you for your participation in the American Tree Farm System (ATFS) as a Tree Farmer and Certified Family Forest owner. Since 1941, ATFS and its state programs have been educating forest landowners about the benefits of management and recognizing them for their commitment to sustainable forestry. You are a part of a vibrant national network of over 40,000 Tree Farms encompassing more than twenty-six million acres, and an Alabama Tree Farm family of more than 3,700 Tree Farms totaling over 2.4 million acres.

Tree Farmers demonstrate the benefits of responsible forest management to other forest landowners. The Tree Farm program is an internationally recognized forest certification program. Forest products companies and their customers know that pulpwood and sawlogs originating from a Tree Farm are grown and harvested in a sustainable manner. Tree Farm certification also demonstrates that its Certified Family Forest owners have a management plan that addresses air, water, soil quality, wildlife, special sites, invasive species and integrated pest management as described in the ATFS Standards of Sustainability.

Because of the size of Alabama’s Tree Farm program, we are unable to visit with every Tree Farmer in the state. This year we are required to reinspect a sample of over 150 landowners, and will make as many additional reinspections as possible. Some of you have been visited for reinspections by your forester over the past five years, but most of you have not. We do not want to miss an opportunity for you to let us know of changes on your property. Please look at the information we have concerning your Tree Farm on the back of this letter, including property and contact information. If there are updates to be made, mark any changes, and return them to us using the enclosed envelope. Please include an email address and primary contact for your property, if the primary contact is someone other than yourself. We will update your records and if necessary get back in touch to resolve any questions. If everything is in order, no action is necessary.

Do not hesitate to contact us if you have questions. Leigh Peters is the Tree Farm Program Administrator at the Alabama Forestry Association and can be reached at lpeters@alaforestry.org or 334.265.8733. Thank you for being an Alabama Tree Farmer!

Sincerely,

Tim Browning
Chair, Alabama Tree Farm Committee
Please review the information below, make any changes and return to us before August 1, 2015 in the enclosed return envelope. Thank you for helping us keep your record up to date!

Tree Farm Number:
Tree Farm Name:
County:
Acres:
Location: LAT: LONG:
Ownership Type:
Absentee:
Certification Date:
Initial Certification Date:
Name:
Organization:
Address:

Mailing Address County:
Phone:
Email:
Save the date!
Outreach Symposium
& Awards Banquet
Friday, February 5, 2016
at the New Alabama Wildlife Federation NaturePlex

Have You Made the Move?
2015 Management Plan Addendum Tool Now Available!

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Farm #:</th>
<th>Tree Farm County:</th>
<th>GPS coordinates if available:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree Farm Name:</td>
<td>Tree Farm Organization (if LLC, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Contact Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>Cell Phone:</td>
<td>City/State:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td>ZIP:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous tracts?</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>If yes, how many tracts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forested acres change?</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>If yes, estimated forested acres:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return to Alabama Tree Farm Committee
Attn: Brandy Cole
555 Alabama Suites
Montgomery, AL 36104

If you prefer to email or call in your updates, contact Brandy Cole at bcole@alforestry.org or 334-481-3128.

Tree Farmers—We Need to Hear From You!
Is Your Tree Farm Information Current? If Not, Let Us Know!

All landowners with woodlands certified to ATFS Standards will need to transition to the 2015-2020 ATFS Standards during 2015. Landowners are encouraged to review the 2015-2020 Standards with their management plans to ensure their plans include key elements while also making any updates to reflect changes to their own objectives, property or management. A copy of the new ATFS Management Plan Addendum is available online at www.treefarmsmysystem.org/new-atfs-addendum or you may contact Leigh Peters at lpeters@alforestry.org to request a print copy. The 2015-2020 Standards may be found online at www.treefarmsmysystem.org/atfs-standards.

If you have room updates that need to be made to the Tree Farm database, please complete the form below and return it to the Alabama Tree Farm Committee. You may also email us with updated information.
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
This project was successful in training new inspectors, as well as retraining active inspectors to the new 2015-2020 ATFS Standard. Training session agendas were planned for Tree Farm Inspector workshops and 8 locations and dates were set to provide the best access across the state. Set dates and locations were then advertised monthly via e-mail to Alabama Tree Farm Inspectors and Alabama Registered Foresters, as well as in the Alabama Forestry Association e-publication Newsroom. Online registration was also offered on Alabama Forestry Association website, in addition to being available via phone, email, and direct mail. We received responses from all formats of registration.
In addition to classroom trainings that were offered, current, active inspectors were encouraged to participate in the online refresher course that was offered by ATFS. The workshops agenda was based on the presentation offered by ATFS. This presentation was then customized to reflect activities in Alabama, as well as personal experiences of the facilitators. This personal touch offered an insight to both new and experienced inspectors. Also at the trainings, the inspectors were encouraged to complete inspections after training and were asked to note which counties they would be willing to complete an inspection in. This proved to be valuable in assigning inspections.
We found the most successful progression to Active Inspector activity was to ask where they would be willing to do inspections, and then to follow up immediately (within ~2 weeks of training) with an assignment of an inspection.
In February 2015, 2 Tree Farm Inspector Training Facilitators attended training provided at the 2015 National Leadership Conference in St. Louis, MO. With all inspectors needing to be retrained to the new 2015-2020 ATFS standard, there was a need for more facilitators across the state. An additional 4 members of the Alabama Tree Farm Committee participated in the facilitator training webinar that was offered.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
A total of 6 facilitators were trained and 161 Inspectors were trained. 118 (73%) inspectors were trained in the classroom and 43 (27%) took the refresher training online. 8 Inspector Trainings were held. Active Inspectors in the database decreased by 33%. 161 Active Inspectors were successfully trained in 2015. This decreased from 240 inspectors active in the database 2014. However the total number of inspectors participating in inspections increased from 2014 to 2015. 77 (48%) active inspectors completed an inspection in 2015, which is an increase from 2014, when 20 (8%) active inspectors completed an inspection.
In 2015, these active inspectors completed a total of 261 inspections. Of those inspections completed 166 (64%) were required re-inspections, 29 (11%) were additional re-inspections, and 66 (25%) were initial inspections.

**What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)?** Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
The Alabama Tree Farm Committee will continue to offer Inspector Training workshops each calendar year. The format of these trainings will be evaluated by attendees and facilitators and feedback will be considered. It is the goal of ATFC to conduct these Inspector trainings in a way that not only educated and informs the inspector on how to conduct an inspection, but also encourages them to be an advocate for the American Tree Farm System and sustainable forestry practices. Inspectors will continue to be presented opportunities to conduct inspections, both voluntary and via direct request through the committee. District Inspectors of the ATFC will monitor inspector activity, and reach out to those inspectors who are active in the database, but have not conducted an inspection.

In future planning, in-active inspectors will be contacted whenever Inspector trainings are scheduled and will be encouraged to attend training and become re-engaged in the Tree Farm Program.

**What are the next steps for this project?**
In 2016, 2 key steps will be made to continue this project. The first will be to continue to engage active inspectors and encourage them to complete inspections. This will be done both through general email and direct mail communications and through direct contact via the district inspectors, the ATFC chair, and the program administrator to directly assign inspections. Initial inquiries, re-inspections, and required re-inspections will be assigned to inspectors. The second step will be to continue to hold Inspector training workshops. 3 are currently scheduled in 2016, one in each region (North/Central/South). The successful methods of communicating these events will be continued, including email and the AFA e-newsletter. Also, we will continue to use successful methods to engage Inspectors, including pinpointing their preferred work area and assigning inspections as soon as possible, after Inspector Training.

**Project Budget**
Total Expenditures: $9491
Total Match: $6591
Additional Budget Explanations:
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.

On October 20 - 21, 2015, 14 individuals met at Lake DeGray Lodge in Bismarck, Arkansas to conduct a strategic planning session for the Arkansas Tree Farm Program. Participants of the Planning Session included:

- Terrell Baker, consultant forester
- Allen Bedell, landowner/logger
- Max Braswell, co-sponsor
- John Cook, chair/forester
- Caroll Guffey, past chair/cooperative extension/forester
- Mark Karnes, landowner
- Jennifer Lambert Johnson, program administrator
- Robert Murphy, vice chair/forester
- Pete Prutzman, consultant forester
- Charles Purtle, landowner
- Jane Purtle, forest landowner
- Josh Smith, district chair/forester
- Moderators:
  - David Halley
  - Vicki Leigh

On the first day we followed the agenda below:

**NOON 1:00 PM** OPENING LUNCH & INFORMAL DISCUSSION Provided on-site
**1:00 PM 1:30 PM** INTRODUCTIONS/RETREAT OVERVIEW
**1:30 PM 2:00 PM** STATE VOICE, STATE CHOICE
**2:00 PM 3:00 PM** PERSONAL VISION LETTERS
**3:00 PM 3:30 PM** DEVELOPING FOCUS AREAS
**3:30 PM 3:45 PM** BREAK
**3:45 PM 4:30 PM** NARROWING OUR FOCUS TO BE SUCCESSFUL
**4:30 PM 5:15 PM** GOALS
**5:15 PM 5:30 PM** NEXT STEPS/ADJOURN
**6:00 PM** Social & Dinner Provided

On Day 2 we followed the agenda below:

**8:00 AM 8:30 AM** Breakfast in Restaurant
**8:30 AM 9:30 AM** REVIEW/ PREVIEW
**9:30 AM NOON** CONCENSUS ON GOAL STATEMENTS
**NOON 12:45 PM** DEVELOPING STRATEGIES
**12:45 PM 2:15 PM** DEVELOPING STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)
Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.

David Halley, the meeting facilitator, reviewed all of the conversations and talking points and provided the Arkansas Tree Farm Program with a Strategic Plan. The plan was reviewed by the Tree Farm Committee and was approved in December 2015. It is part of the Arkansas Tree Farm Committee Program Manual. The Committee is using it as guidance for accomplishing goals.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

A new Committee structure was designed to include sub-committees. This will hopefully create a better workflow for Committee members, and reduce the workload for those individuals who seem to have taken on the burden of responsibility.

What are the next steps for this project?
Meetings of each sub-committee have been planned, goals and timelines will be set at that time.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $2296
Total Match: $4543
Additional Budget Explanations:
State: Arkansas
Submitted By: Jennifer Lambert Johnson
Email: jlambert@arkforests.org

Project Title: Arkansas ATFS Inspector Standards Training
Grant Amount Awarded: $2900
Number of individuals participating: 4
Estimated number of work-hours: 450
Co-Sponsors: Arkansas Forestry Association

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
1) Three members of the ATFC attended the NLC and took the facilitator training.
2) A training manual was developed, including the atfs database login information, the 2015-2020 Standards, updated 004 form, sample management plan, ATFC program manual, a pdf copy of the Tree Farm ppt training, and a listing of area resources.
3) Regional meetings were conducted as follow-up to inspector training, to allow for further q & a and inspector engagement.
4) By the end of the fourth quarter, five classroom-setting inspector training were conducted.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
1) Arkansas went from having 1 trained facilitator to 3
2) Arkansas has 93 trained inspectors, 81 of which were classroom trained
3) Three regional meetings for inspectors were held, 25 people attended
4) Five classroom-setting inspector training were conducted
5) 100% of required inspections were completed

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
The regional meetings were difficult to schedule, but very beneficial. At each of these meetings, the Chair, Vice Chair and Program Administrator attended and a meal was served which encouraged attendance. This informal setting allowed inspectors the opportunity to get to know the ATFC leadership and develop a relationship with each. This helped engage the inspectors in the program and promote open lines of communication. The discussions were geared toward performing inspections, what they found easy/difficult using the database, and helped the ATFC leadership understand more fully the difficulties that inspectors were facing.

What are the next steps for this project?
In 2016 we will build communication with inspectors and landowners. The ATFC has undergone a Strategic Planning Session and is restructuring the Committee. This new structure will expand the capabilities of the Committee. The Strategic Plan includes a communication component. ATFC has also applied for (and received) a grant to expand it's communication with landowners and inspectors. The Committee is also planning the 2nd Annual Tree Farmer Conference.
Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $3200
Total Match: $2100
Additional Budget Explanations:
State: California  
Submitted By: Lois Kaufman  
Email: loda@frontiernet.net  

Project Title: 2015 Inspector Training Road Show  
Grant Amount Awarded: $2980  
Number of individuals participating: 21  
Estimated number of work-hours: 242  
Co-Sponsors: None

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
We completed 6 training sessions throughout the state with poor attendance at 5 locations of only 2 inspectors each. Workshops were held in Redding, Eureka, Ukiah, Grass Valley, San Bernardino and San Diego. Requests were made to have the training earlier in the year before the field and fire season come into full swing. Combining a training with the Tree Farmer of the Year presentation and tour really heightened awareness of the program in San Bernardino. The new app was not received well and I think this is an age problem. We have only received two inspections using the new app and one was completed during a training session. Although we didn't train a lot of inspectors those that we did all do inspections. Our new inspector in Siskiyou county has taken on all the 2016 third party assessment properties in that county and has worked with certification issues in the private sector. That was a MAJOR achievement for us. With our poor attendance we did a few spot classes for individuals at their homes to guide them through the on-line training.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
We were successful in recruiting another facilitator for southern California which lightens the load now having two for the state. This allowed us to have another training in San Diego and expand our coverage. The new facilitator is also working in conjunction with NRCS in recruitment of new Tree Farmers and cost sharing programs with our existing membership. Part of the 2016 assessment will take place in southern CA which we think is an untapped market for Tree Farm. We were only able to get 3 inspectors from the state, two of which were in southern CA. Our goal was to have one per unit where there is a forestry program available for a total of 12. We had planned a presentation to the Board of Forestry with all our program updates on certification and make the appeal to have CalFire formally recognize Tree Farm as part of their service forestry program. Due to changes with Executive directors to the board this didn't happen as planned. However, since then we have received a commitment from the executive director to the board to actually be a representative on our Tree Farm Committee and we are scheduled to make our presentation to the board on April 5th. We also have a commitment from NRCS for a board member and Forest Landowners of California. Our board had zero government representation and were all consulting foresters so this diversity will help is expansion of our information distribution base.
What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

- Inspectors like face to face training not just on the standards but on what's happening with the program. Continue with that and get some more facilitators so we could do more spot training.
- Follow-up communication with inspectors is essential via phone or email.
- Don't be afraid to reach out for help, we're all busy and sometimes a reminder is necessary.
- A call to the Tree Farmer with contact information for their inspector can produce good results. When the Tree Farmer calls asking for an inspectors it is harder to ignore.
- Remind inspectors that during field tours on a Tree Farm you have an excellent opportunity afterward to fill out that inspection report. Or doing it during the tour and make it part of your presentation.
- Follow-up with inspectors that can take the training on-line with constant reminders

What are the next steps for this project?
March 18th will be our first meeting with new board members to really get us moving forward. April 5th is our presentation to the Board of Forestry with a proposal to have a formal commitment for CalFire to re-engage in our program. Requests from CalFire have already come in for inspector training but it may not be practical until after fire season or early 2017. We would also like to get some inspectors from the NRCS staff. The current partnership between our inspector Tim Morin with Davy Tree and Peter Hoagland from is a good example of recruitment. Pete contracts with Davy Tree for management plans and cost share projects and they both solicit landowners for Tree Farm.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $1890
Total Match: $1745
Additional Budget Explanations:
We saved in travel by finding some great air fairs for the southern CA training and used these extra funds to put on an additional training in San Diego and spot individual training. Having another facilitator made this all possible.
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.

As part of our decision to remain third party certified a strategic plan was necessary first step. The strategic planning process was completed with the assistance of ATFS staff and a consulting facilitator. From that plan we moved on to developing a leadership manual, bylaws, communication plan and an MOU with AFF, all completed by the end of 2015. We were too optimistic thinking that we would have new board members with more diversity by the end of the year. The roll out presentation to the Board of Forestry did not happen in 2015 due to staffing changes with the Board but we are on the Agenda for April 5, 2016. We should have stuck with the main requirements for certification and saved the rest for the coming year. We could not have completed this without our professional facilitator. The dashboard assessment brought to light where we were as a committee and saved time when we all got together.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.

Our main goal was to remain a third party certified program and that was accomplished within the set time lines. A major emphasis for this plan was to get CalFire re-engaged in the Tree Farm Program. Before we could make our presentation to the CA Board of Forestry we needed to have all our planning documents complete. Our goal with CalFire was to have at least one trained CalFire inspector in each unit with a Forest Practice/Assistance program and increase the department inspections to 20%. This did not happen. We were starting with 1 at the beginning of 2015. Due to staffing changes with the Board we were not able to make our presentation in 2015 but are on the agenda for April 5, 2016 and have a commitment for a state representative on the committee. Recruiting new committee members was not as easy as we anticipated primarily because we had no leadership manual, bylaws, etc. to provide people to let them know what their commitment to the committee would entail. Now that those are in place interest has increased and March 18th with be our first committee meeting with these potential new members from state, NRCS, University, Industrial Forestry and USFS.

This project drove the point home to our committee that we need new blood and commitment from the members to get engaged and stop be a committee of one person handing the program if we are to continue to have a program in California. We did loose one committee member.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
- Don't try to do too much at once, start small
- Outside help(facilitator) makes it happen, no previous ownership in your committee
- Set specific completion dates for tasks and keep with it, no extensions to procrastinate
- Sometimes you have to ask people

What are the next steps for this project?
March 18, 2016 Committee meeting with the current and potential new committee members
April 5, 2016 Presentation to the CA Board of Forestry on our Tree Farm program and asking for their support.
Implement the strategic plan, fund raising, communication, training

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $970
Total Match: $3052
Additional Budget Explanations:
Our strategic plan volunteers were great and donated more time than I could have ever imagined to complete this project.
State: Iowa
Submitted By: ron fullenkamp
Email: rcful@iowatelecom.net

Project Title: Iowa Strategic Planning Program
Grant Amount Awarded: $1000
Number of individuals participating: 10
Estimated number of work-hours: 135
Co-Sponsors: none

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
Planning session was held for one and one-half day in Ames, Iowa. Tom Davison was the facilitator and Vicki Leigh was the director. We went over the reason for the retreat, the agenda, their vision letters from members and developed focus areas. We then worked on the focus areas and action ideas and made decisions on where we in Iowa wanted to go. Successful was our learning what we were about and where we want to go with Iowa Tre Farm. What was not successful was a misunderstanding by one member and another not liking the idea that we needed this since we had a Iowa manual. Both have resigned from the committee over this.

Describe the outcomes of this project – what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
The outcome of this project was to let the committee members not present go thru our focus areas and have them buy into our plans. We presented the whole program to the full committee at our January meeting. We seemed to have full acceptance of the plan.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee’s projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
Our committee learned where our priorities are after the planning session. We intend for this to be our roadmap for the next several years. We will attempt to work on all of our three focus areas and improve our Iowa presence in sustainable family forestry.

What are the next steps for this project?
We have assigned chairs for each focus area and they will report their groups actions at our April meeting.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $2268
Total Match: $1000
Additional Budget Explanations: none
State: Kentucky
Submitted By: Robert Bauer
Email: bob@kfia.org

Project Title: Certified Pathway Development
Grant Amount Awarded: $2335
Number of individuals participating: 15
Estimated number of work-hours: 150
Co-Sponsors: Kentucky Forest Industries Association
Kentucky Division of Forestry

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
This project dealt with development of plans to meet requirements for Kentucky to move forward with remaining certified under ATFS. The funding provided for development of a Communication Plan, State Leadership Manual and Tree Farm Interest Response Plan. These are all important documents that were developed with input from the State Committee and put together through guidance provided by our Strategic Plan which was developed prior to completion of the supporting documents. Also funds were used to update the database of tree farmers. These projects were all successful.
We had hoped to get a larger percentage of emails but still felt the project was successful in nearly doubling our email contacts.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
The funding resulted in the development of three plans including a Communication Plan, Leadership Manual and Tree Interest Response Plan. These plans will all be used in administering the program and although much of the information was available in bits and pieces these plans make it easier to run the program and provides specific information to all on the committee and new incoming members.
Also all tree farmers were followed up with by mail to update the database and make an attempt to collect email addresses and this resulted in responses from 80 tree farmers and increasing the number of emails available to 180 plus improving contact information addresses and other information in the database. The email addresses will be used to improve regular contact with tree farmers and provide state legislative updates from the Committee co-sponsor the KY Forest Industries Association.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
The development of the plans helped the Committee to better look at priorities and will assist with planning over the next couple of years to improve the program. The response from the tree farmer follow up was better than we expected and was due to the offering to respond by mail, phone or email which worked well.
We plan to use the plans on a regular basis and are looking at continued to follow ups and more regular contact with tree farmers through email.
**What are the next steps for this project?**
Putting the plans to use and utilizing the improved email database to reach out to tree farmers with regular legislative updates on Kentucky issues and other important issues.

**Project Budget**
Total Expenditures: $5110
Total Match: $2775
Additional Budget Explanations:
State: Kentucky
Submitted By: Robert Bauer
Email: bob@kfia.org

Project Title: ATFS Inspector Training
Grant Amount Awarded: $2900
Number of individuals participating: 55
Estimated number of work-hours: 310
Co-Sponsors: Kentucky Forest Industries Association
Kentucky Division of Forestry
University of Kentucky Forestry Department

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
This project was designed to keep and expand our tree farm inspectors in the state. With the loss of the ability for inspectors to update online because they had not done a recent inspection within the two years we were looking at losing the majority of our inspectors. This project brought a number of partners together on the committee to put together a web based training which included hands on activities and specific follow up requirements to be retrained as an inspector. The project also included training for University of Kentucky forestry students during their spring junior field forestry semester which included inspector training and discussions of the tree farm program. When they receive their forestry degree the following year they are then approved as inspectors. Keeping the inspectors trained and up to date to keep up with the new standards was the most important goal of the project and it was successful in keeping existing inspectors up to date and bringing in some new inspectors as they graduate from Forestry school. We were not real successful in adding new inspectors that are already in the workforce because our attention had to be turned to getting existing inspectors trained to keep up with changes in procedures at the national level. The good thing is that the training is still available and we hope to turn our resources to expanding the inspector work force over the next year and continuing to add past inspectors through the training module that was developed.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
This project brought a number of partners together on the committee to put together a web based training which included hands on activities and specific follow up requirements to be retrained as an inspector. The training has resulted in people getting updated and trained as inspectors that we may have otherwise lost. Also the training is still available and we hope to turn our resources to expanding the inspector work force over the next year and continue to get past inspectors back on the active role.
The project also included training for University of Kentucky forestry students during their spring junior field forestry semester which included inspector training and discussions of the tree farm program. When they receive their forestry degree the following year they are then approved as inspectors. The training resulted in 12 people being trained who will be approved as inspectors when they receive their degrees and will be out in the workforce throughout the country and will be educated to the importance of the tree farm program. The good thing is that the training is still available and we hope to turn our resources to expanding the inspector work force over the next year.
What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

We will continue the project for training purposes now that it is in place and it will help us expand the inspector work force over the next year. Also the forestry student training will be incorporated annually and maintained to train new inspectors every year.

What are the next steps for this project?
Continue the developed training program to reach out to potential inspectors that are in the work force already and improve our ability to reach new inspectors. The programs will continue to be used in the future to support our state program.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $7475
Total Match: $2900
Additional Budget Explanations:
Funds were used to develop training that all inspectors could access which was deemed more cost efficient than having meetings around the state that would reach much smaller numbers of existing and potential new inspectors.
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
This project was composed of the following primary components: (1) 100% of Tree Farmer contact information in the database was successfully reviewed for accuracy and up-dated; (2) a GIS database of all Tree Farm properties was successfully created; (3) Nine Tree Farm events were successfully held across the state, three co-hosted with the MD Forest Association, attracting approximately 150 attendees; and (4) a webinar of the live event was successfully recorded and posted online on the University of MD Extension website. Although the overall Grant was highly successful, we were disappointed at the poor response by Tree Farmers to the planned events (a total of 15 events were planned, of which six events were cancelled due to low response).

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
One of the major accomplishments of this Grant was the creation of a GIS database to compliment the existing tabular database of Tree Farmers. We now have the ability to pull up a GIS map of the state and locate all Tree Farms on the landscape. This also allows us to analyze multiple GIS attributes of the state's Tree Farms for any GIS attribute for which data is available. Additionally, completion of 100% of the review and up-date of all Tree Farm contact information in the tabular database was a major success. Subsequent to the database review, the accuracy of our database mailing addresses was verified by direct mail invitations that were sent out to all MD Tree Farmers in our database, with no returns for bad addresses. The nine Tree Farm events that were held across the state were positive venues to communicate information about the Tree Farm program, and strengthened the Committee's partnership efforts with the Maryland Forests Association (which was a co-sponsor of three of the events).

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
We learned that for a relatively small investment, we were able to hire a college student with GIS skills to create a very useful GIS database for the Tree Farm program that will provide a number of natural resource analytical benefits for many years into the future. We would not have been able to create this GIS database without the funding support form this ATFS Grant. However, now that we have the GIS database up and running, it will be relatively easy to keep it up-dated, as our database manager has GIS skills (they just didn't have the 420 hours of time that it took to create the GIS database). We also learned that attracting Tree Farmers to programmatic /
informational events is a bit of a challenge. We had hoped that by scheduling local events within a short drive (no more than 30-minutes), we would be able to engage / meet with a substantial percentage of our Tree Farmers, and to provide them with the opportunity for face-to-face interaction. Unfortunately, only a small percentage of our Tree Farmers came to these events.

**What are the next steps for this project?**
Continue to maintain the GIS database, and begin analysis on selected GIS data attributes. Continue to keep tabular database up-dated on a regular basis.

**Project Budget**
Total Expenditures: $10004
Total Match: $21600
Additional Budget Explanations:
Match Amount = Approximately 540 hours of MD DNR Forest Service staff time was dedicated as Salary Match to this Grant Project estimated at $40/hour = $21,600 in Match
State: Maryland  
Submitted By: Kenneth Jolly  
Email: Kenneth.Jolly@maryland.gov

Project Title: Maryland Delaware Inspector Training  
Grant Amount Awarded: $2600  
Number of individuals participating: 20  
Estimated number of work-hours: 48  
Co-Sponsors: In partnership with the MD State Tree Farm Committee, the MD DNR Forest Service was the primary co-sponsor of this event.

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
One Tree Farm Inspector Training was held, attended by approximately 20 participants (most were Inspectors, however, there were three MD Committee Members in attendance). Three Inspectors came from the neighboring state of Delaware, which was one of the goals of the Grant project. Another major goal for the Grant was to hold two Inspector Trainings. Although a second Inspector Training was planned and advertised, only one person registered for the Training, so it was cancelled. At the one Training that was conducted, most of the attendees were already Inspectors who needed to attend the class per the new Inspector requirements in the 2015-2020 Standards. One brand-new Inspector attended. The only non-successful aspect of the training was the inability to attract private consulting foresters. In Maryland, the majority (95-98%) of Tree Farm Inspections are conducted by State Forestry Agency personnel. However, the majority of private consulting foresters, even though they were inactive, maintained the Certified Inspector credential. With the implementation of the 2015-2020 Standards, this situation has changed, and the majority of private consulting foresters in MD have now decided to let their Certified Inspector status lapse. It was clear that private foresters did not want to spend a day participating in the Training. Virtually all of the private foresters who have maintained their Certified Inspectors in MD were eligible to take the online training and did so, versus spending a full day (including travel time) to attend the Training.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
Overall the Training was a good success for those who attended - on the evaluation forms, 40% of the attendees stated they had learned "a great deal" about the Tree Farm Certification process, and that the Training was "very helpful." 80% said the Training was "about the right length." The Training also provided an excellent opportunity to up-date the participants on the need for Plan Addendums as well as some of the items that were pointed out as needing attention from the MD 2014 Assessment. Another positive outcome of the Grant was obtaining the "Certified Facilitator" credential for a MD Committee Member, so the state can continue to provide Certified Inspector Trainings in the future.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
One of the not-so-promising lessons learned from this Grant is that it will be difficult to retain private consulting foresters as Certified Inspectors in MD under the new Standards. On the positive side, the Grant provided the opportunity to have a new Training Facilitator certified to give the Training in MD. Additionally, the new Training materials utilized in the Training - particularly the interactive component of going through a Management Plan and evaluating it against the Standards - appeared to be a success.

What are the next steps for this project?
The State Committee will need to explore other options to reach out to consultants to "sell them" on the benefits of being a Certified Inspector. Also, the Committee will need to look into creative ways to minimize the time commitment of the Inspector Training - possibly offering the Training in conjunction with other forestry meetings, highlighting the availability of CFE's, etc.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $1562
Total Match: $1760
Additional Budget Explanations:
The primary reason for the left over funding was due to the cancellation of the second Inspector Training workshop - e.g., expenses for two Inspector Trainings were included as part of the Grant budget, but only one was conducted, resulting in unexpended
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.

Bill Pike and Greg Cox took the facilitator training at the NLC in Feb 2015.
Greg set up and sent out mailings and emails for an inspector training workshop held in Sturbridge on April 8th. We had 52 foresters sign up and 51 attend the training.
We filed for continuing education credits for Massachusetts, Connecticut & New England SAF.
We made a special point to invite foresters from Connecticut and Rhode Island who work in Massachusetts or have Massachusetts Tree Farmers as clients.
We entered those inspectors in the database and held a second workshop on October 8th in Northampton for 7 additional inspectors.
With online training and training done in other states, we now have 68 currently certified Tree Farm inspectors, including 17 new inspectors.
Two new inspectors have filed certifications/recertifications in 2015 and 2 others helped with the 2015 Massachusetts Tree Farm assessment.
Included in the 68 current inspectors are 6 state service foresters who give us another option for getting properties inspected when the consultant forester involved isn't a certified inspector.
We hope to get more of these inspectors involved in working off the backlog of overdue inspections in 2016.
We still have more than 20 foresters who aren't currently certified in the 2015-2020 Tree Farm standards, including 10 or more who were certified in the 2010 - 2015 standards. The committee may put on another training workshop in 2016 if some of those foresters express interest in taking/renewing their training.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.

Our goal for this project was to get as many foresters as possible trained in the 2015-2020 Tree Farm standards so we could get our 2015 mandatory certifications completed and the 2015 Assessment taken care of. We have been able to train 68 of the approximately 90 foresters in Massachusetts in the new standards, about 76 percent.
We were able to complete the 2015 Assessment with all properties having currently certified inspectors, and were able to complete the 2015 mandatory inspections, with 2 being completed by new inspectors.
We have also been able to assign all of the 18 mandatory inspections due in 2016 to certified inspectors.
What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

This workshop series worked pretty much as planned
If we hold more workshops in 2016 or later, we will incorporate lessons we learned from the 2015 Tree Farm assessment to discuss how foresters can efficiently make sure that the Tree Farmers they work with meet the current standards' requirements.

What are the next steps for this project?
we will be sending all our certified inspectors an email newsletter this spring encouraging them to get their clients recertified as Tree Farms and inviting them to help recertify Tree Farms without currently trained inspectors
We hope to assign optional Tree Farm inspections for all overdue (not done within 5 years) Tree Farms this year and expect to get many of these inspectors involved in this.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $5254
Total Match: $26448
Additional Budget Explanations:
Good Morning

Have you signed up for the Tree Farm Inspectors Training Workshop in Sturbridge on April 8th?  If you have, we'll see you on the 8th

If you haven’t, this email is for you.

The American Forest Foundation has recently revised the Tree Farm Standards of Sustainability, and the new 2015-2020 version has gone into effect. Because the standards are somewhat different, the Tree Farm system requires that all Tree Farm inspectors must take training in the new standards to be able to certify or recertify Tree Farms, and all previous inspector certification expired on March 15th.

To help foresters recertify as Tree Farm inspectors, we’ve set up a training workshop at the Sturbridge Host Hotel on April 8th from 8:30 am to 3 pm. The workshop has been approved for 4.5 Mass forester CFEs, 3.5 national SAF CFEs, and CT forester credits are pending. The cost of the workshop is $25 including lunch. The workshop will explain the new standards, how to apply them to Tree Farms here, and how to use the new certification form and app. The program will also explain how the 3rd party Tree Farm assessment will be conducted on selected Mass. Tree Farms in May, and what foresters can do to prepare.

The deadline for signing up for the workshop is Friday, April 3rd, so we can give the hotel a head count and make sufficient copies for all attendees. Each inspector will receive a waterproof copy of the new standards and guidance, and information about the new reinspection app for smart phones.

Do you need to attend the workshop?: If a forester wants to be able to certify or recertify client’s woodlands as Tree Farms, he/she will need to be certified in the 2015-2020 standards to be qualified to do so.

If you were trained in the 2010-2015 standards, and have filed Tree Farm certifications or recertifications in the past two years (2013 or 2014), you can either attend the training workshop or take online training to be certified in the 2015-2020 standards. See www.treefarmsystem.org for information about the online training

If you haven’t filed a Tree Farm certification or recertification in the past two years, you must complete an inspector training workshop to be certified in the new standards.

Will other workshops be offered later this year? We hope to put on a second inspector training workshop in Northampton in the fall

If I don’t take the training, what will happen? You won’t be a certified inspector obviously. Which means that when Tree Farmers who are looking for a forester asks us for a list, your contact information won’t be on the list.
And, if one of your clients has a Tree Farm due to be recertified, we will make arrangements to have another forester meet with your client and carry out the inspection.

How do I sign up for the April 8th workshop?

Either send a $25 check to the Tree Farm Committee at 13 Pond Road, Hawley, MA 01339 by April 3rd,
Or call Greg Cox at 413 339-5526 by April 3rd to sign up,
Or email Greg Cox at gcox@crocker.com by April 3rd to reserve a spot.

Hope we’ll see you on the 8th!

Gregory Cox
Program Director
Massachusetts Forest Alliance
13 Pond Road
Hawley, MA 01339

gcox@crocker.com
413 339-5526
413 475-2883
www.massforestalliance.org
State: Minnesota
Submitted By: Tom Witkowski
Email: tomforester@charter.net

Project Title: Inspector Training
Grant Amount Awarded: $1875
Number of individuals participating: 3
Estimated number of work-hours: 43
Co-Sponsors: Minnesota Forest Industries

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
We sponsored 3 Inspector Training Workshops at sites across the state in an effort to increase attendance by makes the site more available, less travel time, travel costs, etc for foresters: Grand Rapids, Rochester and Park Rapids
What was not successful was the attendance. We only had 21 foresters attend

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
The foresters who did attend were supporters of tree farm and enthusiastic about the program, however as mentioned above, poor attendance. We had anticipated 65 foresters to attend. That number was based on training we had held in the past plus the expectations that all foresters would need classroom training that attendance would be up.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
Have to increase attendance.
Not sure why such poor attendance.
Some is based on apparently a general lack of interest in Tree Farm by foresters; consulting foresters don't see it as a "paying proposition".
Not sure why such poor attendance, but could be difficulting in getting notice out to foresters. We did put notice out through Extension which handles Continuing Education offerings and our Better Forests magazine which inspecting foresters and DNR forestry offices receive.
We also sent notice directly through email to long list of inspecting foresters plus Stewardship foresters of the training.
Also, dissapointed in turnout of Industry Foresters,(NONE attended) and few MN DNR foresters
So, not sure what we could have done differently on notification.

What are the next steps for this project?
Project is complete.
We have had a few (3) foresters since training who are interested, so we may try to put something together for them. One problem is they are all from different dircctions in the state, long travel distance.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $2290
Total Match: $1875
Additional Budget Explanations:
State: Mississippi
Submitted By: Tom Monaghan
Email: tomm@msforestry.net

Project Title: Comprehensive Statewide ATFS Inspector Training for Mississippi
Grant Amount Awarded: $2900
Number of individuals participating: 255
Estimated number of work-hours: 1923
Co-Sponsors: None

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
We contracted (with the Mississippi State University Department of Forestry) the services of an Associate Extension Forester who is also a trained facilitator. He conducted 7 inspector training workshops in 2015. These workshops were successful.
We also used three other facilitators to conduct two Inspector Training workshops. These workshops were also successful.
We communicated the need for updated inspector training to all active and inactive inspectors and all registered foresters via email, phone, and direct contact. Prior to each workshop, we sent an announcement to all registered foresters in Mississippi via the MS Board of Registration for Foresters email list. Results indicate that these efforts were successful.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
We trained 217 inspectors in nine (9) workshops in 2015. In addition, 41 inspectors were trained online. A total of 258 inspectors were trained in 2015. The Tree Farm Database does not provide a report of those foresters trained for the first time. We estimate that approximately 10% (of the inspectors trained in 2015) were new inspectors (trained for the first time).
Our state's operational definition of "active" inspector is "an inspector who conducts at least one inspection (or reinspection) during the calendar year". Based on this definition, the number of active inspectors dropped from 79 in 2014 to 47 in 2015.
A January 2016 email was sent to all registered foresters and inactive inspectors reminding them that they are inactive until they are re-trained. Responses indicate that many previously active inspectors still need and want training.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
While we did re-train a significant number of inspectors in one year (258), we learned that one year is probably insufficient time to re-train all inspectors who are likely to be "active" (conducting inspections). We recognize that we will need to continue our inspector training efforts and promote the use of online training. All inspectors are volunteers. We cannot expect 100% of them to drop their job duties and responsibilities to attend workshops on a date that does not match with their work schedule.
What are the next steps for this project?
The next steps are:
1) Continue inspector training workshops in 2016
2) Continue to promote online inspector training
3) Encourage facilitator training for new District Chairs and other interested committee leaders and members

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $5000
Total Match: $50790
Additional Budget Explanations:
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.

From the ATFS database, we compiled a list of approximately 1,600 Tree Farms not inspected in the past 10 years (since 2004), stratified the report by district and county, and distributed lists to District Chairs and the MS Tree Farm Committee. We compared the list to the lists of database "issues" sent to us by Mike Burns in preparation for the 2015 Assessment. Mike Burns' lists included Tree Farms with invalid addresses, unknown locations, multiple parcels, etc. We found considerable "overlap" between and among the lists. In total, there were at least 1,700 Tree Farms in need of immediate attention.

As a result of discussions with Mike Burns, we realized that we did not have time for typical database cleanup activities prior to the selection of sample Tree Farms for our 2015 statewide Assessment. So, we immediately decertified 1,700 of our 4,000 Tree Farms and placed them in the Pioneer category. We then implemented several activities over the past year aimed at resolving the issues that led to the decertifications.

We sent county-specific invalid address lists to "cooperating" agency offices (USDA, NRCS, and FSA) and County Forestry Associations in each county with a request to help find correct addresses. We directly contacted inspectors identified on the "multiple parcels" list and asked them to submit 004 forms for each non-contiguous parcel involved. One inspector (a consulting forester) certified more than 20 new Tree Farms from three Tree Farms on the "multiple parcels" list. At least 200 inspectors received county-specific lists of Tree Farms in need of voluntary re-inspection. More than 70 inspectors responded with actions leading to some form of database cleanup, such as decertification or reinspection and recertification.

We also publicized our database cleanup in a newsletter to all Tree Farmers. At least 30 Tree Farmers called our administrative office to check their status. Those on the Pioneer list were referred to local inspectors.

While progress has been shown in "reinstating" (recertifying) those who were decertified, setting appropriate, defensible parameters and mass decertification (moving to Pioneer) seems to be the best strategy. Follow up activities, such as direct contact, with 1,700 Pioneer Tree Farmers is a work in progress and will continue over the next few years.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.

In 2015, we have increased the number of Certified Tree Farms by 273, but of those, approximately 42 were the result of voluntary reinspections and 16 Tree Farms were decertified. We did not recertify as many Tree Farms as we expected. This is due to (1) the difficulty in contacting Tree Farmers who have not been reinspected in more than 10 years, (2) the conflict of conducting a state assessment in the same year as this project, and (3) the conflict of our MS Forestry Commission personnel being involved in an audit of school trust (16th Section) lands during the same year.
We measured part of our success by the results of our 2015 State Assessment. While we did have some management plans with missing elements (minor non-conformities), all 42 of the Tree Farms sampled had current (less than 10 years old) management plans. If we had not implemented the mass decertification, we estimate that 41% of our assessment sample Tree Farms would have had significant non-conformities, primarily the lack of a current management plan or no plan at all.

If there is a "failure" associated with this project, it is that we have been unable to take specific, definitive action on all 1,600+ Pioneer Tree Farms on our list. But this is actually part of our "lessons learned" rather than a failure. Database cleanup is not a one-year project.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

We want to plan to continue our efforts to locate and reinspect (or decertify) those on our Pioneer list, particularly those who were decertified due to issues identified in this project. We learned that a goal of reaching out to 1,700 individuals in a one-year project is unrealistic. It is a continuous, on-going project.

We further learned that an intensive and extensive project (such as this one) is very time-consuming, particularly in the same year as a state assessment.

We learned that we need to establish and publicize some definitive guidelines and responsibilities for Tree Farmers in regard to maintenance of their "Certified" status. Tree Farmers must realize that they can be in danger of being decertified if they are not proactive in maintaining their status. For example, we cannot expect our volunteers (inspectors) to search for owners who have not made any effort to keep us informed of changes in ownership, address, deaths, etc.

What are the next steps for this project?

Our next steps are to continue to try to contact those on our Pioneer list. We will initiate a direct mail letter in 2016 to specifically reach out to those who were decertified as a result of this project. We will continue to provide district and county lists of Pioneer owners to District Chairs and inspectors. We will continue to provide inspector incentives for voluntary reinspections of those decertified due to database cleanup.

Project Budget

Total Expenditures: $10200
Total Match: $39200

Additional Budget Explanations:
Contractual Services includes the time spent by the Tree Farm Administrator and the Administrator's Program Assistant.
Inspector Incentive Awards are the additional awards for voluntary inspections generated by the efforts to contact Pioneer Tree Farms that were decertified in-mass.
Matching funds are a conservative estimate of the time spent by our volunteers and supporting organizations.
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.

Used mailings to Missouri Tree Farmers along with follow up contacts by Regional TF Chairs, to clean up records and contact information in the Tree Farm database. This was accomplished with two mailings, the first of which, contained a letter from the State TF Chair, explaining the options of certification vs. recognition, along with a self addressed return postcard indicating each Tree Farmers preference (Certification vs. Recognition). Returned letters and non-responses were followed up with record reviews and/or contacts by the Regional TF Chairs. A second reminder post card was mailed in Sept and additional information was garnered from responses. A total of 42% of the Tree Farmers responded through this effort and many records were updated or dropped (decertified).

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.

A 42% response rate was considered a great success. Also, follow up contacts by Regional TF Chairs proved successful in reestablishing contact with Tree Farmers and decertifying inactive and uninterested properties. This information is valuable to the administration of the Tree Farm Program in Missouri as it will assist us in focusing management and outreach efforts on active, interested landowners and it will save us time and money by not sending expensive mailings to inactive landowners.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

Most surprising was that the Tree Farmers were split in their preference for Certification vs. Recognition. We expected a clear majority for one or the other, but preference was split evenly amongst the 42% who responded. Our Committee is following up with a letter to our Tree Farmers explaining the voting results and the State Committees decision to remain a Certified program. Future follow-up will determine how the committee will pay for the added costs of Certification.

What are the next steps for this project?
As mentioned above, future communication with Tree Farmers and the Committee will discuss options for paying additional audit costs, and will focus on continuing efforts to inform
landowners and Tree Farmers of Certification benefits. Discussion about Certification will be held at the upcoming Tree Farm Annual Conference on April 29-30

**Project Budget**
Total Expenditures: $1826
Total Match: $4800
Additional Budget Explanations:
An additional mailing containing a letter from the Past Missouri Tree Farm Chair explaining the Certification decision is being mailed the week of March 14. The cost is expected to be approximately $500.
State: Montana
Submitted By: Angela Mallon
Email: amallon@mt.gov

Project Title: Develop fundraising strategy
Grant Amount Awarded: $3500
Number of individuals participating: 14
Estimated number of work-hours: 144
Co-Sponsors:

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
On November 17th, 2015, the Montana Tree Farm Steering Committee held a grassroots work meeting to develop a communications plan and fundraising strategy.
Successes: Collaboratively developed outlines for both communications plan and fundraising strategy through large and small group work. We stayed on task, accomplished all objectives established for the meeting, and ended on time.
Not successful: Chair was left with a significant amount of work to compile information following meeting. Committee could not see a more efficient way to accomplish this necessary step.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
Montana Tree Farm now has 1) a draft communications plan and 2) a fundraising strategy to review and approve at the January 2016 meeting.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
1) With a good agenda and a good facilitator, we can stay on track
2) Working in small groups, we can achieve a lot more
3) By breaking tasks into component parts, we can accomplish projects that initially seem daunting
4) More post-session work needs to be delegated

What are the next steps for this project?
Approve communications plan and fundraising strategy and implement

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $1146.46
Total Match: $1535
Additional Budget Explanations:
Remainder of funds will be used to develop promotional materials for fundraising strategy and implement communication plan
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
The Montana Tree Farm Steering Committee conducted a workshop to update inspector qualifications to the 2015-2020 standards of sustainability. For the first time ever, this workshop included a field practicum in addition to the classroom session. The field portion was enormously popular - many commented it was the best inspector training they had attended because of the field exercise. The facilitator felt pressure to get through the classroom portion quickly to allow for more time in the field, the result being that some inspectors felt both sessions to be truncated. Feedback from inspectors indicated that more time would be tolerated and even appreciated.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
This inspector training resulted in certification of 10 new inspectors and recertification of 35 current inspectors, for a total of 45. The original proposal stated a goal of recertifying 90% of current inspectors (around 100 at the time). However, re-evaluation of the status of our inspector ranks showed many had not completed an inspection in years, had relocated to a different state, or were simply not interested in updating their qualifications. The inspectors we did recertify are among our best and most engaged, and we hope to keep them engaged by establishing a more equitable process for assigning reinspections. We did attain our goal of training 5 to 10 new inspectors, several of whom are recent college graduates from the University of Montana, and one of whom recently attained a position at the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, where he will be directly involved in supporting the Tree Farm program.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
We received so much positive feedback on the field practicum. We will repeat this training activity in future inspector trainings. We will also devote a full 4 hours to the morning classroom session as well as the field portion.

What are the next steps for this project?
Instructor training is complete. Now the certification coordinator will focus her efforts on distributing inspections equitably so every trained inspector has the option of completing a new sign-up or recertification at least once every 2 years.
Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $1840
Total Match: $5650
Additional Budget Explanations:
Sources of match: 60 hours of professional volunteer time valued at $20/hr, time of agency and industry employees attending the training with time covered by employer (27 x $20 x 8 hours), mileage of instructor donated by employer (230 miles x 0.565)
State: Nebraska
Submitted By: Doak Nickerson
Email: hnickerson1@unl.edu

Project Title: The Future of the Nebraska Tree Farm Program Working Together to Build Our Future  November 2015 December 2018  STRATEGIC PLAN
Grant Amount Awarded: $1000
Number of individuals participating: 8
Estimated number of work-hours: 128
Co-Sponsors: Nebraska Forest Service

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
1) Completed the 1 day brainstorming session for building the foundation of the Strategic Plan for the Nebraska Tree Farm System (2015 - 2018).
2) Provided the ATFS Facilitator (Tom Davidson) with necessary tools to develop and write the official strategic planning document.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
1) Defined what success might look like for the Nebraska Tree Farm Program.
2) Came away with a clearer understanding of what the Nebraska Tree Farm Program needs to focus on in the next one to three years to be successful.
3) Developed a list of suggested strategies to help the Tree Farm Committee achieve that success.
4) Each Committee member personally committed to being involved to address one of the goals established at the retreat.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)?  Did this project produce any surprising results?  For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
The official strategic plan laid down in written form for the Nebraska Tree Farm System helped:
1) Position itself to better serve its Tree Farm membership
2) Chart its course for States Voice - States Choice (i.e. recognition track)
3) Anticipate future challenges/needs for growing the program.

What are the next steps for this project?
Please refer to "The Future of the Nebraska Tree Farm Program - Working Together to Build Our Future" - STRATEGIC PLAN.*
* This document was emailed to Sara Anrrich under separate cover.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $1000
Total Match: $6400
Additional Budget Explanations:
ATFS grant used for meeting room rental, breaks, lunch & NFS mileage.
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
The New Hampshire Tree Committee conducted four (4) trainings during the 2015 year. These trainings were twofold. They were designed to offer training to new inspectors and to those who preferred classroom training. The first training was held at our annual inspectors meeting this and was very well attended with over 50 of our inspectors coming. At this training, the new standards and new 004 were highlighted and discussed in detail. There was a question and answer period and power point on using your phone to complete the 004. The NH Tree Farm also participates in two major industry-wide meetings in which we offer inspector training as part of the program. We use a portion of the grant money to cover the cost of our inspectors attending these meetings. This served to increase inspector capacity, as well as promotes the program to our industry and other influential stake holders. This was very well received by the 66 inspectors that attended and will be continued in the future. The final training session was for new inspectors and was also well attended with 26 new inspectors getting trained. All inspectors attend these session were giving a Tree Farm Padfolio to take and use in their business. This again was very well received by the inspectors.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
In total we reached 116 of our inspectors during the year with this training and we trained or retrained a total of 26 new inspectors. 100% of the program participants increased their awareness of the New Standards and new methods of completing the 004. Our administrator has been seeing an improvement in the 004 that have been turned in with the training the inspectors received and many are starting to use the new phone 004 forms to submit their re-inspection information.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee’s projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
We will be continuing the portion of the project paying for the Inspectors to attend the two major industry-wide meetings.
We will be offering the annual inspectors meeting again this year and be offering some continuing education credits for inspector's after the meeting.

What are the next steps for this project?
We are in the process of email our inspectors asking if they want training again this year and what they are looking for in that training

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $5829
Total Match: $2929
Additional Budget Explanations:
State: New Hampshire
Submitted By: Rita Carroll
Email: rcarroll@forestsociety.org

Project Title: NH database cleanup
Grant Amount Awarded: $1795
Number of individuals participating: 2
Estimated number of work-hours: 140
Co-Sponsors: Society for the Protection of NH Forests, the Granite State Division of the Society of American Foresters

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.

NH is fortunate to have a database that has data that is older than the ATFS database, which enabled us to do comparisons of data to ensure accuracy and retain historical information. We were able to find and resume contact with Tree Farmers that were missing from the ATFS database because our data is older. Over the course of the year we compared parts of each database:

1) Tree Farmers/Tree Farms: Multiple reports were run from ATFS and NH Databases. Tree Farm Status (including year of last inspection), Tree Farm information, and landowner contact information was compared for more than 800 Tree Farms due for optional inspections in either 2015 or 2016 (or earlier).

2) Postcards were sent to more than 450 landowners who were due for inspections in 2015 (or earlier). The few that were returned were followed up on to update contact information. This mailing will be repeated within the next few months for those due in 2016 (or earlier) and will likewise be followed up on.

3) Inspecting foresters: Contact information, including email addresses were compared for 200 inspecting foresters. I ran multiple reports (ATFS contact information, NH contact information and our former Inspector Chair's email list). I compared and updated the contact information for all three.

4) For each mailing we do of our newsletters, the ATFS contact list is run through an NCOA. Contact information is updated by comparing databases and contacting Tree Farmers directly. The numbers of pieces of returned mail have steadily been going down.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.

I am not completely finished with this project yet and will continue to run comparison reports from the two databases. We are improving our accuracy in terms of what TFs exist and when they are due for inspections. Some were missing from the ATFS database, so therefore not tagged for optional inspections. Now when I run optionals for a certain year the match is very close if not exact for each year, which ensures all TFs are accounted for.

One serious concern of mine was that when running reports of the total number of TFs in NH and the number of total acres, I was getting significantly different numbers from each database. I recently ran the two reports after this clean up project, and they were nearly spot on. Regarding inspectors' emails, the number of undeliverable emails went from more than 40 (120 were sent) to fewer than 2. We regularly communicate with our inspectors via email and having a clean email list is critical. I plan to do the same for our TFrs, as we are gathering more and more email addresses and planning to email to them more.
What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

Having an older database (the NH database) has been extremely helpful and I will continue to run comparisons between that and the ATFS database, but in sections. I learned that comparing all the information all at once is too cumbersome. Running multiple comparisons in logical sub-sections is both more manageable and less likely to result in errors.

Running comparison reports for our optional inspections going far back in time has been extremely helpful and I will continue to do that each year. I have about two more years' worth of options to run which will allow me to capture all the TFs in the 6-year cycle, ensuring that all our Tree Farms are accounted for. We have fewer than 20 Tree Farms that are more than two years overdue for an optional inspection, and we are in the process of personally reaching out to them beyond the normal mailings and forester contact that we do each year. This work will always continue, but through the extra time given to do this project this year, I now have a better understanding of the ATFS database, I feel that both this and the NH Databases are cleaner, and I am more confident that we are able to reach out to all our Tree Farmers - we know who they are and when they are due for optional inspections.

What are the next steps for this project?

Continue to compare two databases, optional year by optional year. Ensure they agree in terms of when last inspected, TF status and information and landowner contact information.

We will continue to clean up mailing addresses by calling landowners who are flagged when the post office runs the NCOA.

We will continue to solicit TFr email addresses and follow up on emails that are undeliverable to them and to our inspectors.

We are investigating the structure and table relationships of both Nationals and the NH databases, with the goal of formulating and implementing a plan to eliminate redundancy and ease of updating the information from the ATFS database into the NH database. At this point we update and use the ATFS database for all our TF work, but we might develop some custom queries that we want to do and cannot with the ATFS database.

Project Budget

Total Expenditures: $3610
Total Match: $1805
Additional Budget Explanations:
State: New Jersey  
Submitted By: Dennis Galway  
Email: dgalwayds1@verizon.net  

Project Title: NJ Strategic Planning Workshop  
Grant Amount Awarded: $750  
Number of individuals participating: 7  
Estimated number of work-hours: 117  
Co-Sponsors: ATFS

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
Specific major activities included:
Reviewed the pre-meeting dashboard findings to (1) bring people who were not on that call up to speed, (2) make any needed adjustments, and (3) get on the same page about the current situation before moving forward to the desired situation.
Held an extensive Q&A with the ATFS representative to clarify any on-going or new issues or concerns.
Reviewed individual vision letters (from the pre-meeting assignment) and incorporated additional ideas from those in attendance.
Identified themes and patterns, which helped identify key focus areas for the strategic plan.
Prioritized focus areas so that plans could be targeted on the key areas that the committee wished to improve; this included a discussion about the committee’s current capacity and what criteria would be used in prioritizing the focus areas.
Developed action plans for each focus area, including concrete action steps, owners, contributors, and timelines.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
Two new members received background information on what to expect in running the program in the future. Also learned what their responsibilities will be within the committee to make the state program successful.
Entire committee was reminded how important it is to share workload and not let a few members do most of the work.
Awareness has been brought back to forefront of thought regarding what is needed to have a good functional committee and run a successful program. Time will tell if this awareness will translate to change for the better or continue to be "same old".
"required" is misspelled below.
Outcomes for this type workshop - grant report are not necessarily ready or apparent or reportable right away or even in the 3 months since the workshop. The report of outcomes asked for is generic and not specific although I have tried to make it specific to our workshop. The outcomes will be more apparent after a year has gone by and all activities and reports have been completed and then we can see if and how things have changed for the better or worse.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
Committee needs to be equality minded in the responsibility of running the program
Chair has to delegate responsibility based on strengths of committee members
Timely communication among committee members, tree farm members, sponsors, ATFS, and traditional partners is key
The committee is not keen on the additional and detailed reporting required by ATFS but with newly energized committee members aware of problems that need to be fixed and more equal distribution of workloads hopefully it will not be too much of a chore!

What are the next steps for this project?
Finish any required reports for the strategic planning and 2015-2020 standards and guidelines but the deadlines.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $874
Total Match: $1755
Additional Budget Explanations:
Mileage reimbursement = $315 (583.4 total miles - not counting one member who lives in MD and drove 240 miles one way home on second day) - and one member works for State not reimbursed - no gas costs reimbursed to any member or made part of this reports
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
The NCTFP conducted a Tree Farmer fundraising campaign with goals of increasing the number of individuals who donate to the program and having 25% of the program's budget come from individuals. These are the steps we took in this effort:
1. Held 3 Tree Farmer focus group meetings across the state to build relationships with Tree Farmers, learn what their needs and interests are, and get their input on whether fundraising or dues are better for supporting the state program. These events were moderately well attended but confirmed the Board of Directors' intention to fundraise instead of charge dues.
2. Updated our promotional materials and establish giving levels. This was done successfully.
3. Identified volunteers to call on prospective donors. This was somewhat successful, but it would have been nice to have more volunteers.
4. Developed a list of prospective donors for personal visits. This was somewhat successful, but we would like to have had more names on the list.
5. Direct mail to all Tree Farmers not visited. This was somewhat successful in that it made Tree Farmers aware of the opportunity to give, but there was low participation. Personal visits were more successful than direct mail campaign in getting large gifts. But many individuals who were visited did not give because they do not see a value for themselves. They asked the question "What's in it for me?"
There was confusion about the difference between the national program and the state program and which organization they should support.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
233% increase in number of individual donors (but still very few donors)
43.4% increase in individual giving
3 donors increased their pledges
66.6% of 2015 donors were individuals
25% of 2015 donations were from individuals
22% of budget provided by individual donations (Goal is 25%)
Largest gifts were memorials, stock and proceeds from timber sale
Largest gifts were from inner circle or personal visits
The 2015 Tree Farmer campaign essentially broke even, which our fundraising consultant tells us is good for a first year. Tree Farmers provided 22% of the year's budget, just shy of our 25% goal.
What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

Only a small percentage of Tree Farmers gave
Most were new donors
Fundraiser broke even in 2015
22% of budget was from Tree Farmers & individuals
Personal visits were most productive
Questions these results raise:
What can we do to make people feel more connected?
They won't give if you don't ask
Planted seed for future donations
Companies will give again because Tree Farmers gave
Recruit more volunteers who can identify more prospective donors

What are the next steps for this project?
annual outreach to Tree Farmers for support of the program
ongoing outreach to corporations
continue building relationships with Tree Farmers and corporations
continue improving value of programs and services offered to enhance perception of value

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $23223
Total Match: $13223
Additional Budget Explanations:
See budget details in attached document.
(Note from Page 1 of this report: estimated volunteer hours do not include hours of consultant or NCTFP staff.)
State: Ohio
Submitted By: Joe Puperi
Email: joe.puperi@dnr.state.oh.us

Project Title: Strategic Plan
Grant Amount Awarded: $1000
Number of individuals participating: 8
Estimated number of work-hours: 132
Co-Sponsors: Ohio Tree Farm Committee is co-sponsored by the Ohio Forestry Association and the Ohio Division of Forestry.

**Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.**
We successfully met with ATFS consultant David Halley who helped us think through and prioritize the functions of the Committee for the next 3-5 years. That Strategic Plan was then brought to the Committee-as-a-whole who adopted the Plan. Cannot think of anything that was not successful.

**Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.**
Strategic Plan was developed.

**What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?**
We learned how to work together and assign tasks.
The position of "nominating chair" was eliminated and rolled into Vice Chair (Chair Elect) duties.
The focus given by the planning process will help accomplish specific tasks rather than have vague ideas of things that would be nice to get done.

**What are the next steps for this project?**
Follow-through! We need to continue to focus on prioritizing the items in the Plan. To that end, we have rearranged our meeting agenda format so (almost) everything we discuss falls into one of the identified priority areas.

**Project Budget**
Total Expenditures: $897
Total Match: $5202
Additional Budget Explanations:
State: Oregon
Submitted By: Joe Holmberg
Email: praediolum@gmail.com

Project Title: Oregon Forestry Tax Symposium
Grant Amount Awarded: $1500
Number of individuals participating: 3
Estimated number of work-hours: 80
Co-Sponsors: Oregon State University, Oregon Forest Resources Institute

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
A Forestry Tax Symposium was held January 26, 2015 at Oregon State University. Topics addressed included: Income Taxes; Estate, Succession and Business Planning; Property Taxes; Deferrals & Harvest Taxes; Conservation Easements; Tax treatment of outside funding ie cost share, grants; and Forms of Business for family forestlands. The Aldo Leopold Institute designed a facilitated World Cafe listening session near the end of the symposium to evaluate what participants learned, what questions still remained and what steps they might take as a result of knowledge gained. The Institute also conducted a mail survey in May 2015 to measure actions taken. Funds were awarded to assist the Aldo Leopold Institute with post symposium evaluation mailing.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
About 40% of Symposium attendees responded to either the email or regular mail (sent to those not responding to email or to those not providing an email contact). This is a very good response rate. The Aldo Leopold Institute prepared a summary of their findings which is being sent separately.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
Educators, Extension Foresters convene symposia, conferences and other forestry related educational sessions. Many, if not most, of these events are promoted and supported by the Oregon Tree Farm System. All of us are curious whether the information transmitted is placed into actual practice and whether there are any long-term results. The Aldo Leopold Institutes survey findings provide a foundation for all of the principals to include in planning and conducting future forestry educational events.

What are the next steps for this project?
Alert educators to the summary and recommendations of the report.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $2060
Total Match: $8000
Additional Budget Explanations:
State: Oregon
Submitted By: Joe Holmberg
Email: praediolum@gmail.com

Project Title: ATFS Inspector Training
Grant Amount Awarded: $2650
Number of individuals participating: 4
Estimated number of work-hours: 160
Co-Sponsors: Oregon State University Forestry and Natural Resources Extension

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
AFF issued revisions to its Standards and all current Oregon Tree Farm Inspectors were required to be re-trained to the revised Standards. It had been 2 years since any Inspector training had been conducted in Oregon and current and prospective Inspectors needed training to the 2015-2020 Standards

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
A total of 83 Inspectors are currently qualified to complete Tree Farm Inspections in Oregon. Of these, 19 completed their training on-line and 57 were trained at 8 locations around the State. An additional 7 Inspectors were trained in other States and declared their availability to inspect Oregon Tree Farms. The locations and numbers trained in face-to face sessions are:
- Aurora 14
- La Grande 6
- Roseburg 4
- Tillamook 4
- Tangent 13
- Central Point 5
- Sisters 6
- Myrtle Point 4

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
The size of the State necessitates considerable travel by facilitators to encourage existing and potential Inspectors to attend the training. It is essential to use a variety of methods to alert existing and potential Inspectors to the training opportunity.

What are the next steps for this project?
Additional annual Inspector training will be conducted where demand exists.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $2681
Total Match: $16000
Additional Budget Explanations:
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
A Strategic Plan was created for the state committee of Pennsylvania covering a three year period running from October 2015 thru September 2018. The group successfully worked together to focus on three main areas; creating sub-committees for Inspections, Communication and Capacity Building.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
The state committee needed a "direction" and without a strategic plan in place it would be rudderless moving forward. This plan, and the sub-committees formed, includes new individuals that are taking on leadership responsibilities within their assigned committees. The state's "Mission Statement" was redefined and goals were put in place for each committee. It is much too early to determine what goals were met and if any were not met.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
The one major improvement over the Strategic Plan we put in place a few years ago is focusing only on 3 core areas this time, whereas the last Strategic Plan included 17, which was unrealistic and unattainable.

What are the next steps for this project?
Follow-up, follow-up and continual follow-up. The committee must work with the drafted plan, as it is a moving, viable operational guide. It is important that the committee stays focused within each of the 3 sub-committees to make certain the state continues to strive and meet each goal that was set.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $5887
Total Match: $4887
Additional Budget Explanations:
The total amount actually spent was $1,887, $1,000 of which was off-set by the grant. The remaining amount was calculated for volunteer time of 204 hours for the 17 attendees, not counting any of their travel time.
State: Rhode Island
Submitted By: Marc Tremblay
Email: mstremb@cox.net

Project Title: RI Woodlands Conference
Grant Amount Awarded: $2500
Number of individuals participating: 12
Estimated number of work-hours: 120
Co-Sponsors: RIFCO, RI Woodland Partnership (includes RI SAF, RC& D council, NoRI Conservation District)

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
We had a successful event on May 9, 2015 with 35 people plus speakers and volunteers attending the conference.
What was not very productive was the follow-up contact process, where we called, e-mailed, and mailed information to attendees that were not Tree Farmers, inviting them to other partner events and asking directly if we could interest them in the Tree Farm program. Although a few may have attended other partner events and/or the TF tour in the fall, this effort did not lead to any new management plans or other TF interest that we are aware of.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
100% of non-TF attendees have increased awareness of the Tree Farm program and Tree Farm events that have been or will be held through the next year by way of follow-up contacts and by receiving the RIFCO newsletter that includes a TF page over the next year.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
Consensus from partners is to work on having a similar event every 2 or 3 years;
Mailing postcards prior to the event had limited response and registration success, although the mailing likely increased awareness of partner organizations

What are the next steps for this project?
We will continue to mail RIFCO newsletters with TF page to participants for another couple of issues to see if any follow-up responses occur.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $1772
Total Match: $2500
Additional Budget Explanations:
Funds remaining are mostly due to no one asking for travel reimbursements. We would like to utilize this amount to reimburse Committee members for legislative Fly-in and NLC attendance.
State: South Carolina
Submitted By: Guy Sabin
Email: gsabin@scforestry.org

Project Title: SC 2015 Inspector Workshops
Grant Amount Awarded: $2500
Number of individuals participating: 4
Estimated number of work-hours: 140
Co-Sponsors: SC Tree Farm Committee
KapStone Charleston Kraft

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
- Notified inspectors of their status and need for training to meet the 2015-2020 Tree Farm Standard.
- Promoted online refresher training for those eligible.
- Held 5 Inspector Training workshops at locations across the state.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
- 5 Inspector Training workshops were held in Columbia, Clemson, Florence, and Summerville, SC.
- 116 people completed the classroom trainings.
- Since the March 2015 inactivation of all inspectors, the SC inspector corps has been rebuilt to 172 active

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee’s projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
- SC has normally offered 1-2 classroom trainings per year, and successfully met increased need for training in 2015 with support from this grant.
- Plan for as much advance notice as possible for advertising workshops.
- Many inspectors had expiration

What are the next steps for this project?
- SCTF will continue to offer Inspector training as needed.
- Additional effort will be made to further engage inspectors. Part of these efforts will be through coordinator contacts with landowners needing updated management plans and inspections to determine whether the landowner already has a forester or needs additional assistance.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $5614
Total Match: $3114
Additional Budget Explanations:
State: South Carolina
Submitted By: Guy Sabin
Email: gsabin@scforestry.org

Project Title: SC Database Improvement Project
Grant Amount Awarded: $7000
Number of individuals participating: 2
Estimated number of work-hours: 360
Co-Sponsors: SC Forestry Association

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
The combination of transitioning from recognition to certification and implementing a dues-paying membership system has created database challenges in SC. This project addressed these issues by:
- Revising and updating membership status and categories and tracking.
- Implemented a better system for invoicing and receiving payments.
- Shifted updated Tree Farm information into ATFS database to minimize duplicate fields and make ATFS and state data more consistent to assist cross-referencing.
- Reviewed data and identified Tree Farms for decertification.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
- Full review of state database, with >95% accuracy of contact information for members. State program members can be readily matched with ATFS records even if names and status are different.
- State database is fully implemented for invoicing and receiving.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
- Biggest challenge was the mix of recognition and certification members in the ATFS database with no optional fields other than Notes. Suggestions for database improvements have been provided to ATFS.
- SC membership project grew faster than data handling capacity, leading to inconsistent and incomplete data. It is important to establish database fields and formats early.
- A separate bookkeeping system is necessary and should be made as consistent with Tree Farmer data as possible.
- Ongoing data correction in the ATFS database is needed to correct legacy formatting and reduce duplicate entries.

What are the next steps for this project?
- Continue updating the ATFS database, especially for older Tree Farms.
- Transfer more Pioneer and Prospect members from state to ATFS database.
- Continue with efforts to contact members that are currently certified but need an updated management plan

**Project Budget**
Total Expenditures: $14040
Total Match: $7040
Additional Budget Explanations:
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.

The South Dakota data base system was found to be very out dated and the national data base was more complete, which was the opposite of what we anticipated. We dumped the state data base and worked from the national data base system. We contracted the use of a part time secretary to contact tree farmers and obtain information with very poor results. Tree farmers were reluctant to give out contact information because of distrust and lack of tree farm knowledge. The use of the inspector pool was necessary as these individuals were the ones that the tree farmers trusted. The results were much better and other issues could be discussed with the tree farmers.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.

After the data base clean up was complete in November of 2015, a mailing was conducted to 105 tree farmer members. Only 2 were returned due to one death and another due to the address used was a summer only address. When telephone numbers and email addresses were obtained these were assumed to be as accurate as the mailings.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee’s projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

The national data base was very accurate and up to date, and suitable for our needs
Discontinue stand alone state data base system
The inspectors have the trust of the tree farm community and must remain the main contact point even for simple contact information and updates
updating contact information was insufficient, most often acreage, ownership, and title holdings required updating which could not be handled by a secretary and required a known inspector.

What are the next steps for this project?
Inspectors must remain the contact point with tree farmers
Mandatory inspections of all tree farmers must be completed every 5 year period
The balance of the grant 963 will be used to follow up with one on one contacts, and group meetings to obtain feedback on improving services to tree farm members
**Project Budget**

Total Expenditures: $1137

Total Match: $5301

Additional Budget Explanations:

During 2015 we spent 5301 to consulting foresters plus and unrecorded amount of hours by volunteer inspectors to contact landowners and usually conducting an inspection, and minor plan updates, in addition to updating items needed for the data base
State: Texas  
Submitted By: Susan Stutts  
Email: sstutts@texasforestry.org  

Project Title: Database Cleanup  
Grant Amount Awarded: $10000  
Number of individuals participating: 11  
Estimated number of work-hours: 309  
Co-Sponsors: Texas Forestry Association, Texas A&M Forest Service, Consulting Foresters

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
Three mailouts to Tree Farmers (1st request, 2nd request, 3rd was to send addendums to all not decertified (2000). A lot of addresses were updated. Approximately 400 were decertified. We felt the project was successful, but there is still work to be done. We probably kept more certified than we should have. Also, this is an ongoing project, but we feel we got a good start.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
1st request for updates to Tree Farmers - 2390 were mailed. 2nd request for non-responsive Tree Farmers - 1307. Attached is a report of 8/24/15, and a final report of 1/19/16, which has the numbers for the entire project. We hoped more would response, but we feel good about those who did. Note: We broke up the database in two categories: last inspected 2009 and earlier, and last inspected 2010 and greater. There were many documents used in this project, and some of which are included in the attachment. Note: Forms returned OR inspector/forester directive was 75%. Explanation: We sent the non responsive list to the area chairs and they and their inspectors verbally or by email directed us to keep many of those who did not return forms.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
We learned that this a major project and requires much more time and people. It will be an ongoing process as it is the first section of our strategic plan.

What are the next steps for this project?
Review the last inspected 2009 and earlier and determine if more should be decertified or placed in Pioneer category.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $10205  
Total Match: $5710  
Additional Budget Explanations:
State: Texas
Submitted By: Susan Stutts
Email: sstutts@texasforestry.org

Project Title: Inspector Training
Grant Amount Awarded: $2900
Number of individuals participating: 2
Estimated number of work-hours: 40
Co-Sponsors: Texas Forestry Association
Society of American Foresters
ATFS - Mike Burns, Nephtali Chavez
Texas A&M Forest Service (volunteer)

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
Conducted three live inspector training workshops in accordance with the new 2015 Standard. All were successful, specifically though, the multi-state training held in conjunction with an SAF conference worked well, it was early in the year (January), and attended by inspectors in several states.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
We feel this was a success in that it gave several opportunities for foresters to attend one of the trainings. A total of 64 were trained.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
This was standard training for inspectors. There was a lot of Q&A and input from the attendees. We will continue training each year.

What are the next steps for this project?
Schedule a 2016 training date.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $3137
Total Match: $1904
Additional Budget Explanations:
The grant proposal called for four workshops, however, there was not enough funding and therefore three were conducted.
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
Activities completed for this project included the following:
1. Communicate with tree farmers about the pending data verification and the SVSC - we used our newsletter, direct mail letters and postcards, and email to alert tree farmers about pending calls. SVSC, standards changes, inspection requirements, etc.
2. Develop the phone protocol - the committee spend more than six months working on the script for questions, explanations, and data verification. We developed, tested, revised, retested several times to get it right. The data sheets proved to be very problematic. Each iteration of the data sheets revealed additional problems extracting data from the ATFS database in the format needed.
3. Solicit interns and volunteers - when the protocol was ready for prime time, we had missed the second semester interns and were not able to find summer interns. In the fall, we had one intern from UVM who was willing to help us but her availability was limited. The committee and paid administrative staff ultimately made most of the calls.
4. Make phone calls - once we were finally ready with the protocol and data mining, our phone calls began in earnest in the fall. An initial round of about 90 calls targeted the tree farmers who had fallen through the cracks on inspections (last inspections more than 10 years ago). These calls proved to be very problematic as many had bad or missing phone numbers, missing forester information, bad addresses, etc. For many this took, much sleuthing with online searching or county forester inquiries. Once contacted, this group also took considerable time on the phone as these tree farmers were often elderly, out of touch with the property, unaware that they were in the program, or had no tree farm forester. The committee also had to decide how much effort was enough. After how many messages do you decide to decertify a property? This decision was ultimately made on a case by case basis but generally, four phone calls was the limit. After completing this group of calls, we moved on to the next group of tree farmers who had been inspected within the last ten years but prior to the introduction of the 2010 standard. Our last group of tree farmers are those with inspection dates of 2010 or later.
5. After much discussion among tree farm committee members and a select group of tree farmers, the committee made a unanimous decision to continue with certification. This decision was not reached lightly but all members felt very strongly that giving up certification was not an option. We fully understood that there could be tree farmers who did not agree with this decision but believed that credibility of the program was tied to certification and that we would prefer to have a smaller contingent of engaged tree farmers instead of a larger contingent of unengaged. This decision was communicated to tree farmer via mail and also in phone calls.
6. Update the ATFS database - as data sheets were updated, this information was entered online. However, there are numerous problems with the way data is stored and retrieved and the type of data that is available in each report. Database issues have contributed countless hours to this effort, which is still a work in progress. There is much information we solicited (such as forester,
date of management plan, payments made) that cannot reside in the atfs database for lack of fields. This requires us to maintain a second database with additional information that must be keyed in separately.

In addition to data input, there are numerous data output problems that set our project back by months. For example, downloaded data does not give second owner name in a way that's usable for mail merge, nor can you easily tie multiple tree farms to a single owner. The data sheets that we used were merged multiple times to try to get the correct information in them. Ultimately, we had to cross reference every data sheet with the atfs record and manually input missing information. The hours turned to days, weeks, and months before calls could even begin.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.

Our goal was to contact 90% of the certified tree farmers with a 10% loss rate for those we were unable to contact. This loss would have been approximately 50 of our 548 existing tree farms in January 2015.

Our loss rate proved a little higher based on both inaccurate contact information, disinterest, land no longer owned, etc. As a result of calls made or attempted (approximately 340), we decertified 62 properties. Of the decertified properties, 18 were no longer interested, 26 were missing owners, 11 properties were sold, and 7 tree farmers were deceased.

Additionally, another 69 have been placed in Pioneer status awaiting plan updates or inspections. We fully anticipate that another 30 or more tree farms could be decertified or placed in Pioneer status in the remaining ~140 calls that are currently underway.

Of the 18 who opted out of the program, disinterest was general in nature. Some joined in the "good old days" and wanted to see no changes. Others were elderly and could no longer manage their property to the tree farm standard or could not afford to have a plan update. All the properties placed in Pioneer will eagerly return when all paperwork is in order. The total program loss is about 11% so far and this confirms for the committee that our SVSC decision was correct.

Neither certification nor increased cost has scared away a solid core of tree farmers. We currently have 442 tree farmers certified in our Vermont program, including new tree farmers who have come in since we made our certification decision.

The protocol that we used also netted a great deal of additional information about programs, participation, volunteer interest, etc. These data are not yet compiled but will guide the committee in planning programs, soliciting committee members, awarding exemplary stewardship, etc.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

There were many surprises along the way and neither committee members nor administrator were prepared for the difficulties we encountered in manipulating data, updating data, reaching landowners, gathering information. It's very clear that at least 50% of what is delivered by mail or email goes unread. This has led us to conclude that we need to call tree farmers every five years when they are due for a regular reinspection. We cannot count on people actually reading or remembering what they read.

There are also many updates to the atfs database that would make this job much easier. We have shared these problems with AFF staff and offered to be part of a database review team. Unless the national database can be configured for new fields of entry, we will be forced to maintain multiple records. This is certainly not the best outcome for program administrator and staff who
are already overburdened with obligations of data validity, required inspections, assessments, optional inspections, tours, awards, etc.

*What are the next steps for this project?*

The committee will continue to reach out to tree farmers, ensuring that we contact or attempt to contact everyone and will update the national database as well as our own database.

**Project Budget**

Total Expenditures: $17873  
Total Match: $8247  
Additional Budget Explanations: 
Original budget included line items for activities that we did not complete as outlined in the report. The cost of the work completed was far greater than estimated due to the problems also outlined in the report.
TELEPHONE SURVEY – TREE FARM DATABASE UPDATE

General instructions:
- All text in lowercase letters should be read.
- All text in UPPERCASE bold letters should not be read out loud.
- All questions and answers should be read as they are worded.
- Text that is underlined should be emphasized.
- Characters in [ ] serve as directions and should not be read.
- Please read through the protocol before you begin your calls.

MAKE PHONE CALL
[Use data verification table for name and phone number.]
If bad phone number, try to find new number via google, UVA, Grant list, etc. If no new number is found, make note for administrator to send letter by first class mail, certified, return receipt requested. If mail returned for bad address, remove from system and indicate reason as “cannot contact landowner.”

| 1. INTRODUCTION | a. IF NO ANSWER, LEAVE MESSAGE:  
Hello, my name is ……… I’m calling on behalf of the VT State Tree Farm Program. We are updating the Tree Farm database and would like to verify your information. I’ll try to call you back at another time or if you would prefer, you can call the administrative office at 802-747-7900 and speak with Kathleen.  

b. IF ANSWER:  
Hello, My name is ……………….. I’m calling on behalf of the VT State Tree Farm Program. We are updating the Tree Farm database and would like to verify information about your Tree Farm.  
GO TO QUESTION 2 |

| 2. Are you aware that your property is enrolled in the Vermont Tree Farm program? | a. IF NO:  
Is someone available who might know about the Tree Farm?  
i. IF NO: When should I call back to speak with someone who knows about the Tree Farm property? [Record date/time below.]  

Call back date/time: _____________________________  

b. IF YES:  
Great, do you have about 15 minutes to answer some questions about your Tree Farm?  
a. IF YES:  
Thank you. Let’s get started with the questions. GO TO QUESTION 3  

b. IF NO:  
That’s okay. What would be a good time for me to call back? [Record date/time below.]  

Date/Time: _____________________________  
Thank you for your time today and I look forward to speaking to you on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. Do you still own your Tree Farm property?                            | a. IF NO: Thank you for your time. We’ll remove your name and information from the Tree Farm database. If you ever have any questions, you may contact Kathleen at 802-747-7900. [Repeat name and number if necessary.] Good bye.  
  b. IF YES: We recently sent you a mailing explaining some important changes to Tree Farm and an update to the management standard. Did you read this?  
    a. IF YES: Do you have any questions? [Answer questions or take notes to pass along] **GO TO QUESTION 4**  
    b. IF NO: Would you like me to briefly explain the changes?  
      i. IF YES: [Explain the changes] **GO TO QUESTION 4**  
      ii. IF NO: OK. I can remove you from the Tree Farm System if you no longer wish to be part of the Tree Farm program. Is this your preference? Is there something you can tell us about your decision that will help us strengthen the program?  
      
| 4. Do you understand the program now costs $10 per year per tree farmer and that the cost will increase to no more than $30 per year per tree farmer by 2018 to cover the cost of certification? | a. IF NO: Based on this information, do you still wish to be part of the Tree Farm program?  
  IF NO: thank you. We’ll decertify your property and remove you from the Tree Farm database. Is there something you can tell us about your decision that will help us strengthen the program?  
  b. IF YES: Thank you. I’ll continue with data verification. **GO TO DATA TABLE** [Go to data table attached to confirm information. When verification is complete, follow instructions at end of data table.] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. Do you have a written forest management plan or Forest Stewardship Plan? | a. IF YES: GO TO QUESTION 6  
   a. IF NO:  
   A management plan is required to be a Certified Tree Farm and to remain part of the Tree Farm program. You will need to have a management plan by October 1 if you wish to remain in the program.  
   Would you like a phone call from someone on the Tree Farm committee to learn more about management plans or how to develop a management plan for your property?  
   a. IF YES:  
   i. When is a good time to reach you? [Record date/time] ______________________  
   AFTER RECORDING DATE/TIME, OFFER FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS:  
   ii. You can also consult with a Tree Farm forester listed on the Tree Farm website at www.vermonttreefarm.org  
   iii. You can access My Land Plan at the American Tree Farm System website to learn more about developing a management plan for your property [provide website: treefarmsystem.org] and then call the administrative office if you have additional questions.  
   IF THERE IS NO INTEREST IN DEVELOPING A MANAGEMENT PLAN, HEARING FROM A COMMITTEE MEMBER, CONSULTING THE WEBSITE, OR ACCESSING MY LAND PLAN  
   Thank you. We can remove you from the Tree Farm system database. We appreciate your time and if you should ever have any questions or wish to return to the Tree Farm program, you may contact Kathleen at 802-747-7900 [Repeat name and number if needed.] Good bye. |
| 6. Did you have a forester or other natural resource professional help you develop your management plan? | a. IF YES: GO TO QUESTION 7  
   b. IF NO: GO TO QUESTION 8 |
| 7. How often do you consult with your forester? | ___ annually  
   ___ every 5 years  
   ___ every 10 years  
   ___ greater than every ten years  
   ___ Other [Please record] |
<p>| 8. Your property was last | [Record the date] ______________________________ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **inspected on (check the data table for last inspection date). When was your management plan developed or last updated?** | [If needed, prompt]  
[ ] Less than 5 years ago  
[ ] 5-10 years ago  
[If it was 5-10 years (2010 or earlier)]  
Since the standards were updated in 2015, please ask your forester to review your plan for compliance to the new standard before the end of 2015.  
**GO TO QUESTION 9** |
| **9. Vermont Woodlands Association sponsors the Tree Farm program and we’d like to ask you a few questions about our services for Tree Farm.** | From time to time, VWA offers Vermont Tree Farm program workshops and other educational events. In the last 2 years, have you taken advantage of any of these opportunities?  
**a. IF YES,**  
Thank you. **GO TO QUESTION 10**  
**b. IF NO:**  
Can you tell us why? [Record answers here]  
_________________________________________________________  
What would you like us to offer? [Use Question 10 to prompt. Record answers here.]  
_________________________________________________________  
**GO TO QUESTION 11** |
| **10. What topics are of most interest to you?** | [ ] timber management  
[ ] wildlife management  
[ ] recreation  
[ ] tax and finance issues  
[ ] secession planning, legacy planning, etc.  
[ ] other (Specify) _________________________________________  
**GO TO QUESTION 11** |
| **11. In what ways do you prefer to receive information? (check all that apply)** | [ ] direct mail  
[ ] e-mail  
[ ] webinar or conference call  
[ ] website  
[ ] Facebook  
[ ] text alert  
**GO TO QUESTION 12** |
| **12. Vermont Tree Farm is led by the state Tree Farm committee. This is a volunteer group of Tree Farmers like yourself and other forestry** | **a. IF NO:**  
Thank you for your time today. If you have any questions you may contact Kathleen, program administrator at 802-747-7900 or email info@vermontwoodlands.org  
**b. IF YES:** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>professionals. Would you be interested in getting involved with the state Tree Farm committee?</th>
<th>What would you like to do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ host field day or other tree farm event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ attend a tree farm event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ serve on the committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ promote the program with friends and neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ other [Specify] _________________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GO TO CLOSING**

**13. IN CLOSING SAY:**

Every Tree Farm will need to meet the new 2015 Standards of Certification. If your plan met the 2010 standards, then you should meet 2015. If you have not reviewed your management plan or spoken to your forester in the last five years, it would be a good time to do that as Tree Farms that do not meet the new standard will be placed in Pioneer status or decertified until plans are updated.

Thank you for helping with our database update. Is there something that you’d like to tell us about your experience as a Tree Farmer?

[Record here]: ___________________________________________________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREE FARMER</th>
<th>DB information</th>
<th>Check if correct or update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary contact:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate contact:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate phone number:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing address:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate email address:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TREE FARM PROPERTY                              |                |                            |
| Tree Farm #                                     |                |                            |
| Tree Farm acres                                 |                |                            |
| Forester                                        |                |                            |
| Absentee owner                                  |                |                            |
| Tree Farm address (if different from above):    |                |                            |
| Street                                          |                |                            |
| City/Town (IMPORTANT TO GET THIS INFORMATION)   |                |                            |
| County                                          |                |                            |
| Directions to Tree Farm (if in the record):     |                |                            |
| Multiple tree farms: (If yes, continue to verification for next tree farm) | | |
| Magazine subscriber: will need to ask           |                |                            |

Thank you for this information. There are just a few more questions. Return to question 6.
State: Vermont
Submitted By: Kathleen Wanner
Email: kmwanner@comcast.net

Project Title: ATFS Inspector Training
Grant Amount Awarded: $2900
Number of individuals participating: 6
Estimated number of work-hours: 72
Co-Sponsors: Vermont Woodlands Association
Marsh Billings Rockefeller National Historical Park
Shelburne Farms
Northwoods Stewardship Center
VT Dept. of Forests, Parks & Recreation

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
Vermont's tree farm committee planned and hosted six inspector training sessions throughout the state. Spring dates were scheduled and all foresters were notified well in advance to facilitate their attendance. We used our existing tree farm inspector lists as well as forester lists maintained by the VT Dept. of Forests, Parks & Recreation.

Sessions were held on:
March 27, 2015 in partnership with NE SAF meeting, Fairlee
April 7, 2015 at Marsh Billings Rockefeller National Park, Woodstock
April 28, 2015 at Shelburne Farms, Shelburne
May 5, 2015 at Northwoods Stewardship Center, E. Charleston

Additional sessions were scheduled for the fall to catch those foresters unable to attend earlier sessions:
November 13, 2015 at State Forestry Office, Rutland
December 1, 2015 at Facilitator's home, Clarendon

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
A total of 67 foresters were trained in the six classroom sessions held during 2015. Of this group, it appears that 15 are new inspectors to our VT list. An additional 9 inspectors took the online training to update their status to active. While these numbers are a bit short of our goal to retrain 70 and bring in 25 new, we seem to have a good inspector corps.
Activity in the ATFS database shows that 28 inspectors have completed a total of 56 actions. Of these, 16 have already completed the required 2 actions and a total of 21 new tree farms have been enrolled in the program. This activity covers a period of approximately 10 months.
Fluency with the 004 is still a work in progress. Although a substantial portion of the training focuses on completing the 004 correctly (mock 004s are completed and the message is driven home that every question must be answered unless otherwise stated), we still see many missing answers on the 004. This problem would be resolved easily if inspectors would use the mobile app or online database entry. Most still prefer to complete by hand or use the writable pdf. In conversation with other state administrators, this seems to be a recurring problem. Those inspectors who use the mobile app cannot submit incomplete 004s and thus they do a thorough job. Unfortunately, the mobile app and online submission was not fully up to speed when training
began. We had several inspectors who were having difficulties that we could not resolve. I believe that these problems have since been resolved through contact with the national office.

**What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?**

While administrators saw the mobile app and online database access as good tools for inspectors, and tools that would reduce administrative time, it's surprising how many inspectors cling to old habits. Although everyone has access to the database with a username and password, very few take advantage. Most don't even remember that they have this access and prefer to call the administrative office. Even fewer use the mobile app. We anticipated that at least our younger foresters would prefer this but it does not seem to be the case.

**What are the next steps for this project?**
We will continue to train inspectors during 2016 to re-engage those who have not trained to the new standard.
We will continue to promote the online database and mobile app with foresters until they get comfortable with new procedures.

**Project Budget**
Total Expenditures: $20037
Total Match: $17137
Additional Budget Explanations:
State: Virginia  
Submitted By: Shannon McCabe  
Email: vatreefarm@vaforestry.org

Project Title: ATFS Inspector Training to the New Standards of Sustainability for Virginia Inspectors
Grant Amount Awarded: $2900
Number of individuals participating: 7
Estimated number of work-hours: 400
Co-Sponsors: Virginia Department of Forestry, Virginia Forestry Association, Virginia Cooperative Extension

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
In February, the Committee evaluated the need and resources available for hosting classroom inspector training sessions and decided to schedule one in the central part of the state (Charlottesville) in conjunction with the 2015 Virginia Forestry Summit in April, one in the eastern part of the state (Newport News) in October, and one in the western part of the state (Christiansburg) also in October. A hybrid classroom/online training was also added in Appomattox in August. Locations were selected based on cost-effectiveness of location and availability of facilitators. All previous and prospective Virginia Tree Farm inspectors were contacted with information about upcoming training sessions multiple times and provided with links to online registration forms. Those eligible for updating credentials via the online refresher were provided with information on doing so and reminded several times throughout the year. Prior to each classroom training, facilitators met via conference call and exchanged e-mails to determine who would be responsible for which parts of the inspector training presentation. The Program Administrator updated relevant inspector training slides to contain Virginia specific information. The Program Administrator coordinated and confirmed meeting space and A/V required for each session, printed copies of all materials, purchased beverages/snacks and pre-ordered lunches with the assistance of local facilitators when relevant. Three to four trained facilitators led each session which consisted of classroom and field tour portions. After each session, Program Administrator input inspector data into the ATFS database and send inspectors information and next steps.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
Three traditional classroom inspector training sessions and one hybrid classroom/online session were held in 2015. Each traditional training contained a field tour component which feedback from participants showed was valuable to include. Prior to the Standards revision, there were 208 active Virginia Tree Farm inspectors. 108 of these inspectors were retrained to the 2015-2020 Standards of Sustainability (45 in classroom training sessions, 55 online, 8 in hybrid classroom/online session). In addition, 31 new inspectors were trained for a total of 139 currently active Virginia Tree Farm inspectors. Unfortunately, we did not meet our goal of retraining 75% of previously active inspectors though due to budget and time restrictions we were only able to hold 3 traditional classroom training sessions rather than the session per region (six) we had hoped to provide. We did meet our goal of training at least 2 new inspectors.
What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

For the first time, the Virginia Tree Farm Committee included field tours with each classroom training session offered. We received positive feedback from attendees who indicated they appreciated the opportunity to get out in the field and see firsthand an example of completing a field inspection. Also for the first time we offered a hybrid classroom/online training session for inspectors eligible to complete the online refresher who did not wish to complete the refresher on their own. This session also received positive feedback from attendees.

What are the next steps for this project?
The Virginia Tree Farm Committee will host at least one classroom inspector training in 2016. We will continue to reach out to all trained inspectors with requests to complete inspections and provide relevant program updates.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $4452
Total Match: $1550
Additional Budget Explanations:
Total Expenditures above is total cost of project. ATFS grant supported expenses total $2900.
State: Virginia
Submitted By: Shannon McCabe
Email: vatreefarm@vaforestry.org

Project Title: Virginia Tree Farm Committee Strategic Planning Process
Grant Amount Awarded: $1000
Number of individuals participating: 11
Estimated number of work-hours: 300
Co-Sponsors: Virginia Tree Farm Committee, Virginia Forestry Association, Virginia Department of Forestry

Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
As a pre-requisite for choosing the Certified Pathway in the State Voice State Choice Process, the Virginia Tree Farm Committee was required to undergo a strategic planning process to develop a 3-5 year strategic plan. The following outlines the specific steps we took to complete this project:
1. Virginia Tree Farm Committee Program Administrator contacted the ATFS office for information and guidance related to the process in December 2015.
2. During a regular meeting of the Committee in December 2015, the Committee completed a Background Questionnaire provided by ATFS and submitted it to ATFS following the meeting.
3. Program Administrator worked with ATFS and Committee to determine availability and schedule the strategic planning retreat through e-mail coordination in January.
4. Program Administrator reserved a room at the Virginia Department of Forestry office in Charlottesville in February.
5. Program Administrator worked with strategic planning facilitator in January to set-up a "dashboard" call with the Committee prior to the strategic planning retreat.
6. "Dashboard" was held during a regular meeting of the Virginia Tree Farm Committee in February.
7. Program Administrator continued conversation with strategic planning facilitator regarding specific details of the retreat throughout March and April.
8. Program Administrator worked with Committee to determine attendees and requirements for lodging in April.
9. In April, Program Administrator reserved rooms at a nearby hotel for attendees requiring lodging.
10. Program Administrator distributed details and homework assignment provided by strategic planning facilitator to attendees in April.
11. Attendees completed homework assignment and submitted it to strategic planning facilitator in late April.
12. The week of the strategic planning retreat, Program Administrator bought snacks and ordered meals to be delivered for attendees.
13. Eleven committee members attended the strategic planning retreat held May 6-7.
14. Strategic planning retreat attendees worked to complete the strategic plan document following the retreat.
15. Virginia Tree Farm Committee developed "teams" to address specific focus areas and continued to work toward implementing the strategic plan.
Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.

The most notable evidence of success for this project is our strategic plan document that will help to guide decisions and activities of the Virginia Tree Farm Committee moving forward. This document contains our list of most important focus areas and related action items that we will work to complete over the next several years. Our progress as well as the document itself will be evaluated as we work to implement the strategic plan by review at Committee meetings and comparison of projected vs actual actions taken. As a result of development of this plan, the Virginia Tree Farm Committee developed three "teams" to address specific focus areas. The financial strategy team has been most active most recently as the Committee works to determine a fundraising and financial solvency strategy for the future. The eleven Committee members who attended the strategic planning retreat indicated through a feedback form that they believed it to be a positive experience.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

The Committee enjoyed this opportunity to discuss "big picture" activities and plans for the future of the Virginia Tree Farm Program which had proven difficult to accomplish at regular Committee meetings which focus on tasks immediately at hand. We learned that it is important to ensure this type of communication continues as we move forward.

What are the next steps for this project?

The Committee will continue to implement its strategic plan and track completion of established action items. We expect that some anticipated focus areas and related action items may need to be adjusted as we work to become an independent non-profit entity with a new governing body and plan to adjust and evaluate accordingly. The need for further strategic planning will be evaluated upon completion of this plan's implementation.

Project Budget

Total Expenditures: $1689
Total Match: $689

Additional Budget Explanations:

Total indicated above is total project budget, $1000 is total amount of ATFS Grant Fund expenditures.
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.

* PERSONAL VISION LETTERS: What ideal future do we want to create?
* DEVELOP FOCUS AREAS: What do our letters tell us we might focus on?
* NARROWING OUR FOCUS TO BE SUCCESSFUL: We can't do it all, so what should be the strategic priorities for us to focus on?
* GOALS: What are the defined goals of our focus areas?
* REVIEW/PREVIEW PROCESS
* REACH CONSENSUS ON GOAL STATEMENTS
* DEVELOP STRATEGIES: How are we going to do it? LUNCH
* ORGANIZED THE WORK: How do we organize ourselves to get the work done?
* INITIAL STEPS: Putting a stake in the ground
* NEXT STEPS & EVALUATIONS

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.

THE OUTCOME OF THE PROJECT WAS A 35-PAGE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE WV TREE FARM PROGRAM; i.e., goals, timelines, deadlines & committee-member assignments.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

Organization, member assignments, areas that can be improved and areas in which we are doing a good job.

What are the next steps for this project?
Implementation of the strategic plan by meeting our deadlines in a timely way.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $1000
Total Match: $9634
Additional Budget Explanations:
In-kind includes mileage and work-hours.
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.

The Tree Farm Committee gathered for a day and a half retreat at the Spearfish Canyon Lodge to define what they envisioned the Wyoming Tree Farm program becoming, to create their next one to three years strategic plan for the group. The group hoped to gain a clearer understanding of what the focus of the committee was going to be and develop a list of suggested strategies. Each committee member plans to personally commit to becoming involved in a project that addresses one of the goals established at the retreat. The retreat was a success, but what is the challenge ahead is incorporating the objectives into the committees daily work project of the Stewardship program in a stand beside fashion.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.

One National Dashboard Summary for ATFS Tree Farm Committee and one strategic plan was created for the Wyoming Tree Farm Committee. Other successes were to get the five districts pulled together for a sustainable forestry discussion and get to know each other and a plan a stewardship/Tree Farm vision.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?

The committee would like to focus on the top four areas recognized to create a successful Tree Farm program area in Wyoming. The surprising result of the focus areas identified during the retreat discussion were marketing ATFS and the forest value through developing partnerships and certifying more tree farmers, all of which acquired two thirds of the votes for the priority focus areas from vision exercise for a successful Wyoming Tree Farm program. These goals are generally the components of the Stewardship/Tree Farm program as well by the past concepts, thus fitting to carry them on, since our goal was to stand beside the Wyoming Stewardship program.

What are the next steps for this project?
Market and sell the Stewardship/Tree Farm concept while improving the quality of the forest practices to show the primary value of the forest. Continue to grow Tree Farm certification across the state at a smart pace.

Project Budget
Total Expenditures: $1028
Total Match: $4769
Additional Budget Explanations:
Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.
Wyoming Tree Farm Committee supported the training to have the first Certified Tree Farm Inspection Trainer and then offered the new standards inspector training to all interested foresters or forestry technicians in two training sessions. The training sessions were meshed with the Tree Farm Retreat while we had the certified Tree Farm Inspectors most already present. This saved on funding for travel because the Stewardship program funding travel to the Tree Farm retreat. So the committee decided to fund an appreciation supper for Tree Farm Inspectors, Tree Farm Committee and invited Tree Farm landowners as well to join the celebration with their inspectors as well. This supper also served as an appreciation 25th celebration for our first Wyoming Certified Tree Farm Inspection Trainer with his Wyoming State Forestry job.

Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.
The state of Wyoming now has their first Certified Tree Farm Inspection Trainer who has successfully recertified eight-five percent of the State Inspectors to the new 2015-2020 standards by the end of 2015.

What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee’s projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?
The Committee learned to mesh their functions with other activities to save time, funding and to attract different interest to the Tree Farm messages. This is also a higher value in Wyoming because of time it takes to travel across our big state as well as the sparser population to support functions. Most people want to support the functions but have limited time and funding to do so, or if do have time and funding are the retired part of society that come to Wyoming for the space and slow life down, but in concept support the main purpose of Tree Farm/Stewardship to put sustainable forestry on the ground.

What are the next steps for this project?
Continue to periodically offer inspector certification training to keep our certified inspectors number up to a good level to keep Tree Farm exposed statewide. Also want to keep our inspectors supported with appreciation type activities like nice meals and incentive items like the jackets and gift cards we presented them. Also occasionally, send them to potential training they might not have opportunities to take otherwise.
**Project Budget**

Total Expenditures: $2607  
Total Match: $7553

Additional Budget Explanations:
The original estimated cost of the pens was less and the travel expense due to co sponsor supporting that cost because it was meshed with another function the co sponsor supported. Thus committee supported appreciation meals, jackets, gift cards and susta

State: Wyoming  
Submitted By: Lori Kempton  
Email: kempton@rtconnect.net

**Project Title:** 2015 ATFS Grant Funds - Field Day  
Grant Amount Awarded: $3000  
Number of individuals participating: 61  
Estimated number of work-hours: 399  
Co-Sponsors: Wyoming State Forestry Division

**Describe the specific activities completed for this project, highlight what was and what was not successful.**  
The committee held two Landowner Appreciation Day/Field Days events for outreach activities. One in the Black Hills and one in the Big Horns, the Wyoming State Forestry Division district that Tree Farm expanded to this last year. These field days seem to make good outreach activities, landowners seem to like the on site activities and enjoy learning new sustainable forestry information. Getting out to meet new people is also serving as the start of advocacy functions. Field days in general seem to be doing the trick to grow landowner numbers. But our advocacy is just barely starting out and will probably take some time unless it is stimulated with local issues at a local level for a jump start. The landowners participated in field day discussions and somewhat the presentations, but we did not record or develop to much for press you could say. Our remote rural areas develop personalities that are not really comfortable with being in the lime light in a crowd. Just taking lots of pictures at the field days seemed to be causing some reluctant participants.

**Describe the outcomes of this project - what evidence do you have of success or failure? Refer back to your application to see what outcomes you predicted. This answer should be mostly numbers based.**  
Two Landowner Appreciation Day/Field Day events where held with one to three landowners helping present sustainable forestry messages. The numbers at the Landowner Appreciation days was not quite as we had hoped but was not a discouragement the numbers that turned out.

**What were the lessons that your committee learned that will improve your future projects (and thus could improve other committee's projects)? Did this project produce any surprising results? For instance try answering this question: What part of this project would your committee like to continue? Why or why not?**

Overall the Landowner Field Days generally seem to be doing the trick to grow landowners numbers. But with a year of changing management the future appears to be going to a stronger
forester and landowner delivered program over ATFS delivery, which may have hampered meeting targets originally presented for this grant, but knowing this might allow better buy in for on the ground activity if we can match that to the grant proposals.

**What are the next steps for this project?**
We continually communicate sustainable forestry messages with those that attend our field day. And any landowners that are not already Tree Farmers we contact and offer stewardship assistance to and ask if they want to be Tree Farmer as well.

**Project Budget**
Total Expenditures: $3000
Total Match: $8610
Additional Budget Explanations: