

The Future of the California Tree Farm Program Strategic Plan

Working Together to Build a Sustainable Future

March 2015 – February 2018



Strategic Plan Intent

This Strategic Plan (Plan) has been developed to guide activities of the California Tree Farm Committee (CTFC or Committee) for the improvement and advancement of the California Tree Farm Program (CTFP or Program) to enhance Program benefits to member Tree Farms, forest health, and sustainability of California's forested landscapes in fulfillment of the California Tree Farm Program mission. Implementation of the actions identified in this Strategic Plan will be the responsibility of the California Tree Farm Committee. This initial plan focuses on implementation on actions to be taken by the California Tree Farm Committee over a three- year period. This Plan is intended to establish a framework to focus Committee activities related to 1) Governance, 2) Communications, and 3) Operations. It is intended that this Plan be an adaptive and flexible document that will be serve as a foundation for future strategic plans.

The Strategic Plan framework and matrix was developed during a facilitated workshop in March of 2015 and focused on addressing strengths and weaknesses identified by the Committee in a pre-meeting "dashboard" survey. The dashboard survey is summarized in Appendix 1. This workshop resulted in a matrix of focus areas and associated action items which comprises the working framework of the Plan. Workshop participants included members of the current Committee and representatives from, UC Extension, federal and state agencies and the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection.

Progress of the Strategic Plan will be measured against the indicators of program health highlighted in the dashboard with the objective to improve Committee and Program performance for all indicators to the level necessary to support certification.

Tree Farm Mission

The mission of the Tree Farm Program in California is: "To promote the growing of renewable forest resources on private lands while protecting environmental benefits and increasing public understanding of all benefits of productive forestry."

California Tree Farm Program

The California Tree Farm Program has committed to be a certified program under certification Standards established by the American Tree Farm System. The Standards are based on international sustainability metrics and North American Guidelines for sustainable forest management. The Standards were developed at the direction of the American Forest Foundation (AFF) Board of Trustees by the “*2015-2020 AFF Independent Standards Review Panel*” which is an independent AFF National Standards Interpretation Committee comprised of individuals with expertise in the area of forest certification, forest management, marketing and global sustainability.

In electing to be a certified Program, the California Tree Farm Committee, is committed to ensuring that the ATFS Standards are met and that individual Tree Farms meet ATFS certification requirements.

The Program is designed to:

- 1) Provide a pathway and assistance to enroll new Tree Farms and ensure that existing Tree Farms meet ATFS Standards of Sustainability.
- 2) Provide for inspection of existing Tree Farms at prescribed intervals to ensure that existing Tree Farms continue to meet Standards.
- 3) Provide training and oversight of qualified Tree Farm Inspectors.
- 4) Maximize potential market benefit of ATFS certification to member Tree Farmers
- 5) Provide forums to maximize landowner access to management tools and forestry advice.

Program Need

California’s forest resources are vast, productive and diverse and cover nearly one-third of the state. The 33 million acres of forests include unique forest types such as oak woodlands, coast redwood and the ponderosa pine and mixed conifer types of the Sierra Nevada.

There are 13.9 million acres of private forested land in California. The mixture of owners includes families, individuals, service organizations, conservation groups, partnerships, clubs, timberland investment management organizations and Native American tribes. They also own well over 4 million acres of forested land that does not qualify as productive timberland capable of growing 20 cubic feet/acre/year of fiber. According to the National Woodland Owner Survey conducted by the United States Forest Service Pacific Northwest Research Station as part of the Forest Inventory and Analysis program there are over 100 thousand family owned forests that are 10 acres or more in size. Ninety-eight percent of these family ownerships are less than 500 acres. About five percent of the surveyed owners had written management plans.

Forestland management objectives and styles vary significantly for private family owned forests. Of the owners reporting as part of the woodland survey, less than 25 percent had harvested timber, firewood or other non-timber forest products from their lands in the five years preceding the survey. It is anticipated that this percentage will continue to decline as the wood products industry has become smaller and the number of sawmills has decreased. Also, public expectations for sustainable management of forest lands in California has resulted in a complex regulatory process which are confusing and costly. As a result, for all practical purposes this regulatory scheme has precluded timber harvesting on parcels less than 40 acres in size.

The need for outreach to owners of family forests is significant and the potential for influencing positive outcomes relative to forest health, sustainability, and associated environmental benefits through enrolling new landowners in the California Tree Farm Program is great.

State of the Current California Tree Farm Program

The California Tree Farm Program has been in existence since 1942. Landowners comprise the core of the program with largely volunteer support from a network of forestry organizations, forestry professionals, agency representatives, UC Forestry Extension specialists, non-governmental entities and other forestry related interests. Volunteer engagement is key to ensuring that the program is successful. Forestland ownerships from 10 to 10,000 contiguous acres are eligible but ownership must be privately held and not publicly traded. Currently there are 549 Certified Tree Farms covering 466,014 acres in the California Tree Farm Program.

Certification Standards

The American Forest Foundation 2015-2020 Standards of Sustainability for Forest Certification are designed to provide guidance to forestland owners to be effective stewards of the land they own, promote forest health, ensure sustainability of resources and promote environmental, economic and social benefits.

The standards recognize the need to accommodate a range and diversity of family owned small to mid-sized forest ownerships and can be utilized adaptively and as appropriate for the size, scale, and intensity unique to each individual landowner. In total there are eight Standards of Sustainability which are intended to provide specific aspects of sustainable forest management. Each Standard incorporates performance measures and indicators. All components of each Standard apply to every certified property. Performance measures and indicators that include the word “shall” are considered core elements and are required for certification. Performance measures and indicators that include the word “should” allow for latitude in implementation. Qualified tree farm inspectors and third-party assessors are urged to respect the landowner’s opportunity for creative solutions and adaptive management intended by the Standards. As such, the American Forest Foundation Standards will be used adaptively and as appropriate for the size, scale, and intensity of the forest ownership and level of management. Specific information regarding the 2015-2020

Standards of Sustainability are available at: <https://www.treefarmssystem.org/afts-standards>.

California Tree Farm Committee

The California Tree Farm Program is administered by the California Tree Farm Committee. Membership on the California Tree Farm Committee is voluntary. Day to day operations are conducted under contract by the Executive Director. The Program and Committee are co-sponsored by the Forest Landowners of California.

At the national level the California Program is part of the American Tree Farm System which is sponsored by the American Forest Foundation.

The California Tree Farm Committee, is committed to:

- 1) Administering the California Tree Farm Program for the benefit of Family Forest landowners consistent with Program Mission and ATFS Standards and procedures.
- 2) Maintaining a functioning and dynamic State Tree Committee with clearly stated bylaws, leadership manuals, and other procedural mechanisms in place to ensure that the California Tree Farm Program meets current American Tree Farm Standards for certification.
- 3) Coordinating with University of California Extension staff, agency personnel and others to provide forest landowner outreach, education, and information through newsletters, conferences, field days, webinars, web-based tools, etc.
- 4) Building partnerships with forestry and natural resource focused groups, associations and individuals.
- 5) Enlisting and training a cadre of certified inspecting foresters trained in accordance with American Tree Farm System standards.
- 6) Maintaining an accurate and current record of certified Tree Farms and Inspectors
- 7) Coordinating of completion of required inspections.
- 8) Promoting the Family Forest brand and Tree Farm Program benefits.

- 9) Assuring that completed inspection forms are returned to the American Tree Farm System and working with the American Tree Farm System to ensure that data entry is accurate and complete.
- 10) Ensuring that all Tree Farms included in the California Tree Farm Program meet current certification standards.

California Tree Farm Program Strategic Plan Overview

The Strategic Plan has been developed to guide three key functional areas of Tree farm Committee activity relative to delivery of the Tree Farm Program. These key areas are associated with governance, communications, and program operations. The Strategic Plan is intended to be a working document with specific focus areas, actions and timelines. However, while the actions and responsible parties, and timing have been designated within the plan, it is the intent to move forward in an adaptive approach with adjustments in timing or responsible parties relative to a specific action item anticipated and made where appropriate.

The Strategic Plan has been developed to address five Focus areas associated with these key activities. Each of these focus areas include an associated set of action items, identification of responsible parties for completion of a specific action item and a timeline for completion of each action item. Those actions items associated with governance have been designated with a “G”, those associated with communications have been designated with a “C” and those associated with operations are designated with an “O”. As noted within the matrix there are a number of action items that will support multiple Committee functions.

The five focus areas selected by the California Tree Farm Committee include:

Focus Area 1-Database clean-up to ensure that records in the California Tree Farm and Tree Farm Inspector database are accurate and reliable.

Focus Area 2-Enhance the Tree Farm Committee including its size, diversity, structure, and engagement level to ensure long-term viability and effectiveness.

Focus Area 3-Refine the Family Forest Brand in support of the Tree Farm Mission in California through refined and expanded communications to key audiences so that we can better achieve our mission.

Focus Area 4-Build and Utilize Partnerships with Affiliated Natural Resource Groups to share messaging, resources and brand identities so that communications efforts are more unified and efficient.

Focus Area 5-Rejuvenate on the Ground Support from Industry, and CAL FIRE so that the Program will have capacity to accomplish the greater volume of work necessary to meet certification requirements.

STRATEGIC PLAN DEVELOPMENT

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Matthew Cocking	Forester, Natural Resource Conservation Service
Daniel Cohoon	CFTC, Redwood District Chair, Able Forestry Consultants
Mike De Lasaux	UC Cooperative Extension Natural Resources Advisor
George Gentry	California Board of Forestry and Forestry
Chuck Henderson	Shasta Forests
Lois Kaufman	CTFC Executive Director
Len Lindstrand, Jr.	CFTC Northern District Chair, Tree Farmer
Dave McNamara	Treasurer – CA Tree Farm Committee
Bill Snyder	CFTC Chair, Forester
Steve Smith	California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection
Rick Standiford	UC Cooperative Extension Forest Management Specialist
Tom Davidson	Facilitator, Leadership Nature
Sarah Anrrich	ATFS Volunteer Capacity Manager



Strategic Plan Development Participants (l to r): George Gentry, Tom Davidson, Mike Delasaux, Sarah Anrich, Dan Cohoon, Lois Kaufman, Dave McNamara, Bill Snyder (Not pictured: Rick Standiford, Steve Smith, Mathew Cocking, Chuck Henderson, Len Lindstrand, Jr.)

STRATEGIC PLAN

California Tree Farm Program

March 2015 – February 2018

Required Focus Area #1 – Clean up the database so that it is accurate and reliable for assessments and user friendly for tracking and communication purposes		
Action Item	Owner/Leader	Due Date
1. Request current download from National database (O,G)	Executive Director with assistance from NRCS	April 30, 2015
2. Identify inconsistencies and anomalies (O,G)	Executive Director with assistance from NRCS	May 1, 2015
3. Break down the list by region for review during upcoming training (O)	Executive Director with assistance from NRCS	May 1, 2015
4. Get database training (O)	Executive Director with assistance from NRCS	May 15, 2015
5. Show Lois how to Mail Merge (O)	UC Extension	June 1, 2015
6. Conduct one-on-one outreach to check data where necessary (O)	Executive Director with assistance from NRCS	June 15, 2015
7. Make decisions about older records (O)	Executive Director with assistance from NRCS	August, 2015
8. Enter selected records into "Prospect" category (O)	Executive Director with assistance from NRCS	August, 2015
9. Create a maintenance procedure (O,G)	Executive Director with assistance from NRCS	August, 2015
10. Complete (O,G)	Executive Director with assistance from NRCS	September, 2015

Focus Area #2 – Enhance the California Tree Farm Committee including its size, diversity, structure and engagement level so that the committee is viable and effective for the long run

Action Item	Owner/Lead Person	Other Contributors	Milestones & Due Dates
1. Determine executive committee, full committee structure, subcommittees, and draft bylaws (G)	Executive Director and CFTC Chair	Approved by Regional Directors, Tree Farmers and FLC (include young stakeholders)	June 1
2. Form new committee (G)	Executive Director and CFTC Chair	All support as directed	August 1
3. Develop new bylaws, policy manual, internal communication process (G,C,O)	New committee	All support as directed	End of 2015
4. Fill subcommittee positions (G)	New committee	All support as directed	Q1 2016
5. Evaluate the need for a California sponsor and as needed pursue an MOU (G)*	Chair, Executive Director	Executive Committee	Q4 2016

*This action item was added as part of the process to finalize the draft Strategic Plan

Focus Area #3 – Refine the Family Forest brand in California through a refined and expanded communications that make our purpose and value known to all key audiences, so that we can better achieve our mission

Action Item	Owner/Lead Person	Other Contributors	Milestones & Due Dates
1. Conduct focus group surveys, develop survey tools, gather data and summarize (C)	UC Extension, Chair, Executive Director	Other Tree Farmers, NGOs, communication experts, younger forest owners	Q1 2016
2. Craft extended communication plan (C)	Executive committee	Communication experts	Q2 2016
3. Implement communication plan (C)	Chair, Executive Committee, CFTC, UC Extension	Committee, landowner organizations, industry, NGOs, government entities	Q3 and Q4 2016

Focus Area #4 – Build and utilize partnerships with affiliated natural resources groups to share messaging, resources and brand identities so that communication efforts are more unified and efficient

Action Item	Owner/Lead Person	Other Contributors	Milestones & Due Dates
1. Create a list of partners, research the, inventory current and potential links with Tree Farm mission (C)	District Chairs, UC Extension, Chair	NRCS, UCCE, CAL FIRE, Tree Farm Committee, USFS, CFA, SAF	Q1, 2016
2. Strategic plan for outreach (O,C)	Tree Farm Committee, Chair and Northern district Chair	S&PF (Dan M), Dan Porter (TNC), UCCE, SIC, BOF, SAF, CLFA	Q2, 2016
3. Share website, links, newsletters, etc., consistent with plan (O,C)	UC Extension, BOF, NRCS, USFS	S&PF (Dan M), Dan Porter (TNC), UCCE, SIC, BOF, SAF, CLFA	Q3 and Q4, 2016

Focus Area #5 - Rejuvenate on-the-ground support from industry and CDF in addition to the needed occasional financial support, so that we can accomplish a greater volume of quality work to meet certification requirements

Action Item	Owner/Lead Person	Other Contributors	Milestones & Due Dates
1. Develop briefing materials specific to industry, CDF and USFS	Bill and Lois	SPI – Mark Pawlicki CalFire – Steve Smith USFS – Jason Ko NCRS and UCCE	August 15 Draft Final September 1
2. Conduct physical meetings with stakeholders	Bill – USFS, Cal Fire CFA – get a member	Soper Collins SIC	November 1
3. Presentation to Board of Forestry	Lois	DAN – Field Trip	Oct or November

Appendix 1: Summarized State Voice Dashboard Assessment California*

The following is an environmental scan (assessment) of key indicators of program health. The scan is designed to support the committee in identifying priorities and gauge progress toward 2015 State's Choice Pathway benchmarks.

Note: If a key indicator is a required prerequisite or benchmark for the Certified or Recognition pathway it will be noted.

1. Tree Farmer Database Health Indicator: How would you describe the quality of your state's data in the ATFS Database?

Prerequisite for Certified Pathway: Yes

Gauge:

Green: Our data has been recently updated through a comprehensive outreach/data cleanse project and we now have reliable and accurate contact information including landowner e-mails, land addresses and phone numbers.

- ✓ **Yellow:** We systematically reviewed and confirmed landowner details in the last three years. We have a high percentage of landowners in the database with accurate contact information, but overall it still needs some work. We are getting mail returned. The assessment has identified minor flaws in our database accuracy (5-15% replacement rate or acreage/county discrepancies).

Orange: We have not comprehensively reviewed our data or confirmed landowner information. We have a moderate percentage of good contact information, but still lack reliable contact information and much of it needs updating. The assessment has identified several instances in our database accuracy (15-25% replacement rate or acreage/county discrepancies).

Red: Our data is not very accurate. We have a lot of poor or incomplete data and much of it needs to be purged. The assessment has identified some major flaws in the accuracy of the database (25% or greater replacement rate or acreage/county discrepancies).

Have reviewed last 3 years. Still needs work. 5-15% replacement rate. Use database separate from national. Never done a comprehensive clean up. Cleaning up as we go. Number of Tree Farmers errors. I keep a separate database. I have an email list for newsletters and snail mail. Training on the system will help. Need to use ATFS database exclusively. I email anyone who is not in ATFS database on our database. We can talk more about how to streamline.

2. State Tree Farm Committee Health Indicator: Over the last calendar year, how would you describe the health of your state's ATFS Tree Farm Committee?

Green: We have an adequately sized and active committee with excellent diversity (including age and gender) and involvement along a broad spectrum of supporters from different sectors and interest areas. We have active subcommittees and we rotate responsibilities by having term limits.

Yellow: We have an adequately sized committee, but not all members are very active and it is lacking diversity. One or two people do all the work.

Orange: We have a small group of active committee members with fairly good diversity, but need to recruit some more members to help with the workload.

- ✓ **Red:** We have a committee, but we don't meet very often. We don't have much diversity and many members have served for a long time. We need to recruit new members to create diversity and we need to be more engaged.

3. Committee Diversity Indicator: Do you have people in the following groups represented on your committee in the past calendar year?

Landowners/Tree Farmers: Yes No

State/Federal Forestry Agency: Yes No

Landowner Associations: Yes No

Consulting Foresters: Yes No

Extension/University: Yes No

NRCS: Yes No

Forest Industry: Yes No

State Implementation Committee: Yes No

Conservation Organization (Land trust, watershed collaborative, etc.): Yes No

In the past calendar year, did your state program have a dedicated Program Administrator?
Yes, part-time and paid by the committee.

Please list your program's co-sponsors (no acronyms, please).:

Forest Landowners of California; all foresters, some are TFs too, some also landowner association members, also consulting foresters, no industry, no NRCS.

4. Tree Farmer Inspector Corp Health Indicator: In the past calendar year, how would you describe the health of your state program's corps of ATFS inspectors?

Gauge:

Green: We have an excellent and sufficient corps of inspectors that are distributed throughout the state. Fifty percent (50%) of our inspectors complete one or more inspections a year. We have a good mix of state and private inspectors completing inspections.

Yellow: We have a good corps of inspectors, but we lack some representation in some regions of the state. Our inspectors are mainly from one sector of the forest community.

✓ **Orange:** We have a good corps of inspectors, but only a small percentage of them do inspections.

Red: We are really lacking in a good core of active inspectors in the state, and we struggle to get inspections completed.

5. Strategic Plan Indicator: Do you have a written 3-5 year strategic plan that you used in the last calendar year to help your committee set and track goals? Do you set and track goals annually?

Prerequisite for Certified Pathway: Yes

Benchmark for Certified Pathway: Yes, State Committees must set and track goals annually.

Gauge:

Green: Yes, we have a plan and it is current. Year plan completed: _____

✓ **Yellow:** No, but we are in the process of completing a strategic plan by the end of 2015.

Orange: Yes, we have a plan but it's older than five years old.

Red: No, and we currently have no plan to develop a strategic plan.

6. Written Communications Plan Indicator: Do you have a written communications plan in place that you followed during the last two years?

Prerequisite for Certified Pathway: Yes

Gauge:

Green: Yes, we have a written plan and it has been updated within the last two years.

Yellow: No, but we are in the process of completing a written communications plan before the end of this year.

Orange: Yes, we have a written plan, but it has been more than two years since it was last updated/amended/revised.

✓ **Red:** No, and we are not planning to develop a written communications plan.

We do our own direct mail campaign every year to current donors (partners) and forwards Action Alerts whenever AFF sends them out. We also did an SVSC presentation and some field days. Used first class mail to get response service.

7. Landowner Communications Health Indicator: In the past calendar year, did you have regular communications (newsletters, e-mails, postcards, etc.) with all Tree Farmers in your state to help convey the value, benefits and responsibilities of the program as well as opportunities for Tree Farmers to learn through workshops, field days, webinars, etc.?

Prerequisite for Certified Pathway: Yes

Gauge:

Green: We sent more than eight (8) direct communications to Tree Farmers last year.

✓ **Yellow:** We sent four (4) or more direct communications to Tree Farmers last year (standard required).

✓ **Orange:** We sent fewer than four (4) communications per year to Tree Farmers last year.

Red: We did not send any direct communications to Tree Farmers last year.

If your state program has a live website, please provide the link below. If not, please indicate n/a.

Stand alone website. www.caltreefarm.com; SIC uses their website, too.

8. Field Visits with Tree Farmers Indicator: What proportion of Tree Farmers have been field inspected in the last 5 years?

Benchmark for Certified Pathway: Yes

Gauge:

Green: 100% to 81% of our current Tree Farmers have been inspected within the last five years to update their contact information, ensure management plans qualify, and are still interested in staying in program.

Yellow: 80% to 66% of our Tree Farmers have been inspected within the last five years.

Orange: Only 33% to 65% of our Tree Farmers have been inspected individually within last five years.

✓ **Red:** Less than 33% of our Tree Farmers have not been inspected individually within the last five years.

9. Management Plans Meeting Tree Farm Standards Indicator: Do all your Tree Farmers have a qualifying management plans that meets all the new standards?

Gauge:

- ✓ **Green:** In our last assessment, 90 to 100% of our Tree Farmers sampled have qualifying plans that meet all the new standards.

Yellow: In our last assessment, 75 to 89% of our Tree Farmers sampled have qualifying plans that meet all the new standards.

Orange: 50 to 74% of our Tree Farmers sampled have qualifying plans that meet all the new standards.

Red: We have no idea. Probably less than 50% of our Tree Farms have a qualifying plan that meets the new standard.

10. Internal Monitoring Health Indicator: How would you describe the success you have had in completing your required sample inspections in the past calendar year?

Benchmark for Certified Pathway: Yes

Gauge:

- ✓ **Green:** Yes, we completed all our required inspections on time.

Yellow: Yes, we completed all of our required inspections, but a few (10% or less) were late.

Red: No, we did not complete all of our required inspections and do not plan to.

11. Landowner Interest Response Time Indicator: Based on the past calendar year, how would you qualify the efficiency of your state program's ability to respond to new landowners interested in the Tree Farm program including capturing contact information and responding to requests for information in a timely manner?

Prerequisite for Certified Pathway: Yes,

Gauge:

Green: Interested landowner is contacted within week to capture contact information. Follow-up request for information are provided within a month, and a site visit is made in a timely manner.

Yellow: Interested landowner is contacted in a timely manner with request for information but follow-up visits took a while.

- ✓ **Orange:** Requests are recorded but not systematically. We have no system in place to track requests for information or follow up to make sure they have been handled or scheduled.

Red: We did not use any regular system to respond to new landowners interested in becoming Tree Farmers.

12. Reporting to AFF Health Indicator: Do you complete and submit all the required AFF annual reports and documentation for the program, financial, grants, etc.

Benchmark for Certified Pathway: Yes, must complete and submit all required annual reporting and documentation to National AFF office.

Benchmark for Recognition Pathway: Yes, same as above.

Gauge:

✓ **Green:** We do an excellent job of reporting

Yellow: We do an adequate job of reporting; it is sometimes late and/or incomplete.

Red: We consistently do a poor job of completing and submitting all the required reports.

12. Recognition and Incentives Program:

Benchmark for Certified Pathway: Yes, must participate in recognition programs.

Benchmark for Recognition Pathway: Yes, must participate in recognition programs.

Did you award a State Outstanding Tree Farmer of the Year (OTFY) last year?

Gauge:

✓ **Green:** Yes, we held an awards ceremony and presented an award to our state-level OTFY(s).

Yellow: No, we did not have a state-level OTFY last year, but we have presented at least one state-level OTFY in the past three years..

Red: No, we did not have a state-level OTFY last year, and it's been more than three years since we last presented a state-level OTFY award.

Did you award a State Outstanding Inspector of the Year (OIY) last year?

Gauge:

Green: Yes, we held an awards ceremony and presented an award to our state-level OIY(s).

Yellow: No, we did not have a state-level OIY last year, but we have presented at least one state-level OIY in the past three years..

✓ **Red:** No, we did not have a state-level OIY last year, and it's been more than three years since we last presented a state-level OTFY award.

Please list any other awards that you presented to landowners or volunteers in your state in the past calendar year.

We do Tree Farmer of the Year every year but there has not been a major reason to recognize any one Tree Farm Inspector of the Year.

13. Financial Stability Indicator: How would you describe your committee's long-term financial stability?

Gauge:

Green: We have more than a year's worth of reserves in our bank account. We use our reserves to invest in new initiatives each year that could potentially grow our program and assets.

Yellow: We have more than a year's worth of reserves in our bank account but do not tap into these reserves to expand our program or take on new projects.

- ✓ **Orange:** We have some reserves, but not enough to cover a year's worth of expenses
- Red:** We have little or no reserves, and barely cover our expenses.

Is your committee an independent 501(c)3?

Yes

┆ No

┆ Not yet, but we will be by the end of this year.

14. Fundraising Health Indicator: How would you describe your committee's involvement in fundraising activities such as making donation requests to partners, industry, Tree Farmers, etc.?

Benchmark for Certified Pathway: Yes

Gauge:

Green: Yes, we engage in several fundraising activities. We have a fundraising committee and follow a written fundraising plan.

Yellow: We hold a few fundraising events each year with moderate successful.

- ✓ **Red:** We currently are not doing any fundraising.

Maintenance Scheduled:

- Are you planning on developing a written Fundraising Plan? No
- Do you have a Fundraising Committee? No
- Have you requested a capacity grant from AFF to complete a Fundraising Plan? No
- Are you aware of your State's annual return in the AFF direct appeals?

15. Develop a State Leadership Manual Indicator: What is the status of your leadership manual?

Prerequisite for Certified Pathway: Yes

Prerequisite for Recognition Pathway: Yes

Gauge:

Green: We have a written leadership manual, and it includes the basic information such as an organizational chart, roles of each position, contact information, and a succession plan with term limits. The manual was revised/updated/amended in the past two years.

Yellow: We have a written leadership manual, but it is lacking some of the basic information listed above. It has been more than two years since we reviewed or revised the manual.

- ✓ **Red:** No, we currently do not have a state leadership manual.

We do have a documented process for how to processing inspections.

When was your last assessment?

When is your next planned assessment?

16. State Assessment by Third Party: How well did you do on your last third-party assessment? Were there some red flags?

Gauge:

Green: We had no nonconformities or opportunities for improvement at all.

- ✓ **Yellow:** We had some minor infractions (examples: less than 10% of landowners selected needed to update plans; one or two instances of database inaccuracy), but we quickly corrected them.

Orange: We had program-wide problems (examples: around 50% of landowners needed to update management plans; a couple of irregularities in Required Sample; our replacement rate was around 20%, etc.) we are working on correcting them within next year

Red: We had some major program-wide problems (more than 50% of landowners selected needed to update their plans, our replacement rate was over 20%; there was a major issue with our Required Sample, et c.), and it will take a year or more to correct

The 2011 Audit had some minor non-conformances in the database but it went well. The auditors were good knowledgeable people to work with. Next audit will be 2016.