

**Board of Forestry and Fire Protection  
Range Management Advisory Committee (RMAC)**

**Rangelands Focus Group**

**Minutes  
September 18, 2007**

**Attending:**

**RMAC:**

**Representing**

Ken Zimmerman	California Cattlemen's Association
Mike Connor	Public Member
Clancy Dutra	California Farm Bureau Federation
J.R McCollister	Public Member
Ed Anchordoguy	California Wool Growers Association
Chuck Pritchard	California Association of Resource Conservation Districts
Scott Carnegie	California Forestry Association
Mel Thompson	California Wool Growers Association
Jeff Stephens	CAL FIRE / RMAC Executive Secretary

**Members of the Public:**

Eric Huff	Board of Forestry & Fire Protection
-----------	-------------------------------------

**Items 1 & 2 Call to Order and Introductions:**

Mike Connor called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM. Introductions of all present were made.

**Item 3, Review of the July 2007 Minutes:**

Minutes were reviewed and corrections noted by Jeff Stephens. Chuck Pritchard made the motion to approve the minutes with corrections. Ken Zimmerman seconded. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

**Item 4 Develop Draft Policy for Board of Forestry and Fire Protection  
consideration regarding clarification of the CRM specialty:**

Mike Connor stated that a new version has been sent with revisions from the last meeting. He asked for further comment and revision. Most of the discussion among RMAC members centered upon making the paper relevant to CRMs in light of the fact that it is based on the Professional Foresters Law. This included shifting text such as Eric Huff's proposal to move some text to the lead (third paragraph) with other edits as well.

Mike Connor provided comment from Neil McDougald for consideration. He argued that the definition of "rangeland" be altered by deleting the phrase "suitable for grazing and browsing" and suggested that rangeland be defined by the vegetation type present i.e., it

is “land supporting grass, shrubs, and savanna vegetation and that it may or may not be grazed or browsed by livestock”. Mr. McDougald’s point being that we associate rangeland with grazing and that may not always be the case. Ken Zimmerman stated that the Board has adopted a definition of grazing which states “suitable for grazing and browsing”. JR McCollister stated that the Board’s definition does not say “used” for grazing; rather it states “suitable for grazing”. Eric Huff cited the California Code of Regulations, Title 14 CCR 1651(c), as the source of the current definition which references the vegetation as described by the above and states that it is land grazed by livestock. Ken Zimmerman argued that the definition should be one adopted by the Board rather than re-write Board language currently in effect. Scott Carnegie recommended citing the CCR as the source of the definition. The conclusion was to accept the definition per the CCR as stated by Eric Huff and reference the CCR as the source.

Regarding Certified Rangeland Manager (CRM) Tasks as presented in the Draft Policy 12 Mike Connor referred to suggested edits from Eric Huff and others including written comment submitted by Neil McDougald. Title 14 CCR 1651(b) was considered for inclusion. This CCR requires consultation with an RPF when practicing on forested landscapes. Eric Huff and Scott Carnegie favored inclusion of the 1651(b) indicating that it clarifies that a CRM may practice range management on forested landscapes. Mike Connor agreed and RMAC accepted inclusion of the CCR for consideration at the Full RMAC. Eric Huff agreed to incorporate all revisions as made in the Focus Group meeting and have a copy ready for review by Mike Connor by close of business same day.

**Item 5 Discussion on the Control of Noxious Weeds as Related to Caltrans Equipment Operations:**

Mike Connor began discussion by reminding the RMAC of past correspondence with Caltrans regarding a weed control policy for cleaning equipment prior to leaving job sites. He then asked the RMAC if this is an issue the committee wishes to continue pursuing and is another Caltrans representative desired for a future meeting. His opinion is that CAL FIRE does have a policy for cleaning that it is enforced. Jeff Stephens was asked to follow-up and provide the policy if any for CAL FIRE. Scott Carnegie expressed concern that RMAC not single out an agency without knowing what other agencies or private companies (utility companies) are doing to address the problem. Mel Thompson suggested coordinating the effort with Steve Schoenig.

Ken Zimmerman noted that Caltrans is doing better and making a more concerted effort to control weeds on their roadside program, including the “Good Neighbor Program”. Clancy Dutra noted that each county has a Weed Management Area and perhaps they should be brought into the discussion. Steve Schoenig would be the contact to access the WMA for each county.

Mike Connor suggested two action items: 1) Invite a Caltrans representative for a second meeting, and 2) Jeff Stephens will follow-up with identifying any CAL FIRE policies for cleaning equipment.

Ken Zimmerman recommended that a representative with the California Association of Ag Commissioners and Sealers Association also be consulted for their input.

Chuck Pritchard posed the question that RMAC should consider where we limit the issue. For example, there are numerous examples in the private sector (ranch & farm equipment) that also potentially are part of the problem. Ken Zimmerman stated that a Cattleman's Association representative could be consulted.

Mel Thompson cited a presentation that he made on prescribed grazing and in the audience was a Caltrans employee that was involved in vegetation management; his point being that Caltrans employees working in weed management do exist and have an interest in the problem; it is a matter of locating them and opening communications.

Mike Connor closed discussion. Jeff Stephens will pursue that action items stated above.

**Item 6 Status on the National Society for Range Management Database for Continuing Education Credits:**

Mike Connor opened discussion by providing a status of his investigations regarding a system to capture continuing education credits for CRMs. He stated that it would be an added administrative burden for the Cal-Pac Section of Society of Range Management (SRM) to take on the task of tracking continuing education. One possible solution is to utilize the National SRM computerized system for tracking and certification. Chuck Pritchard asked how the National SRM handles it currently. Mike Connor stated that SRM Headquarters continues to identify SRM sanctioned courses that are suitable for continuing education credits. Lists of attendees are sent to the headquarters for data entry. In addition the individual may log onto the SRM webpage and enter additional course work completed.

Mike Connor has been speaking with Leonard Jolly with the National SRM and others. His understanding is that a new computerized system is expected to be on line soon. The Cal-Pac Section is investigating whether it would be practical to use the National computer system to record CRM credits for the Cal-Pac Section. Mike Connor will continue to follow progress on the National SRM database and whether it will meet the need for CRMs.

**Item 7 Letter to the Cal-Pac Society of Range Management Certification Panel; Status of Response and Potential Follow-up:**

Mike Connor stated that the letter from RMAC to the Society of Range Management Certification Panel requesting input on CRM exams has not received a response to date. He further recommended that Ken Zimmerman attend the Cal-Pac SRM meeting in November and make a request for a response. Ken Zimmerman agreed to attend the Certification Panel breakout session and make the request for a response.

Mike Connor proposed that if the Full RMAC on September 19 agrees on content of the Draft Board Policy 12 that the Draft should be sent to the Certification Panel and asked for comment and/or support. JR McCollister asked if RMAC must first go through the Board with such a request. Mike Connor stated that he prefers to gain support from the Panel first and then approach the Board with support from the Certification Panel.

Mel Thompson reminded RMAC that the Draft Policy 12 and the letter sent to the Panel are interconnected in that the letter mentions Policy 12. RMAC is therefore seeking

support for the letter and Policy 12 as a package. Mike Connor noted his comment and stated that in the last meeting of the Panel that he attended the Panel expressed dissatisfaction with Policy 11, and therefore believes there is some support for revisions as expressed in Draft Policy 12.

Clancy Dutra recommended that the RMAC report to the Board prepared by Jeff Stephens include a copy of Draft Policy 12 with a statement that RMAC has circulated the draft to the Certification Panel and is seeking Panel comment and support. In this way the Board will be fully aware of RMAC's activity on the issue of Draft Policy 12. RMAC members agreed with this approach.

Mike Connor briefed Eric Huff on the strategy as discussed above asking for his comment on this methodology. Mr. Huff stated that he agrees with the approach and added that he would also favor Draft Policy 12 going through the Professional Foresters Examining Committee (PFEC) as well. Mike Connor will prepare a cover letter for the Certification Panel introducing Draft Policy 12.

### **Item 8. New and Unfinished Business**

Ken Zimmerman stated that there is an interim position open on the PFEC and that RMAC may submit a nomination for consideration by the Board. He recommended that RMAC give consideration to submitting Bill Frost, UC Cooperative Extension, as the nominee. Mike Connor agreed to bring the issue before the Full RMAC on September 19<sup>th</sup>.

Chuck Pritchard asked to relay some of the information that he learned at a recent trip to Wyoming and South Dakota as part of the National GLCI (Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative) meeting.

The GLCI meeting near Casper Wyoming included visits to working ranches involved in various mineral extraction activities. This included a uranium mine that has been reopened using a water injection system with bicarbonate of soda that extracts the ore in solution without open pits or settling ponds. Impacts to other above ground resources are minimal.

In South Dakota there are 5 million acres of rangeland that has been calculated to convert enough carbon dioxide to oxygen to cover all needs for New York City and Los Angeles for 2 years. Mr. Pritchard stated that there is work underway that examines carbon sequestration as a possible revenue source for ranchers.

Chuck Pritchard cited an individual from Belgium speaking on the use of wind, solar, and biomass that generates 100% of the energy needs on two islands off the coast of Belgium. Belgium is a leader in these technologies and is looking to export the technology to the US.

Chuck Pritchard noted several upcoming conferences:

National Conference on Agriculture and the Environment in Monterey November 7-9. They will address sustainability, water quality, and the agriculture interface with communities.

NCBA (National Cattlemen's Beef Association), February 6-9 in Reno

NACD (National Association of Conservation Districts), February 10-13 Reno

CARCD (California Association of Conservation Districts), November 7-10 Reno  
National SRM January 26 -31 Louisville KY  
Fourth Annual Conference of the GLCI, December 2009, Reno

Chuck Pritchard also noted a DVD presentation narrated by Tom Brokaw that identifies what new-comers to Montana can expect when moving into rural America. He was impressed with content and recommended it to RMAC as a review of issues that occur when urban populations move to rural America and the conflict that may result with older established families.

**Item 7 Public Comment**

None

Meeting adjourned