

Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
Professional Foresters Registration Program



Licensing News

Volume 25 - Issue 1



June 2010

The View from the 15th Floor

“WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?”

One of my favorite memories is a day I spent with a mentor and friend doing initial reconnaissance on a very remote and steep property north of Davenport. At the end of the day, as darkness approached, we found ourselves on a remnant skid trail that ended at a precipitous drop overlooking a shaly, rocky cascade. Not wanting to return the way we came and not really knowing exactly where we were due to the coarse scale of the map we had to work with, we guessed that it could be a shorter distance to the pickup if we went straight off the cliff. As we took a moment to ponder our predicament and consider the ramifications of jumping off, my friend told me a joke that was perfectly aligned with the moment. We decided to go ahead and make the leap since I was about to fall off of the ledge laughing anyway.

Lately I've been thinking a lot about where this licensing program is headed, wondering if it's time for a leap into unknown territory. Ever wonder what this licensing program might have become had it been divorced from Timber Harvesting Plans? I've written previously about how the program was at one time envisioned to include different levels of licensure. Rather than the RPF holding plan writing responsibility, there was a notion to create a "Certified THP Specialty." In theory, you could have been both an RPF and a certified plan writer. Even today, our Foresters Law allows for the creation of such specialties – we could have 'certified timber inventory specialists,' or 'certified silviculture specialists,' or 'certified fire and fuels management specialists,' among others.

If you had to point to one particularly lousy byproduct of the paper production now required for timber harvesting in California, it's that foresters spend more time in front of a word processor than in the forest. Is writing harvesting plans really forestry? Or, could you turn that responsibility over to a 'certified harvesting planner' and let the forester handle the implementation of the plan as well as every other aspect of the actual meaningful forestry work to be done in the field? Think about it if you haven't already: agency Review Team representatives have essentially as much authority over an RPF's harvest plan as the RPF. Sure, Cal Fire has RPFs and the California Geological Survey has licensed geologists, but representatives of the other involved agencies as well as special rule counties are not required to be licensed. Yet, they are free to suggest any changes to the harvest plan they deem appropriate within the confines of their chain of command. RPFs have to be licensed to propose a set of impact mitigations, but pursuant to the Foresters Law, a number of other professions can propose the same set of mitigations without a license. Why then should a person have to be licensed as an RPF to write a harvest plan – particularly since our Forest Practice Rules are so comprehensive that they limit an RPF's professional discretion in the plan writing phase anyway? It seems to me that professional discretion only really happens when you're actually amongst the trees.

This bout of heresy got me thinking about what sort of changes I would make to our licensing law if it were in my power to do so. To help inform my perspective, I consulted the Society of American Foresters website and perused their review of the various forester licensing statutes.

According to SAF, there are 17 states in the union with a forester licensing or registration statute, and 13 of them are mandatory. The states with mandatory licensing other than California include Alabama, Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire.

The View from the 15th Floor Cont...

Those with a mandatory registration statute include Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, and South Carolina. I won't get into the differences between licensing and registration since I don't understand them myself (ours is a licensing statute according to SAF, but the word "registration" appears in our regulations and our moniker is "Registered Professional Forester"). But, I do want to touch on a few of the interesting differences and similarities between our statute and those of the other 13 states.

For instance, 11 of the 13 states have a state board whose sole purpose is to oversee the licensing/registration of foresters while 2, California and Massachusetts, handle this responsibility with an appointed committee.

Though California and Massachusetts again share the distinction of not requiring continuing education, the remaining 11 states require some number of annual or periodic continuing education credits following initial licensure or registration. Maryland and Massachusetts are the only 2 of the 13 states that do not require successful completion of either a written or oral examination for licensure/registration.

In Alabama the practice of forestry is broadly defined to include the teaching of forestry, as well as:

...the administration of forestry theories, principles, practices, or programs directly or indirectly related to the environmental and economic use, and the biological and ecological understanding of gross areas of land in public or private ownership or direction, or both, and supervision over persons engaged in the formation or implementation, or both, of forestry policies.

[Code of Alabama, Chapter 12, Article 1, Section 34-12-1, Definitions]

However, the licensing laws in Alabama as well as Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina go on to state that both federal and state officers and employees working on federal and state lands, respectively are not prevented from practicing forestry without a license. Likewise, federal and state officers or employees are not prevented from conducting forestry education programs or offering free forestry advice to timberland owners.

Arkansas also acknowledges college or university teaching of forestry and/or forestry research as the practice of forestry. In Maine and Georgia however, forestry instruction is not considered actual practice of forestry. Unlike California, Maine also offers "Intern Forester" registration to those individuals who have met certain education/experience requirements and are working under the sponsorship of a licensed forester.

Maryland has licensing laws for both foresters and "tree care experts." The tree care expert license would appear to be akin to certification as an arborist working in suburban and urban settings. It's interesting to note though that the Maryland foresters law also applies to, "...small groupings and individual trees in suburban and urban settings." You can't be licensed as a forester in Maryland unless you have an undergraduate degree in forestry from an SAF-Accredited or state Board of Foresters approved curriculum, and two years of practical experience. But, similar to California, you can practice forestry under the supervision of a licensed forester. Like other states, you can also maintain a license as "inactive" indefinitely for a lesser renewal fee of \$25, as opposed to the California option of alternation between withdrawal and active status, or outright relinquishment.

The View from the 15th Floor Cont...

Like at least 7 of the 13 states, disciplinary action against a forester in Maryland can include action against the status of the license as well as a financial penalty. The financial penalty may also be imposed against an individual found to be practicing forestry without a license. Unlicensed practice is likewise punishable with a financial penalty in both Alabama and Mississippi.

In Connecticut, there are three types of certifications: you can be certified as a "forester," "supervising forest products harvester," or "forest products harvester." Similar to Maryland, there is also a distinct state licensing requirement for those wishing to practice arboriculture.

If there's a big distinction to be found between California and the other 12 states, it's that none of them have a set of regulations for timber management on non-federal lands comparable to ours. Bet you didn't see that one coming. The licensed practice of forestry outside of California generally appears to be more concerned with making sure that competent people are entrusted to manage forested lands. Foresters aren't told what to do by a rulebook, so much as encouraged to practice what they've learned by education and experience.

I've already gone on too long here and you probably stopped reading two pages ago, so let me give you my wish list of things I'd change about the licensing program if I could. Number one on my list would be the explicit recognition of apprentice foresters. Call them "forestry technicians," or "intern foresters" if you like, but the point is to bring succeeding generations of foresters into our midst before the exam day comes. I'd even go so far as to say that we ought to extend this status to forestry students who have completed some minimum amount of forestry coursework at the community college level.

Number two on my list is a statutory change to create a status category for retired or inactive RPFs. It seems unfair to force a retiree on a fixed income to relinquish their license because they can't justify paying renewal fees when they no longer practice. Or, to require a person engaged in lengthy military service overseas to keep playing the withdrawal-reinstatement game. Why not retain our inactive registrants by allowing them to pay a nominal fee to maintain a license in inactive status. A couple of years ago the PFEC looked at attempting to create this status by Board regulation and even had me draft up a regulatory plead for the Board's consideration. However, upon legal review by Board Counsel it was determined that further legislative authorization would be necessary.

Moving on, there's a change I've already hinted at: creation of a certified specialty in timber harvest planning and modification of the Forest Practice Act to acknowledge that either a certified timber harvest planner or an RPF may write and sign timber harvest planning documents. The certified timber harvest planner would not be permitted to supervise field forestry activities unless they were also an RPF or under the supervision of an RPF. The examination for this specialty would be entirely geared to test State Forest Practice Program, CEQA, and plan construction knowledge. It could perhaps also be a ladder between the apprentice forester and RPF classifications if a person wanted to go that route.

While I'm on the subject of certified specialties, I'd like to create a certified hardwood forester specialty. One particular objective in creating this specialty would be encouraging local governments to recognize hardwood forestry expertise in the context of CEQA projects proposed in hardwood forests. Maybe we'd even go so far as to seek explicit CEQA recognition of this specialty. The way I envision it you'd have to be an RPF to qualify for this specialty.

The View from the 15th Floor Cont...

I would also like to consider a fire and fuels management specialty. The focus of this specialty could include defensible space assistance to homeowners as well as state and private vegetation treatment work at various scales to support landscape resiliency to fire occurrence. An applicant for this specialty would likely need to demonstrate qualifications in the use of prescribed fire and fire control systems, mechanical and hand treatment methods for reducing hazardous fuel loading, fire behavior simulators, and fire ecology. Here again, I believe it would be appropriate for an individual to be an RPF prior to seeking this specialty status.

Continuing education would be a feature of my ideal licensing program, but please note that I'm not going so far as to say it should be compulsory. All I'm suggesting is that this program could sponsor regular professional education sessions on topics pertinent to the apprentice forester, certified specialists, and the RPF.

Changes I would make to the disciplinary aspect of the law would include stiff financial penalties for unlicensed practice. The current law provides little for holding unlicensed practitioners accountable. Historically to the present, licensing officers have relied upon harshly toned 'cease and desist' letters as well as phone calls from Deputies Attorney General to persuade unlicensed individuals to comply with the law. This works fine with honorable people, but does nothing to dissuade the ethically challenged. As noted in the previous pages, a good number of the other licensing statutes include financial penalties and take an active interest in defending the license from trespass. In my opinion, this change is long overdue.

I'll wrap it up there having no doubt challenged your desire to continue funding the windbag of a licensing officer with whom you are presently stuck. I look forward to your thoughts on this rambling commentary and expect to see a few of you at PFEC meetings over the remainder of the year.

Best to you as the temperatures and fastballs rise.

Eric K. Huff, RPF No. 2544
Executive Officer-Foresters Registration
Sacramento, CA

Questions, comments, or differences of opinion you feel compelled to share? Please do not hesitate to give me a ring or drop me an email.

Current PFEC Composition

Professional Foresters Registration shall protect the public interest through the regulation of those individuals who are licensed to practice the profession of forestry, and whose activities have an impact upon the ecology of forested landscapes and the quality of the forest environment, within the State of California.

PROFESSIONAL FORESTERS EXAMINING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Douglas Ferrier, Chair	RPF - Consultant
Mr. Otto van Emmerik, Vice-Chair	RPF - Industry
Mr. Thomas Osipowich	RPF - CDF, Retired
Mr. Gerald Jensen	RPF - USFS, Retired
Dr. Kimberley Rodrigues	RPF - Public Representative
Mr. Raymond Flynn	Public Representative
Mr. Michael Stroud	CRM/RPF - Certified Specialty, Retired
Mr. William Frost	CRM-Certified Specialty

PROGRAM STAFF

Eric K. Huff, RPF No. 2544 Executive Officer – Foresters Registration eric.huff@fire.ca.gov	Wendy Zampardi Assistant to the Executive Officer wendy.zampardi@fire.ca.gov
--	--

Office of Professional Foresters Registration
P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460
916-653-8031

Current Board of Forestry & Fire Protection Composition

The Board's mission is to lead California in developing policies and programs that serve the public interest in environmentally, economically, and socially sustainable management of forest and rangelands, and a fire protection system that protects and serves the people of the state.

MEMBERS OF THE STATE BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. Stan L. Dixon, Chair	Public Representative
Ms. Pam Giacomini, Vice-Chair	Range & Livestock Representative
Mr. Lloyd Bradshaw	Timber Industry Representative
Mr. Gary Nakamura	Public Representative
Dr. Douglas Piirto	Public Representative
Mr. James Ostrowski	Timber Industry Representative
Mr. Bruce Saito	Public Representative
Mr. Thomas Walz	Timber Industry Representative
Mr. Mark Andre	Public Representative

BOARD STAFF

George "YG" Gentry, RPF No. 2262
Executive Officer
916-653-8007
george.gentry@fire.ca.gov

Eric K. Huff, RPF No. 2544
Assistant Executive Officer
916-653-8031
eric.huff@fire.ca.gov

Chris Zimny, RPF No. 2587
Regulations Coordinator
916-653-9418
chris.zimny@fire.ca.gov

Laura Alarcon-Stalians
Board Analyst
916-653-7102
laura.alarcon-stalians@fire.ca.gov

Linda Cano
Executive Assistant
916-653-8007
linda.cano@fire.ca.gov

Registered Professional Foresters & Certified Rangeland Managers

RPF and CRM Rolls

The following chart shows current RPF and CRM numbers by status:

Status	RPF's	CRM's
Valid	1251	78
Withdrawn	128	2
Revoked for Non-Renewal or by Disciplinary Action	148	7
Voluntarily Relinquished	536	5
Total	2063	92

Welcome to New Registrants

The following individuals passed the RPF and CRM Exams held in November 2009 and were approved for registration by the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. The pass rate for the RPF Exam was 50% and the pass rate for the CRM Exam was 100%. Congratulations to all and welcome to the fold!

Ms. Megan L. Parker	RPF No. 2906
Mr. Jeremy Frank Ravenscroft	RPF No. 2907
Mr. Jose "Tony" Gomez	RPF No. 2908
Mr. Glenn C. Flamik	RPF No. 2909
Mr. Elliott T. Brooks	RPF No. 2910
Mr. Zsolt Ka'tay	RPF No. 2911
Mr. Don Henderson	CRM No. 95
Mr. Matt Wacker	CRM No. 96

RPF and CRM Examination Announcements

The Fall 2010 examination has been scheduled for October 22, 2010 and the deadline for applications is August 13, 2010. The Spring 2011 examination has been scheduled for April 15, 2011 and the deadline for applications is February 11, 2011. Those interested in applying for the RPF or CRM examinations are encouraged to contact the Executive Officer, Eric Huff with any questions about qualifications prior to submitting an application and exam fee. Eric may be reached at 916-653-8031 or by email to eric.huff@fire.ca.gov.

Employment Survey Reminder

A brief employment survey was included in the odd-numbered license renewal forms last year. 512 registrants completed the survey, with another 45 registrants choosing to leave the survey blank. The survey has been repeated with the even-numbered renewal period this year and the new survey results will be presented in the next issue. If you haven't renewed your registration yet, please be sure to complete the employment survey found at the bottom of the Contact Information Form in addition to making any necessary changes to your information.

In Memoriam

With respect and condolences to family and friends, Professional Foresters Registration notes the passing of the following individuals since the last edition of the *News*. Please take a moment to honor their memory and service to the profession of forestry.

Mr. Bruce John Bayless	RPF No. 1652
Mr. Robert James Hubbell	RPF No. 34
Mr. Jon Douglas Kennedy	RPF No. 2232
Mr. James C. Denny	RPF No. 427
Mr. Christopher "Kip" Kelley	RPF No. 2175
Mr. Francis Marion Busby	RPF No. 158

Lost in the Woods

The individuals listed below are currently out of touch with the licensing program. If you see your name, or can help us with contact information for somebody else on the list, please contact Wendy at 916-653-8031 or by email to wendy.zampardi@fire.ca.gov. Remember, by regulation it is every registrant's responsibility to notify the licensing office within ten days of any address changes (14 CCR Section 1606, Professional Foresters Regulations).

Stephen Fitch	RPF No. 1143	James Mote	RPF No. 2430
Jack Hansen	RPF No. 563	Thomas Nelson	RPF No. 2201
John Henshaw	RPF No. 2075	John Pieper	RPF No. 1723
James Hordyk	RPF No. 1880	Lawrence Potts	RPF No. 917
Donald Huston	RPF No. 470	Michael Rice	RPF No. 662
Jeffrey Lindsey	RPF No. 2481	Michael Raysor	RPF No. 2153
George Lottritz	RPF No. 1191	Joel Segers	RPF No. 1943
Henry Martin	RPF No. 1567	Gwynne Sharrer	RPF No. 121
Robert Martin	RPF No. 2411	Michael Swezy	RPF No. 2111
		David Wise	RPF No. 2000

2010 Francis H. Raymond Award

The Board of Forestry and Fire Protection is pleased to announce that Mr. John R. Mount, RPF No. 114 will receive the *2010 Francis H. Raymond Award for Outstanding Contributions to California Forestry* at the July 7, 2010 Board Meeting.

The Board is recognizing Mr. Mount with its highest honor for his dedication to mentoring youth and educating the public about the benefits of forest management. Among Mr. Mount's many actions in support of California forestry was the commitment of himself and his entire forestry staff to the very first offering of the Northern California SAF sponsored "Forest Conservation Days." He subsequently went on to create "Forest Science Days" and "Local Forest Conservation Days" at his employer's 'Camp Edison' to educate elementary schoolchildren about forest stewardship. Mr. Mount has been a tireless supporter of three different chapters of the Society of American Foresters and helped establish the Central Sierra Historical Society.

Among many accolades over the course of his career, Mr. Mount was selected SAF's "Field Forester of the Year" in 2000 and remains the only professional forester to receive the Wildlife Society's "Conservationist of the Year" award in 2001. He was elected SAF Fellow in 1989.

Mr. Mount has served as Chair of the Forest Products Commission and has continued to support the Forest Foundation since the Commission was shuttered. He was a director of the Forest Landowners of California for ten years and is a life member of the American Forestry Association. He serves on advisory committees to Cal Poly SLO, Kings River Community College, and Sierra High School. Mr. Mount's history of civic involvement also includes service as President of the Shaver Lake Lions Club and Auberry School Board.

Quiz the Licensing Officer

I frequently respond to individual questions about the application of the Professional Foresters Law and thought it might be useful to share some of these questions and answers. If you have a question you'd like to see answered in another edition of Licensing News, please feel free to call or email me.

Question: What are the penalties for unlicensed practice of forestry?

Answer: the Professional Foresters Law, Public Resources Code Section 766 states that, *"On and after July 1, 1973, it shall be unlawful for any person to act in the capacity of, or to use the title of, a professional forester without being registered pursuant to this article, unless exempted from the provisions thereof."* The Law goes on to address disciplinary response against registrants only. The Title 14 Professional Foresters Regulations adopted by the Board likewise specifically address disciplinary review of those licensed as RPFs or CRMs (or any other prospective specialty adopted by the Board). In other words, there are no penalties for unlicensed practice specified in statute or regulation. The Board has attempted to remedy this somewhat by adoption of Policy No. 6 for Professional Foresters Registration which states as follows:

Complaints involving non-licensed persons using the title of, or acting in the capacity of a "Professional Forester" or "Certified Specialist" (such as Certified Rangeland Manager) without being registered, or otherwise exempted, are acting illegally (Public Resources Code Section 766) and are handled in a manner consistent with Policy 8.

Quiz the Licensing Officer Cont...

The Executive Officer may hire expert witnesses to review investigation results and establish prudent standards of conduct.

If the investigation, expert witness, or Executive Officer's evaluation show sufficient cause, the appropriate District Attorney General's office may be asked to prosecute the case. Such prosecution may be based upon unfair or unlawful business practices, or false and misleading advertising. Action against a non-licensed person may include the Civil Code of Procedure, Section 1029.8 which governs cost recovery and punitive awards in the case of damages caused by an unlicensed person.

What this means in practice is that I would have to be able to prove that an individual had been financially compensated for the illegal practice of forestry; that damage had been suffered by an individual and/or resource as a result of that unlicensed practice; and then convince a local District Attorney to file suit against that individual in order to collect a monetary award. Our crackerjack Deputy Attorney General's representative has advised that Policy 6 is virtually useless, and that case law does not favor the complainant where licensing law authority is murky.

I would only add that I can find no evidence to suggest that in our 37 years of history, there has ever been a case in which a complaint of unlicensed practice of forestry was prosecuted by a local district attorney. The standard course of action is to send a "cease and desist" letter to the offender and work to reconcile the issue through discourse. On occasion, the Deputy Attorney General's representative is brought in to assist in such efforts.

Question: Does the Professional Foresters Law apply in the Wildland Urban Interface?

Answer: It depends.

The *forested landscapes* definition in PRC Section 754 draws an imaginary line between tree dominated landscapes such as conifer forests and oak woodlands, and those that are, "...*not otherwise devoted to nonforestry commercial, urban, or farming uses.*" When it comes to creation and maintenance of a defensible space perimeter around a residential or related structure, that line is crystal clear. Creation of less-flammable space between vegetation and structures is not considered the practice of forestry. But, the point at which creation of defensible space on contiguous, undeveloped rural residential parcels becomes the domain of the RPF is a little less clear. It is for this reason that the Professional Foresters Examining Committee has advised that evaluation of the necessity for an RPF must occur on a case by case basis.

In general, when a project of some kind is intended to occur on an undeveloped parcel outside of an otherwise urban environment and that parcel clearly involves the manipulation of native tree cover—whether it be conifer, hardwood, or a mix—I will always advocate for RPF involvement in the project. For instance, when a local resource conservation district, open space district, or fire safe council proposes to do fuel treatments beyond the defensible space perimeter for infrastructure and pursuant to some sort of fuel treatment plan (a plan that should have been developed in consultation with an RPF), an RPF really should be involved. This does not preclude the involvement of other experts as well, but an RPF should be part of the team pursuant to our law.

Quiz the Licensing Officer Cont...

Folks commonly confuse the Forest Practice Act's (FPA) requirements with those of the Professional Foresters Law (PFL). One has to remember that the two laws are distinct and different: the FPA's definition of *timberland* [PRC Section 4526] is not the same as the PFL's definition of *forested landscape* [PRC Section 754]. Whether or not wood products will be commercialized from a project has no bearing on whether or not an RPF has to be involved. The PFL applies to ALL native forest types and not just commercial timberland.

For instance, an RPF recently asked me if fuels treatments in the WUI to support conversion of biomass and solid waste to synthetic diesel fuel would necessitate RPF involvement. If you're working in a native forest type of some kind and you plan to manipulate the cover for any purpose not related to establishment of an infrastructure-related defensible space perimeter, then regardless of the commercial opportunity I would be compelled to advocate for RPF involvement.

On a side note, there are open space districts that openly contest the application of the PFL and attempt to circumvent it by treating it as though it were just another part of the FPA. They argue that their tree cover manipulation activities are not for a commercial purpose therefore they don't have to hire an RPF. They're wrong and I'd like to think their day of reckoning is coming, but unless and until the PFL recognizes explicit penalties for unlicensed practice, there is little I can do except to encourage voluntary compliance.

Disciplinary Actions Report

Currently, there are a total of twelve (12) open disciplinary cases. Two cases remain in the probation stage; five are presently in the investigation phase; and three remain open to allow for ongoing review of respondent performance. One case of unlicensed practice has been satisfactorily resolved while two others remain open to allow for further dialogue.

The following case has been closed:

CASE NUMBER: 315

ALLEGATION:

The complaint alleged failures in the RPF's professional responsibility related to the authoring of a proposed Non-industrial Timber Management Plan (NTMP). Specifically, it was alleged that the RPF's work on the NTMP included numerous errors and omissions as detailed in a plan return letter issued by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

DISCIPLINE:

The Professional Foresters Examining Committee reviewed the respondent RPF's responses to the alleged failures identified in the complaint as well as additional correspondence from the complainant. Upon conclusion of this review, the PFEC determined that a failure of professional responsibility could not be sustained. The respondent RPF was **exonerated** and all parties were notified.

Important Notices and Announcements

~ The following memorandum from Deputy Director, Bill Snyder is reproduced here at the Department of Forestry & Fire Protection's request ~

To: ALL REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL FORESTERS

From: Bill Snyder
Deputy Director
Resource Management

Subject: **Forest Practice Rules for Emergency Notice Timber Operations Problems Related to Providing Notice to Native Americans**

The large numbers of Emergency Notices that were filed with the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) as a result of the June 2008 lightning caused wildfires raised concerns among some of California's Native American communities regarding potential for damage to cultural resources and notification procedures. One concern Native Americans raised is that the emergency notification process does not afford sufficient time to provide an effective response. The other concern relates to inconsistencies in the type of information contained in Emergency Notices (RM-67 or RM-65 forms) being sent to Native Americans. The purpose of this letter is to bring these concerns to your attention and request your assistance in addressing these points.

By way of background, the decision in the EPIC vs. Johnson lawsuit in 1985 found in favor of the plaintiffs on five key issues; one of these pertained to inadequate Native American noticing. The court ruled that CAL FIRE's failure to send notification of the plan to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was an error that constituted prejudicial abuse of discretion. This decision was precedent setting and has become case law. Since the decision, CAL FIRE and the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (Board) have worked cooperatively with the NAHC to develop effective and efficient Native American notification/review procedures. The overall intent of this process is to ensure that significant archaeological and historical sites are adequately identified and protected. Two key components of this process are accomplished by providing Native Americans with the opportunity to review proposed timber operations and providing an opportunity for the tribes to advise CAL FIRE and RPFs concerning cultural resources that could be impacted during project activities; especially information related to the presence of sites with significant cultural or religious importance to Native Americans that may only be identified through the consultation process.

To facilitate timely and meaningful notification to tribes and to allow for prompt salvage of damaged timber, the Board established specific rules for notification of operations conducted under Emergency Notices covering three acres or more in size. Under the provisions of these rules, RPFs are required to include a Confidential Archaeological Letter (CAL) to accompany an Emergency Notice submitted to the Director. At a minimum, the CAL must include:

- Archaeological Records Check information, (ref. 14 CCR §§ 929.1, 949.1, and 969.1(c)(2))
- A description of archaeological survey methods and procedures used during the archaeological survey of the area covered by the Emergency Notice, (ref. 14 CCR §§ 929.1, 949.1, and 969.1(c)(7))
- A list and description of all archaeological or historical sites identified within the area covered by the Emergency Notice, (ref. 14 CCR §§ 929.1, 949.1, and 969.1(c)(8))
- An Archaeological Coverage map or maps prepared in accordance with the specifications listed in the definition for such a map (ref. 14 CCR §§ 895.1, 929.1, 949.1, and 969.1(c)(9))

Native American Notice Memo Cont...

- A preliminary determination of significance if damaging effects to any site cannot be avoided, (ref. 14 CCR §§ 929.1, 949.1, and 969.1(c)(10))
- A description of specific enforceable protection measures, both within the site boundaries and within 100 feet of the site boundaries (ref. 14 CCR §§ 929.1, 949.1, and 969.1(c)(11)), and
- Site Records for all sites determined to be significant or those for which no determination of significance has been made. (ref. 14 CCR §§ 929.1, 949.1, and 969.1(c)(11))

Part of the confusion on the part of Native American contacts who are receiving information regarding proposed operations under Emergency Notices is that they are not always receiving a copy of the Confidential Archaeological Letter as part of the Emergency Notice. As specified in 14 CCR § 1052 (a)(10), the Emergency Notice includes a copy of the Confidential Archeological Letter. As such, RPFs are advised that when providing a copy of the Emergency Notice to the appropriate tribal contact, a copy of the Confidential Archaeological Letter, with the information listed above, must be included in order to comply with the rules.

Also, as noted in the introductory paragraph, timely notification is very important. CAL FIRE recognizes the importance of beginning timely salvage operations. Notwithstanding this objective, RPF's are encouraged to provide as much lead time as possible to the appropriate Native American contact(s) prior to submittal of an Emergency Notice to CAL FIRE. This is particularly important for areas that have not been previously evaluated under a Timber Harvesting Plan. RPF's are encouraged to mail the notice to Native Americans at the earliest opportunity. Preferably, this would be as soon as the field survey and records check have been completed and all the required information has been collected. In the transmittal letter, it would be helpful to explain that the notice pertains to Emergency Notice timber operations and that timber operations may commence within five days of receipt of the Emergency Notice by CAL FIRE. It would also be helpful to provide information regarding whom they should contact if they are aware of additional cultural resources that may require protection. Additionally, CAL FIRE, as appropriate, will be taking steps as part of its Emergency Response on large incidents to advise Native American contacts that timber salvage operations are anticipated.

CAL FIRE appreciates your review and careful consideration of this correspondence, and anticipates your continued compliance with the Forest Practice Rules for Emergency Notices. With improved rule compliance and incorporation of CAL FIRE's additional suggestions for communication with Native Americans, I believe the identified issues can be effectively addressed through an administrative process.

Feel free to contact Linda Pollack or Richard Jenkins, CAL FIRE's Senior State Archaeologists assigned to address this concern, if you have any questions. Linda can be reached at (559) 243-4119 or via email at Linda.Pollack@fire.ca.gov and Richard can be reached at (530) 224-4749 or via email at Rich.Jenkins@fire.ca.gov .

Coast Redwood Forest Science Symposium

Hold the Date: June 20 – 23, 2011

Location: Univ. of California, Santa Cruz

Policies and strategies guiding the use and management of California's coastal ecoregion are dependent on objective scientific information. Attention to this region has increased in recent years. At the same time, much new information has been collected. Each year the array of decisions affecting lands and natural resources in the redwood region carry more weight; evidence the recent interest in watershed assessment, fish and wildlife recovery efforts and silvicultural changes. This symposium is part of a continuing effort to promote the development and communication of scientific findings to inform management and policy decisions.



Audience: The conference is intended for anyone involved in the research, education, management, and conservation of coast redwood systems. This includes RPFs, landowners, community groups, land trusts, policy makers, forest managers, funding groups

Sponsored by:

- UC Berkeley Ctr. for Forestry and UC Div. of Ag and Nat. Res.
- Cal Poly San Luis Obispo Nat. Res. Mgt. Dept. and College of Ag., Food and Env. Sci;
- Humboldt State Univ. Forestry and Wildland Res. Dept. and College of Nat. Res. and Sci.

See: <http://ucanr.org/sites/redwood>

A Call for Papers will be announced in July, 2010

Sessions will include:

- Water & Watersheds
- Wildlife, Fisheries, Aquatic Ecology
- Forest Ecology
- Silviculture and Restoration
- Genetics & Regeneration
- Erosion, Physical Processes
- Economics, Policy, Social Sci.
- Forest Health (insects, disease, fire)
- Monitoring
- Climate & Atmosphere
- Carbon Storage and Cycles
- Community Forestry
- Forest Operations
- Wood Products, Utilization

Conference Organizers who can answer your questions:

- Rick Standiford, UC Berkeley standifo@berkeley.edu
- Doug Piirto, Cal Poly dpiirto@calpoly.edu
- John Stuart, Humboldt State jds2@humboldt.edu
- Greg Giusti, UC Coop. Ext. gagiusti@ucdavis.edu
- Yana Valachovic, UC Coop. Ext. yvala@ucdavis.edu
- Sherry Cooper, UC ANR slcooper@ucdavis.edu

Please Mark Your Calendars

Professional Foresters Examining Committee Meetings

- Meetings held in Sacramento; more information including meeting agendas and minutes may be found at:

http://www.bof.fire.ca.gov/professional_foresters_registration/.

Board of Forestry and Fire Protection Meetings

- Meetings held in Sacramento; more information including agendas and minutes may be found at:

http://www.bof.fire.ca.gov/board_business/.

Monitoring Study Group Meetings

- More information including meeting dates, agendas and minutes may be found at:

http://www.bof.fire.ca.gov/board_committees/monitoring_study_group/meeting_agendas/.

Range Management Advisory Committee Meetings

- Meetings held in Sacramento; more information including agendas and minutes may be found at:

http://www.bof.fire.ca.gov/board_committees/range_management_advisory_committee/.

California-Pacific Section - Society for Range Management Meetings

- For meeting dates and other Cal-Pac SRM information, please refer to the following website:

<http://www.rangelands.org/casrm/index.html>.

California Urban Forests Council Meetings and Events

- For meeting dates and other Council information, please refer to the following website:

<http://www.caufc.org/>.

Northern California Society of American Foresters Summer Meeting

- July 9-10, 2010, "Restoring Working Forests." More information may be found at:

http://norcalsaf.org/temparticles/Summer_2010_meeting_flyer_FINAL_0526.pdf.

Wildfire Awareness Week-Living with Fire in the Tahoe Basin

- July 9, 2010, "Wildland Urban Interface Fire Summit," Harvey's Casino, Stateline, NV. More information may be found at:

<http://www.livingwithfire.info/tahoe/index.php?click=nevadafireweek&id=276&details=on>.

2010 California Forest Pest Council Insect, Disease, Animal Damage, and Weed Committees Tour

- July 21-22 Placer, Yuba, Butte Counties near Auburn, CA. More information may be found at:

<http://caforestpestcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/05/2010-Weed-Tour-Announcement-3.pdf>

Deadline for October 22, 2010 RPF & CRM Examination Applications

- August 13, 2010. Prospective applicants with questions about their qualifications are encouraged to contact Eric Huff at 916-653-8031 or by email to eric.huff@fire.ca.gov.