

Minutes of July 26, 2011 Meeting  
CalPac Certification Panel  
Minutes of Open Session  
L. Ford, Chair: August 11, 2011

The panel met in Sonora at the UC Coop Extension office on July 26, 2011. Panel members present—Bush, Connor, Ford, Frost, Gustafson, Horney (by phone), Pearce. Guests—Ferrier and Huff (both by phone). Panel members absent—Bartolome.

## OPEN SESSION

### 1. Reports of Chairman and Secretary.

Ford explained the plan for the day, and the distinction between Open and Closed Sessions.

Approval of minutes from June 9, 2011 Open Session meeting in Davis—Connor moved and Bush seconded motion to approve draft minutes; vote of approval was unanimous.

Ford reported he has delayed compiling the updated memo with summary guidance on panel operations per the Bagley-Keene Act.

Huff reported that Breanna Owens passed the CRM exam, and is now listed as a CRM. Ford reported there's been an inquiry about applying to advance from ARM to CRM, and on taking the exam.

Horney reported he is continuing work on the CRM exam database, and is preparing the next exam for October 2011. He and Pearce are working on the reference list and study guide, and will send that to the panel for review.

**ACTION:** Bartolome to finalize minutes for posting. Ford to record and prepare minutes on this meeting. Ford to complete updated summary of Bagley-Keene Act guidance. Horney and Pearce to continue work on CRM exam and study guide, including developing an expanded list of qualifying range-related courses.

### 2. Continued discussion of CRM examination qualification criteria for substitution of education and experience.

Ford reminded the panel that at its last meeting it adopted new internal guidance for review of applications by reading the minutes on this topic. The panel discussed how to apply the substitutions, and what makes a significant division of opinions among the panel members. Ferrier suggested following the RPF applicant review model, which is not regimented, but reviews each case as distinct. They usually reach consensus, and do not have to rely on a majority vote. We asked what is the minimum education and experience to require, and decided to postpone that discussion until the next meeting.

**ACTION:** The panel will meet in closed session to review the applications previously declined, then determine how to inform the applicants and publicize generally.

### 3. Continued discussion of revised CRM Program Description

The panel reviewed proposed revisions to the CRM Program Description from Eric Huff. He proposed to include the revised description in Title 14 Professional Foresters Rules rather than keep it as a reference. The ARM part of program was removed. Huff and Ferrier explained the ARM isn't defined specifically enough to include in the foresters rules. The RPF program is considering an apprentice program, which might be a useful model for the ARM. The ARM should

be defined more specifically (such as what authority an ARM has, and how it leads to the CRM) and go through a review by PFEC and BOF, or made a separate program of CalPac. CalPac cannot be involved in appeals process. Huff replaced the appeal language with references to forest practices code. The discipline language clarified. Huff requests the panel assist him in developing language to specify discipline for unlicensed practice for future by new legislation proposals. Frost moved and Connor seconded motion to accept Huff's revisions, and to have the description incorporated into the foresters rules; vote of approval was unanimous. We agreed to postpone further discussion of the ARM until our next meeting.

**ACTION:** Ford will inform the CalPac President of this progress (after final decisions are made), and request eventual discussion of panel's recommendations at BOD meeting.

4. New and unfinished business. Ford described the need for additional help conducting the chair's business. The workload for all has increased. The persistent backlog of significant issues to resolve has been largely completed, but there's a new set of issues to take on. And we might have more applications to review if the new guidance on substitution of qualifications and challenging the exam works. Suggestions included appointing a co-chair, use sub-committees, increasing the size of the panel, asking for non-voting volunteers to assist

**ACTION:** Ford will prepare a memo on needs and recommendations. A sub-committee of Connor and Bush will take Ford's recommendations and investigate further.

5. Public comment—no members of the public were present.