



etc. Chuck Pritchard cited the example where the student is being asked to cite genus and species of toxic species. He would prefer if the question asked what the common names are and under what conditions they are considered toxic.

Leonard Hale noted that rangeland economics on a federal lease is important in consideration of the other users that impact the resources important to the lessee such as damage to forage and roads. Scott Carnegie recommended issues such as easements, policy, regulations and guidelines be considered as test content.

Mike Connor observed that over the years the test may have been prepared by retired range managers that concentrated on the more traditional aspects of range management versus the subjects suggested by RMAC. Clancy Dutra countered with the comment that in his opinion the test is dominated by academic questions versus questions prepared by individuals that have experience managing a ranch.

Mike Connor thanked the RMAC for comment and stated that the next step would be to seek input to the CRM test content. Leonard Hale asked who should be approached by RMAC in order to have input to the exam questions. Mr. Connor responded that he assumes it would be the Professional Foresters Examining Committee (PFEC) and the Board.

Scott Carnegie asked if there is an action item to come from this discussion. Mike Connor referred to the proposed letter on today's agenda to the Cal- Pac SRM Certification Panel, and stated that the request for input should be made in this letter.

Continuing Education Units (CEU) for Certified Rangeland managers: Mel Thompson opened the discussion with a question to Mike Connor. He asked if a broader range of organizational subjects and courses could be included and/or taken advantage of for CRM credit. For example, if the Farm Bureau offered a course with broad applications over a variety of disciplines, is there a way to get it advertised and utilized by CRMs? Mike Connor stated that currently the CRM is expected to track their own credits and if ever asked provide a list of classes taken. He stated that it is possible to send recommended courses to the National SRM for consideration, but that this is not being formally encouraged. Ed Anchordoguy asked if the certification of for CEU ever runs out. Mike Connor stated yes 32 credits are required every two years.

Mike Connor stated that he has been communicating with the National SRM on the status of their CEU database. It is not fully operational as of his last communication.

Ed Anchordoguy stated that he is familiar with the International Society Arboriculture (ISA) and is a certified arborist. They require 30 hours of credit for a 3 year certification. An arborist must apply to the ISA for credit with pre-approved courses by the ISA. The ISA has books that can be read or tests that can be taken on line for credit as well. He also stated that he pays several hundred dollars per year to the ISA for administering the CEU program. Scott Carnegie noted that the Society of American Foresters has a similar service; however, there is no certification as a professional forester involved with completion of course work, merely a certificate stating that so many hours of CEU have been completed.

Ed Anchordoguy stated that the Department of Pesticide Regulation requires a very formal process of taking accredited courses for recertification as a licensed pest control advisor or applicator.

Clancy Dutra stated that one requirement of any record keeping should be proof of attendance. He noted one example that he is aware of where attendance at a course was claimed but did not actually occur.

Chuck Pritchard raised the issue of whether a certification process could be supported given the relatively few CRMs in the state compared to RPFs and other professional societies. Sufficient revenue may not be present.

Mel Thompson suggested a less formal process whereby any CRM could identify a course (say tax assessment) and advertise the course to other CRMs via email. The person overseeing the CEU program would then provide the accreditation. This would encourage broadening the skill level. Ed Anchordoguy stated that there is a risk of diluting the value of certification without a formal certification process. Mike Connor noted value in both approaches.

Mike Connor once again stated that the National SRM is developing a database to account for CEUs headed up by Leonard Jolly and due for completion this summer. He recommended that RMAC wait for the National database since the California Section of SRM will most likely want to see the national product before making any changes at the state level. Chuck Pritchard asked how the National product would work. Mike Connor stated that each CRM submits course work for consideration in the database.

Noelle Cremers asked for clarification between those courses that are submitted by the individual for CEU and those where individuals are signing enrollment sheets at courses endorsed by SRM. Mike Connor explained that if a CRM signs an enrollment sheet at an SRM endorsed course the credit for the course is reported to SRM using the enrollment sheets direct. In the case of the individual reporting attendance at a course that has not necessarily been endorsed by SRM the SRM must determine if the course qualifies for credit.

Mike Connor summarized the intended action as one where SRM Cal-Pac develops a more structured process for a CEU process. Currently it is a self regulating process. He stated that the language for this recommendation will be developed as part of the letter to the SRM Cal-Pac Section.

Ken Zimmerman asked Scott Carnegie if it would be useful for CRMs and the California Licensed Forester Association (CLFA) to open dialogue for the mutual benefit of both. Scott Carnegie responded that there exists a good deal of ignorance among the CLFA as to the existence of CRMs and that communication would be beneficial. Mel Thompson agreed with Ken Zimmerman that communication would be beneficial. Ken Zimmerman based his comment on the Forester's Licensing Law that is common to both disciplines.

Finalize draft letter to the Cal-Pac Society of Range Management Certification Panel: Mike Connor circulated a draft of the letter with comment from Mel Thompson contained within. The letter received several edits and was deferred for consideration at the Full RMAC meeting on September 19, 2007.

Item 4e Consider Re-opening of discussions with USFS and BLM regarding their requiring certification of range conservationists: RMAC in discussion elected to table this item until after the role of the CRM is better clarified with the development of the proposed Board Policy # 12.

**Item 5 Develop draft policy for Board of Forestry and Fire Protection consideration regarding clarification of the CRM specialty:**

A draft Policy 12 was distributed by Mike Connor. Mr. Connor and Mel Thompson clarified for RMAC that developing Policy 12 was suggested by Eric Huff in lieu of making modifications to the existing Board Policy # 11. Policy 12 would be solely dedicated to CRMs.

Discussion focused on suggested edits by Mel Thompson and others. Ken Zimmerman recommended that the definition of rangelands as it reads within the RMAC Strategic Plan should be adopted for Policy 12. RMAC agreed and the change was adopted.

Mel Thompson opened discussion on broadening the scope of the policy by using language which is not tied to terms such as “forested landscapes,” thus avoiding the limitations encountered under current Board Policy. Mike Connor noted that RMAC’s efforts should go beyond merely describing where CRM’s are appropriate and actually write policy that provides authority for enforcement for the use of a CRM. This led to statements by Mel Thompson and Chuck Pritchard that Eric Huff had agreed in a previous RMAC meeting that the approach should be to shift the requirement for use of a CRM as defined by canopy (vegetation) to the activity performed. Ken Zimmerman stated that the activities have been defined according to the definition of rangelands that include areas suitable for grazing and browsing animals.

Discussion returned to the point made by Mike Connor; whether the word required should be used when referencing the use of a CRM. Clancy Dutra stated that use of the word “required” in policy would likely result in objections from the producer group organizations represented by RMAC.

Eric Huff joined the discussion. Mike Connor asked Mr. Huff where it is specified in law the circumstances under which a CRM is required. Eric Huff responded by stating that there is an important distinction between requirements for a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) and a CRM. The RPF has additional law stated within the Professional Foresters Licensing Act that specifies where and when an RPF is required. There is no such law for a CRM. The requirements for a CRM can not be established without statute providing the authority.

J.R. McCollister noted that given the current law RMAC can not write policy which requires the use of a CRM; however, RMAC could write policy stating when it is appropriate and encouraged to use a CRM. Mel Thompson agreed. Eric Huff also agreed and stated that use of the word “required” would not be appropriate.

Mike Connor then clarified that if a person chose to not use a CRM on non-forested areas then there really is no avenue for any enforcement action. Eric Huff agreed. Jeff Stephens asked Eric Huff if an RPF were to practice the skills typical of a CRM, and it could be demonstrated that the RPF was acting outside the area of expertise and

therefore operating in a negligent manner, then the RPF could be taken to task by Licensing for violation of the Licensing Law. Mr. Huff responded in the affirmative. Mr. Huff also stated he could act upon say an electrical engineer providing range advice. That portion of the Foresters Licensing Law prohibiting such activity would apply and cease and desist orders could be issued. Also, he can take action upon individuals that represent themselves as CRM but are not in fact certified with the Board. The action would be letters instructing them to cease this activity and possibly violations under the Business & Profession Code.

Edits to the proposed Policy # 12 were completed during the remaining discussion and the document referred to the Full RMAC for consideration.

**Item 6, New and Unfinished Business**

None

**Item 7 Public Comment**

None

Meeting adjourned