

RANGE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

P.O. Box 944246
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460
Website: www.bof.fire.ca.gov
(916) 653-8007



RANGE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, July 21, 2022, 12:30 PM

Hybrid Teleconference and In-Person Meeting

ROLL CALL

RMAC Members Present

Chair Dr. Marc Horney
Vice Chair Rich Ross
Joel Kramer
Lance Criley
Dr. Paul Starrs
Cole Bush
Katie Delbar, ex officio member

RMAC Members Absent

Dr. Stephanie Larson – present virtually in capacity as a public participant
Billie Roney
Bart Cremers
Taylor Hagata
Andrée Soares

RMAC Staff

Dr. Kristina Wolf, Environmental Scientist

Department Staff

Curtis Yee, IT Manager, Technical Support

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.

Items are numbered by their corresponding Number on the agenda and documented below in order of their introduction during the meeting.

1) Call to Order, Webinar Format, and Roll Call – Dr. Kristina Wolf, Board Staff

See results of roll call, above. Dr. Wolf reviewed the webinar format and functionality.

2) Chairman’s Report – Dr. Marc Horney, Chair

Dr. Horney reported on his attendance at the most recent State Lands’ Grazing License and Land Management subcommittee and stated that Dr. Wolf provided the RMAC update in his stead at the Board of Forestry & Fire Protection (Board) meeting in July.

Dr. Horney also attended a meeting with CalCAN and Audubon regarding legislation SB 977, and he will report on that later in the meeting.

3) Approval of March and May 2022 meeting minutes – Dr. Wolf, Board Staff

Two adjustments to the roll call to correct attendance were made to the March meeting minutes. One minor revision was made to the March and May meeting minutes to correct the year from 2021 to 2022.

Motion by Member Starrs; seconded by Member Ross

Roll Call Vote:

Bush	Aye
Starrs	Aye
Kramer	Aye
Cremers	Absent
Roney	Absent
Criley	Aye
Larson	Absent
Soares	Absent
Ross	Aye
Hagata	Absent
Horney	Aye

The motion passes unanimously.

4) Update on proposed grant to fund educational program for California Certified Rangeland Manager (CRM) training – Dr. Susan Marshall, California Polytechnic State University, Humboldt

A PowerPoint introduction and pre-recorded video of a presentation by Dr. Susan Marshall was shared, and can be viewed online at [Susan Marshall RMAC presentation outline July 21](https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/bgtf2mgr/4-susan-marshall-rmac-presentation-outline-july-21_ada.pdf)¹ and [RMAC Susan Marshall Presentation on CRM Survey](https://screencast-o-matic.com/watch/c3i2FgV0sk)²; the presentation slides shown in the recorded presentation can be found at [CA RMAC](#)

¹ https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/bgtf2mgr/4-susan-marshall-rmac-presentation-outline-july-21_ada.pdf

² <https://screencast-o-matic.com/watch/c3i2FgV0sk>

[Certified Rangeland Manager Survey 2020-04-20](#)³. Main points from this presentation are as follows:

- In the Spring of 2020 Dr. Marshall made this presentation to the Certified Rangeland Manager (CRM) Panel (on the California Pacific Section of the Society for Range Management [Cal-Pac SRM]). Initially the survey was developed in 2019 to determine the level of CRM activity compared to retirement status, how many had sat for the exam, where they were working, their subject matter expertise, and other demographic information, as well as how the panel might assist in CRM workforce development, professionalism, and recruitment. The survey received 65 responses, and Dan Stapleton with the Board confirmed 78 CRMs at that time, so the response rate was about 83% for active CRMs. Highlights:
 - Most respondents stated that the CRM license was NOT required for their current paid position. UCCE used to have a policy requiring this for their livestock advisors, but the majority of places do not require this. 11 respondents worked for UCCE, 4 for NRCS, and several were retired. Specialties primarily included vegetation management, in addition to mapping, targeted grazing concerns, conservation planning, ranch planning, and more. Many CRMs had other certifications, including Registered Professional Foresters (RPF), licensed Pesticide Control Applicators (PCA), and the nation-wide range manager certification (SRM certification program). Most CRMs had a master's degree. About half of respondents had a degree in range management, with other degrees in more general natural sciences (e.g., biology ecology, earth science, wildlife, agriculture).
 - Some of the biggest challenges for consulting activities, 30% of respondents said they weren't working because they were retired or because other job duties were too pressing; so, as many as 40% of these respondents were not working as CRMs. This could mean that there are only about 30 active CRMs in the state. There are no continuing education requirements for the CRM program, but there is a willingness for some current CRMs to help provide that kind of training. The highest level of proficiency for ecological proficiencies were in annual grasslands and wetlands/watercourses/riparian areas.
 - The most important CRM needs per the survey included updates to the Cal-Pac SRM webpage, working with CAL FIRE to support them in their activities, develop continuing education requirements/curriculum, and more. There is a lot of desire for additional, ongoing training for CRMs, even if that cost CRMs money. More practical ranch experience, and more educational outreach were also an important component for CRM needs.
 - Conclusions include the need for the CRM panel to develop plans to respond to the above needs; and the panel should coordinate to address these needs with the CRM and CPRM/CRMC (SRM) programs,

³ https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/ja5f5jz4/4-ca-certified-rangeland-manager-survey-2020-04-20_ada.pdf

agencies and universities, and potential clientele. Last spring the CRM panel and Cal-Pac SRM did clarify their roles in the CRM program guidelines.

- Dr. Marshall also discussed a proposal related to increasing the number of CRMs in the state; the project proposal is summarized at [RMAC California Rangeland Education Project Summary](#)⁴. The proposal was sent to the USDA and NIFA (National Institute for Food and Agriculture) grant programs. The proposals were spurred on by conversations with Audubon, and the establishment of their Conservation Ranching Program which includes several kinds of certifications, such as the bird-friendly ranching certification (Audubon-certified). Various academic, governmental, NGOs, and private landowners are involved in developing, supporting, and promoting this proposal. This is a one-time \$30K grant to support travel to scientific meetings (support booths and listening sessions), research to identify strengths/weakness in California range curricula. Dr. Marshall created a crosswalk between educational requirements and universities with range programs, which can be found at [RMAC Draft Rangeland Education Crosswalk](#)⁵. The CRM study guide is also accessible at that website. Technical documents and literature to support range education can also be found at the [Rangelands Gateway](#)⁶ website. An additional panel will be developed to create learning tools and to assist folks in completing the educational requirements for the CRM exam, and to study for that exam. Lastly, the proposal includes the goal of developing a pilot place-based learning cohort in partnership with a working ranch and would be utilized to assist prospective CRMs as well. Outcome of this proposal will come end of September 2022.
- Question and Answer/Discussion
 - Member Starrs asked if there is any idea of what would be considered an optimal number of CRMs for the state of California given the current demand and what seems to be a fairly active upswing in the needs for this. Chair Horney responded: this is not an easy answer; there are maybe 20–30 active CRMs, and the level of activity for individuals could be very low. There has been a lot of question about what CRMs should be “used for”; the upswing in interest in targeted grazing is an obvious place where CRMs could be very valuable, and there would be a need for more CRMs to meet that need. There is legislation pending from Senator Laird’s office, SB 977, which was intended to provide funding through the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) for ranchers who want to do conservation related actions on their properties. The bill is currently in Senate Appropriations. There has been substantial advocacy from Calcian and partners for adding language about CRMs in that bill, but that was not approved by the Senator’s office. There also seems to be a need at the federal level for range certifications; for example, there have been at least two national forests and some NRCS offices that have failed to find range conservationists to fill positions. The

⁴ https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/nvnyrwz/4-california-rangeland-education-project-summary_ada.pdf

⁵ <https://rangesec.org/rangeland-careers-degrees/>

⁶ <https://docs.rangelandsgateway.org/>

grant proposed (above) could also support efforts to elucidate the needs for CRMs in the state.

- Larry Ford: Mr. Ford stated that these efforts are critical and wanted to remind the committee that owners of private land or managers working on federal lands are NOT required to have a CRM license. When it comes to consultants, many have licensed CRMs on their staff, and they do a lot of range consultation work that is meeting a fair amount of need. He does not feel the situation is as dire as maybe described. Dr. Marshall responded that Pelayo Alvarez from Audubon feels that there are a lot of landowners, maybe smaller landowners, that have little to no background in natural resource management; there is a lot of concern for these properties that need more management, but owners aren't sure how to manage them or where to find resources to do so; there is a concern that a lot of these lands are in the wildland-urban interface (WUI), and are a major concern for wildfire. Moreover, there is a need for diversity and inclusion in the professional consultant community as well. Mr. Ford responded: why hasn't Mr. Alvarez applied to be a CRM himself? Why have others who would also qualify not applied as well? Dr. Marshall: it is important to build a stronger foundation to make the educational requirements more available and accessible, and that could help encourage folks to apply for and take the CRM exam; that is, if we make it easier for them to access, they could participate.
- Member Bush: as a grazing practitioner, organizer of grazing efforts across multiple stakeholders, and a representative of the California Wool Growers Association, there is a huge opportunity for CRMs to get on-the-ground experience with targeted grazing efforts at scale. Member Bush has interest in becoming a CRM, but as an active professional, going back to college to meet the requirements is rather prohibitive.
- Chair Horney: the ongoing conversation on the CRM panel and elsewhere has been going on for years; the CRM panel is built by academics, and it reflects that. There are a few members of the panel that have suggested over the years that the bar on the CRM license requirements may be too high, or prohibitive, especially if practitioners did not take those college courses early on in their education. The CRM panel would likely welcome and benefit from this kind of conversation to solicit feedback on the requirements for taking the CRM exam.
- Member Delbar: to get your RPF you can come from the field and take a test and not have all the college background; it can be a difficult way to go, but people do go this route and are successful. Perhaps the CRM exam could also do this? Moreover, CAL FIRE does not have any CRMs (maybe one) in their ranks, and given its activity in using prescribed fire on rangelands, it is important to ensure proper understanding on things like removal of livestock, etc. to inform them on how livestock are integrated into the vegetation management practices is missing because CAL FIRE employees don't usually have that knowledge.

- Brian Shobe: Regarding SB 977⁷, I'll just note that we're still waiting for Senator Laird and Audubon CA to share the draft amendments they promised to address the feedback CalCAN and Cal-Pac SRM provided.
- Member Starrs: in academia, sometimes there is university resistance to field-based courses and field courses; the proposal discussed here could address that, and it could be important in the future for RMAC to recognize that in the field, on the ground training is extraordinarily important for individuals entering the field out of university. Chair Horney seconded this, and even at an institution that prides itself on learn-by-doing, retaining field courses is exceedingly and increasingly more difficult. The CRM panel might be able to help this situation by connecting bridges from the people who are managing lands to those who want to qualify for the CRM exam, particularly students coming out of university, especially those coming from non-agricultural backgrounds, which includes most students in agricultural majors, at least at Cal Poly.

5) Updates on Community Supported Grazing Summit, a workshop by the Ojai Valley Fire Safe Council, Community Environmental Council of Santa Barbara, and Shepherdess Land & Livestock – Chris Danch, Executive Director, Ojai Valley Fire Safe Council; and Cole Bush, owner-operator, Shepherdess Land & Livestock

Member Bush reported in lieu of partner Chris Danch, who was unable to join at this meeting as previously planned. The Ojai Valley has been developing a community supported grazing program with multiple stakeholders, and they have stitched together parcels throughout the community to manage vegetation with prescribed grazing around the corridor of the town. In response to increased demand and need across the state, they have been working on developing a transferable framework that could be used by other communities to adapt to their situations for a similar kind of community-supported grazing program. On April 8th in Ojai there was a Summit bringing together over 30 managers, individuals from land conservancies, tribal members, and grazing practitioners, among others, to continue working to develop this program and make it transferable for other regions and communities. The goal is to increase local capacity for funding and implementing local and regional projects to manage vegetation for wildfire mitigation and risk reduction, particularly in areas critically needing treatment. The program focuses on economic development, public education, ecological restoration, community resilience, and promoting fire-safe communities. They look forward to sharing more as this effort progresses. A link to the Community Environmental Council of Santa Barbara's summary of the event from their blog, "All Hooves On-Deck"⁸ is online. The council documented all the outcomes from the Summit, and they will compile that in a written report or summary of takeaways from the Summit and plans for a regional Summit are being developed to continue to develop efforts for this transferable framework. Funding sources are being pursued. Chris Danch will report on the next summary of progress.

⁷ https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB977

⁸ https://cecsb.org/blog/grazing-summit?utm_source=CEC+Supporters&utm_campaign=0e444b6840-Newsletter-2022-05&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_d09a19fbeb-0e444b6840-247746328

6) Bilingual Grazing Manager Training – Cole Bush, owner-operator, Sheperdess Land & Livestock

Member Bush announced a pilot program series for Bilingual Herder/Manager training, specifically to address the needs for bilingual training of practitioners for both sheep and goats, but also cattle, as they implement targeted grazing projects. Topics will also include ecological considerations such as native plants identification, business and leadership acumen, etc. Partners include Kaos Sheep Outfit, Fibershed, and Sheperdess Land & Livestock, with support by the California Audubon Society and the Hopland Research and Education Center (HREC). Rosie Bush and Pelayo Alvarez will be the instructors at the first training. The series will be on Aug 26th from 8 AM–4 PM at HREC in Hopland. Advertisements can be found on the RMAC webpage under Meeting Materials.^{9,10,11}

Larry Ford indicated his support for this kind of training on all rangelands, including some forestlands. He proposed we directly appeal to the governor and CAL FIRE to describe the urgent need for these kinds of trainings to better support vegetation management. Prescribed burning alone will never be sufficient, and must be combined with prescribed grazing, which is one of the most important tools that can be used at this time to achieve these goals.

7) Draft presentations for grazing license, land management, and guidance booklet templates produced by the Subcommittee on State Lands Grazing Licenses and Land Management (SLGLLM) – SLGLLM sub-Committee Action Team leads

The SLGLLM committee provided brief presentations of the draft documents produced thus far.

The SLGLLM sub-committee is composed of the following experts and smaller Action Teams within the committee:

- Guidance Booklet Action Team: Member Katie Delbar and Tracy K. Schohr
- License Action Team is composed of Member Rich Ross, Member Bart Cremers, and Kevin Conway
- Land Management Plan Action Team: Larry Ford, Member Lance Criley, and Jeanette Griffin.
- Tony Psihopaidas is a member of the Department of General Services (DGS).

Ms. Schohr provided the draft summary for the Guidance Booklet. She has been working with the full sub-committee to produce a packet to support primarily state land managers, and the practitioners grazing on those lands. The draft documents produced thus far are still in a high-level form but will be more refined over the next month. The committee has worked with DGS as well to ensure that the documents will comply with their protocols and requirements. The draft document is available online.¹²

⁹ https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/uzck0mtp/6-bilingual-grazing-mgr-training-project-overview_ada.pdf

¹⁰ <https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/svvpctze/6-capacitacio-n-de-pastores.png>

¹¹ <https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/o41o3orw/6-grazier-training-flyer.png>

¹² https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/dpmpqq2r/7-a-grazing-guidance-document-outline_ada.docx

Comments can still be sent to the committee by emailing them to Kristina.Wolf@bof.ca.gov.

Member Ross stated that he is not sure that the documents should include links to non-state sources of literature, and is concerned about documents being referenced, for example, like those coming out of the Savory Institute, and other potentially controversial documents.

Member Ross summarized the Grazing License draft and indicated that the preface in this document also helps to explain why this kind of document was produced in the first place: large ungulates in California have been replaced by domestic livestock, but with anti-grazing sentiment and increased wildfire concerns, support for developing grazing plans for vegetation management is increasingly important, and can enhance habitat and reduce fuel loads. The idea is to assist agencies in developing these documents, because many state agencies do not feel equipped to develop and implement a grazing license or land management plan. The grazing license is available online.¹³ Member Larson added that there are additional resources out there that describe developing a lease, such as the one that she and Larry Ford wrote together; those links could be embedded within this document when developing leases on public lands. Ms. Schohr indicated that is included in the Guidance Booklet. Member Delbar stated that additional information needs to be included about logistical planning as well, including information on season of grazing, exclusion of grazing, and rest periods; Member Ross seconded that comment.

Mr. Ford commented that all of the documents also need to be in sync and provided a summary on the Grazing/Land Management Plan (GLMP), and continued with a summary of the GLMP, which can be found online.¹⁴

An introduction is provided in the draft document, and then goes into the main content of the plan outline. He stated that livestock grazing can be a practical and logical tool for most California landscapes, but it won't necessarily be beneficial if it is not planned and implemented thoughtfully. The challenge is integrating targeted grazing objectives with conventional livestock management objectives so that the grazing program is sustainable and includes co-considerations for things like native/invasive plants, wildlife habitat, soil impacts, etc. **He recommended that RMAC take the lead on developing a separate webpage with links to highly regarded examples of grazing management plans.** The plans should include explanations for how grazing will be managed for these purposes; should include references to and be complementary to any other plans (Habitat Conservation Plans, Resource Management Plans, Timber Harvest Plans, etc) that apply to that parcel of land. Some kind of monitoring should be conducted, both by the grazing operator but also the agency personnel and needs to be described in the GLMP. Requirements for a CRM should also be addressed, if needed. The outline includes the main sections that the Action Team felt should be addressed in a GLMP at a minimum, with flexibility built in to accommodate limited resources.

Member Ross commented that an Environmental Impact Statement is often customarily required for potential projects, and often the project proponents must foot

¹³ https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/mc1deote/7-b-license-draft-2022-07-19_ada.docx

¹⁴ https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/hkqngpf1/7-c-land-mgmt-plan-draft-2022-06-24_ada.docx

the bill for that, which is likely prohibitive for most grazing practitioners. Mr. Ford responded that often ranchers can get assistance from NRCS or a local RCD for this. Chair Horney indicated that for many state lands, and perhaps all, often this has already been done, so this should not be an issue most of the time. In the coming year, the RMAC may ask other state agencies to report on the management plans that currently exist on some state lands' parcels.

Member Griffin stated that State Parks typically do not have grazing on their properties, and they were invited early on to join this committee, but they did not join or participate in this process. They don't allow grazing unless the property has a historic record of grazing. This is a departmental issue, but ideally, they could take the templates developed and use them.

Members of the public may submit public comment on these documents once the 30-day public comment period is opened. Comments may be submitted by email to Kristina.Wolf@bof.ca.gov. Once the comment period closes, Dr. Wolf will compile all comments and send them to each Action Team, which will address those comments in revised drafts. DGS will then review those documents, and send comments to the Action Teams, which will have time to address those comments. The revised draft documents will then be presented at the next meeting of SLGLLM, which will be set for a few weeks from now. Finally, the documents will be shared at an RMAC meeting. If the RMAC agrees they are ready to go to the Board, they will be sent to the Board for their review at the subsequent Board meeting, and revisions may be requested at that time.

8) Educational Series Workshop Planning – Dr. Horney, Chair, and Dr. Wolf, Board Staff

The compiled list of proposed educational workshop series topics was shared,¹⁵ and the Chair provided his own input on that list.¹⁶ Chair Horney felt that if the SLGLLM process was sufficiently completed by the fall, then perhaps the workshop could revolve around that, with the focus being a prescribed grazing management plan. At the last meeting, there was some interest in doing a workshop followed by a field day at one or multiple locations in the state. Additional topics proposed included a workshop about the \$200 million dedicated by the Governor for fuels treatments, and where those funds are going to be allocated and how practitioners or landowners might tap into those resources. The CWGA survey regarding prescribed grazing was also included as a potential topic. The public's attention seems to be largely focused on fuels and fire, so perhaps a focus on prescribed grazing for fuels management would be appropriate for this year's workshop.

Dr. Wolf proposed forming an Action Team for planning the workshop series. Dr. Horney volunteered to be one member of this Action Team, and also suggested that Member Kramer be a member as well.

The Chair motioned that the RMAC form a subcommittee (or Action Team) of two to three individuals, or up to four from the RMAC, provided Bagley-Keene Act

¹⁵ https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/0lojpn5r/8-a-workshop-topics-july-2022_ada.docx

¹⁶ https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/wmvolxkc/8-b-workshop-topics-july-2022-rev-from-chair_ada.docx

requirements are observed. Member Bush seconded the motion (as did Member Larson, but she was attending as a public attendee at that time).

Roll Call Vote:

Bush	Aye
Starrs	Aye
Kramer	Aye
Cremers	Absent
Roney	Absent
Criley	Aye
Larson	Absent
Soares	Absent
Ross	Aye
Hagata	Absent
Horney	Aye

The motion passes unanimously. An email will be sent out to request volunteers for this sub-committee/Action Team.

9) Establish RMAC Annual Priorities and Strategic Plan update (2025) – Dr. Horney, Chair

The compiled list of proposed annual priorities was shared,¹⁷ and the Chair provided his own input on that list.¹⁸ Dr. Horney briefly reviewed some of the priorities and objectives. Chair Horney highlighted the idea of collaborating more with RPFs, and perhaps the RMAC could invite an RPF to come to the RMAC meetings and engage with the committee, members, and stakeholders. Member Starrs noted that one person on Dr. Marshall’s list of CRMs was both a CRM and an RPF. Member Larson also clarified that there are currently 83 certified CRMs; Dr. Wolf stated that nobody took the CRM exam in April 2022.

Chair Horney stated that a demonstration fuels management project could be developed in collaboration with an RPF and a CRM. Member Ross mentioned Swain Mountain Experimental Forest could serve as an important location for this project, as it has little management and desperately needs land and fuels management.

Finally, Chair Horney highlighted the CRM registration and licensing process as being a critical issue; perhaps the CRM and RPF licensing exams could include some common content, which could serve to build connections between RPFs and CRMs. Member Ross noted that many of the forests have been managed such that the density is so high, they are at high risk of wildfire; to that point, RPFs need cross-training with CRMs. Member Delbar also noted a lack of logistical understanding on the part of RPFs, and when they manage those landscapes, often there are difficulties with the directives given by RPFs for managing livestock.

Dr. Wolf shared that the RMAC does not need to update the Strategic Plan until 2025 (start end 2024), so these priorities would be for 2022 and 2023. Dr. Wolf will send the revised version from the Chair to all RMAC members, who will have time before the

¹⁷ https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/pw3plt11/9-a-annual-priorities-july-2022_ada.docx

¹⁸ https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/hjpjaxu3/9-b-annual-priorities-july-2022-rev-from-chair_ada.docx

next meeting to go through Marc's suggestions and the current revised list of priorities and may send comments to Kristina.Wolf@bof.ca.gov within two weeks. The annual priorities and objectives will be discussed and voted on at the next meeting, assuming there is a quorum.

10) Discussion of Developing a Program for Funding, Promoting, and/or Supporting Rangeland Research – Dr. Wolf, Board Staff

Dr. Wolf stated that there has been some discussion regarding the possibility of securing a source of funding (potentially recurring, or one-time) to support RMAC activities, such as funding to:

- Implement educational workshops
- Hire student interns, graduate students, or state agency personnel for necessary research/review papers
- Seed money for research projects (e.g., CRM state needs? Range research?)

The RMAC is lacking a source of funds, and succinct and clear plans for where and how funds would be allocated. These need to be very clearly stated and supported in a proposal to the Board, other departments, or legislators, depending on the proposed source of funding.

This should be of interest to the Board, as there is an obvious connection between wildfires starting in range and spreading to forest, and thus a clear connection between RMAC and AB 1492 Timber Regulation and Forest Restoration Program). **Member Delbar stated that the Board should have a field day visiting rangelands to demonstrate the need for this kind of work and funding.** Josh Davy and Larry Forero were referenced as potential sources for finding locations for this. Please send comments on this to Kristina.Wolf@bof.ca.gov.

11) Updates from Partner Organizations & Public Forum

a) Legislative Updates

- i. SB 977 (Laird) California Conservation Ranching Incentive Program: Passed unanimously in Senate May 25th; passed unanimously in the Assembly on June 28th and referred to Appropriations Committee for a hearing set August 3rd, 2022. The Appropriations Committee is responsible for passing appropriation bills, which have a fiscal impact and regulate expenditures of money by the government; these can include bills that appropriate money, result in substantial expenditure of state money, or result in a substantial loss of revenue to the state.

“This bill would, upon an appropriation by the Legislature, establish the California Conservation Ranching Incentive Program. The bill would require the board [the WCB] to administer the program to award block grants to eligible entities, as defined, to administer, plan, and implement local programs to enhance and or restore California’s nonpublic private rangelands, grazing lands, and grasslands by contracting with landowners or lessees for projects to implement conservation ranching practices, as specified. The bill would require the board to prioritize block grants that result in projects that meet specified criteria, develop program grant

guidelines and would require the board and any program grantee, in evaluating proposed projects, to consider specified selection criteria. The bill would authorize permit the board to authorize a block program grantee to use not more than 30% of the block grant moneys for specified administrative and outreach purposes relating to the program.”

ii. Budget:

1. Agricultural Lands: Livestock Producers: Managerial Employees: Livestock Pass Program: Disaster Access to Ranch Lands (AB 1103) – Based on a legislative and Administration compromise, an increase of \$60,000 General Fund one-time in 2022-23 to implement the training curriculum for livestock producers eligible for the livestock pass program and to comply with the requirements of Chapter 609, Statutes of 2021 (AB 1103). A statutory change was made through SB 178 to change the date by which the curriculum will be made available from January 1, 2023 to July 1, 2023.
2. Wildfire and Forest Resilience Package – The Governor's Budget included a package of investments that targets the state's wildfire risks, including \$50 million General Fund in 2021-22 and \$105 million General Fund in 2022-23 for CAL FIRE, as a part of a comprehensive package to increase the pace and scale of forest health activities and reduce wildfire risk.
3. Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force (SB 456) – An increase of \$2.2 million General Fund and two positions starting in 2022-23 to implement the operational requirements of the Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force and will enable CAL FIRE to implement and comply with Chapter 387, Statutes of 2021 (SB 456).

b) Updates from Partner Organizations

- Member Bush reported that the CWGA Annual Conventions is coming up next month, and on the first day (the 25th) there is a section on Targeted Grazing.
- Member Kramer reported on behalf of California Resource Conservation Districts.
 - The Napa Resource Conservation District (RCD) has contributed to a UC Davis study on carbon sequestration and grazing.
 - The Ventura RCD reported on the Community Supported Grazing program that Member Bush reported on at this meeting.
 - The Sonoma RCD was awarded \$120K to distribute funds for six different grazing projects, and to support smaller projects for infrastructure.
 - The Department of Food and Agriculture has released a funding opportunity, Beginner Farmer Training Program
 - The Grazing School of the West is developing a grazing program for educational outreach on grazing in urban environments.

- John Austel, the partner in San Diego on a demonstration project, has been asked by the California Cattlemen's Association to be the chapter president.

c) Public Forum

- Mike Garabedian commented that in 1981 a senator had a bill that required all state agencies to report on their vegetation management activity, and upon compiling them, Mike was very surprised at how many there were. Member Starrs commented that would be very useful information to have. If anyone has information on this, they can submit it to Kristina.Wolf@bof.ca.gov.
- Debra Leon commented that as a concerned resident, she is interested in catastrophic wildfire in her own neighborhood in San Diego. A contract grazer came in and very successfully grazed one of the most high-risk areas in the community. As an individual, she wants to know, is it possible to just find an area of concern and say this area needs to be grazed? How to connect the need to the practitioner for grazing? She thanked the committee for all the good work that is being done by the RMAC and associated committees, and the RCD in San Diego. Chair Horney stated that this would be a good general topic at addressing at a public workshop. Member Starrs stated that there are several entities that have done research into this kind of interagency-private land-other entities collaborating on coordinated responses to increasing wildfire hazard and wildfire management.

The next RMAC meeting will be determined by poll emailed to the committee members.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 3:30 PM.