

**Board of Forestry and Fire Protection**

**FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS (FSOR), pursuant to GOV §11346.9(a)**

**“REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL FORESTER AND CERTIFIED SPECIALTY AMENDMENTS, 2019”**

**Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (14 CCR),  
Division 1.5, Chapter 10:**

**Article 1, 2 & 4**

**Amend: §§ 1600, 1601, 1602, 1610, 1612, 1612.1, 1612.2, 1613, 1614, 1620, 1650,  
1651,**

**Adopt: §1611.5**

**UPDATE OF INFORMATION CONTAINED IN ISOR (pursuant to GOV §11346.9(a)(1))**

No information contained in the Initial Statement of Reasons (ISOR) requires an update. All material relied upon was identified in the ISOR and made available for public review prior to the close of the public comment period.

**SUMMARY OF BOARD’S MODIFICATIONS TO 45-DAY NOTICED RULE TEXT AND INFORMATION REQUIRED PURSUANT TO GOV §11346.2(b)(1)) (pursuant to GOV §11346.9(a)(1))**

The rule text was adopted in its 45-Day noticed form.

**MANDATE ON LOCAL AGENCIES AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS (pursuant to GOV §11346.9(a)(2)):**

The adopted regulation does not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts.

**COST TO ANY LOCAL AGENCY OR SCHOOL DISTRICT WHICH MUST BE REIMBURSED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPLICABLE GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS COMMENCING WITH GOV §17500 (pursuant to GOV §11346.9(a)(2)):**

The adopted regulation does not impose a reimbursable cost to any local agency or school district.

**ALTERNATIVE 3, BOARD’S ADOPTED ALTERNATIVE (update, pursuant to GOV §11346.9(a)(1)), of information pursuant to GOV §11346.2(b)(4)): Adopt Rulemaking Proposal as Modified Through Formal Public Review and Comment Process**

The Board selected Alternative #3 as proposed and modified through the formal public review and comment process. The Board adopted the rule text published with the 45-Day Notice (on March 8, 2019).

The proposed action is the most cost-efficient, equally or more effective, and least burdensome alternative. Alternatives 1 and 2 would not be more effective or equally effective while being less burdensome or impact fewer small businesses than the proposed action. Specifically, alternatives 1 and 2 would not be less burdensome and equally effective in achieving the purposes of the regulation in a manner that ensures full compliance with the authorizing statute or other law being implemented or made specific by the proposed regulation than the proposed action. Additionally, alternatives 1 and 2 would not be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed and would not be as effective and less burdensome to affected private

persons than the proposed action, or would not be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law than the proposed action. Further, none of the alternatives would have any adverse impact on small business. Small business means independently owned and operated, not dominant in their field of operations and having less than 100 employees.

### **ALTERNATIVES DETERMINATION (pursuant to GOV §11346.9(a)(4) and (5))**

No other alternatives have been proposed or otherwise brought to the Board's attention, except as set forth in the ISOR and provided herein in the summary and responses to comments. Based upon the findings below and a review of alternatives the Board has determined the following:

- No alternative considered would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulation was intended.
- No alternative would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the adopted regulation.
- No alternative would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law. (reference ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS in ISOR)
- No alternative considered would lessen any adverse economic impact on small business. (reference ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS in ISOR)

### **FINDINGS (BASED ON INFORMATION, FACTS, EVIDENCE AND EXPERT OPINION) TO SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVES DETERMINATION**

- The Board finds that the existing regulations related to the implementation of the Professional Foresters Law regarding Registered Professional Foresters (RPFs) and Certified Specialties may lack clarity.
- The Board finds that the Professional Foresters Law authorizes the Board to promulgate and amend regulations related to RPFs and Certified Specialties (PRC §§ 751, 759, 772, and 778).
- The Board finds that the adopted alternative is necessary to provide clarity in the regulatory provisions applicable to both RPFs and Certified Specialists. Additionally, the adopted alternative is necessary to improve the clarity of existing regulations with regards to the disciplinary process and professional standards and responsibilities for RPFs, the Certified Rangeland Manager specialty and any future Certified Specialties that may be approved by the Board for a private society or public agency.
- The Board finds that the adopted alternative improves the functioning of the disciplinary process for RPFs and CRMs and clearly defines the organizational framework for any future Certified Specialty.

- The Board also finds that the adopted alternative promotes fairness and equity through a clearly defined, efficient, and improved professional disciplinary process.
- The Board finds the adopted alternative fulfills the obligations of the Board, specified in statute, and represents a product based upon compromise and the greatest degree of consensus achievable at the time the Board authorized noticing of these amendments.

**BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED (update, pursuant to GOV §11346.9(a)(1)), of information pursuant to GOV §11346.2(b)(4))**

**Alternative 1: No Action**

The Board considered taking no action, but the “No Action” alternative was rejected because it would not address the problems.

The Board rejected this alternative as it does not address the existing issues of clarity which are present within the existing regulations. Additionally, this lack of clarity may affect not only existing certified specialties, but any future certified specialties which may exist in the future.

**Alternative #2: Make Existing Regulation Less Prescriptive**

This action could include greatly simplifying the Registration of Professional Foresters Rules, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 10 and create one standard regulatory section for all Registered Professional Foresters and Specialty Certificates.

This alternative was rejected because the existing statutory requirements for the registration of professional foresters and Certified Specialists are too disparate for unification. Statute does not allow for a public agency or professional society to submit an independent certification program for professional foresters, but this is the basis of the Certified Specialist program.

**SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (pursuant to GOV 11346.9(a)(3))**

The comments below are identified in the following format: The letter S or W followed by a series of numbers separated by a hyphen, followed by the name and affiliation (if any) of the commenter (e.g. W1-8: John Doe, Healthy Forest Association).

S: Indicates the comment was received from a speaker during the Board hearing associated with the Notices of Proposed Action.

W: Indicates the comment was received in a written format.

1st number: Identifies the comments in the order in which it was received.

**WRITTEN COMMENTS AND RESPONSES RESULTING FROM 45-DAY NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING PUBLISHED MARCH 8, 2019**

**Comment W1-1: Mindy Nicoletti, President, Cal-Pac SRM, and Susan Edinger**

**Marshall, Chair, CRM Panel, Cal-Pac SRM**

“Our organization has reviewed the Board of Forestry’s proposed amendments to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (14 CCR, Division 1.5, Chapter 10). We wish to express our support for the amendments as proposed and agree with the Board of Forestry’s assessment that these changes provide important clarity regarding the regulatory provisions and disciplinary process applicable to Registered Professional Foresters (RPFs), Certified Rangeland Managers (CRMs), and potential additional Certified Specialists.

Thank you for the consideration and attention you have paid to this matter.”

**Board Response:** The Board appreciates the Support of Cal-Pac SRM.

**Rule Text Change:** No.

<p><b>VERBAL COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE INITIAL HEARING CONDUCTED MAY 9, 2019</b></p>
---

**SUMMARIZE HEARING COMMENTS HERE**