# **RMAC ANNUAL PRIORITIES**

These are tied back to RMAC’s statutory mandates, which includes the annual review of current priorities, and incorporation of other advised agency priorities (e.g., CDFA, California Environmental Protection Agency [CalEPA], Board of Forestry and Fire Protection [Board], CNRA). Please review the priorities (called “objectives”) in the Annual Priorities section of the Strategic Plan. Below each listed priority, or any new ones you add, please note particular action items that could occur now (in 2022), OR in the future (and specify the timeframe). **Please use Track Changes.**

* **Promote appropriate grazing for fuels management and multiple ecosystem services.**

***Action Item/Objective:***

1. Development of templates for a grazing license and land management plan, and an accompanying Guidance Booklet, by the RMAC subcommittee on State Lands Grazing License and Land Management (SLGLLM)

* **Increase collaboration and joint educational opportunities for RPFs and CRMS**

To address potential bias in forestry community toward Registered Professional Foresters (RPFs) as being more suited to develop and implement burn plans than Certified Rangeland Managers (CRMs); there could be opportunities to rectify this, perhaps via combined training programs with both RPFs and CRMs to develop burn plans.

***Action Item/ Objective:***

* **Increase the number of CRMs, and utilization of them, in California**

Regarding the CRM program (Objective 2(a)), currently Registered Professional Foresters (RPFs) are developing burn plans and often not consulting with anyone that has range experience. Moreover, cattle producers are being asked NOT to graze for many months so that a burn can occur, and then are not being allowed to graze thereafter (often for several years). Invasive plants and land management are not being considered, and instead, the goal of just burning MORE acres remains the focus. Additionally, there are only 86 CRMs left in the State, and the RMAC needs to promote that program. CAL FIRE should be hiring CRMs and folks with range background in developing burn plans.

***Action Item/ Objective:***

* **Develop educational opportunities and outreach re: fuel reduction methods**

Grazing is considered a fuel reduction method in the State’s Wildfire Resilience Action Plan, so some coordination with CAL FIRE may be in order. Is there already existing infrastructure for this kind of communication and coordination, and if not, can we help facilitate that?

***Action Item/ Objective:***

1. RMAC annual educational workshop series

* **Develop research plan, and identify and procure funding sources**

Potential for the RMAC to develop research priorities and seek funding; this is related to Objective 4 (Monitor for issues in rangeland science and management); the RMAC could not just identify data gaps, but also help to fill them. Perhaps seek matched funding sources.

Potential for federal funding or collaborations as appropriate? Note the CDFA mandates under the FAC 7271 and 7273.

***Action Item/ Objective:***

* **Increase collaborations with related agencies and bodies,** including the California Natural Reserve System interactions between RMAC and the California Natural Reserve System and entities such as the California Rangeland Trust

***Action Item/ Objective:***

* **Water Pollution Regulation, Ground Water Regulation**

Develop white papers on this topic, as the industry needs more clarity as conditions change (Dept of Water Resources, Groundwater Sustainability agencies) – overlap with CDFA programs that fund pump efficiency upgrades on wells.

Is there anything that RMAC can do about the issue this year? Maybe not, but this could be part of a longer-term priority. There have been ongoing discussions between Dr. Wolf, Dr. Horney, and the Waterboards.

***Action Item/ Objective:***

* **Livestock Pass Program**

Some of these county programs are getting held up over discussions on terminology and definitions. Member Ross noted that the program at this stage is “worthless”, as the county-by-county designation of the pass makes it infeasible for livestock operators to cross county lines outside their pass zone during an emergency (note: many practitioners work in several counties, but the pass may only be valid in their county of residence). He believes there needs to be a change in the program to accommodate crossing over county lines.

Is there anything that RMAC can do about the issue this year? Maybe not, but this could be part of a longer-term priority.

***Action Item/ Objective:***

**Please send your comments to Dr. Wolf (**[**kristina.wolf@bof.ca.gov**](mailto:kristina.wolf@bof.ca.gov)**), and the annual priorities and objectives/action items for 2022 will be set and voted on at the next meeting if there is a quorum present.**