

These minutes were authored by Grey Hayes, Elkhorn Slough Coastal Training Program. They were circulated for review over email and comments were received by Richard Morris; his suggested corrections were incorporated into the minutes. Any additional corrections/suggestions would be welcomed by the author. The minutes will be approved at the next Steering Committee meeting.

There were 18 participants present:

Last, First	Organization
Alvarez, Pelayo	California Rangeland Conservation Coalition
Barry, Sheila	UC Cooperative Extension
Bartolome, James	UC Berkeley
Devers, Joanna	Big Sur Land Trust
Dorrance, Steve	The Dorrance Family Ranch
Ford, Lawrence	Consultant
Hayes, Grey	Elkhorn Slough Coastal Training Program
McLaughlin, Blair	UC Santa Cruz
Morris, Anne	Baumgartner Ranch
Morris, Joe	T.O. Cattle Company
Morris, Richard	Baumgartner Ranch
Mountjoy, Daniel	NRCS
Olstein, Daniel	The Nature Conservancy
Rao, Devii	Gold Ridge RCD
Rutherford, Rob	Cal Poly SLO
Schohr, Tracy	California Rangeland Conservation Coalition
Work, George	The Work Ranch

Agenda

1. Review Business Plan – Rich Morris
2. Update on Outreach Contract – Daniel Olstein
3. CCRC x UC support – Rich Morris
4. Fund raising – Rich Morris
5. Roles and Responsibilities of CCRC participants – Grey Hayes
6. Internal Communication tools – Daniel Olstein
7. CCRC x CRCC cooperation – Rich Morris
8. CCRC General Meetings Scheduling – Grey Hayes
9. Sonoma meeting with CCRC – Grey Hayes (with Devii)
10. Monitoring Update – Larry Ford
11. Research proposal – Blair McLaughlin
12. Researcher protocol – Grey Hayes

13. Coastal Training Program events – Grey Hayes
 - a. PRBO work
 - b. Water quality
14. CCRC work with federal and state agencies – Grey Hayes
 - a. DFG, State Parks, BLM, Forest Service....
15. Performance-based indicators project with Winrock – Daniel Mountjoy
16. Schedule next meeting – Daniel Olstein
17. Management monitoring update – Sheila Barry

1. Business Plan Update – Rich Morris

There are 3 parts of the business plan as it stands: 1) an introduction, which is on hold awaiting completion of Glen Martin's contract – his language will largely serve as the introduction; 2) a section on what we are doing and where we are going; 3) a review of research and scientific findings, and; 4) staff needs (including job descriptions), budget and funding needed..

There was discussion about also needing an education and outreach section.

There was more discussion about the purpose of the plan. Although in part this document should be used for fund raising, the group agreed that the document would be helpful as an internal communication tool for keeping the group on track for its overall goal(s).

Joe reminded the group of the need to address the CCRC's 'weak links.' The business plan has that potential insofar as it: 1) creates a means to focus ideas and catalyze awareness in the larger community, and; 2) plans for a way to market products, CCRC and its indicators project.

The group agreed to make the holistic goal that the group already created more evident and at center of the business plan.

The group conferred with Tracy about how the CRCC progressed with its business planning. She notes that their group created a business plan in order to secure its initial funding (2 years ago), but that the group quickly grew out of its plan and is in the process of updating it, which should occur in the near future. Their current business plan does not well describe the group's current situation.

The group supports furthering and improving the plan and was thankful for Rich taking the lead.

ACTION: Rich will continue to flesh out the business plan with BSLT help. Future drafts of the business plan will refer more explicitly to the group's holistic goal.

2. Update on Outreach Contract – Daniel Olstein

Daniel reviewed the original scope of work for the contract, which included 4 written products. Glen Martin is the contractor that was hired; he completed drafts of all the documents required in the contract. These have been circulated to our network, and the CCRC has given limited feedback to Glen. Because of concerns about the amount of work still needed to complete satisfactory documents, the group has since narrowed the scope for the remaining products to two documents: a one page document introducing the CCRC and a set of profiles of the CCRC membership. The latter now includes profiles of George Work and Joe Morris, though the group hopes to include one or two more in the final product.

Because of the need to have these products sooner than later, the group directed Daniel to help complete the contract by mid-July, soon after Glen returns from vacation.

ACTION: Daniel will work with Glen to finalize the contract in July, including more work on the profiles.

3. Fund raising – Rich Morris

Rich gave the group an overview of the current status of fund raising for the CCRC, the goal of which is to acquire sufficient funding to hire an administrator and continue the Indicator monitoring project for 3 years, during which time the group would become more financially sound. There was some concern in the group that the grant also explicitly contain funding for outreach and education.

The Big Sur Land Trust is working actively with the CCRC to create a business plan (see above) and then to approach the Hewlett Foundation for funding; the Packard Foundation may be a back up funding source if the former does not materialize. Rich notes that Peggy McNutt may have additional ideas for funding sources. The group continued to support this focus and thanked Rich and the Big Sur Land Trust for this work.

ACTION: Rich will work with BSLT to complete funding application after completion of business plan.

4. CCRC x UC support – Rich Morris

Rich reviewed the results of a recent meeting where Larry Ford, Grey Hayes, Lynn Huntsinger, James Bartolome, and he met in Berkeley to discuss more formal support from UC of the CCRC (eg., a letter of support for a future grant). That meeting served to further discussions about what UC can do for the CCRC and vice versa. Rich was hoping for an endorsement of the CCRC by UC, much as the group

is also looking for same from TNC and NRCS. There was a discussion about how the CCRC grants could provide funding support for Masters level students to complete the yearly monitoring. The group also agreed that the CCRC could serve a valuable function to support UC Extension and other initiatives that support better rangeland stewardship. The group agreed that the CCRC will approach the UC office of the president to formulate an M.O.U. later in 2008.

The group discussed the potential for the CCRC and CRCC to help support UC programs such as Extension. Sheila noted that the current southerly extent of UC Cooperative Extension range assistance is Santa Clara County, due to staff losses in other areas. Rob noted that the attrition of Extension is a significant impact to local communities, who would be well suited to help lobby for more support. Jamie noted that Extension had seen significant expansion in recent years, but had begun declining for the last 2 years due to retirement and budget difficulties. He noted that there were now very supportive people high up in UC that would receive well CCRC lobbying: Dan Dooly, a VP in the office of the President, along with Rick Standiford and Barbara Allen-Diaz. He noted that there is presently no rangeland expertise in the Program Leader positions at UC Extension, and that these are the managers who are important to filling rangeland positions. A significant problem is the California budget. It was noted that Regional Directors and Deans of programs are the best folks to lobby for funding rangeland advisors in Extension. One innovative way of funding positions was evidenced with an example from a position co-funded between UC and the Tahoe Conservancy. Tracy noted that NRCS had similarly co-funded a position in Tehama County. All agreed that the CCRC should help focus agencies wherever possible to fund Extension positions, and that the group might be particularly well poised to help NRCS and UC Extension jointly fund a position dedicated especially to the CCRC's indicators monitoring project.

The group also discussed approaching CCRC ranchers to participate in a UC round table discussion about the contribution of rangelands to human welfare in California over the next 100 years. Jamie noted that there would be 8 such meetings to formulate a problem statement and then to annotate solutions, including a cross discipline group of 15 or so participants in Berkeley in late 2009. The focus was to be private lands, not public lands. Some ranchers at hand were interested, but a notice needs to be sent to the whole group. There is some funding to support travel for ranchers to participate in the talks.

ACTION: Grey and Rich will work together to draft a letter to the office of the president outlining a potential MOU; Jamie will review and consult in interim and eventually assist with letter submission and drafting of the MOU.

ACTION: The CCRC and CRCC will await notification as an opportune time to lobby for support for UC Extension positions and funding.

ACTION: *it is unclear how this will happen**** Somehow, the CCRC will organize/advertise or otherwise participate in the UC round table discussions.***

5. Roles and Responsibilities of CCRC participants – Grey Hayes

This portion of the meeting continued discussions about formalizing roles and responsibilities for CCRC participants. The following is the current list of the roles as we have defined them:

Role	Person	Responsibility
External communication: Education and outreach		
Internal communication: news	Larry Ford	Regular email updates on CCRC progress towards goals
Fundraising	Rich Morris	Organize CCRC efforts to raise funds for the group. Oversee grant proposals
Internal communication: science	Grey Hayes	Inform CCRC initiatives with the best available science
Internal communication: logistics	Daniel Olstein	Organize meetings and discussions for the group, maintain tools to assist with this process
Internal communication: meeting notes		

The group discussed the need for a more focused campaign and leadership for education and outreach. Steve noted that the group would benefit from creating more enthusiasm for rangeland stewardship, fostering additional research, and sharing beneficial stewardship practices with a broader community.

Larry outlined his proposal to produce a regular email update of the CCRC, which spurred some discussion. He said that it could be as regular as every other week and could include information on the progress on the indicators project, policy updates, etc. The group supported this idea and thanked Larry.

The group discussed its website, and Larry reminded the group that there is a domain name reserved for use should the group decide to move forward with a more formal site for public education. The group suggested that this was a critical step, but there were no decisions made about how to progress.

The group had a lengthy discussion on what types of news to share, and when, how to communicate within and outside the group, and where efforts would have the most

impact. It was evident that the education and outreach work of the CCRC needed further thought and so the group formed a committee to discuss this work. The committee consists of: Rich Morris, Larry Ford, Stacey Sullivan, and Sheila Barry.

ACTION: An education and outreach committee will form to create a plan for action and further define roles and responsibilities. Specifically, the committee will decide about: frequency and content of email updates, how to review such email updates (editorial board?), and how to move forward with the website. Rich will chair this committee and convene it soon to move forward.

ACTION: Those with more defined roles and responsibilities will fulfill these roles until they request that someone else take over.

ACTION: The group will continue to seek volunteers to fill necessary roles as they are identified (such as secretary).

6. Internal Communication tools – Daniel Olstein

Daniel noted that we might be able improve internal communications by using a tool that TNC has been active in creating, called Conserve Online. This tool can create an email listserve as well as serve to store documents, such as our contact database.

There was discussion about how secure the site is, and Daniel assured us that it would be secure.

ACTION: Daniel will look into setting up a CCRC account on the Conserve Online site.

7. CCRC x CRCC cooperation – Rich Morris

There was a brief discussion resulting in approval of the CCRC signing the CRCC's Rangeland Resolution.

There was discussion clarifying the connection between the CRCC and CCRC. The group understands that there are lots of ecological similarities between the groups' work, and that the two groups share lots in terms of ideas, initiatives, and projects. Tracy suggested that the CRCC's research arm may be a little more nascent whereas their education and outreach components are a little more advanced. Both groups share similar challenges in terms of grappling with the interests and involvement of state agencies, such as California Department of Fish and Game. Central interests that were discussed were: 1) value of maintaining private ranches and 2) value of rangeland stewardship.

The group asked for an update from Tracy on CRCC activities. She noted that their group was working on facilitating a multi-county safe harbors agreement on ranches, including Butte, Glen, Shasta, and Tehama Counties. She suggested that a similar project would be beneficial to the CCRC membership.

Tracy noted that the grant from US Fish and Wildlife that supports their work allows their staff to work outside of the geographical boundaries of the CRCC, including in areas where the CCRC works.

Tracy also noted that Fish and Wildlife is supportive of their work because it allows a federal agency to reach otherwise difficult to reach people.

The group came to a realization that outreach communication work such as the CCRC has contemplated could work in tandem between the two groups. For instance, lobbying for support for UC Extension, etc., might be stronger if both groups participated separately.

ACTION: Rich will send an email letter to the CRCC to express the CCRC's support of the Rangeland Resolution.

8. CCRC General Meetings Scheduling – Grey Hayes

Grey suggested that the group schedule regular general meetings with specific ongoing agenda items. After some discussion, the group decided to advertise regular meetings on the 3rd Thursday in April and October each year. A regular agenda would include the following items:

Research – 1-3 scientific studies would be presented, applications to present would be received after the group issues an announcement in advance of the meetings. Proposals would be vetted according to the applicability to CCRC goals and interests, the importance of the emerging issue, etc. Guidelines need to be developed, still.

Professional Sharing – land stewards would present emerging or ongoing issues that are of interest to the CCRC.

Updates on CCRC projects – including monitoring and outreach.

Tracy outlined that the CRCC has a summit every other year, the next one will be in Chico in January 2009. Their steering committee will decide in July what the topic will be for this next meeting. Past topics have included: raptors, vernal pools, and oak woodlands.

ACTION: The CCRC will have meetings on October 16, 2008 and April 16, 2009

ACTION: Daniel will email the CCRC to announce these regular meeting dates

ACTION: Grey will draft an announcement for researchers to present at the October meeting. After CCRC input, this announcement will be widely advertised.

9. Sonoma meeting with CCRC – Grey Hayes (with Devii)

Grey was contacted by Patricia Hickey of the Gold Ridge RCD requesting that CCRC representatives make a presentation to a group her group in collaboration with the Marin County Agricultural Commissioner's office would help organize in Sonoma and Marin counties. There are a number of potential partners in this region who may be interested in forming a chapter of the CCRC, but they would like to learn more. Currently, the Gold Ridge RCD works with 10-12 ranchers and 10-12 dairies.

The group discussed the benefits of such a meeting. Larry noted that the spring 2008 monitoring project ran into some distrust amongst land managers there, as they were unfamiliar about the goals of the project and the CCRC.

Steve noted that any such meeting would benefit from participants being on the land, and that the meeting might best take place on a ranch in that area. The group agreed that it would be good to get CCRC participants out on the ranch in advance of their presentation(s), perhaps just before the meeting.

The group decided that it would be easy to get CCRC participants to go, and that the Gold Ridge RCD should suggest some dates far enough in advance to schedule.

ACTION: Devii would let Patricia know that the CCRC is ready to participate, that the dates should be suggested, and that we prefer for the meeting to take place on a private ranch.

ACTION: Once a date is set to meet with Sonoma and Marin parties, Daniel will email the CCRC for interested participants.

10. Monitoring Update – Larry Ford

Larry updated the group on the CCRC Spring 2008 Indicators Monitoring Project. There were 8 properties added over the sites monitored the previous year: 2 BSLT (Marks and Arroyo Seco); 5 Gold Ridge RCD, and; Harkins Slough in Santa Cruz County. Field work was completed and they tried to be more efficient, usually adding monitoring sites to each property. The socio-economic indicators were recorded for each new property, with the exception of the 2 BSLT properties where NRCS had not yet followed through. Ken Oster was a fabulous cooperator, producing maps for even the sites Sheila helped to monitor. Devii also provided maps for the Gold Ridge sites. Sheila helped monitor more properties than any other cooperator.

Larry is now overseeing the entering of data, and then there will be analysis, with a goal of a final report in August. Also still to be done is for Sheila, Jamie, and Larry to create a datasheet for management activities. There was discussion on this, and the group will continue working on this aspect (?); it is not clear who would take the lead, at this point, for collecting data.

John Warner will be writing individual property reports for this year.

In the future, the project will go more smoothly if there is a CCRC lead person on this, as there are lots of cooperators and properties and the organization is a bit scattered.

The monitoring suggests that there is much more bare ground this year than last. The aquatic macroinvertebrate monitoring was more difficult because streams had dried up early; some streams lacked invertebrates altogether, for some reason.

Larry emphasized that the monitoring in 2008 should be viewed as yet another testing year, and that it would be premature to identify real problems; he suggested that there needs to be more statistical rigor in the future. He also reminded us that we are monitoring only the more broadly applicable indicators, not the special indicators of interest to individual property owners. Also, Larry noted that we still cannot link the effects we see through the monitoring to the causes of those.

Larry suggests that the CCRC partner more closely in the future with NRCS to develop the 2nd tier and special indicators, so that the CCRC can better identify the source of problems on ranches, should these appear.

11. Research proposal – Blair McLaughlin

Blair presented the group with her proposal on monitoring valley oak recruitment on ranches. The group asked her questions such as on distinguishing valley oak vs. blue oak, how her research differs from previous studies, wild herbivore effects, etc. She notes that her research will take into account more local, site-level effects on recruitment such as slope, aspect, and, especially, management.

The group suggested Blair work with Sheila, Jamie, and Larry to record management data similarly to the indicators monitoring project. The group was largely supportive and interested in the work.

ACTION: Rich will write a letter of support for Blair to us in seeking funding.

12. Researcher protocol – Grey Hayes

Grey suggested that the CCRC would do well to create a methodology for researchers to approach CCRC participants. The group agreed to the following methodology:

First screen: Grey emails CCRC participants to determine if they would like to opt in or out of receiving research proposals.

Second screen: Grey will receive proposals, work with subcommittee to vet, and send appropriate proposals to willing ranchers.

George suggested that Grey collects information from ranchers about the research they individually really need.

ACTION: Grey will survey land CCRC participants to assess their willingness to participate in research and what information they are most interested in gaining through research.

HOMEWORK

Rich:

Continue to flesh out the business plan with BSLT help. Future drafts of the business plan will refer more explicitly to the group's holistic goal.

Work with BSLT to complete funding application after completion of business plan.

Work together with Grey to draft a letter to the office of the president outlining a potential MOU; Jamie will review and consult in interim and eventually assist with letter submission and drafting of the MOU.

Chair an education and outreach committee to create a plan for action and further define roles and responsibilities. Specifically, the committee will decide about: frequency and content of email updates, how to review such email updates (editorial board?), and how to move forward with the website.

Send an email letter to the CRCC to express the CCRC's support of the Rangeland Resolution.

Write a letter of support for Blair to us in seeking funding.

Daniel Olstein:

Work with Glen to finalize the contract in July, including more work on the profiles.

Daniel will look into setting up a CCRC account on the Conserve Online site.

Email the CCRC to announce regular meeting dates

Once a date is set to meet with Sonoma and Marin parties, email the CCRC for interested participants.

Grey:

Work together with Rich to draft a letter to the office of the president outlining a potential MOU; Jamie will review and consult in interim and eventually assist with letter submission and drafting of the MOU.

Draft an announcement for researchers to present at the October meeting. After CCRC input, this announcement will be widely advertised.

Survey land CCRC participants to assess their willingness to participate in research and what information they are most interested in gaining through research.

Sheila:

Participate in an education and outreach committee, Rich chairs

Larry:

Participate in an education and outreach committee, Rich chairs

Stacey:

Participate in an education and outreach committee, Rich chairs

Devii:

Let Patricia know that the CCRC is ready to participate, that the dates should be suggested, and that we prefer for the meeting to take place on a private ranch.

CCRC:

The CCRC and CRCC will await notification as an opportune time to lobby for support for UC Extension positions and funding.

Those with more defined roles and responsibilities will fulfill these roles until they request that someone else take over.

The group will continue to seek volunteers to fill necessary roles as they are identified (such as secretary).

The CCRC will have meetings on October 16, 2008 and April 16, 2009

Unresolved:

***it is unclear how this will happen** Somehow, the CCRC will organize/advertise or otherwise participate in the UC round table discussions.*