

Briefing Materials

Prepared for the California Agricultural Land Equity Task Force Meeting on February 16, 2024

The California Agricultural Land Equity Task Force (Task Force) was established in the Budget Act of 2022 ([AB 179](#)) to develop recommendations to equitably increase access to agricultural land for food production and traditional tribal agricultural uses. The Task Force consists of a regionally diverse group of individuals representing socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers, land trusts, agricultural finance and real estate, and the State of California.

This briefing packet, developed by Strategic Growth Council (SGC) staff, includes three components:

1. A staff report to share updates and answer Task Force members' questions;
2. A summary of the introductory conversations the CSUS facilitator conducted with Task Force members;
3. Examples of policy recommendations with a summary that defines and explains different components of making recommendations.

Table of Contents

Strategic Growth Council Staff Report 2

Summary of Introductory Conversations with Task Force Members 5

Examples of Policy Recommendations 14

Strategic Growth Council

Staff Report

To California Agricultural Land Equity Task Force Members

February 16, 2024

California Agricultural Land Equity Task Force Membership Updates

Qi Zhou was elected to the Task Force by the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) Producer Advisory Committee in November 2023, and her membership was confirmed by the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) on December 14, 2023. Welcome, Qi!

SGC staff are reviewing nominations for the role of Native and Tribal Liaison on the Task Force. Staff will submit their recommendation to the Strategic Growth Council in time for the newly appointed member to join the Task Force during its May 2024 meeting.

The next Task Force meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 9, 2024, and will be held in the San Diego area. More details are forthcoming. SGC staff will assist Task Force members in booking travel in order to access state rates and ensure travel policy compliance.

Strategic Growth Council Staffing Update

In December 2023, Camille Frazier and Tessa Salzman joined SGC as the Agricultural Land Equity Program Lead and Agricultural Land Equity Program Analyst, respectively. Together with Sean Kennedy, SGC Deputy Director of Energy Investments, they will support SGC in administering the Task Force.

Announcements

SGC hosted its second annual Catalyst Conference on February 1-2, 2024. The conference theme was "Progress in Place: From Power Building to Project Implementation" and focused on promoting community and local capacity, while anticipating challenges associated with project development and implementation. Task Force members are invited to share ideas for future conference themes and proceedings with SGC staff.

The application period closed on February 5, 2024, for SGC's newly established Tribal Capacity Building Pilot Program. The Program will award two-year grants to 4-6 tribes and fund staff salaries and activities that advance each tribe's climate-related work. Awarded tribes may receive funding between \$150,000 and \$250,000 each for the pilot two-year grant term.

Responses to Questions from Task Force Members

Reimbursement

During the October 30, 2023, meeting, Task Force members asked the following questions about reimbursement:

What counts as a "necessary expense"?

SGC Response: A "necessary expense" is any documentable expense that is required to facilitate participation in the work of the Task Force. In practice, this is mostly limited to travel costs, such as hotel rooms, train tickets, and meals (within the limitations of CalHR's reimbursement rates). Note that all requests for reimbursement must: 1) be pre-approved before money is spent, and 2) provide documentation of the expense, such as a receipt or mileage map.

Can Task Force members be reimbursed for expenses other than those associated with Task Force meetings?

SGC Response: Task Force members can be reimbursed for necessary expenses incurred in the completion of Task Force-related work outside of the context of Task Force meetings, such as subcommittee meetings or other duties like site visits and listening sessions, as formally assigned by the Task Force or its subcommittees.

Can non-Task Force members be reimbursed and/or paid for their involvement with the Task Force?

SGC Response: SGC staff are currently working on creating model scopes of work that can be used to establish contracts for services that support the work of the Task Force. This may include presenting as an agendized guest or participating in the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), among other forms of expert engagement (e.g. consultation, outreach).

Translation

At the request of a Task Force member, SGC staff investigated options for translating briefing materials into Spanish. The Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is currently working to establish a large contract for language services that

will include translation, but those services will be reserved for translating shortened summaries rather than full documents. There are funds allotted in the Task Force budget (below) for the Agricultural Land Equity team to separately set up a contract for translation. SGC Staff welcome feedback about which materials should be translated (e.g., all briefing materials, just the final report, etc.), and into which languages.

Task Force Budget

At the request of a Task Force member, SGC staff have compiled the following overview of the budget for the California Agricultural Land Equity Task Force and its associated Initiative at SGC.

Available funds include the following allocations: \$1 million from the general fund, as established in AB 179, and \$2.25 million from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF), as approved by the Strategic Growth Council in October 2022.

Research and local assistance (grant) funds will support action-oriented research activities that support Task Force objectives in line with California Climate Investments requirements.

Task Force Budget Table

Category	FY 22-23 (actual)	FY 23-24	FY 24-25	FY 25-26	TOTAL
Personnel (SGC staff)	\$0	\$188,500	\$386,000	\$474,000	\$1,048,500
Operating expenses (travel, facilitator, language access, etc.)	\$264,529	\$267,000	\$228,000	\$346,782	\$1,106,311
Research and local assistance	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000
Residual	-	-	-	-	\$100,189
TOTAL	\$264,529	\$455,500	\$1,614,000	\$820,782	\$3,255,000

Summary of Introductory Conversations with Task Force Members

Introduction

This document presents the summarized findings from informal conversations with California Agricultural Land Equity Task Force (Task Force) members conducted by California State University Sacramento (CSUS) staff. No confidential information is included in this report, nor are any names attributed to statements expressed in discussions.

Process

Before the first Task Force meeting on October 30, 2023, CSUS facilitation support staff conducted informal, confidential orientation calls with all Task Force members. These introductory conversations took place in August and September of 2023 and allowed the facilitator to meet each member, learn more about their background and inspiration to serve on the Task Force, and provide basic information about serving on the Task Force, including information on the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. The conversations also provided an opportunity for members to share their aspirations and expectations for the Task Force.

The CSUS facilitator shared with members that the expected outcome of the series of introductory calls would be a summarized “findings” document providing aggregated information from the conversations. In the summary below, SGC and CSUS staff have highlighted patterns and recurring themes while working to preserve the specific language and vocabulary used by Task Force members during their conversations. The ideas that follow are therefore support staff’s best attempt to summarize conversations with Task Force members and do not represent the opinions of either agency.

A set of discussion questions was used to guide the conversations. They are shared in the Appendix (pp. 13-14).

Quotes are presented with *“quotation signs and bold, italicized text.”*

Overview

The following sections provide a high-level summary of what Task Force members shared related to their definitions of land equity, anticipated challenges, potential topics to explore, and desired outcomes. The purpose of this summary is to share key points that the Task Force members highlighted as a starting place for group discussion. The notes below are not meant to determine the scope or direction that the Task Force must take, but rather offer a common foundation from which to build.

At a high level, members expressed their excitement to work with and learn from one another. Task Force members collectively hold a rich set of knowledge and experiences that include: urban and rural farmers; food, seed, and medicine producers; acquiring and helping others access land; legal expertise related to lease terms and succession planning; experience on state and federal advisory committees; experience making policy recommendations in the food and farming context; experience helping Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) producers with on-farm practices and in applying for and implementing state and federal grants; community organizing; forming nonprofits; cooperative governance; leadership on Tribal and Intertribal Councils; and more.

The summary below is the aggregation of many ideas from 12 different individuals and therefore captures a range of perspectives, concerns, goals, and potential paths forward.

Questions and Summarized Responses

Question 1: How do you define “land equity”?

Most members acknowledged that land equity in the food and agriculture context is a difficult concept to clearly and concisely define, in part because of the magnitude of the term and the breadth of principles it may cover. Nonetheless, members shared many initial ideas, details, and perspectives on the topic, which are organized and summarized below. Four supportive quotes are provided below.

Equity is "about making sure there are avenues to access land for folks who weren't born into money or have powerful connections. And then layering on to that all kinds of historical social injustices."

"Land back to the indigenous folks that had to be dehumanized from the land in which we all benefit from."

"Equity means going beyond just removing barriers...[It means] radical opportunities for land ownership for farmers and communities of color, and other creative pathways [towards] land ownerships and tenure."

"It's not just accessing any land. The assets on that land are essential, including water, high quality soil, proximity to markets, etc. All these things shape equity."

Key point I: Land equity means fair and just access to land

Specific points shared by Task Force members include:

- Agricultural land and the practice of farming are available, affordable and accessible to minority populations, tribes, communities, and underserved farmers and ranchers.
- Land and resources are controlled by the community, allowing them to grow food for their own local, healthy food supply.
- Small farmers that work the land can own their own land, alleviating the current power dynamics between landowners and tenants.
- Land is returned to indigenous communities.
- Those who have been excluded from land access are given priority to land and resources. The following groups were mentioned specifically by different

Task Force members:

- Asian, Japanese American
- BIPOC, Communities of color
- Black, African American
- Farmworkers
- Immigrant farmers
- Latina women
- Latinx farmers
- Minority populations and underserved communities
- Native American tribes, indigenous communities
- Small farms (under 20 acres)

Key Point II: Land equity is achieved when barriers are removed and resources are provided

Task Force members specifically expressed the need to:

- **Acknowledge** the disproportionate and systemic barriers for certain communities, groups, and individuals to accessing land.
- **Remove** these barriers and eliminate discrimination that prevents equitable access to land, equipment, business resources, etc.
- **Provide** resources and opportunities to address past harms and disparities and increase capacity for all folks who would like to farm.

Question 2: What would you consider successful outcomes of the Task Force's efforts?

In response to this question, members described outcomes related to the *process* the Task Force will take to identify recommendations as well as the *substance* of the recommendations themselves. The summary in this section conveys a high-level, “broad-strokes” vision, while the section further down in the report titled “Topics for Further Exploration” includes more detail about individual topics.

Successful Outcomes: Process

The **process** of identifying recommendations includes:

- collective problem-solving to address systemic issues;
- genuine and sustained community engagement, especially with tribal communities; and
- the Task Force is formally institutionalized as a permanent structure.

Successful Outcomes: Substance

The recommendations are **designed to**:

- be progressive and actionable;
- be well informed and supported by both quantitative and qualitative information;
- avoid unintended negative consequences;
- improve existing programs and policies and to generate new approaches and structures;
- consider both public and private land; and
- be adopted by the Legislature and Governor and include mechanisms for accountability.

The final recommendations lead to **outcomes on the ground**, such as:

- The current demographic composition of land tenure changes so that BIPOC farming communities gain expansive access to the land versus just a few small parcels.

- California Native American tribes reclaim sovereignty over lands, traditional forms of growing food, and other cultural practices.
- Abundant support is provided for independent small farmers, new and beginning farmers, and farmworkers who want to become farm operators.
- Immigration barriers that impede land access are removed.

Question 3: What challenges do you foresee?

The Task Force members mentioned various challenges related to cost and availability, prohibitive regulations, and the scale of addressing land equity more broadly. The challenges listed below capture what Task Force members shared in their initial conversations with the CSUS facilitator and not necessarily a comprehensive list of barriers to agricultural land equity.

Challenge 1: Cost and Availability of Land

- Ever-increasing costs of agricultural land
- Limited land available for small and underserved farmers
- Limited eligibility to apply and qualify for a grant or loan
- Corporate consolidation and ownership
- Foreign investment in land

Challenge 2: Regulatory Barriers

- Existing regulations often do not apply to small farmers
- Inequitable water access and rights
- Land use and zoning barriers
- Current legal frameworks do not account for culturally diverse food production practices

Challenge 3: Contextual Challenges

- Long history of institutionally imposed challenges and barriers
- Difficult to find solutions for a large, diverse state
- Potential opposition from non-native citizens

Topics for Further Exploration

This section highlights the topics, questions, and potential solutions that Task Force members shared with the CSUS facilitator. The key points are consolidated into seven topic areas, below, in order to provide members with an initial framework to begin discussing.

The ideas listed under each topic below are diverse and complex. Some ideas include a specific recommendation that *could be* considered for inclusion in the recommendations report such as “ease zoning restrictions to be able to grow on more land”, while other ideas would need further development to become a recommendation, such as “corporate consolidation and ownership”.

The topics listed below are meant to be discussed and developed further as Task Force members see fit.

Topic 1: Land Access and Tenure

Task Force members shared the ideas below in relation to improving current agricultural land access and approaches to securing additional opportunities for individuals and the community. These included:

- Prioritize secure, favorable lease terms that protect tenants, including clear renewal terms and the ability to improve the land.
- Prioritize new and small farmers in succession planning (preparing for a legal transition in land ownership).
- Consider different pathways for land acquisition, including subsidies for land purchases, land grants (public land or land use rights gifted to a community or individual), and forgivable loans (loan can be forgiven or deferred when conditions are met).
- Explore structures for communal land ownership, tenure, governance, and/or management.

Topic 2: Land Access for Tribes

Many Task Force members noted that California tribes are and should be at the forefront of land equity efforts. The ideas in this list were mentioned specifically in the context of tribes, but the topics listed above in the “Land Access and Tenure” section are also connected and relevant to tribes. Specific ideas shared were as follows:

- Include non-federally recognized tribes in land equity efforts.
- Prioritize open and accessible public lands for traditional tribal agricultural uses.
- Support the land back movement.
- Offer first right of refusal.

Topic 3: Land Markets

Task Force members described market forces that drive up land prices and limit availability for farmers as key challenges that need to be addressed. “Market forces”

include factors that affect the price, demand, and supply of land. Task Force members highlighted the following:

Current challenges:

- Foreign investment in agricultural land
- Corporate consolidation and ownership of land

Possible interventions:

- Move land from speculative market to public trust.
- Establish a transparent public process to buy or secure land.

Task Force member quote: “[I hope to consider] taking land out of the speculative market, so that it may lose value as an investment but it gains value as something of a public trust... I wouldn’t want the solutions to be based in the individual landowner at all times. How do we move into more community-based land tenure?”

Topic 4: Financial Resources

In the current system of land ownership, access to land depends upon access to capital. Historical and ongoing forms of exclusion from financial resources have led to wide disparities in land access. Task Force members mentioned various interventions for expanding access to financial resources among those who have been historically excluded, including:

- Reform loan programs, e.g. by improving financing terms for small farmers and farmworkers.
- Eliminate land tenure as a prerequisite for accessing resources such as grants and loans.
- Institute stronger financial and business support for farmers without registered businesses.

Topic 5: Sustaining Natural Resources

The ideas in this list address the stewardship of natural resources for food production and traditional tribal uses into the future.

- Include water conservation, soil health, and pollinator benefits in the land equity conversation.
- Promote traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) and cultural burning.
- Protect natural and cultural resources.
- Consider water access and rights.
- Keep land for farming instead of development.

Topic 6: Regulations

The ideas that Task Force members shared related to regulations are summarized here in two large categories. Each category could be broken out into its own main topic and expanded on as Task Force members see fit.

- Revise regulations designed for large scale farms so that they work for small farmers, e.g. address the impacts of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) on small farmers.
- Evaluate land use planning (state and regional), e.g. consider easing zoning restrictions to be able to grow on more land.

Topic 7: Meeting Diverse Farmer Needs

Members noted many additional considerations related to land equity, placing this work in a broader context than just the physical land itself. The huge diversity of farmers, growing systems, and contextual needs in California require an equally diverse set of considerations to achieve land equity, such as:

- Multilingual outreach materials
- Immigration reform to allow for land access for undocumented people
- Housing access
- Food access and security

Appendix

Questionnaire: Introductory Calls with California Agricultural Land Equity Task Force Members

Below are the thirteen questions the facilitator asked the Task Force members.

1. Please share briefly a bit about yourself, your background, the mission of the agency/organization/company you work for, and your role therein.
2. What inspired you to serve on this Task Force?
3. Do you have experience serving on a Task Force, Advisory Body or similar?
4. Are you familiar with Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act requirements / have you participated in any Bagley-Keene bodies or meetings?
5. Are you aware of in-person attendance requirements for meetings? What location(s) are preferable for you? Are you OK with air travel if we rotate locations?
6. Inaugural meeting: We are considering dates in September or October. What dates are best for you?

7. Quarterly meetings: Are there any key dates/ time of year/ time of day to avoid when scheduling? (e.g., consider potential conflicts w/ BIPOC Committee meetings)
8. The Task Force was convened to develop recommendations to equitably increase land access to rural and urban agricultural land for food production and sustainable traditional tribal agricultural uses in California. Looking forward, and considering the purpose of the Task Force:
 - a. How do you define 'land equity'?
 - b. What are the major challenges you hope to address through your role on this Task Force, and what would you consider a successful outcome or outcomes?
9. What do you see as potential barriers to what the collective “we” is trying to accomplish via the Task Force?
 - a. Is there anything you hope to avoid happening with respect to the TF’s efforts?
 - b. How might you recommend these challenges/barriers be managed? Do you have any advice for overcoming these stumbling blocks?
10. Are you interested in any kind of subject–matter training to support the Task Force’s discussions and your role on the Task Force? (e.g., training on how Agriculture Policy works for the state of CA, overviews of state government and legislative processes, etc.)
11. At this time, do you have any specific requests for briefing materials?
 - a. What is the most pressing information that needs to be developed or examined to address the responsibilities of the Task Force and the development of its recommendations?
12. Do you have any questions about the Task Force?
13. Is there anything else you would like to share?

Examples of Policy Recommendations

Overview

At the request of several Task Force members, SGC staff have compiled a list of policy recommendations written by task forces and similar entities that provide examples of different formats and approaches, as described below.

The reports linked here are *not* intended as templates that the Task Force must follow, but rather, as examples that can provide a foundational understanding of the key elements of existing reports.

What is a Policy Recommendation?

A policy recommendation is advice that a particular action be taken by a group or person with authority to meet a particular outcome or goal. Policy recommendations are often delivered as part of a policy brief: a concise summary of a particular issue, the policy options to deal with it, and some recommendations on the best option(s) (as described in the [FAO's Food Security Communications Toolkit](#)).

While the term “policy recommendation” implies a focus on government policies, policy recommendations often include actions beyond the legislative process, such as calling for additional research or proposing new institutional structures.

Not all recommendations have the same impact. The strongest recommendations have a clear goal, outcome, and action, and they name the specific responsible actors and forms of accountability. Weak recommendations, on the other hand, are presented in general terms, without establishing responsibility nor methods to ensure follow-through.

The section below outlines four key components of policy recommendations and provides examples of each. They four key components include:

- 1) clear statement of goals and outcomes,
- 2) types of recommended actions,
- 3) targets of intervention, and
- 4) styles and audiences.

Key Components of Recommendations

Clear Statement of Goals and Outcomes

Reports outlining recommendations often begin with a clear and succinct description of the authors' goals (immeasurable, broad vision) and intended outcomes (measurable). Strong recommendations consistently refer back to these goals and outcomes in justifying the specific actions highlighted.

Example: The Washington State (WA) Environmental Justice Task Force (EJTF) submitted a report to the Legislature and Governor in Fall 2020 that is particularly effective in outlining 1) the EJTF's mandated outcomes, 2) the goals that motivated the EJTF members' work and recommendations, and 3) specific actions to meet goals and achieve outcomes.

Types of Recommended Actions

The authors of the reports linked below recommend different types of actions to achieve their stated outcomes. These include:

Legislation/Policy

The use of the lawmaking process (local, state, and federal) to enact change.

Example: Among many other legislative actions, the Reparations Task Force calls for:

- a. "changing the California constitution to prohibit involuntary servitude,"
- b. "abolishing the death penalty," and
- c. "requiring district-based voting and independent redistricting commissions" (p. 49-50).

Regulations

Establishing legally binding rules and directives guiding the interpretation and implementation of laws.

Example: The Scottish Land Commission recommends establishing new regulatory mechanisms for land markets, including:

- a. "A public interest test at the point of large-scale land transactions;
- b. An obligation to prepare and engage on a management plan for large land holdings;
- c. Strengthening implementation of the Land Rights and Responsibilities Statement through increased statutory weight and a review mechanism to provide a backstop in addressing poor practice" (p. 8).

Guidance

Offering supplemental material that clarifies existing rules. Guidelines are non-binding, but allow for greater flexibility and quicker response to feedback.

Example: The Committee to House the Bay Area’s CASA Compact calls for “the State of California [to] review its spatial guidelines for public facilities (i.e., schools) to evaluate potential for changes that could open up land for housing without compromising the quality of on-site public services” (p. 16).

Programs

Developing and funding programs, or proposing changes to existing programs, tailored to particular goals and audiences, e.g. grant or educational programs.

Example 1: California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) “will coordinate the implementation of several grants and technical assistance programs for private landowners through a unified Wildfire Resilience and Forestry Assistance Program” (p. 8).

Example 2: The California Reparations Report recommends increasing funding to schools to reduce racial disparities and funding grants to address the unequal impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic (p. 50).

Institutional Changes

Changing the culture and structures of the institutions implicated in the recommendations.

Example 1: The Washington State (WA) Environmental Justice (EJ) Task Force recommends that the State “convene a permanent EJ interagency workgroup of relevant agency staff that includes members representing overburdened communities” (p. 8).

Example 2: The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Advisory Committee on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers advises that the USDA “encourage a cultural change to minimize the inconsistency of program understanding levels within the various FSA [Farm Services Agency] offices” (p. 7).

Financial Changes

Implementing fiscal incentives, market interventions, and/or shifting how funding is allotted, awarded, and distributed.

Example 1: The Reparations Task Force calls for monetary compensation to decedents and offers “preliminary estimates for the Legislature’s consideration, regarding losses to African Americans in California, due to (a) health disparities, (b) disproportionate African American mass incarceration and over-policing, (c) housing discrimination, and (d) devaluation of African American businesses. Further, with regard to two other atrocities, unjust property takings by eminent domain and labor discrimination, the Task Force recommends a method of calculation for such reparations” (p. 41).

Example 2: The WA State EJ Task Force recommends that “for new and existing revenue and expenditures with an environmental nexus, the state Legislature and agencies should equitably distribute investments ensuring that resources are allocated to the most overburdened communities” (p. 8).

Knowledge-Building

Producing the information required to effectively understand, evaluate, and address relevant issues. Examples:

Example 1: The California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) report recommends expediting the consolidation of crash reports to “provide significant improvement to crash data availability” (p. 51).

Example 2: As noted in the Wildfire Action and Resilience Plan, “CAL FIRE and the USFS, in coordination with the USDA California Climate Hub, the California Air Resources Board (CARB), and other agencies, will seek to establish a Forest Data Hub to coordinate and integrate federal, state, and local reporting on forest management and carbon accounting programs, and serve as a clearinghouse for new and emerging technologies and data platforms (p. 9).

Targets of Intervention

Policy recommendations often suggest actions that target a range of different populations and/or geographic scales, as in the following:

Population or Community

Example: The California Reparations Report establishes that “eligibility for monetary reparations should be limited to those who are able to establish that they are a lineal descendant of an African American Chattel enslaved person or of a free African American person living in the United States prior to the end of the 19th Century” (pp. 5-6).

Local Government

Example: The Committee to House the Bay Area (CASA) Compact recommends that “each jurisdiction should create and maintain an up-to-date listing of all rules, codes and standards that apply to residential development applications” (p. 12).

Region

Example: California’s Wildfire Action and Resilience Plan calls for “mobilizing regional action plans” for more effective forest management (p. 21)

State

Example: The WA State EJ Task Force lists as a goal that “[state] agencies will have at least one staff position dedicated to integrating EJ principles specifically, and equity more broadly, into agency actions” (p. 8)

Federal

Example: The USDA Advisory Committee on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers recommends developing “a standard definition for a beginning farmer and rancher (BFR) that can be applied consistently across USDA programs and agencies” (p. 4).

Styles and Intended Audiences

A task force’s specific goals and intended outcomes are often reflected in and supported by the style of the final report.

Example of a report intended for a broad audience:

The Reparations Task Force prioritized knowledge-building and public outreach as key to its work. This goal was reflected both in its public meetings as well as its final report and executive summary, which document historical and ongoing forms of structural racism and peoples' lived experiences of these injustices.

Example of a report intended for specialists:

The CalSTA Zero Traffic Fatalities Task Force begins its report with a discussion of existing data on traffic fatalities as a way of contextualizing and justifying the Task Force’s recommendations. However, the authors’ discussion of this data is oriented toward researchers and practitioners and is not easily understandable to the general public.

Examples Cited Above

Reports Delivered to State Governor and Legislature by Task Force

- [CA Reparations Task Force Executive Summary and Full Report](#)
- [WA State Environmental Justice Task Force Final Report](#)

Reports Delivered by and/or to Other Governing Bodies

- [California's Wildfire and Forest Resilience Action Plan](#)
- [CalSTA Zero Traffic Fatalities Task Force](#)
- [CASA \(The Committee to House the Bay Area\) Compact](#)
- [Scottish Land Commission's Natural Capital and Land: Recommendations for a Just Transition](#)
- [USDA Advisory Committee on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers](#)