

CALIFORNIA FISH AND WILDLIFE  
STRATEGIC VISION PROJECT

---

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR REVIEW

---

Comments Through January 16, 2012

# AUTHOR'S COPY

## LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

Bill No.

as introduced, Walters.

General Subject: Collective bargaining: state employees.

Existing law authorizes the Public Employment Relations Board to, in accordance with reasonable standards, designate positions or classes of positions which have duties consisting primarily of the enforcement of state laws. Existing law prohibits employees in these designated positions or classes from being denied the right to be in a bargaining unit composed solely of such employees.

This bill would require the Public Employment Relations Board to recognize positions or classes of positions designated as peace officers under specified provisions that shall not be denied the right to be a unit composed solely of those positions and classes.

This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

Vote: 2/3. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.



THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 3521.7 of the Government Code is repealed.

~~3521.7. The board may, in accordance with reasonable standards, designate positions or classes of positions which have duties consisting primarily of the enforcement of state laws. Employees so designated shall not be denied the right to be in a unit composed solely of such employees.~~

SEC. 2. Section 3521.7 is added to the Government Code, to read:

3521.7. The board shall recognize positions or classes of positions designated under Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 830) of Title 3 of Part 2 of the Penal Code as peace officers that shall not be denied the right to be a unit composed solely of employees in these positions and classes.

SEC. 3. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting the necessity are:

In order to implement the terms of a negotiated memorandum of understanding, it is necessary that this act take effect immediately.



113026362803BLL

From: Melanie Weaver  
Sent: Friday, January 06, 2012 2:42 PM  
To: Melissa Miller-Henson  
Subject: draft strategic comments

There are many things the Department can and should make improvements upon, however many of the suggested action items suggest that money is not in short supply. One suggestion is a separate "research" function. The Department should not be conducting research just for the sake of research - that is why we have universities. Wildlife management is our role and that includes resource assessment activities and answering management concerns. We have plenty of competent scientists to perform wildlife management and is duplicative to suggest another branch is needed so objective recommendations are made. Our profession and role requires us to be objective. Our limitations are resources (lack of money and administrative hurdles) and the public's disapproval of suggested management options. The reality is that because we are a resource agency we will make decisions that the public at large will not agree with. There are many different factions and we can not please them all. We are not and should not be State Parks - we actively manage and contentious issues are inherent with that responsibility. For example, developers will never be "happy" with decisions that limit affects on habitat or wildlife.

Again, outsiders are making recommendations on how the Department should function and yet those same individuals really don't have a clear understanding of how we operate and our limitations. We work for the government which means the public typically wants transparency. Transparency equates to many administrative hurdles that prevent a timely response to whatever issue is out there. The stakeholder group may respond by reminding the employees that there have been several venues for us to comment including meetings. The reality is that we are busy trying to perform our jobs and battle administrative tasks and don't have any more time or energy to try and educate or inform the stakeholder group. We have been beat down by the public at large for being "state workers". We are swamped with filling out endless paperwork to make simple purchases or remind the Budget Branch to fix program allotments and fix inappropriate spending of funds. We need strong leadership and an administrative function to be responsive and fully assume their role rather than biologists spending time tracking and fighting for dollars or proving why a contract with a conservation partner is needed in order to conduct needed resource assessment.

Thanks for allowing me to comment.

Melanie Weaver  
Staff Environmental Scientist Waterfowl Program, Wildlife Branch Department of  
Fish and Game  
1812 Ninth Street  
Sacramento CA 95814  
(916)445-3717 office  
(916)445-4048 fax  
mweaver@dfg.ca.gov

SUBMITTED BY JENNIFER  
FEARING TO JAN. 5, 2012  
BRCC/SAG MTG

**Possible key priorities**

**Sustainable financing:** Propose fiscal transparency legislation

**Regulatory/permitting:** Propose legislation to streamline permitting process for environmental restoration

**Governance/mission:** Identify qualifications for FG&C commissioners; change the name and mission of DFG

**Science:** Develop standards for improving quality of DFG science; develop deeper engagement with UC/CSU - science based partnerships based on clear standards and accessibility to science

**Enforcement:** Increase DFG wardens' collective bargaining strength and ensure dedication of necessary resources so that DFG can do its job in the field; Identify mechanisms to increase funding for circuit prosecutor project or similar

SUBMITTED 1/5/12 BY GEORGE OSBORN  
TO JOINT BRCC/SAG MTG.

62803

01/04/12 01:29 PM  
RN 11 30263 PAGE 1

## AUTHOR'S COPY

### LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

Bill No.

as introduced, Walters (et AL).

General Subject: Collective bargaining: state employees.

Existing law authorizes the Public Employment Relations Board to, in accordance with reasonable standards, designate positions or classes of positions which have duties consisting primarily of the enforcement of state laws. Existing law prohibits employees in these designated positions or classes from being denied the right to be in a bargaining unit composed solely of such employees.

This bill would require the Public Employment Relations Board to recognize positions or classes of positions designated as peace officers under specified provisions that shall not be denied the right to be a unit composed solely of those positions and classes.

This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

Vote: 2/3. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.



113026362803814

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 3521.7 of the Government Code is repealed.

~~3521.7. The board may, in accordance with reasonable standards, designate positions or classes of positions which have duties consisting primarily of the enforcement of state laws. Employees so designated shall not be denied the right to be in a unit composed solely of such employees.~~

SEC. 2. Section 3521.7 is added to the Government Code, to read:

3521.7. The board shall recognize positions or classes of positions designated under Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 830) of Title 3 of Part 2 of the Penal Code as peace officers that shall not be denied the right to be a unit composed solely of employees in these positions and classes.

SEC. 3. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting the necessity are:

In order to implement the terms of a negotiated memorandum of understanding, it is necessary that this act take effect immediately.



**From:** Glenda Marsh  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 03, 2012 10:51 AM  
**To:** Strategic Vision  
**Cc:** Angela Donlan  
**Subject:** comments on chapter 3 and appendix B

My over all comment is "what activities do stakeholders believe state government should carry out/be responsible for when it comes to management and protection of the state's natural resources?" I don't see the themes and goals presented from this perspective. I don't see the perspective/frame that generated the 4 common themes. Why these 4 themes in Chapter 3? Are these the things that stakeholders believe state government (tax payers) should be responsible for?

Appendix B has everything AND the kitchen sink. This doesn't look possible nor likely to be funded at a useful level and DFG would be right back where we are now: under funded and under staffed to do all the things that people want us to do.

I think the question I pose above is a more constructive one than having various stakeholders drive DFG's activities and focus by legislative wins and losses. For example, the regulated community wants less regulation, so they go to the legislature to defund/underfund regulatory programs. The environmental community wants increased environmental protection (regulations) and restoration (costs money), so they go to the legislature to increase funding.

Comment on Table 1 Communication, Education and Outreach

Public awareness of DFG activities, regs, mission....of course, we are not that visible in the day to day media coverage because there are lots of stories competing for peoples' attention. So, a person may say "I don't hear a lot about DFG", but what's really happening is that we don't show up in the media they are watching/purchasing.

I think DFG needs to target media that is consumed by our target constituencies, so that we are showing up in the places/spaces that people are paying attention to. There's no such thing any more as a mass public watching mass media (tv news) and everyone is getting the same information. Media and news and what someone is interested in 'following' is very segmented now.

Comment on Table 2 Partnerships and Table 4 Integrated Resource Management

In this section there is an expectation that DFG participate in many external activities and organizations, coordinate our input to their activities in order

to achieve resource management integration. This requires dedicated staff and maybe having more of a matrix structure in our organization.

Integrated Resource Management needs to include DFG's role in 'green infrastructure', downstream users pay for maintenance of upstream green infrastructure which supplies them with clean water, recreation, etc. Establish a fee relationship between users and maintaining green infrastructure.

Comment on Table 9 Staff Development, page 56

RP - Personnel - Include supporting and developing DFG's existing Scientific Community Development Program as an important overarching tool for developing and maintaining the Department's scientific staff.

Comment on Table 10 Adequate, Stable and Sustainable Funding

Add: collect entrance fees to refuges and wildlife areas

Add: continue CEQA fee audit to collect fees due to DFG from counties.

Due to lack of staff, this audit was suspended after collecting over \$100,000 in unpaid fees. There is more that could be collected. There didn't seem to be an incentive to make this a continuing priority however, because collecting the unpaid fees did not translate to any spending authority. In other words, just because we collected the fees didn't mean DFG was able to use the money to meet needs in relevant programs.

Establish a fee relationship between users and maintaining green infrastructure.



California  
Native  
Grasslands  
Association

P.O. Box 8327  
Woodland, CA 95776

Phone/Fax 530.661.2280

www.cnga.org  
admin@cnga.org

The mission of the California Native Grasslands Association is to promote, preserve, and restore the diversity of California's native grasses and grassland ecosystems through education, advocacy, research, and stewardship.

December 31, 2011

California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project  
California Natural Resources Agency  
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311  
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Fish and Wildlife Vision Needs to Address Invasive Weeds

The California Native Grasslands Association (CNGA) understands that the Resources Agency is updating the strategic vision under AB 2376. The legislation mandates that the strategic vision include comprehensive biodiversity management and sustainable ecosystem functions.

Invasive weeds need to be addressed in this review.

The Department's mission is to manage "California's diverse fish, wildlife, and plant resources, and the habitats upon which they depend, for their ecological values and for their use and enjoyment by the public." Invasive weeds increasingly threaten to undo the work of all us seeking the same goal. CNGA is keenly aware of the destructive effects of invasive weeds that are continuing to spread into the grasslands ecological systems of the State.

CNGA welcomes the Department's work on natural community conservation programs, the updating of the *Manual of California Vegetation*, attuning the CEQA process to impacts on rare remaining native prairie communities, and advancing science on California's economically important natural ecosystems.

As part of the Strategic Vision, we subscribe to and support the specific proposals of the California Invasive Plant Council, i.e., that DFG and F&GC do the following:

- Take the lead role in addressing invasive plants in California's wild lands.
- Dedicate significant funding to invasive plant management.
- Partner with WMAs, Cal-IPC, and others on invasive plant management programs.
- Take an active role in leading the interagency Invasive Species Council of California and implementing the actions recommended in its Strategic Framework.
- Educate the public on the wildlife impacts of invasive species, and how citizens can help reduce the problem.

Sincerely,

Jim Hanson

President, CNGA Board of Directors and Conservation Committee Chair

cc: Stakeholders Advisory Group and Cal-IPC:

Mark Biddlecomb, Ducks Unlimited: [mbiddlecomb@ducks.org](mailto:mbiddlecomb@ducks.org)

Jay Ziegler, The Nature Conservancy: [jay\\_ziegler@tnc.org](mailto:jay_ziegler@tnc.org)

Kathy Wood, Tulare Basin Wildlife Partners: [kwoodmclaughlin@gmail.com](mailto:kwoodmclaughlin@gmail.com)

Dan Taylor, Audubon California: [dtaylor@audubon.org](mailto:dtaylor@audubon.org)

Kim Delfino, Defenders of Wildlife: [kdelfino@defenders.org](mailto:kdelfino@defenders.org)

Eileen Reynolds, Tejon Ranch: [ereynolds@tejonranch.com](mailto:ereynolds@tejonranch.com)

Nita Vail, California Rangeland Trust: [nvail@rangelandtrust.org](mailto:nvail@rangelandtrust.org)

John Carlson, Jr., California Waterfowl Association: [jcarlson@calwaterfowl.org](mailto:jcarlson@calwaterfowl.org)

Bill Gaines, California Outdoor Heritage Alliance: [bill@outdoorheritage.org](mailto:bill@outdoorheritage.org)

Karen Buhr, California Association of RCDs: [karen-buhr@carcd.org](mailto:karen-buhr@carcd.org)

Darla Guenzler, California Council of Land Trusts: [darla@calandtrusts.org](mailto:darla@calandtrusts.org)

Doug Johnson, Director, California Invasive Plant Council: [dwjohanson@cal-ipc.org](mailto:dwjohanson@cal-ipc.org)