



California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision: Barriers to Implementation Report

April 20, 2012



How to cite this document:

California Fish and Wildlife Vision Project. *California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision: Barriers to Implementation Report*. April 20, 2012.

*"We can chart our future clearly and wisely only when we know
the path which has led to the present."*

— *Adlai E. Stevenson*

California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project
California Natural Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814
<http://www.vision.ca.gov/>
Strategicvision@resources.ca.gov

Contents

Executive Summary.....	iii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Background.....	2
Overview of Past Evaluations	3
The Mandate of AB 2376.....	5
Chapter 2: Assessment.....	7
Purpose and Process.....	7
Assessment Findings.....	7
Expanded DFG Mission.....	8
Political Landscape	9
DFG Leadership	9
Priorities	10
Funding.....	10
Organizational Issues.....	11
Culture.....	11
Permitting Process	12
Enforcement.....	12
Staff Training	13
Science	13
Fish and Game Commission	13
Legislative Relationships	14
Communications and Stakeholder and Public Relations.....	14
Reorganization	15
Chapter 3: Literature Review	17
Introduction.....	17
Scope and Method of Research.....	17
Background.....	18
Barriers to Implementation: External.....	18
Mandates and Procedural Conditions.....	19
Conflicting or Unclear Mandates	19
Procedural Requirements	19
Shifts in Demographic Values and Constituent Interests.....	20
Funding Sources	22
Barriers to Implementation: Internal	23
Hierarchical Structure.....	24
Leadership	25
Technical Expertise.....	26
Communication	27
Collaborative Processes.....	28

Barriers to Implementation – A Call for Transformation.....	29
Chapter 4: Recommendations from the Assessment	31
DFG Leadership and Opportunities for Change.....	31
Expanded DFG Mission	32
Funding	32
Priorities.....	33
Organizational Change.....	33
DFG Strategic Planning Process	34
Legislative Relationships.....	35
Stakeholder Relationships	35
Communications and Public Relations	36
Fish and Game Commission Structure.....	36
References for Literature Review (Chapter 3)	37
Appendix A: Past Evaluations of DFG and F&GC.....	41
Appendix B: Interview Participants.....	43
Appendix C: Interview Questionnaire	45
Appendix D: Survey Questionnaire	47
Appendix E: Survey Participants	49

Executive Summary

As part of developing the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision (CFWSV), an assessment was conducted examining past evaluations of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and Fish and Game Commission (F&GC) - and the degree to which recommendations from those evaluations were implemented. The purpose of the assessment was to provide feedback on how effective DFG and F&GC have been in implementing past recommendations for improvement and identify any barriers that have constrained or prohibited implementation of such recommendations. In concert with the assessment, a literature review was conducted to identify and describe commonalities and differences in the barriers that government agencies (particularly those with public trust roles for protecting natural resources) encounter in their efforts to fulfill their responsibilities.

Consisting of both the assessment and literature review, this *California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision: Barriers to Implementation Report* is not intended to judge the efficacy of DFG or F&GC nor comment on the good works and accomplishments of these organizations and their employees. Rather, the intent of the assessment is to identify past barriers to implementing changes; the intent of the literature review is to determine whether the barriers encountered in California have been experienced by other, similar organizations. The goal of both is to contribute to the likelihood of addressing such barriers in order to successfully implement the CFWSV and accompanying recommendations.

The Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) was engaged to assist the CFWSV Project staff in conducting the assessment and literature review. CCP is a unit of California State University, Sacramento College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies. CCP, in its role as a third-party neutral, assisted with developing interview and survey questions, conducting interviews, reviewing survey results, preparing the literature review and writing this report.

For the assessment, interviews were conducted with 19 key former and current state officials (legislative or executive) who had direct interaction with and/or participated in decisions affecting DFG and F&GC (interviewees). In addition, 22 individuals contributed to a supplementary on-line survey (respondents). Interviewees and respondents represent past and present leadership of DFG and F&GC, administration representatives and legislative staff.

Very few of the individuals interviewed recalled specific reports, recommendations and the outcome of those recommendations. Individuals responding to the survey had a much higher recall rate. Those recalling specific recommendations opined that while some recommendations were fully or partially implemented, most were not. In their opinion, recommendations most likely to be implemented included those related to audits and those addressing then-current high profile issues.

Of the vast majority of respondents that did not recall specific recommendations, the consensus view was that, in general, reports were not addressed due to one or more of the following main reasons:

- Adequate or lack of adequate funding - either condition negating any sense of urgency to address change.
- Politically unacceptable recommendations (e.g., recommendations to increase fees).

- Lack of political will - there is no legislative or administrative interest in fighting for change if there are no or few supporting constituencies.
- Overbroad reports, where implementation was considered infeasible.
- Lack of synchronicity with the annual budget cycle.
- Lack of follow up by the California State Legislature on Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) report recommendations.
- No commitment by DFG leadership to change.

Interviewees and survey respondents also offered insights into DFG and F&GC and discussed barriers to organizational change. A number of common themes emerged and the findings in Chapter 2 are organized according to those themes:

- Expanded DFG Mission
- Political Landscape
- DFG Leadership
- Priorities
- Funding
- Organizational Issues
- Fish and Game Commission
- Legislative Relationships
- Communications, Stakeholder and Public Relations
- Stakeholder Relations
- Reorganization

In addition to suggesting what have been the barriers to implementing changes at DFG and F&GC, many interviewees and respondents offered recommendations to help both organizations successfully transform to meet changing needs. Some key recommendations include:

- Strong leadership and a commitment to change by the director of DFG and the executive director of F&GC will be required to successfully transform DFG and F&GC into more open and responsive organizations.
- Recognize that any lasting and effective change is a long-term process that involves DFG and F&GC leadership, staff, internal cultural changes, external stakeholders and legislative support.
- Collaborative problem solving can produce sustainable change. Engage DFG employees at all levels as well as external stakeholders in shaping DFG's strategic plan. The plan should span the tenure of multiple directors and administrations.
- DFG is being asked to do \$1 billion in programs while receiving only \$400 million in funding. Since additional funding is unlikely in the near future, seek legislative relief from unfunded and

underfunded mandates. This will allow DFG to better prioritize efforts and achieve beneficial outcomes.

- Dedicated funds restrict DFG’s ability to set priorities. Seek legislative support to combine funds; this would allow DFG to manage habitats on a landscape basis rather than managing individual species.
- Encourage partnerships with non-profit organizations and other public departments and agencies to leverage limited funding.
- DFG must find a way to be relevant to 100% of California’s population – not just the 5% who are hunters and anglers. Brand and market DFG as a protector of California’s wildlife for the benefit of all citizens.
- Strengthen relationships with legislators and legislative staff.
- Hire more wardens.
- Continue the CFWSV Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) or some set of stakeholders that also includes employee representation. The purpose of the SAG would be to collaboratively advise DFG on priorities, better manage stakeholder expectations, and lobby the legislature on behalf of DFG and F&GC.

The literature review used scholarly peer-reviewed journals, academic and professional sources, and legislative or government agency reports. Research was conducted by searching specific terms in academic journal databases and online search engines to locate sources about organizational change or transformation within state and federal agencies, including sources found on the CFWSV website. A second search was conducted of terms about implementation and change barriers specific to natural resource management agencies. The literature search was not exhaustive of all sources related to the topic; rather the results reflect the best efforts to provide a substantial review of the relevant literature on the subject.

The literature review generally found that challenges to implementing change in fish and wildlife agencies across the country to be somewhat consistent with those that interviewees and respondents suggested exist in California. Three identified external barriers, or those which DFG and F&GC have little or no control over, were:

- Mandates and Procedural Conditions
- Shifts in Demographic Values and Constituent Interests
- Funding Sources

Five internal barriers, or those over which DFG and F&GC have the most control and ability to change, were:

- Hierarchical Structure
- Leadership
- Technical Expertise
- Communication

- Collaborative Processes

Ultimately, the literature suggested that transformation is needed within fish and wildlife agencies across the country, to reflect and meet the needs of today’s demographics. Those fish and wildlife agencies that have experienced similar barriers to implementing change may be able to offer lessons learned and potentially models for California to use.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This report, *California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision: Barriers to Implementation Report*, is part of the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision (CFWSV) Project. The purpose of the CFWSV Project is to fulfill the legislative mandate of AB 2376, which calls for the California Natural Resources Agency to convene a committee to develop and submit to the governor and legislature a strategic vision for the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC). In response to changing conditions and needs, the strategic vision is required to address, among other things, improving and enhancing the capacity and effectiveness of DFG and F&GC in fulfilling their public trust responsibilities for protecting and managing the state's fish and wildlife.

Many people and organizations have contributed significant time, energy and ideas to developing the CFWSV; a successful outcome includes not only developing the CFWSV and accompanying recommendations, but also successful implementation of both. A key element of the CFWSV Project is to identify some of the potential challenges facing DFG and F&GC that might stand in the way of successful implementation.

This report is composed of three sections: an assessment of current and former state officials (legislative or executive) who had direct interaction with and/or participated in decisions affecting DFG and F&GC, a Literature Review and a summary of recommendations offered by interviewees and survey respondents. The sections are:

1. **Assessment** of past reports and the degree to which past recommendations were implemented by DFG and F&GC (Chapter 2). Based on confidential interviews with and surveys from more than 40 former and current legislative and executive officials who had direct interaction with and/or participated in decisions affecting DFG and F&GC, this assessment provides insights into how effective DFG and F&GC have been in the past in implementing recommendations for improvement, and identifies any barriers that have constrained or prohibited implementation of such recommendations. Assessment findings are detailed in Chapter 2.
2. **Literature Review** of barriers to implementing change in fish and wildlife agencies in particular and government agencies in general. The literature review provides context for the strategic vision and potential recommendations, with a focus on what challenges to implementing change are faced by other fish and wildlife agencies around the country as well as other government agencies. The Literature Review is presented in Chapter 3.
3. **Recommendations** for change were also offered by assessment interviewees and survey respondents. They see transformation of DFG and F&GC as daunting but necessary to respond to changing demographics and societal values. They described their intent as wanting DFG and F&GC to be successful as they evolve to meet the challenges of the 21st century. Recommendations from interviewees and survey respondents can be found in Chapter 4.

The assessment and Literature Review contained in this report were never intended to be exhaustive, but are relatively comprehensive. And, because the assessment and the Literature review were performed separately, each may highlight barriers not identified in the other; this is neither inconsistent nor unexpected.

This report is not intended to judge the efficacy of DFG or F&GC nor comment on the good works and accomplishments of these organizations and their employees. Rather, the intent of the assessment is to identify past barriers to implementing changes; the intent of the literature review is to determine whether the barriers encountered in California have been experienced by other, similar organizations. Produced by staff and consultants responsible for supporting the CFWSV Project, this report is presented with the ultimate goal of offering potential guidance that can contribute to the likelihood of successfully implementing the CFWSV and accompanying recommendations.

Background

In 1927, California's governor established the Division of Fish and Game within the Department of Natural Resources, to be administered by the Fish and Game Commission (F&GC). In 1951, the division was elevated to department status and became the Department of Fish and Game (DFG). Currently, the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) oversees its Departments including DFG. These three entities – CNRA, DFG and F&GC – bear various responsibilities for stewardship of fish and wildlife at the state level.

While DFG continues to administer the policies and regulations set by the F&GC, the California State Legislature (Legislature) has also mandated other policies and program responsibilities to DFG. Over the years, DFG's responsibilities have been expanded from traditional fish and game management to now include such diverse areas as oil spill prevention and response, endangered and threatened species regulation, management of marine resources and ecological reserves, and natural community conservation planning. DFG also has lead, responsible, and trustee agency roles pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The mission of F&GC is, on behalf of California citizens, to ensure the long-term sustainability of California's fish and wildlife resources. While F&GC may be considered by some members of the general public as synonymous with DFG, F&GC is a separate entity that has been involved in the management and wise use of California's fish and wildlife resources since 1870. Between 1870 and 1940, individual commissioners served at the pleasure of the Governor; however, in 1940 the California electorate added a constitutional amendment that provides for a five-member F&GC, where members have six-year staggered terms, are appointed by the governor, and are subject to confirmation by the California State Senate. The constitutional amendment also empowered the Legislature to delegate to F&GC powers related to protecting, propagating and preserving fish and game.

The Legislature has delegated to F&GC a variety of powers, some general in nature and some very specific. A major responsibility of F&GC is the formulation of general policies for the conduct of DFG, while the director of DFG is responsible for administering DFG's activities in accordance with these policies. F&GC's policies concern fisheries and wildlife management, introduction of exotics, use of DFG-administered land, and a variety of other subjects.

Overview of Past Evaluations

Historically, CNRA, DFG and F&GC have been concerned, as have outside entities, with their strategy, that is, with how they structure their organizations, set priorities, and align their resources in order to best fulfill their missions. Over the years, a number of documents have put forward visions or recommendations for these agencies at the level that could be called strategic. *All references to documents in this section can be found in Appendix A.*

As long ago as 1958, a report mandated by Senate Concurrent Resolution (SCR) Number 126¹ included among its recommendations for DFG the following:

Clarify F&GC role as a policy-formulating body for DFG; improve DFG planning activities; revise departmental organization for further improvements; improve teamwork among DFG personnel; and establish better management controls. (Legislative Budget Committee, 1958)

Since then a number of studies, both internal and external, have made additional observations or recommendations for DFG and/or F&GC that have had strategic implications. Some examples include:

A Department of Finance Review of Nongame Activities (1976)² identified the continuing struggle of identifying and funding activities between “game” and “nongame.”

The “Little Hoover Commission” report (1990)³ was a review of DFG and F&GC undertaken by request of then-Assemblyman Stan Statham (R-Oak Run) because he was concerned about the efficiency of DFG (LA Times June 24, 1989). The report made a number of observations at the strategic level. For example, it stated, “F&GC has not, and as presently structured, cannot adequately exercise its statutory authority over DFG.” It also noted that F&GC did not work in a vacuum, but “...has difficulty meeting its mandate because of external pressures and factors outside of its control...” and noted the important relationships among the F&GC, CNRA, Legislature, and governor’s office.

The Legislative Analyst’s Office’s “A Review of the Department of Fish and Game” (1991) noted such structural and strategic issues as “lack of clarity of DFG’s mission”, “organizational problems”, and fiscal concerns.

A Vision for the Future (1993) was an internal study undertaken by DFG to review its organizational structure and begin the process of developing and articulating the future direction of DFG.⁴ The major conclusion of the internal committee that conducted the study was that DFG needed a more effective system for anticipating and responding to change and carrying out its mission. The internal

¹ Full title of report: *Booz, Allen and Hamilton: Report on Survey, Department of Fish and Game: Report of Booz, Allen and Hamilton to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (1958).*

² Full title of report: *Department of Finance: A Review of Nongame Activities The Department of Fish and Game: A Staff Reference Report (1976)*

³ Full title of report: *Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy: Report on California’s Fish and Game Commission and the Department of Fish and Game (1990)*

⁴ Full title of report: *Department of Fish and Game: Department of Fish and Game, 1990’s and Beyond: A Vision for the Future: the Department of Fish and Game, Its Mission, Values, and Goals to Meet the Challenge of the Future (1993)*

committee's consensus was that DFG had been "reacting instead of acting. The Department lacked an effective and systematic method of anticipating change or for reworking program and budgets as priorities change."

DFG Strategic Plan: Where Do We Want To Be? (1995) was the culmination of the process begun by the DFG internal committee that had produced "A Vision for the Future." The strategic plan for DFG stated that for successful implementation DFG "must: 1) align the structure of DFG's budget and the strategic plan so that it can evaluate the cost implications of modifying efforts in various areas; 2) formalize and implement the budgetary and planning cycles so that strategic and operational decisions affect the budget, and not vice-versa; and 3) begin the steps leading to action plans (for the budget year) to implement identified strategies."

Fish and Game Commission Strategic Plan (1998) was the result of F&GC's own strategic planning effort, begun in 1997. The plan was "strongly influenced" by public input solicited during focus groups and workshops held throughout California. The plan focused on California's diminishing fish and wildlife resources, their importance to California, their management, and the role of F&GC in meeting this challenge. The plan includes a strategic agenda – vision, mission, critical initial strategic challenges, goals, and implementation strategies – and a commitment to ensure the future sustainability of the state's fish and wildlife resources. This plan continues to be relevant to F&GC's activities.

Department of Fish and Game: Seven Strategic Initiatives (2006) was the most recent effort by DFG to develop its own strategy. The DFG director assembled a team of staff, middle managers, and executive team members to participate in a structured process to solicit, capture and assemble ideas – ultimately initiatives – that represented a direction for DFG. The group was challenged to look beyond day-to-day activities, however vital, and consider what legacy they would leave for wildlife, the public and DFG employees. They were tasked with determining how to maximize existing resources and capitalize on new funding sources to best insure this inheritance and to identify where organizationally the responsibility for these efforts would reside.

From this effort emerged the Seven Strategic Initiatives, each identifying current pertinent issues and goals/objectives/desired outcomes:

1. Enhance communications, education and outreach
2. Develop statewide land stewardship based upon resource needs
3. Develop strong water resource management program
4. Develop/enhance partnerships
5. Improve regulatory programs
6. Enhance organizational vitality by focusing on employees and internal systems
7. Expand scientific capacity

The Treanor Report (2009) was a study funded by a private foundation which surveyed wildlife stewardship organizations in other states as potential models for considering modifications to

California's wildlife management structures and processes. The study focused primarily on the relationship between DFG and F&GC, noting that

California has a tri-furcated system of wildlife management that is divided among the Commission, the Department, and the Legislature. Theoretically, the Fish and Game Commission sets policy and the Department of Fish and Game implements it. The Commission makes regulations and the Department enforces those regulations. In reality things are much more complicated.

The report went on to make a number of specific recommendations concerning both agencies.

Other studies and reports on DFG and F&GC have not been as explicitly strategic in their focus, but nevertheless highlight strategic issues. For example, two reports from the Bureau of State Audits have strategic implications: First, an audit of DFG's Office of Spill Prevention and Response, in its response to the 2007 Cosco Busan oil spill in San Francisco Bay, made recommendations touching on interactions with local governments, staff training, and funds management. Another, an audit of DFG's management of programs related to fish stamps required for sport fishing in the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, touched on such matters as DFG's ability to "identify, approve, and fund viable projects" for which fish stamp revenues were earmarked.

Similarly, the Legislative Analyst's Office has studied DFG on numerous occasions, on topics ranging so broadly as to include departmental reorganization, funding and fiscal management, and CEQA review processes.

A number of assessments and recommendations in these and other reports suggest the need for DFG and F&GC to develop and implement updated strategies to optimize their organizational capabilities and effectiveness. In addition, the legislation mandating the CFWSV notes that reforms may be necessary "to take on the challenges of the 21st century," including climate change and adaptation, and renewable energy needs.

The Mandate of AB 2376

In response to reviews of the past and current activities of DFG and F&GC, and in recognition of changing circumstances for which the agencies must prepare, California State Assembly Member Huffman introduced AB 2376 (2010), which was signed by the governor on September 28, 2010. It is this bill which mandates development of a strategic vision.

AB 2376 requires the California Natural Resources Agency to convene a cabinet-level committee to develop a California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision (strategic vision) for DFG and F&GC, and submit it to the governor and California State Legislature by July 1, 2012. This legislation is intended to establish a strategic vision for DFG and F&GC that addresses, among other things improving and enhancing their capacity and effectiveness in fulfilling public trust responsibilities for protecting and managing the state's fish and wildlife

The strategic vision is also intended to address the breadth of issues and mandates that constitute the purview of DFG and F&GC. AB 2376 requires that it address the following subject areas:

1. Improving and enhancing capacity of the DFG and F&GC to fulfill their public trust responsibilities to protect and manage the state’s fish and wildlife for their ecological values and for the use and benefit of the people of the state.
2. Comprehensive biodiversity management, including conservation planning and monitoring.
3. Sustainable ecosystem functions, including terrestrial, freshwater, and marine habitat.
4. Opportunities for sustainable recreational and commercial harvest of fish and wildlife.
5. Permitting, regulatory, and enforcement functions.
6. Science capacity and academic relationships, including strategies to protect and enhance the independence and integrity of the science that forms the basis for department and commission policies and decisions.
7. Education, communication, and relations with the public, landowners, nonprofit entities, and land management agencies.
8. Reforms necessary to take on the challenges of the 21st century, including, but not necessarily limited to:
 - A. Climate change and adaptation.
 - B. Meeting California’s future renewable energy needs while protecting sensitive habitat.
 - C. The restoration of the state’s native fish species.
 - D. Implementing and updating the state’s Wildlife Action Plan.
9. The development and deployment of technology to meet DFG’s mission, including data modeling, collection, and online reporting.
10. Budget and fiscal development, accounting, and management.
11. Coordination among state agencies.
12. Recommendations for institutional or governance changes, including clarification of the roles of DFG and F&GC.
13. Strategies for identifying stable funding options to fulfill the mission of DFG while reducing dependency on the General Fund.
14. Other recommendations deemed desirable by the committee.

The bill requires that the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Executive Committee (Executive Committee) seek input from elected officials, governmental agencies, and interested parties, and to review existing reports and studies on the functioning of DFG and other state models for fish and wildlife governance.

AB 2376 also requires the governor or Executive Committee to appoint a “blue ribbon” citizen commission or task force, a stakeholder advisory group, and any other group the governor or Executive Committee deem necessary or desirable to support the Executive Committee in developing the strategic vision.

Chapter 2: Assessment

Purpose and Process

The purpose of the assessment was to examine how past strategic recommendations have been implemented and identify any barriers that have constrained or prohibited the implementation of such recommendations. A list of twenty-eight past evaluations of DFG and F&GC was developed as a basis for discussion. The list includes reports from the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), Bureau of State Audits and other sources – and can be found in Appendix A.

Interviews were conducted with individuals who had direct interaction and/or participated in decisions affecting DFG and F&GC. See appendix B for the list of interviewees. The project team created a questionnaire (Appendix C) for use as a springboard for the interviews. Emails were sent to interviewees inviting them to participate in the assessment. Confidential interviews were conducted between November 9, 2011 and March 23, 2012 with 19 individuals representing the administration, legislative staff and DFG from the years 1990 through 2011. Questionnaires were provided in advance to the interviewees.

To broaden the base of information, a survey (appendix D) was developed and sent to a larger group of individuals who also had direct interaction and/or participated in decisions affecting DFG and F&GC. Twenty individuals responded (Appendix E).

The results of the interviews and survey were reviewed to identify common themes, barriers to implementation of past recommendations, and other comments and recommendations offered by interviewees. The draft assessment report was review by the CFWSV Project Team in preparation for release to the CFWSV Executive Committee for consideration as they develop the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision.

Assessment Findings

Very few of the individuals interviewed recalled specific past evaluations of DFG and F&GC, recommendations, and the outcome of those recommendations. Individuals responding to the survey had a much higher recall rate. Those recalling specific recommendations opined that while some recommendations were fully or partially implemented, most were not. In their opinion, recommendations most likely to be implemented included those related to audits and those addressing then-current high profile issues. One example cited was the improvement of fiscal transparency in response to the 2005 Bureau of State Audits Report. A comment was made that recommendations that included a detailed problem statement were more likely to be considered.

Many interviewees and survey respondents (respondents) recalled parts of recommendations being implemented but very few could cite specific examples. A few suggested that some recommendations were addressed incrementally by DFG and F&GC. The majority of interviewees and respondents agreed that DFG had not broadly communicated successful implementation of recommendations.

Of those that did not recall specific recommendations, the consensus view was that, in general, reports were not addressed due to one or more of the following main reasons:

- Adequate or lack of adequate funding - either condition negating any sense of urgency to address change.
- Politically unacceptable recommendations (e.g., recommendations to increase fees).
- Lack of political will - there is no legislative or administrative interest in fighting for change if there are no or few supporting constituencies.
- Overbroad reports, where implementation was considered infeasible.
- Lack of synchronicity with the annual budget cycle.
- Lack of follow up by the Legislature on Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) report recommendations.
- No commitment by DFG leadership to change.

Interviewees and survey respondents also offered insights into DFG and F&GC and discussed barriers to organizational change. Several common themes emerged, and the findings are organized according to theme.

Expanded DFG Mission

Initially a “hook and bullet” organization with a goal of sustainable hunting and fishing, interviewees described DFG’s expanded role to now include habitat protection, stewardship and additional regulatory responsibilities. Constituencies have expanded to include preservationists, recreationalists and other non-consumptive users. Interviewees and respondents opined that the organization has not evolved quickly enough to meet the expectations of all users, which has fostered mistrust of DFG and F&GC. To compound the issue, stakeholder expectations have expanded, and in some cases exceeded, DFG’s capacity and funding.

Several interviewees and respondents indicated that there is frequently tension between biologists who manage a species for take (e.g., those who see wild pigs as a hunting resource and a source of revenue) and environmentalists who support biodiversity (e.g., those who see wild pigs as a pest). Constrained by dedicated funds and further compounded by inadequate resources, DFG is inherently conflicted in meeting its mission of *“managing 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.”* Interviewees and respondents believe this conflict has become a polarizing factor and a barrier to change.

Many interviewees and respondents believe that habitats should be managed at the landscape level instead of species by species. Wildlife areas and ecological reserves are viewed as potential demonstration sites for landscape management.

Political Landscape

Interviewees and survey respondents alike commented that DFG is not a priority within most administrations, leaving DFG with little political power to advance the Department's agenda. Many commented that the Director seldom has had the ear of the Governor. Instead, Governors are more likely to hear from displeased constituents.

Several individuals commented that DFG is one of only a few regulatory bodies whose director reports directly to the Governor. Concern was expressed in two areas. First, the director is subject to political influence in decision-making. Examples of political influence were cited (e.g., timber harvest plans, etc.) Second, unlike other bodies such as the Water Boards, there is no public forum to appeal decisions. In the example of the Water Boards, the Executive Officer reports directly to the Regional Board. The public can appeal decisions to the Board.

Political influence was cited as a barrier to long-term change.

DFG Leadership

All interviewees and respondents agreed that DFG is a complex organization. Several individuals commented that few are aware of all DFG does – including some past directors. More than one interviewee noted that there appears to be a higher-than-normal rate of turnover of the DFG director. The result is a lack of continuity of leadership which in and of itself is a barrier to change. By the time a strategic plan with performance measures is developed and communicated, the director is often gone. Without consistent leadership, change is constant but ineffective.

Several interviewees and respondents commented that DFG is constantly faced with the need to deal with short-term challenges. It is difficult to find time to address long-term issues, particularly in tough budget years. DFG would be well served to develop long-term planning to prepare DFG for the future.

There is also a perception of diffused authority, control and responsibility at the leadership levels. A few interviewees felt that almost everyone can say “no”; few can say “yes.” Without strong leadership, one interviewee commented that DFG focuses on *what* to do and seldom engaged in discussions of *how* to do it.

Under the direction of the director, DFG branches are empowered to formulate policy and develop budgets. Regional managers are tasked with implementing that policy. While acknowledging the diverse habitat in each of the seven regions, interviewees and survey respondents commented that DFG policy is not implemented consistently across the regions. Some suggested the lack of consistent application of policy was due to training, funding and lack of executive leadership. Other cited the decentralized organization. All agreed that consistent policy implementation was important.

Interviewees and respondents also expressed concern that DFG does not work well with other agencies and potentially creates its own problems. Several examples were cited where DFG chose not to cooperate with other agencies. One example cited was DFG choosing to develop a separate (and incompatible) GIS system of marine data despite the fact the Ocean Protection Council has created a multi-agency collaborative to develop a web portal for all ocean-related information.

Priorities

A few interviewees suggested that DFG priorities are currently based on legislative mandates first, judicial directives second and other mission critical discretionary activities third. While acknowledging that DFG does not have the luxury of ignoring legislative or judicial mandates, many respondents agreed that these criteria for setting priorities do not serve DFG well. Budget constraints and underfunded and unfunded mandates exacerbate the problem of setting priorities. The prioritization process is further compounded by the politics of competing constituencies. Several respondents indicated that it was difficult to set and stand by priorities and that this is, in itself, a significant barrier to change.

Funding

The overarching barrier to change identified by all interviewees and respondents was funding. Interestingly, it was not lack of funding (though most acknowledged this as a major problem) but rather the tension between consumptive users and those who support non-consumptive uses. DFG is involved in delivering good programs but is under enormous pressure to satisfy all constituencies. It was pointed out that the current Fish and Game (F&G) Code mandates an estimated \$1 Billion in activities; current DFG funding is at \$400 Million. The core issue is that the F&G Code exceeds DFG's capacity. All agreed the question to be answered is: What are the citizens of California willing to pay for?

A majority of interviewees and respondents commented that there is a disconnect between legislative priorities and DFG's budget. The Legislature frequently mandates programs without providing adequate funding. The Legislature also appears to be unwilling to raise fees on existing programs to bridge the Department's gap between revenues and operational costs. Timber harvest plans and streambed alteration agreements were cited as programs with inadequate fees to cover costs. In these budget constrained times with General Fund money being cut, DFG is in a difficult position. Legislation requires DFG to comply with the mandates; it doesn't give DFG the option to ignore mandates irrespective if adequate funding is available.

The current budget structure is thought to be too complicated. Interviewees and respondents cited the myriad of dedicated funds. Not trusting DFG to fulfill its mission to support traditional hunting and fishing programs, respondents stated that constituents have lobbied past legislatures to tie funding sources to management of specific programs. Currently there are in excess of 40 dedicated funds. Compounding the issue are the constituencies associated with the various dedicated funds who believe it is "their money" and only they can decide how it should be spent. Frequently they do not want to pay the administrative overhead for DFG to manage the fund. In addition, with so many different funding sources, it is difficult for some staff to properly charge their time to specific programs. An example cited was a warden who checks a fishing license while investigating a report of deer poaching.

Several interviewees and respondents commented that lack of resources cannot be fixed by reorganizing DFG. Most suggested that the answer is more staff and money or recognition that DFG cannot fulfill all its obligations as currently funded and needs to realign priorities. There were several suggestions that DFG be more strategic in setting priorities. There was also recognition that legislative

mandates do not allow DFG to prioritize programs; the word “shall” in statute does not allow DFG the luxury of implementing only programs they can afford.

Several other comments were recorded as follows:

- A few individuals commented that DFG lacked a process to evaluate the effectiveness of various programs.
- Fluctuating funding presents a challenge to DFG. It is difficult to manage programs from one year to the next without a relatively constant and stable funding source.
- Public-private partnerships were seen as a way to leverage reduced funding. A comment was made that DFG needs to be open to new ways of doing business. The challenge will be to structure partnerships to avoid bias and economic benefits to private partners.

Organizational Issues

Culture

DFG and F&GC are perceived as conservative, closed organizations with little history of involving outsiders. For the most part, DFG is seen as a traditional hunting and fishing organization with an institutional culture that is more reactive than proactive and not conducive to change. Several interviewees and respondents commented that DFG takes a conservative approach to programs with a goal of avoiding litigation and negative press. Also, a few individuals commented that DFG staff are not encouraged to think “outside the box”; they tend to be “problem finders” not “problem solvers.”

DFG employees are seen as dedicated and hard working. It was the opinion of many that working for DFG was more than a job; it represents the personal values of staff. The lines between regulation and advocacy are said to be occasionally blurred. Some interviewees suggested that DFG staff, in some cases, appears to be too close to those they regulate and may potentially be biased. Concern was expressed that regulations are not always being consistently enforced.

A majority of interviewees and respondents commented that DFG is perceived as an organization that serves the hunting and fishing community rather than the environmental community and non-consumptive users. Examples cited include an onerous process, similar to applying for a hunting license, to obtain day use passes to some DFG wildlife areas. Several interviewees opined that staff members see themselves as interacting with just 5% of the state’s population instead of seeing themselves as trustees of fish and wildlife resources benefitting 100% of the population.

DFG staff is said to be sometimes viewed by those outside DFG as having a superior attitude of knowing what’s best for a particular species or habitat. A comment was made that DFG appears to be resistant to allowing users to fully enjoy wildlife sites; many areas (more than necessary) are off-limits to the public. A few individuals also commented on internal tension between environmentalists (with a focus on biodiversity) and biologists (focusing on managing species).

Concern was expressed for future DFG employees. A comment was made that DFG job classifications are too narrow to attract the best and brightest college graduates. The narrow job classifications also are seen to restrict the diversity of the workforce.

Permitting Process

Many interviewees and respondents opined that obtaining a permit through DFG is difficult and time-consuming. Frustration was expressed by some about voluntary habitat conservation and restoration program permitting. They commented that the process currently “takes forever.” Streambed Alteration Agreements were also cited as an unnecessarily lengthy process. One respondent commented that regions have designated Regulatory Specialists. Concern was expressed that DFG has created a class of staff who do not interact with the resource. Additional comments were made that it is difficult to agree on permit terms and conditions because of DFG’s presumption of impacts. It was said that DFG now requires applicants to provide proof of no impact rather than DFG investigating potential impacts.

Most interviewees and respondents agreed that some regulatory programs would benefit from a review. Created by statute, not all are as effective as intended. Also, a few commented that DFG could benefit from educating the Legislature on proposed new statutes. It was believed that typically another law is not always needed; instead DFG needs to enforce what’s already on the books.

Enforcement

Most interviewees opined that environmental laws were not being adequately enforced by either DFG staff or wardens – to the detriment of fish, wildlife and plant resources. As the most visible enforcement arm, all agreed that wardens were understaffed and underpaid, making retention difficult. The number of wardens was thought to be at the lowest levels in recent memory. While all supported raising warden salaries, most agreed that it would be a mistake to merge the DFG warden’s union with the California Highway Patrol. Concern was expressed that priorities could change that would negatively impact enforcement of environmental laws.

All agree that the warden’s job was more than checking fishing licenses. A comment was made that when the Warden Academy was created, wardens were trained in resources management as well as law enforcement. A concern was expressed that this is no longer the case.

Wardens now are a division within DFG and report directly to the director. Previously wardens reported to the regional managers. That previous “chain of command” was said to allow biologists to decide enforcement priorities, not the wardens. Several interviewees believe the current structure divides DFG – biologists vs. wardens. Interviewees were split on the appropriate organization. Some thought the wardens should first and foremost be DFG employees and law enforcement personnel second, focusing on enforcing environmental laws and reporting to the regions. Others saw the warden’s current role and reporting structure as appropriate. The question of whether wardens are primarily law enforcement personnel or primarily fish and game enforcement personnel was viewed as a dichotomy and a barrier to change.

Several interviewees and some respondents also commented that wardens are handicapped by outdated technology. Examples cited include the inability of wardens to communicate with other law enforcement agencies due to incompatible equipment.

Staff Training

Inadequate staff training was cited as a barrier to change. Several interviewees commented that wardens initially receive 22 weeks of training; biologists and other staff receive one week of training a year, if they are lucky. Yet both wardens and biologists are expected to know the California Fish and Game Code.

While training is costly, many commented that the benefits are seen to outweigh the expenditures. Group trainings would provide an opportunity to communicate department policies and, at the same time, provide cross-pollination of ideas across regions.

Science

Several interviewees suggested that while science is not a barrier to change, proper use of science provides confidence in and creditability to DFG and F&GC. Several interviewees observed that post-Prop 204, DFG has outsourced most scientific investigation and research. DFG staff has become contract managers rather than scientists. Once known for its research capacity, some respondents expressed frustration that DFG is no longer able to do “incubation” science.

One interviewee commented that monitoring programs and adaptive management seem to be missing from many DFG projects. They opined that lack of monitoring programs have potentially delayed the discovery of adverse conditions.

Fish and Game Commission

Interviewees and respondents generally viewed the current F&GC structure as less than effective. Most thought the role of F&GC is important, but agreed that the current system of part-time commissioners is inadequate. F&GC makes 40 – 50 rules a year – thought to be second in number only to the California Department of Food and Agriculture. Part-time commissioners do not appear to have adequate time to keep up with the issues, let alone find additional time to research topics. In addition, commissioners are not held accountable for missing meetings.

Interviewees and respondents were split on changing the composition of F&GC. Some thought F&GC should be a professional body with commissioners required to have specific expertise (e.g., finance, science, etc.). Others thought expanding the time commitment for commissioners (along with an increase in pay) would provide adequate time for thoughtful decision-making. Most all agreed that more representatives from non-consumptive users should be on the commission.

The current F&GC structure relies on DFG staff for research and analysis. F&GC has no independent options for verifying data. One interviewee suggested that F&GC occasionally yields to special interest groups. Without adequate staff support or independent science review, F&GC can be influenced by factors other than best available science.

Several interviewees commented that F&GC is supposed to provide guidance to DFG on policy priorities but lacks the legislative authority to require DFG to follow that guidance. Conversely, some policies promulgated by F&GC either conflict with existing statutes or lack the resources for DFG to implement. One example cited was pet turtle and frogs released into the wild where they are viewed

as invasive species. F&GC created policy to stop issuing importation permits for turtles and frogs, yet DFG can't enforce this policy because it's counter to statute.

While several interviewees mentioned previous recommendations to have the DFG director report to F&GC, almost all agreed it would be politically infeasible (the director currently reports to the Governor) and ill-advised. However several interviewees opined that DFG and F&GC would benefit from better communication. Paradoxically, several interviewees opined that there is no formal way for the DFG director and F&GC Commissioners to communicate. Open meeting laws prevent ex parte communication.

Legislative Relationships

Any long-term change to DFG and F&GC will require legislative support. DFG is not seen as having a strong relationship with the Legislature or legislative staff. While relationships with the Legislature are improving, a few interviewees mentioned that DFG legislative staff is not visible at the Legislature and have missed opportunities to strengthen legislative relationships. Comments were made that DFG tends to be reactive rather than proactive in the legislative arena. Several interviewees and respondents commented that DFG has a reputation for exaggerating funding needs. It was also pointed out that California State Senate and California State Assembly staff members do not enjoy free access to DFG employees, unlike or to the same degree they do with other departments and agencies. Instead, all requests for information are required to go through DFG's Legislative Affairs office.

Term limits have reduced the time individual legislators have to understand diverse departments such as DFG. Many do not understand all that DFG is responsible for and what it accomplishes. Unlike DWR and the water contractors, it was pointed out that DFG does not enjoy a single, large stakeholder group to assist with lobbying the legislature. Instead, DFG has many diverse stakeholder groups that lobby on behalf of a variety of individual interests and issues.

Communications and Stakeholder and Public Relations

Many interviewees and respondents commented that DFG is not an effective communicator – both internally and externally. Despite the Department's trustee role, the citizens of California do not appear to see the value of DFG. The 5% of the population that DFG interacts with typically see DFG as a regulatory body imposing unwelcome restrictions. Clearly DFG suffers from a negative image.

Stakeholders unmistakably want to see DFG succeed. Several interviewees and respondents commented that DFG suffers from unrealistic stakeholder expectations that DFG will do it all. Additionally, stakeholders tend to think something's broken within the Department when they can't achieve their individual goals. Recommending solutions will not solve the underlying problems unless the problem is fully understood— from all perspectives—and determined to be a problem. This California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision project is seen as a good start in building stakeholder relations.

Reorganization

DFG is thought to have survived three or four reorganizations in the last ten years. None are thought to have produced lasting change and have had the unintended consequence of creating low staff morale. Previous reorganizations have addressed symptoms, but rarely the underlying problems. One example cited was prioritizing answering the phone does not address the underlying problem of inadequate staffing. All agreed that commitment by DFG leadership is required to effect change. It also requires support from the Administration for DFG leadership to be successful.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 3: Literature Review

Introduction

The assessment findings in the preceding chapter represent the professional experience of individuals who have been involved in the leadership of and direction to DFG and F&GC. It is an important information source to assess past organizational conditions and past efforts to implement reports and recommendations related to DFG and F&GC. However, an assessment of conditions specific to DFG and F&GC does not address which of these conditions are unique to California, and which are common to similar organizations throughout the U.S. Understanding this difference is important as it provides context and scale as to whether the challenges are distinct to California or whether the challenges are more common to other government institutions, and fish and wildlife agencies in particular; if the latter, then the experience of other organizations likely offers ideas for ways to overcome the challenges. Therefore, staff's effort in this study was to identify those barriers that exist in other fish and wildlife agencies and to search the literature on those barriers that appear to apply to California.

This literature review has been prepared to describe conditions that affect organizations similar to DFG and F&GC throughout the United States (U.S.). More specifically, this review presents insights about commonalities and differences that government agencies (particularly those with public trust roles for protecting natural resources) encounter in their effort to fulfill their responsibilities and overcome barriers to implementing change.

While not exhaustive, the literature review is relatively comprehensive. The review generally found that challenges to implementing change in fish and wildlife agencies across the country to be somewhat consistent with those that were suggested, through the interviews and surveys, to exist in California. This conclusion is important in that it confirms that California's DFG and F&GC confront many of the challenges that other fish and wildlife agencies also face. As a result, other states and government agencies may have useful suggestions and solutions to share as efforts are made to implement the CFWSV.

Scope and Method of Research

The literature referenced in this review comes from scholarly peer-reviewed journals, academic and professional sources, and legislative or government agency reports. Two criteria were used to screen and select sources for review:

1. Literature that addresses the question about what barriers impede organizational change in government agencies, and
2. Literature that presents research conducted by an organization located in the United States. Studies or reports conducted in or about other countries were omitted since U.S. cultural biases and differences are unique.

Research was conducted by searching specific terms in academic journal databases and online search engines to locate sources about organizational change or transformation within state and federal agencies, including sources found on the CFWSV website. A second search of terms about implementation and change barriers was conducted to locate literature specific to identified barriers and natural resource management agencies. The research was not exhaustive of all sources related to the topic; rather the results reflect the best efforts to provide a substantial review of the relevant literature on the subject.

Regarding the applicability of sources in this literature review, scholarly sources provide empirical evidence and theoretical analysis of the barriers that impede implementation of organizational change (as they relate to the conditions specific to government agencies). Non-scholarly sources provide additional understanding and context of these barriers to implementation.

Background

Federal and state agencies routinely face challenges related to changing economic, social, environmental and legal conditions. In this context, it is appropriate to question how government agencies respond to these challenges, sustain their viability, and continue to provide for the public good now and in the future. Agencies can plan proactive measures to adjust to changes in their sphere of operation, or be reactive when forced to address unfavorable conditions. External and internal barriers can impede an agency's effort to adapt. In some cases, incremental adaptation is postponed to the point where major adaptation, or "transformation," is the only option to regain legitimacy and relevancy to the agency's field of work.

Barriers to implementing change can assume many forms, but fall into two broad categories, those that originate external to agencies, and those that originate internally; this study explores those two broad categories.

Barriers to Implementation: External

External barriers originate external to the agency and define the environment in which an organization must operate; these barriers are most difficult largely because the organization has no or limited ability to take corrective action and, instead, must rely on external sources or collective action with other organizations to address.

For reader clarity, external barriers are generally presented below as independent conditions. However, the literature routinely identifies an interconnection between these external barriers and reflects that in applied situations, several external barriers commonly exert influence on an agency simultaneously. This interconnectedness is therefore also reflected at times in the following text.

Three common external barriers found in the literature are:

1. Mandates and Procedural Conditions
2. Shifting Demographic Values and Constituent Interests

3. Funding Sources

Mandates and Procedural Conditions

The activities of federal and state agencies are by definition, the outcomes of direction initially provided by executive, legislative and/or judicial branches of government. While government agencies act with interpreted levels of autonomy, they are ultimately subject to these various branches that enable and guide them. In that context, the following description of external mandates and procedural conditions presents two unique factors:

- Conflicting or unclear mandates, and
- Procedural requirements

Conflicting or Unclear Mandates

Federal and state legislation give fish and wildlife agencies the authority to manage wildlife for recreational and, more recently, conservation purposes. Barriers the agency must overcome to create organizational change exist when the enabling legislation conflicts with another law (Samson & Knopf, 2001) or when mandates are not clear.

Nie (2003) addresses contradictory statutory and administrative language at a legislative level and notes that confusion about how to implement the statute sparks conflict and litigation to resolve congressional intent or to establish an enforcement mechanism. Additionally, in an effort to establish intent, Congress may articulate procedural requirements that lead to an agency engaging the public in formal processes. Conditions in the political system also illustrate that conflict can be “internally driven by competing human values or...by external factors such as political institutions, processes, budgets and communication strategies that prevent the common interest from being realized,” and it is this quandary that surrounds managers and administrators while they work to implement conservation strategies (Nie, 2003).

In 1991, the California Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO), found that DFG’s responsibilities had evolved from being primarily focused on the conservation of species for hunting and fishing, to a broader focus including resource conservation and identifying and protecting endangered species. This evolution required DFG to expand its programs and services to a broader constituency. In 2010, the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) concluded that the laws, regulations and policies governing natural resource management in the state have evolved over time such that we now have “...a tangled web of state, federal, local and non-profit and citizen group efforts and responsibilities.” As a result, these largely uncoordinated and disconnected efforts and responsibilities are inefficient and create uncertainty about what resource protection and management activities are taking place at a time when funding for such activities is limited (CNRA, 2010).

Procedural Requirements

In order for an agency to fulfill its duties under its enabling legislation, an agency uses statutory and regulatory procedures to guide its decision-making process; these procedures can lead to formal and lengthy processes to reach decisions.

McGarity (1991) finds by example, that shortly after the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) was created, its discretionary powers were increasingly and routinely challenged by various external institutional actors seeking to challenge early USEPA regulations. These actions, whether in the form of congressional and executive branch reviews or judicial findings varied over time but “...their combined impact has been enormous” on the procedural requirements for reaching decisions.

Similarly, in a discussion of how interest groups influence the timing of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) decisions to list species as endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), Ando (1999) found that more public interest in the decision to list a species results in greater delay to make a determination as USFWS complies with procedural requirements to review public petitions, public comments, and requests for hearings during the proposal period. The federal ESA requires USFWS to conduct procedural due-diligence to ensure candidate species are appropriately considered and determined of value for listing. Yet it is the procedural processes that creates a delay and makes USFWS appear to be unresponsive to imminent threats to the protection of endangered species (Ando, 1999).

Samson and Knopf (2001) found that more formal processes have led agencies to respond slowly to threats to species and habitats. For example, pressure from interest groups seeking to influence the listing of a species slows agency action at the federal level; agencies also engage in interagency consultation as required by many federal environmental statutes, which results in “procedural gridlock” (Samson & Knopf, 2001). In addition, procedural compliance becomes a means to protect planning documents from litigation and increase defensibility of agency decisions, which can lead to public processes that rely on formality, and inflexible positioning by the agency (Lachapelle, McCool, & Patterson, 2003). Illustrative of applied interconnectedness between external and internal factors, McGarity found that when bringing multiple staff perspectives together to ensure defensible procedural compliance, even when assuming that every staff member seeks to promulgate their agency’s rules consistent with statutorily- or administratively-established deadlines, the greater the number of agency staff involved the greater the potential for delay (McGarity, 1991).

While science is a critical component to informed decisions, Danter, Griest, Mullins, & Norland (2000) call out that “resource managers have been expected to increase predictability and reduce surprises. Consequently decisions were postponed pending ever-increasing data accumulation and analysis, which often resulted in organizational paralysis.”

Shifts in Demographic Values and Constituent Interests

The 1991 LAO review of DFG stated that California citizens’ participation in traditional hunting and fishing activities had decreased, that this trend was not likely to reverse as the state’s population grows and rural areas continue to be urbanized, and this demographic change, as well as environmental pressures on natural resources management, has led to expanded wildlife conservation responsibilities for DFG.

The hunting and fishing demographic shift is not isolated to California, and there are public attitude assessment studies that document changes in the human valuation of wildlife in the U.S. Over the last 15 years, Responsive Management (a public opinion and attitude survey research firm specializing in natural resource and outdoor recreation issues) has conducted surveys of the general public, hunters,

anglers, boaters, and wildlife viewers. In its spring 2005 Report, Responsive Management stated that 60 percent of U.S residents identified the environment as a very important issue, and “the top issues Americans feel are facing the nation’s natural resources and the environment are water resources, habitat loss, law enforcement, endangered species, and conservation education.” In a 2011 letter to Assembly Member Jared Huffman, LAO staff identified that Florida, New York, Texas, and Washington’s agencies also have responsibilities to provide public access to fish and wildlife resources, and to protect such resources for their intrinsic values, similar to California. This expansion of agency responsibilities is in part because human values have changed, including values of California’s citizens (Taylor, 2011).

Manfredo, Teel and Bright (2003) chart the changes to human valuation of wildlife, specifically the demographics of wildlife agency constituents, and “explore[s] the association between society factors theorized to affect value shift and wildlife value orientation.” The authors define value orientations as “traditionalist” who view wildlife in utilitarian and materialistic manners, and “protectionist” which “think wildlife should have rights similar to those of humans.” In this study, Manfredo et al. (2003) argues that declining residential stability, urbanization, and increasing affluence and education have contributed to the shift away from “traditional” wildlife value orientations. Manfredo, Teel, and Henry (2009) along with 19 state wildlife agencies in the western United States, collected data from 12,600 responses to create a baseline of human values of wildlife. The findings of Manfredo et al. (2009) support their argument that the modernization of society (i.e., urbanization, increasing education, increasing affluence) contributes to people’s views of wildlife shifting away from that of “traditional” views, and continued decline in hunting participation and acceptance of taking lethal actions to manage wildlife.

Some parts of the country may continue to have a more sustained interest in hunting and fishing activities. In the State of New York, Butler, Shanahan, and Decker (2003) conducted a survey of approximately 10,000 residents to assess their wildlife values with the Wildlife Attitudes and Values Scale (WAVS). One dimension of WAVS is “social benefits,” where responses indicate an appreciation of wildlife for its quality, existence, ecological role, education and behavior. Butler et al. (2003) found “no significant changes were detected in attitudes concerning [the] social benefit of wildlife as seen in the trend analysis from 1984–1996.”

In 1990, the Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy’s (Little Hoover Commission) report about DFG and F&GC indicated that these agencies encountered difficulties balancing the desires of traditional constituencies (hunters and anglers) to retain access to fish and game resources, with relatively newer constituencies’ desire for greater protection for fish and wildlife resources and other constituents’ requests to “take” resources for development purposes. The same report suggested that some constituencies had become more direct advocates for fish and wildlife policy and that the expectation of public participation in decision-making was growing as well. This led to constituencies touching every aspect of DFG’s and F&GC’s work. The Little Hoover Commission noted the need for DFG and F&GC to better understand and engage their constituencies since the constituencies would otherwise continue to intervene in agency decision-making in the form of legislative requests or litigation.

Decker, Krueger, Baer, Jr., Knuth, and Richmond (1996) found that as more people with different wildlife value orientations request to participate in a governmental agency’s decision making process,

the agency's historical structures, designed to serve traditional customers' hunting and fishing needs, will not meet the new customers' expectations. Additionally, this shift away from "traditional" values of wildlife, where the value is utilization, means less revenue from the sales of hunting and fishing licenses for the agency (Decker et al., 1996; LAO, 1991; O'Hare, 2006).

In addition, as demographics shift, urbanization expands, and more wildlife interacts with humans, the frequency of human-wildlife conflict grows. Messmer (2000) states that human-wildlife conflict, whether real or perceived, may result from government agency efforts to protect or conserve wildlife. He argues that the interactions human-wildlife conflicts create can provide an important opportunity to engage the public and increase support for professional wildlife management.

Funding Sources

Most of the literature reviewed highlighted reduced or insufficient funding as an external factor that impairs an agency's ability to implement change. In California, the Legislative Analyst's Office (Taylor, 2011) found that expanded mandates to DFG and F&GC were creating greater responsibilities without additional financial resources to support meeting those mandates. In 2001, at the request of DFG, O'Hare (2006) conducted an evaluation of the its funding mechanisms to better understand the "funding problem at the Department of Fish and Game." He concluded that "funding inadequacy, funding inflexibility and complexity, funding insecurity, and [the] maldistribution of funding sources" contributed to funding mechanisms not aligning with organizational systems; this was concluded because important players viewed the agency's activities differently and requested, or established, funding structures to meet the different perceived needs.

Externally, support must be developed from organizations with political oversight, as well as key stakeholders. The control of resources can be heavily influenced by powerful "political overseers" and interest groups; hence, their support is vital (Fernandez & Rainey 2006).

The 1990 Little Hoover Commission's report identified that California's budgeting process did not support the long-term upkeep of DFG programs that required planning and implementation, or acquisition and maintenance, due to the use of different funds during different budget years.

LAO's 1991 review of DFG found that funding was primarily from hunting and fishing license fees and taxes, but that revenue was in decline as fewer people purchased hunting and fishing licenses and the public's interest in wildlife activities changed. Thus DFG was forced to increase its reliance on environmental funds to replace lost user fee revenues. The 1991 review also noted DFG's difficulty with estimating short- and long-term revenues and funding needs, and that DFG was unable to accurately estimate program and service costs and to explain those expenditures to the legislature; this resulted in an increase in statutory restrictions on funds as a way to improve fiscal accountability. These complex statutory restrictions make effective policy implementation challenging due to the lack of flexibility. Additionally, these restrictions convolute the budgeting process, and constrain both DFG and the legislature from setting program priorities (LAO, 1991).

The 2011 LAO staff letter to Assembly Member Huffman found that other states have also seen a decline in revenues from hunting and fishing licenses and fees, and the California legislature's increase of DFG's conservation responsibilities has not included commensurate increases in funding. In addition,

as competing interests actively lobby for budgetary and legislative changes related to fish and wildlife agencies, many of the newer constituencies, such as non-consumptive wildlife-related recreation, do not directly contribute in the same way to support fish and wildlife agency budgets (Lueck, 2000; Manfredo, Decker & Duda, 1998).

Jacobson, Decker, and Carpenter (2007) address this notion of diverse funding as reflective of varied stakeholders' interests. The authors found that agency leaders are aware of the need to find new funding sources in the face of changing social values and expanding environmental threats, but are uncertain of the ways to do so other than to replicate other agencies' funding strategies.

There have been efforts at the federal level to enact legislation to create long-term, reliable funding sources for diverse wildlife conservation programs in an attempt to diversify funding sources beyond traditional hunter, angler, and trapper fees (Anderson & Loomis 2006). Anderson and Loomis (2006) also noted that in order to have an inclusive-stakeholder approach to wildlife management, funding structures must reflect diverse stakeholder interests.

Koontz and Bodine (2008), in their analysis of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service's efforts to implement ecosystem management strategies, found that these agencies faced structural barriers in the federal budgeting processes where funds were distributed program by program, and managers often work against each other to secure funding for their particular activity. In 2010, CNRA identified that the state's tendency to fund projects with a single purpose to address a specific issue leads to challenges in attempting to address multiple issues through more comprehensive planning and management.

Barriers to Implementation: Internal

Internal barriers to implementation are defined by the ability of an organization to implement change on its own. While internal barriers may be perceived as easier to overcome since the organization can generally address them without outside assistance. However, internal barriers can present significant challenges, and as Balthazard, Cook and Potter (2006) contend, internal forces, or culture, play a more critical role than external forces in affecting the ability to implement change within an organization.

Organizational culture emerged from a number of sources as a dominant barrier influencing agencies' ability to address and facilitate change. Organizational culture can be defined as the collective behavior of the individuals within an organization that develops over time and is formed by values, visions, norms, language, subsystems, beliefs and habits. Importantly for this study, how leadership and employees of an organization interact with one another, as well as the public, is influenced by the organization's culture. An organization's culture is representative of its employees' beliefs, values and norms, and those values and beliefs influence agency processes, and as new staff come into the culture they are trained in the ways of the culture, thereby reinforcing the authority of group's values and beliefs (Abrahamson & Fombrun, 1994; Schein, 1990; Schneider, Brief, & Guzzo, 1996).

Over time, an organization becomes more homogenous and defined by the personalities, attitudes and values of the individuals within the organization through a self-perpetuating cycle of attraction, selection and attrition (Schneider, Goldstein & Smith, 1995). The end result is that organizations take on distinct personalities or cultures and, eventually, become less flexible, more predictable in decision-

making, and unable to quickly adapt to changing circumstances, all undesirable characteristics for effectiveness in a rapidly changing or dynamic environment (Schneider and Smith, 2004; Schneider et al., 1995).

From an analysis of four state government departments using the Organizational Culture Inventory (OCI), a validated instrument designed to measure organizational culture in terms of behavioral norms and expectations, Balthazard et al. (2006) linked organizational culture to individual and organizational outcomes; they posit that organizations with dysfunctional cultures (those that have significantly lower efficiency, effectiveness and performance when compared to social standards) can lead to undesired outcomes even when the organization is filled with capable and eager employees. Their results found that constructive cultural norms were positively associated with respondents' reports of role clarity, quality communication, fit and job satisfaction. The governmental department with the most constructive culture was more effective and efficient than the other three departments, and the department with the most defensive culture exhibited the weakest efficiency and effectiveness of the four (Balthazard et al., 2006).

This section about internal barriers focuses on five main factors identified in the literature as key barriers for fish and wildlife agencies stemming from organizational culture:

1. Hierarchical Structure
2. Leadership
3. Technical Expertise
4. Communication
5. Collaborative Processes

Similar to the external barriers discussion, these factors are treated independently here, although the source authors commonly view them as being interconnected in agencies' efforts to implement change.

Hierarchical Structure

There are benefits to hierarchy within an organization, especially one that is young, that focuses on crisis management, that is primarily composed of standardized processes, or that face external uncertainties (such as goal ambiguity); hierarchy can provide greater internal control, clear lines of authority, concentrated decision-making, ordered efficiency, clear promotional pathways, and, in larger organizations, allowance for greater specialization in a particular knowledge area (Cameron & Quinn, 2006; Kraines, 1996; Stazyk & Goerdel, 2011; Hierarchy also has its weaknesses, including slow decision-making, inflexibility and rigidity that reduce the agency's ability to be innovative and adaptable, and the potential for reduced employee job satisfaction and performance; these weaknesses of a hierarchical organizational structure make it less useful for organizations that must adapt to rapidly changing or dynamic environments (Bass & Ovolio, 1993; Bennis, 1993; Powell, 1990).

In its 1990 Report, the Little Hoover Commission articulated that the DFG's organizational structure was highly hierarchical and that the rigidity limited cross-functional teams. Hierarchical relationships

can prevent employees from providing full and complete information to their superiors, and that can result in poor decisions on the part of leaders (Chaleff, 2010). Managers and biologists with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission pointed out in 2005 that the hierarchical nature of the agency discouraged or inhibited the implementation of adaptive management strategies (Jacobson et al., 2006). In a study to compare hierarchical and egalitarian groups' decision-making effectiveness, Edge and Remus (1984) found that in general the hierarchical groups took more time making a decision, enjoyed the task less, and in most circumstances had less effective results than the egalitarian groups; the exception was when individual members of a group were willing to make sacrifices that lead to a competitive edge.

Hierarchical structure is sometimes the result of practical necessity as a governmental agency grows. McGarity (1991) describes that internal responses of the fledgling USEPA to external reviews and challenges early in the USEPA's existence lead to an evolution of hierarchy and structure for the allocation of power within the agency.

In a similar vein, many agency structures were instituted during another era, yet the policies and processes to carry out the agency's functions have not kept pace with the external customers' needs (Jackson, 2005). For example, the assessment of USFWS efforts to implement ecosystem management strategies noted that agency systems and processes had not been updated to reflect the new management paradigm (Danter et al., 2000).

Leadership

A critical factor that can impede efforts to create change within an organization is the lack of strong and strategic leadership to develop a vision of the desired change; related to this factor is an agency not committing the necessary financial and human resources to sustain the needed change, or to not make significant alterations when a challenge at hand requires large-scale rather than incremental adjustments.

Articulating a clear need for change with sustained commitment by leadership must come from the top of the organization (Jackson, 2005). In the natural resource management field, Danter et al. (2000) specifically identifies leadership as "an overlooked tool" to implement and achieve ecosystem management, and that in order to do so, the agency must change from within to overcome the tendency to compartmentalize information. Government agencies' leadership must plan for the future, commit to the vision and the plan, and then communicate the vision and the plan's goals, needs, and purposes to all levels of staff, as well as to the public and other stakeholders (Decker, Jacobson, & Organ, 2011; Fernandez & Rainey, 2006; Lachapelle et al., 2003; Winchell, Sr., 2009). In California, increasing challenges in natural resource management (i.e., climate change, urbanization, invasive species, increased competition for natural resources) suggest that it will be necessary to better integrate multiple and diverse activities with strong leadership and strategic thinking to address the threats to healthy ecosystems (CNRA, 2010).

Visions are not plans, and the strategic thinking to create innovation and successful strategies requires strategic leadership (Samson & Knopf, 2001) as well as construction by leadership of a culture that supports the vision (Bass and Ovolio, 1993). Strategic leaders must also be conscious of their own mindset, and reflect on their preconceptions, which may hinder their ability to be visionary (Anderson

& Anderson, 2011). As this relates to ecosystem management techniques, Danter et al. (2000) articulates that “...personal communication and modeling of personal commitment by leaders are strong determinants of successful organizational change,” ultimately requiring a complete shift of the governance style of the organization.

Lachapelle et al. (2003) point to inadequate definition of planning goals, as well as “lack of trust, procedural obligations, inflexibility, and broader issues” as barriers to implementing a change process. In their case study of natural resource planning processes, the authors note that the presence of any one of these factors may impede the planning process.

Part of leadership’s role in developing a vision and commitment is to establish and communicate priorities. The 2011 LAO letter indicated that none of the fish and wildlife agencies in the four states it studied showed any prioritization of goals and objective or mandates, but rather all were equal. LAO suggests that this lack of prioritization leads to ad hoc decisions when resources are not adequate to pursue all mandates. While priority-setting rests with the legislature through the budgeting process, LAO suggests that budget requests should be informed by some type of strategic plan or set of annual priorities established by leadership. (Taylor, 2011)

Commitment by leadership to provide sufficient financial and human resources to accomplish transformation is a factor that Jackson (2005) and others identify as important to make change possible within an organization. “Leadership must be willing to devote adequate resources to the initiative, in terms of high-quality people and dollars, over an extended period” (Jackson, 2005). Fernandez and Rainey (2006) identify the failure of an agency to provide adequate resources to implement change as a reoccurring theme in public sector organizational change, and they further describe how the failure to provide sufficient support for change negatively impacts employees.

Leadership must also commit to ensuring that resource managers have the capacity to effectively address changing demographics and constituencies. Some authors, including Heywood (1997) and Samson and Knopf (2001), articulate the need to train resource managers to understand collaborative processes that incorporate participation by various stakeholders. Additionally, Winchell, Sr. (2009) describes the importance of assessing whether an agency’s training and development programs include training staff in customer-focused problem solving to meet customer and stakeholders’ changing needs and expectations. However, Winchell, Sr. also recognizes that budget limitations, and day-to-day workloads, makes providing sufficient training opportunities a generally unattainable goal (Winchell, Sr., 2009).

Technical Expertise

Another factor that contributes to internal barriers is the logical and common reliance on technical experts for information and science to support agencies’ decisions, and the unintended consequences of heavy reliance on that expertise.

Governmental agencies tend to employ technical experts and scientists as resource managers to inform and implement conservation management strategies (Keysar, 2005; Lachapelle et al., 2003). Schlager and Freimund (1997) suggest that this reliance on technical expertise has led to staff viewing problems in more functional ways rather than with an eye toward policy implications and the

complexities of blending diverse human perspectives and values into management decisions. Manfredo et al. (1998) state that the social aspect of modern wildlife issues cannot be adequately addressed using the traditional reliance on biology and must include other sciences such as economics, recreation, psychology and anthropology.

However, reliance on additional scientific expertise is not sufficient to ensure timely decisions that better integrate human perspectives. McGarity (1991) described the USEPA rulemaking process and how it relied on an “institutional expertise” that transcended the knowledge and experience of any individual person or office within the agency. Bringing together persons with such diverse expertise presented a “high potential for clash,” a condition that can be immensely creative or devastatingly destructive.

The premise that human interactions affect the natural world and that “actions of players involved in conflict, cooperation, or coordination help define the values of natural environments and the appropriateness of behaviors within or toward the natural environment” (Heywood, 1997), goes to the heart of understanding stakeholder interests regarding natural resources. Manfredo et al. (2003) in their study of the shift in the public’s values towards wildlife notes that “value orientations provide the foundation for an individual’s attitudes and norms, which in turn guide their behavior.”

Schlager and Freimund (1997) also indicate that information about the human dimension of wildlife management is a difficult concept for “hard scientists” to be comfortable with; scientists tend to view such information and perspectives with skepticism.

Communication

Inadequate or poorly constructed communication is a barrier to implementing change within an organization. Leadership must effectively communicate a vision and plan for change to all levels of staff and stakeholders (Lachapelle et al., 2003; Winchell, Sr., 2009).

Communication is a tool to share information between leadership and front line employees; more specifically, two-way communication is a major component of successful change (Jackson, 2005). Two-way communication is not just information generated by management and sent down to employees; rather, it is a feedback loop where staff’s input is sought and evaluated, thereby building participation, addressing both trust issues and resistance, and increasing their willingness to support change (Galambos, Dulmus, & Wodarski, 2005). Otherwise, employees engaged in change do not feel connected to the intended outcomes and will not support or accept the proposed changes (Reichers, Wanous, & Austin, 1997).

However, internal resistance is a form of feedback and provides an opportunity to open channels of communication (Ford & Ford, 2009). People within an organization often resist change for a variety of reasons, including the perceptions that:

- there is no need for change, and they are content with the status quo;
- the change will make it more difficult to meet their needs and create more work for no pay;
- the risks are greater than the rewards;

- the change is beyond their abilities, skills, motivations, or the organization’s structure;
- the change will not work;
- the change process is not going well, and they have no input on the decisions;
- the change is counter to their values; and
- those leading the change are not honest about impacts and success of the change (Yeager & Saggese, 2008).

Ford and Ford (2009) describe employees’ resistance to change as often stemming from uncertainty in the success of the process to reach viable and durable outcomes, new processes are measured against unsuccessful historical change efforts, and the fear of having to take on more work or responsibility without sufficient resources to accomplish tasks.

At the federal level, Leong et al. (2006) looked at communication and collaboration in almost 50 national park units and noted weak internal communication and collaboration among units and divisions within units as an ongoing challenge. The authors also noted that poor communication with the general public prevented increased public understanding of the role of national parks in wildlife management activities, as well as more advance public participation in identifying issues and potential solutions.

In the literature reviewed, authors identified the use of collaborative processes as one way to facilitate communication among and across agencies and stakeholders, though collaborative processes reach beyond improving communication.

Collaborative Processes

Another barrier to implementation stems from a lack of collaborative processes. Collaborative processes are a way to better integrate programs, and the multiple interests of stakeholders, to reduce adversarial approaches to resolving conflict.

Heywood (1997) argues that ecosystem management requires human impacts on the natural environment be considered from a social perspective, as well as from the more traditional time and geographic scales. The author states that this social perspective is relatively new in managing natural resources and requires resource managers who are skilled at assuming “...the role of social facilitator... [to]... establish processes that encourage effective communication and cooperation.” Often referred to as “community-based” decision-making, this social perspective may also require offering incentives to a wide variety of interests to gain their participation and cooperation. If successful, these cooperative efforts can lead to more consistent and effective long-term solutions to the problems ecosystem-based management is intended to address (Heywood, 1997).

For example, even though Florida’s Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission staff may value internal input and collaboration from colleagues, managers and biologists “saw little need to incorporate other stakeholders...except for partner land management agencies” in the decision-making process (Jacobson et al., 2006). However, Samson and Knopf (2001) reiterate the idea that to be effective in the long-term, an agency must use a structure that views diverse stakeholders and their interest as partners. Thus, the agency must help facilitate open dialogue about its purpose and objectives as it

moves beyond “conflicting missions, [government] malfunctions, and an overall lack of responsiveness” (Samson & Knopf, 2001).

If an agency does engage in collaborative processes to make conservation management decisions, the question arises of which parties should participate. Decker et al. (1996) identify the original customers and clients of fish and wildlife agencies as anglers, hunters, and trappers, who have traditionally provided revenue for agency conservation efforts through user fees. However, the authors call for agencies to expand their constituency focus beyond the traditional user groups and to view as stakeholders, all parties affected or potentially affected by, agency decisions and programs.

As the public seeks to engage with agencies during decision-making processes, collaborative processes facilitate managers’ ability to respond to diverse stakeholder interests (Decker et al., 1996). Collaborative processes are an opportunity for stakeholders and managers to communicate and build trust if the conditions allow for it. In their analysis of collaborative institutional arrangements to manage natural resources among various jurisdictional entities and stakeholders, Heikkila and Gerlak (2005) noted that information about ecological problems, guided along by leadership efforts, underpin federal regional efforts to adapt management actions to meet the increased demand for public participation.

Ansell and Gash (2008) specifically look at collaborative governance as a process that has emerged in response to adversarial decision-making and policy implementation that allows various stakeholders to engage each other to learn and have productive dialogue. At the same time, managers develop beneficial relationships with those stakeholders, to have shared meaning and form solutions. However, they also caution that even such efforts to provide an inclusive process may not be effective if powerful stakeholders manipulate the process, the public agency lacks commitment to the process, or the parties distrust the motives of others (Ansell & Gash 2008; Walker & Hurley, 2004). Manfredo et al. (1998) also argue that adversarial decision-making is not only inefficient, but also leads to additional conflicts, whereas incorporating human dimensions can lead to anticipating problems and creating more credible decisions.

In discussing the U.S. Army’s effort to implement legally mandated sustainability policies at base installations, Keysar (2005) emphasizes the need for collaborative processes by stating that assessment and planning tools used to meet the sustainability requirements must have defined “goals-seeking, relational or systems-based, holistic, adaptive and self-reflective, responsive, iterative, interactive and participatory” characteristics, as well as an organizational environment that “supports cooperation and information sharing.” The author indicates that Army practitioners need to develop innovative ways to collaborate with people across traditional funding and functional boundaries to mitigate its traditional system of process “ownership” by a particular environmental or planning division that can curtail integration of sustainability measures (Keysar, 2005).

Barriers to Implementation – A Call for Transformation

Incremental adaptation to changing circumstances is sometimes insufficient or postponed in an organization to the point where major adaptation, or “transformation,” is the only option to regain legitimacy and relevancy in a field of work. Transformational change takes the form of big leaps forward. Such big changes “often involve tensions between competing interests and values within and

outside the organization, [and] are better addressed as a whole rather than incrementally” (Danter et al., 2000).

Jacobson, Organ, Decker, Batcheller, and Carpenter (2010) argue that transformation is needed in fish and wildlife agencies on the basis that “contemporary challenges facing the institution due to changing ecological and social conditions, inadequacy of funding mechanisms to support wildlife management and conservation, increasing uncertainty of political support and environmental threats” are all reasons for an agency to transform, otherwise it will lose relevancy and its ability to effect change.

Decker et al. (2011) also calls out for fish and wildlife agency transformation to better realign with management objectives, diverse stakeholder interests, and threats to habitats and ecosystem functions. Samson and Knopf (2001) see transformation as necessary for agencies because “[government’s] problem-solving technique [of] creating another team and request[ing] additional funding has not solved” the challenges of the lack of agency leadership, piecemeal and conflicting statutory responsibilities, and agency structures that do not meet changing conditions.

Fernandez and Rainey (2006) suggest that fundamental change in the public sector requires pursuing comprehensive, integrative change throughout the organization since pursuing a single “subsystem” change does not provide sufficient momentum to sustain change. Changing multiple subsystems requires an understanding of their inter-relatedness and how changes will impact these and other systems in the organization; the order or sequence of change also matters. Managers must be able to develop processes for change that will lead to alignment of function and structure of the organization with the desired outcome (Fernandez & Rainey, 2006).

Ultimately, the literature suggested that transformation is needed within fish and wildlife agencies across the country, to reflect and meet the needs of today’s demographics. Those fish and wildlife agencies that have experienced similar barriers to implementing change may be able to offer lessons learned and potentially models for California to use.

Chapter 4: Recommendations from the Assessment

In general, interviewees and respondents see the transformation of DFG and F&GC as daunting but necessary. They unanimously agreed that DFG and F&GC have dedicated staff doing important work to protect the wildlife of California. All interviewees and respondents enthusiastically commented that they want to see DFG and F&GC be successful. In that spirit, they offered the following observations and recommendations to overcoming barriers to change:

DFG Leadership and Opportunities for Change

Absent strong leadership by the DFG Director and commitment from the administration and legislature, it is highly unlikely DFG will change. The literature review cites leadership as a critical factor. The following recommendations were offered by interviewees and respondents:

- Long-term commitment from DFG and F&GC leadership is required to transform DFG and F&GC into open and transparent organizations that meet the needs of wildlife in the 21st century. Stable management with a philosophy that change is good is needed.
- Recognize that any lasting and effective change is a long-term process that involves DFG and F&GC leadership, staff, internal cultural changes, external stakeholder involvement and legislative support.
- Any reorganization should be undertaken collaboratively. Bring everyone (DFG and F&GC leadership, staff, legislators and stakeholders, including the general public) together to find commonalities of purpose through education and discussion.
- Create a shared vision where all stakeholders can see something in it for them – consumptive and non-consumptive users as well as the general public. You can't get there from here if you don't have a vision of where you're going. The CFWSV is seen as a good effort to map out a sustainable future for DFG and F&GC by collaboratively creating a shared vision.
- Create short-term, medium-term and long-term goals and objectives. Incremental change is still change.
- Create succession plans to continue long-term desired future outcomes.
- Any changes must involve DFG and F&GC staff. Success can only be achieved when internal forces buy-in to the process. The literature review supports this contention.
- Develop people, relationships and partnerships. Then jointly figure out how to leverage resources to achieve DFG's mission, setting realistic expectations of stakeholders, staff, legislature, administration, etc.
- Critically investigate and identify the true, underlying problem before developing and implementing appropriate solutions. Look at issues from stakeholder as well as DFG perspectives.

Expanded DFG Mission

DFG's trustee role has grown to include habitat protection, stewardship and additional regulatory responsibilities. According to the literature review, this changing circumstance is not unique to California. Recommendations offered by interviewees and respondents to address the tension between consumptive and non-consumptive users include:

- Manage habitats on a landscape basis instead of managing for specific species. This approach is thought to fulfill the trustee responsibilities of protection of wildlife resources while achieving conservation goals. Wildlife Areas and Ecological Reserves were suggested as potential demonstration sites for landscape management.
- Encourage partnerships with non-profit organizations and public departments and agencies to achieve goals and leverage limited funding.

Funding

Funding is a major issue. Any meaningful change must include fiscal reforms. The literature review documents past and present issues. Recommendations include:

- Changing the funding structure will be highly problematic without support from stakeholders. It is currently an adversarial process. DFG should engage stakeholders to explore collaborative solutions.
- Combine dedicated funding to allow for managing habitats to promote both consumptive and non-consumptive uses. While consumptive users will likely not initially support license and tag funds being spent on habitat management, both species and users would benefit in the long term from a diverse and sustainable ecosystem. Combining dedicated funds would also allow DFG to leverage resources and achieve economies of scale.
- Create transparency of expenditures. Communicate costs including administrative costs. Strive to keep administrative costs reasonable. Transparency and accountability are critical.
- A critical question to be answered is: What is the problem—and what are you willing to pay for? Change requires funding.
- Use the current budget as a baseline for setting priorities.
- Be realistic in estimating fiscal needs; credibility with the legislature can build bridges instead of walls.
- Seek legislation to require the California State Legislature to provide adequate funding for all mandates. The Legislature acknowledges that DFG doesn't have enough money but directs DFG to do the best it can. This is not a sustainable future.
- Currently DFG is managed by budget. DFG might consider performance-based management. The thinking is that successful outcomes will attract adequate budgets.

- Develop a stable and sustainable funding source. A fee-driven budget is subject to economic elasticity. Recognizing that limited resources are likely a fact of life for the foreseeable future, respondents indicated the unlikelihood of support for this recommendation.
- Create new funding sources. Suggestions include environmental license plate fees, sales tax percentage dedicated for conservation, and a surcharge attached to purchases of outdoor recreation equipment. Interviewees and respondents agreed that this is highly unlikely in the near term.
- Become more aggressive when seeking higher fees for under-funded programs such as Timber Harvest Plan review, NCCPs and CEQA review. This is acknowledged as a highly political issue. A suggestion was made to promote higher fees as a means of providing for more staff that can perform reviews in a timely manner. It would be important for DFG to deliver on any promises made.

Priorities

There was general agreement that the establishment of short and long-term priorities are necessary to manage change. The following recommendations were made to provide for more departmental discretion in setting DFG priorities in an open and inclusive manner:

- Utilize an ongoing stakeholder group to assist with balancing budgets with priorities.
- Reconcile DFG Code with Title 14 to remove conflicts between statutes. As noted in the literature review, conflicting statutes are not unique to California.
- Seek legislative relief from outdated and unfunded mandates – and permission from the Legislature to prioritize activities based on available funding. An independent body might assist DFG in creating equitable priorities.
- Conduct a cost-benefit analysis of programs and activities could assist DFG in developing priorities by identifying cost effective programs.

Organizational Change

All interviewees and respondents agreed that strong leadership committed to change will be required to transform DFG and F&GC into more open and responsive organizations. The literature review further highlights organizational culture as a barrier to change and the importance of strong leadership to overcome that barrier. Recommendations from interviewees and respondents include:

- Any organizational change must involve DFG and F&GC staff from all levels of the organization. The leadership doesn't have a corner on creative thinking. Field and office staff often have insights that would facilitate change.
- A culture of teamwork needs to be fostered to maximize resources and improve fulfillment of DFG's mission to wildlife and users alike.
- Consistent implementation of policy across regions is highly encouraged.
- Communication is critical. This is noted in the literature review.

- While DFG is first and foremost a regulatory body, developing a culture of “getting it done” versus just saying “no” should be developed.
- Creating an expedited permitting processes dealing with voluntary conservation and restoration projects would assist with establishing collaborative partnerships.
- A permit appeal process is also recommended – with a high bar to prevent a flood of “nuisance” appeals.
- Tailor policies and procedures to recognize non-consumptive users separate from consumptive users. Instead of creating one-size-fits-all polices, tailor policies and procedures to appropriately serve diverse constituencies. One example cited is the recent change to purchase a day-use permit to visit Grey Lodge Wildlife Area. Daily visitors such as birdwatchers are said to now be subjected to the same onerous permit application process as seasonal hunting permits.
- All DFG-owned lands should be accessible to the public.
- Consider consolidating overlapping responsibilities with other state agencies. DFG now manages over 900,000 acres for habitat preservation, biodiversity and recreation. A recommendation was made to consolidate state-owned lands into one agency to manage and preserve open space. A holistic approach to managing resources in an integrated manner could reduce duplication of effort.
- Increase staff training. While training is costly, the benefits are seen to outweigh the expenditures. Group trainings would provide an opportunity to communicate department policies and, at the same time, provide cross-pollination of ideas across regions.
- Increase the number of wardens, paying them commensurate with other law enforcement agencies, and providing effective technology to assist them in performance of their duties.
- Several interviewees suggested that to maximize resources, oversight of wardens should be returned to the regions. This would allow wardens to support regional priorities. Their role could be expanded to issue permits that they would then enforce. Others felt expanding the number of wardens within the current structure would improve enforcement. All agreed this is a vital area to address.
- Several suggestions were made to create independent scientific expertise similar to the State of Florida. Others suggested creating an independent science board, similar to the Delta Stewardship Council, which would appoint panels of scientists with pertinent expertise to provide independent peer review of various research.
- Partnerships with universities and colleges should also be considered as a way to leverage resources.

DFG Strategic Planning Process

It was noted that DFG has announced the development of a Strategic Plan. Recommendations for creating an effective Strategic Plan for DFG include:

- Provide guidance and direction for the future that could span multiple Directors.

- Include clearly defined goals, objectives measurable outcomes and timelines for implementation.
- Provide much more detail than in the past.
- Include an annual performance evaluation that involves staff at all levels to evaluate progress and identify measures to improve performance.
- As part of the planning process, prioritization is critical. The Strategic Plan should include short-term, medium-term and long-term recommendations. Incremental change is still change.
- While feasibility of implementation should be factored in, the Plan should not exclude desired future outcomes that currently appear improbable.
- The Plan should also incorporate an adaptive management component. This is not a one-time fix-all process. Organizations are dynamic and create a mechanism to react to changing circumstances.
- Maintain transparency and accountability throughout the process. Annual reports documenting accomplishments would be well-advised.

Legislative Relationships

Any long-term change to DFG and F&GC will require legislative support. A majority of interviewees and respondents recommended:

- DFG and F&GC strengthen relationships with legislators and legislative staff.
- The DFG Director needs to prioritize building a strong relationship with the legislature.
- The Director should become more involved in budget issues and the legislative process.
- DFG and F&CG should become more proactively engaged in writing well-developed bills for legislative consideration.
- An on-going stakeholder group could assist with lobbying the legislature.

Stakeholder Relationships

DFG would benefit from a champion for change. Recommendations included:

- Continue the CFWSV Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) or some set of stakeholders that also includes employee representation. The purpose of the SAG would be to collaboratively advise DFG on priorities, better manage stakeholder expectations and lobby the legislature on behalf of DFG and F&GC. There is precedence for this. In the early 1990s, DFG established the Common Ground Committee of stakeholders. The purpose of the Committee was to establish trust in DFG and solicit support for issues such as Open Space. The budget was also shared with the Committee.
- Any advisory group must recognize the difference between “change” and “doing things the way I want you to do them.”

- Treating all stakeholders fairly will likely foster collaborative solutions that meet the needs of all parties. The literature review further highlights the benefits of collaboration.
- The Director was advised to become more involved in constituent groups such as hunting and environmental organizations. It would give the Director an opportunity to hear other perspectives and encourage support for DFG’s platforms. DFG staff is encouraged to provide better outreach to all stakeholders.

Communications and Public Relations

With hunting and fishing declining statewide, DFG will need to find new ways to engage citizens in its mission. Communication, education and outreach is key to working with the diverse population of California. This premise is supported by the literature review. Suggestions include:

- Brand and market DFG as a protector of California’s wildlife and a “can do” organization.
- DFG does good work; communicate and celebrate successes.
- Educate the public on the relevancy of DFG and F&GC to all Californians.
- Get DFG’s story out to the public. The recent articles about the wolf wandering into California seemed to capture the imagination of a significant percentage of the population. While not every success is a headline, capitalize on all opportunities to promote the good work of DFG and F&GC.
- DFG must find a way to be relevant to 100% of California’s population, not just the 5% who are members of the hunting and fishing community.

Fish and Game Commission Structure

While the interviewees were split on the proper number of F&GC members (recommendations varied from the current number of 5 to as high as 9), almost all thought members should be required to dedicate more time to the job – and be paid accordingly. Thoughtful decision-making requires more time. Recommendations include:

- Consider a model for Commissioners similar to the California Coastal Commission.
- Recruit F&GC members with more diverse backgrounds. Commissioners should represent all constituencies and be selected because of their ability to seek solutions.
- Create a Commission that is a good forum for debate.
- Hold commissioners accountable for missing meetings. A suggestion was made to initiate a rule to terminate Commissioners missing more than 3 meetings in a specified time period.

References for Literature Review (Chapter 3)

- Abrahamson, E. and Fombrun, C. J. (1994). Macrocultures: Determinants and Consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 19 (4), 728–755.
- Anderson, D., & Anderson, L. A. (2011). Conscious Change Leadership: Achieving Breakthrough Results. *Leader To Leader*, 2011(62), 51–59.
- Anderson, L. E., & Loomis, D. K. (2006). Balancing Stakeholders With an Imbalanced Budget: How Continued Inequities In Wildlife Funding Maintains Old Management Styles. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 11(6), 455–458.
- Ando, A. W. (1999). Waiting to be Protected Under the Endangered Species Act: The Political Economy of Regulatory Delay. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 42(1), 29–60.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, 18(4), 543–571.
- Balthazard, P. A, Cooke, R. A., & Potter, R. E. (2006). Dysfunctional Culture, Dysfunctional Organization: Capturing the Behavioral Norms That Form Organizational Culture and Drive Performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(8), 709–732.
- Bass, B. M, & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 17(1), 112.
- Bennis, W. G. (1993). *Beyond Bureaucracy: Essays on the Development and Evolution of Human Organization*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, John & Sons.
- Beyer, J. and Cameron, K. (1997). "Organizational culture." Druckman, D., Singer, L. and Van Cott, H. (Eds.). *Enhancing Organizational Performance*. (65-96) Washington, D.C: National Academy Press.
- Butler, J. S., Shanahan, J., & Decker, D. J. (2003). Public Attitudes Toward Wildlife Are Changing: A Trend Analysis of New York Residents. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 31(4), 1027–1036.
- California Legislative Analyst's Office. (1991). *A Review of the Department of Fish and Game Issues and Options for Improving its Performance*. Sacramento, C.A.
http://www.vision.ca.gov/docs/LAO_Review_of_DFG_1991.pdf
- California Natural Resources Agency. (2010). *The Future of Natural Resource Management: A White Paper and Action Plan*. Sacramento, CA. http://resources.ca.gov/docs/IRM_Action_Plan12-10.pdf
- Cameron, K. S. & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture*. New York: Addison-Wesley
- Chaleff, I. (2010). "Promoting the Healthy Flow of Information to Senior Leaders." *Leader To Leader*, 2010(56), 12–16.
- Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy (Little Hoover Commission). (1990). *Report on California's Fish and Game Commission and Department of Fish and Game* (Report #99). Sacramento, C.A. <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/reports/environment.html>
- Danter, K. J., Griest, D. L., Mullins, G. W., & Norland, E. (2000). Organizational Change as a Component of Ecosystem Management. *Society & Natural Resources*, 13(6), 537–547.
- Decker, D. J., Jackson, C. A., & Organ, J. F. (2011). Leader's Guide - Transformation of State Fish & Wildlife Agencies: Ensuring the Future of Conservation in a Rapidly Changing World. *Organization of Wildlife Planners*.
- Decker, D. J., Krueger, C. C., Baer, Jr., R. A., Knuth, B. A., & Richmond, M. E. (1996). From Clients to Stakeholders: A Philosophical Shift for Fish and Wildlife Management. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 1(1), 70–82.

- Edge, A. G., & Remus, W. (1984). The Impact of Hierarchical and Egalitarian Organization Structure on Group Decision Making and Attitudes. *Developments in Business Simulation & Experiential Learning*, 11, 35–39.
- Fernandez, S., & Rainey, H. G. (2006). Managing Successful Organizational Change in the Public Sector. *Public Administration Review (Washington, D.C.)*, 66(2), 168–176.
- Ford, J. D., & Ford, L. W. (2009). Decoding Resistance to Change. *Harvard Business Review*, April, 99–103.
- Galambos, C., Dulmus, C. N., & Wodarski, J. S. (2005). Principles for Organizational Change in Human Service Agencies. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 11(1), 63–78.
- Heikkila, T., & Gerlak, A. K. (2005). The Formation of Large-scale Collaborative Resource Management Institutions: Clarifying the Roles of Stakeholders, Science, and Institutions. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 33(4), 583–612.
- Heywood, J. L. (1997). Human Interactions and Natural Environments: Implications for Ecosystem Management. *Integrating Social Science and Ecosystem Management: A National Challenge*, Ed. and Comp. H. K. Cordell, L. Caldwell, and S. Mou, 3-7. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-17. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station.
- Jackson, R. (2005). Achieving Strategic Change in Government. *Public Manager*, 34(1), 40–50.
- Jacobson, C. A., & Decker, D. J., (2006). Ensuring the Future of State Wildlife Management: Understanding Challenges for Institutional Change. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 34(2), 531–536.
- Jacobson, C. A., Decker, D. J., & Carpenter, L. (2007). Securing Alternative Funding for Wildlife Management: Insights from Agency Leaders. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 71(6), 2106–2113.
- Jacobson, S. K., Morris, J. K., Sanders, J. S., Wiley, E. N., Brooks, M., Bennetts, R. E., Percival, H. F., & Marynowski, S. (2006). Understanding Barriers to Implementation of an Adaptive Land Management Program. *Conservation Biology*, 20(5), 1516–1527.
- Jacobson, C. A., Organ, J. F., Decker, D. J., Batcheller, G. R., & Carpenter, L. (2010). A Conservation Institution for the 21st Century: Implications for State Wildlife Agencies. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 74(2), 203–209.
- Keysar, E. (2005). Procedural Integration in Support of Environmental Policy Objectives: Implementing Sustainability. *Journal of Environmental Planning & Management*, 48(4), 549–569.
- Koontz, T. M., & Bodine, J. (2008). Implementing Ecosystem Management in Public Agencies: Lessons from the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. *Conservation Biology*, 22(1), 60–69.
- Kraines, G. A. (1996). Hierarchy's bad rap. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 17(4), 13–15.
- Lachapelle, P. R., McCool, S. F., & Patterson, M. E. (2003). Barriers to Effective Natural Resource Planning in a "Messy" World. *Society & Natural Resources*, 16(6), 473.
- Leong, Kirsten M., Decker, Daniel J., & Wild, Margaret A. (2006). Examining the Role of Community Participation in Biological Resource Management: Human Dimensions of Deer Issues in Northeastern National Park Service Units. *People, Places, and Parks: Proceedings of the 2005 George Wright Society Conference on Parks, Protected Areas, and Cultural Sites*. Harmon, David, Ed. Hancock, Michigan: The George Wright Society. 108–114.
- Lueck, D. (2000). An Economic Guide to State Wildlife Management. *PERC Research Study*, RS 00(2), 33. Bozeman, MT: Political Economy Research Center.
- Manfredo, M. J., Decker, D. J. & Duda, M. D. (1998). What is the Future for Human Dimensions of Wildlife? *Transactions of the 63rd North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*, 278–292.
- Manfredo, M. J., Teel, T. L. & Bright, A. L. (2003). Why Are Public Values Toward Wildlife Changing? *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 8(4), 287–306.

- Manfredo, M. J., Teel, T. L., & Henry, K. L. (2009). Linking Society and Environment: A Multilevel Model of Shifting Wildlife Value Orientations in the Western United States. *Social Science Quarterly*, 90(2), 407–427.
- McGarity, T. O. (1991). The Internal Structure of EPA Rulemaking. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 54(4), 57–111
- Messmer, T. A. (2000). The Emergence of Human–Wildlife Conflict Management: Turning Challenges into Opportunities. *International Biodeterioration & Biodegradation*, 45(3/4), 97–102.
- Nie, M. (2003). Drivers of Natural Resources-Based Political Conflict. *Policy Sciences*, 36(3/4), 307–341.
- O'Hare, M. (2006). Environmental Agencies' Funding Sources Should Follow Their Diverse Business Models. *Policy Studies Journal*, 34(4), 511–532.
- Walter W. Powell (1990). Neither Market Nor Hierarchy: Network Forms of Organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, 295–336
- Reichers, A. E., Wanous, J. P., & Austin, J. T. (1997). Understanding and Managing Cynicism about Organizational Change. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 11(1), 48–59.
- Responsive Management. (2005). Securing a Future for Fish, Wildlife, and Natural Resources in the 21st Century. *Responsive Management Report, Spring*, 1–3.
- Samson, F. B., & Knopf, F. L. (2001). Archaic Agencies, Muddled Missions, and Conservation in the 21st Century. *BioScience*, 51(10), 869–873.
- Schlager, D. B., & Freimund, W. A. (1997). Legal and institutional obstacles to implementing ecosystem management. *Integrating Social Science and Ecosystem Management: A National Challenge, Ed. and Comp. H. K. Cordell, L. Caldwell, and S. Mou*, 57–72.
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational Culture. *American Psychologist*, 45, 109–119.
- Schneider, B., Brief, A. P., & Guzzo, R. A. (1996). Creating a Climate and Culture for Sustainable Organizational Change. *Organizational Dynamics*, 24(4), 6–19.
- Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA Framework: An Update. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 747–774.
- Schneider, B., and Smith, B. D. (2004). Personality and Organizational Culture. *Personality and Organizations*, 347–369.
- Stazyk, E.C. and Goerdel, H.T. (2011). The Benefits of Bureaucracy: Public Managers' Perceptions of Political Support, Goal Ambiguity, and Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21 (4), 645–672.
- Taylor, M. (2011). California Legislative Analyst's Office. *Letter to the Honorable Jared Huffman, Assemblymember, 6th District*. http://vision.ca.gov/docs/LAO_Other_States_Study_9-14-11.pdf
- Walker, P. A., & Hurley, P. T. (2004). Collaboration Derailed: The Politics of “Community-Based” Resource Management in Nevada County. *Society & Natural Resources*, 17(8), 735–751.
- Winchell, Sr., T. E. (2009). Culture of Bureacracy: Managing Change in the Federal Government--Part II. *Public Manager*, 38(3), 36–40.
- Yeager, J., & Saggese, M. L. (2008). Making Your Agency Outcome Informed: A Guide to Overcoming Human Resistance to Change. *Families in Society*, 89(1), 9–18.

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A: Past Evaluations of DFG and F&GC

List of Some Historical Reports Evaluating the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Fish and Game Commission

November 2011

This document lists some of the past strategic planning efforts and studies that have evaluated the programs, management, organization and fiscal affairs of the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Fish and Game Commission, as listed on the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision website (www.vision.ca.gov).

1. **Booz, Allen and Hamilton.** Report on Survey, Department of Fish and Game: Report of Booz, Allen and Hamilton to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (1958, mandated by Senate Concurrent Resolution Number 126.)
2. **Department of Finance.** A Review of Nongame Activities of The Department of Fish and Game: A Staff Reference Report (1976, initiated at the request of the governor to determine the appropriateness of general fund expenditures for nongame activities.)
3. **Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy [Little Hoover Commission (LHC)].** Report on California's Fish and Game Commission and the Department of Fish and Game (1990, requested by then-Assemblyman Stan Statham because he was concerned about the efficiency of DFG [Los Angeles Times; June 24, 1989.]
4. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** A Review of the Department of Fish and Game: Issues and Options for Improving its Performance (1991, as directed by the legislature in the Supplemental Report of the 1990 Budget Act to conduct a study that would provide background and guidance to solve DFG's fiscal and other problems.)
5. **California Department of Fish and Game.** Department of Fish and Game, 1990's and Beyond: A Vision for the Future: the Department of Fish and Game, Its Mission, Values, and Goals to Meet the Challenge of the Future (1993, resulting from a 1990 DFG Organization Committee consisting of 14 upper-level managers to begin the process of developing and articulating the future direction of DFG.)
6. **California Department of Fish and Game. Strategic Plan: Where Do We Want To Be?** (1995, as a follow up to the 1993 vision for the future to create a strategic plan based on the new strategic vision and previous employee input about DFG priorities.)
7. **California Fish and Game Commission.** California Fish and Game Commission Strategic Plan (1998, initiated in 1997 with five focus group meetings and later workshops held around California)
8. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Analysis of the 1998-99 Budget Bill: Reorganization in Progress: An Overview (1998)
9. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Analysis of the 1999-2000 Budget Bill: Department's Reorganization Plan: An Update (1999)
10. **Bureau of State Audits.** California's Wildlife Habitat and Ecosystem (2000, the scope of which was larger than DFG, though it included DFG as a major holder of state land for restoring ecosystems and preserving wildlife habitat.)
11. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Better Protection of Fish and Wildlife: Improving Fish and Game's CEQA Review (2002).
12. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** A Framework for Financing Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) (2003, Presented to Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee.)

13. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Analysis of the 2003-04 Budget Bill: Resource Assessments: Improving Effectiveness and Creating Savings (2003).
14. **Bureau of State Audits.** Department of Fish and Game: The Preservation Fund Comprises a Greater Share of Department Spending Due to Reduction in Other Revenues (2005, focused on the Fish and Game Preservation Fund where a major source of funding is hunting and fishing license sales.)
15. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Department of Fish and Game: Funding Issues (2005, Presented to Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 2.)
16. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Analysis of the 2006-07 Budget Bill: Fiscal Problems Abound at Fish and Game (2006).
17. **California Department of Fish and Game.** Seven Strategic Initiatives (2006, resulting from a team assembled by the director of DFG to take a collective pause and envision DFG in 5, 10 and 15 years into the future.)
18. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Analysis of the 2007-08 Budget Bill: Department's Fiscal Management Improving; Budget Transparency Still Needs Work (2007).
19. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Fish and Game Warden Staff and Compensation (2007, Presented to the Assembly and Senate Budget Committees.)
20. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Funding Timber Harvest Plan Review and Enforcement (2008, Presented to Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 2.)
21. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Department of Fish and Game: Funding Regulatory Programs with Increased Fees (2008, Presented to Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 2.)
22. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Analysis of the 2008-09 Budget Bill: Funding Timber Harvest Plan Review and Enforcement (2008).
23. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Analysis of the 2008-09 Budget Bill: LAO Recommended Fee Proposals Can Partially Offset Budget-Balancing Reductions and Generate Additional Savings (2008).
24. **Bureau of State Audits.** Office of Oil Spill Prevention and Response: It Has Met Many of its Oversight and Response Duties, but Interaction with Local Government, the Media, and Volunteers Needs Improvement (2008, in response to the November 2007 Cosco Busan oil spill in San Francisco Bay.)
25. **Bureau of State Audits.** Department of Fish and Game: Its Limited Success in Identifying Viable Projects and Its Weak Controls Reduce the Benefit of Revenues from Sales of the Bay Delta Sport Fishing Enhancement Stamp (2008, in response to concerns about DFG's management of fish stamps.)
26. **Robert Treanor, et al.** The Treanor Report: A Look at the California Department of Fish and Game and Fish and Game Commission (2009, an effort to review the form of other wildlife agencies, previous reports on DFG and F&GC, and results of interviews with directors, commissioners and stakeholders in California and other states.)
27. **Bureau of State Audits.** Recommendations Not Fully Implemented After One Year: The Omnibus Audit Accountability Act of 2006 (January 2010, a follow up to the Bureau of State Audits reports of 2008 as required by the Omnibus Audit Accountability Act of 2006 which requires state agencies to report annually to the bureau on the status of their implementation of the bureau's recommendations.)
28. **Legislative Analyst's Office.** Department of Fish and Game: 2010-11 Budget and Policy Overview (2010, Presented to Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee)

Appendix B: Interview Participants

Barriers to Implementation - Interviewees

Name	Position
Carol Baker	Principal Program Budget Manager, Department of Finance (1995–2000); Chair, CFWSV Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission
Keali'i Bright	Assembly Budget Committee (2005–2011); Deputy Secretary for Legislation, California Natural Resources Agency (2011–present)
Pete Bontadelli	DFG Director (1987-1991); Director, Office of Oil Spill Prevention and Response (1991–1998) ⁵
Ryan Brodderick	DFG Director (2004–2008)
Mike Chrisman	Member, F&GC (1997–2003); Secretary, California Natural Resources Agency (2003–2010)
Diane Colborn	Chief Consultant, Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee (2005–present)
Bill Craven	Chief Consultant, Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee (1997–present)
Anton Favorini-Csorba	Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office (current)
Michael Harris	Consultant, Senate Budget Committee (1997–2000); Deputy Director for Administration, DFG (2000–2003); Chief Deputy Director, Department of Parks and Recreation (2004–present)
Bob Hight	Director, DFG (1999–2003); CA Superior Court Judge, Sacramento County (current)
Kevin Hunting	Chief Deputy Director, DFG (2008–present)
Patrick Kemp	Principal Program Budget Manager, Department of Finance (2001–2005); Assistant Secretary for Administration and Finance, California Natural Resources Agency (2005–present)
Fred Klass	Department of Finance (DOF) Program Budget Manager (1992–2006); Chief Operating Officer, DOF (2007–2011); Director, Department of General Services (2011–present)
Tina Leahy	Staff Counsel, DFG (2001–2010); Water Policy Consultant, Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee (2010–present)
Michael Mantell	Undersecretary, California Resources Agency (1991–1997) ⁶ ; Principal, Resources Law Group (1998–present)
Sonke Mastrup	Deputy Director, DFG (2001–2011); Executive Director, F&GC (2011–present)
Mark Newton	Program Director for Resources and Environmental Protection, Legislative Analyst's Office (2001–present)
Kasey Schmike	Consultant to Assembly Budget Committee (2000–2005); Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Department of Water Resources (2007–present)
Don Wallace	Assistant Secretary for Administration, California Natural Resources Agency (1993–2005)

⁵ Now known as DFG's Office of Spill Prevention and Response

⁶ Now known as the California Natural Resources Agency

Name	Position

Appendix C: Interview Questionnaire

California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision CFWSV - Barriers to Implementation Assessment Interview Questionnaire

(November 8, 2011)

Thank you for your participation in this assessment. The interviewers will use this questionnaire to guide the interviews and will aim to cover all of the questions with you. The interviewers may, nevertheless, maintain flexibility in the sequence of questions and the extent of follow-up “probes” posed, depending on the tone and flow of the conversation. This questionnaire may be refined, as appropriate, over the course of the interviews to ensure effectiveness.

Introductions and Overview:

- *Introduce everyone.*
- *Overview of the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision (CFWSV) project: In September 2010, Assembly Bill 2376 was signed into law, requiring the California Natural Resources Agency to convene a committee to develop and submit to the Governor and Legislature, by July 1, 2012, a strategic vision for the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC). Building on numerous studies and reports on past reform efforts, the bill provides a pathway to develop a renewed strategic vision for DFG and F&GC. The Bill calls for convening a CFWSV Executive Committee, a Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission, and a Stakeholder Advisory Group to support development of the strategic vision. A draft interim strategic vision is expected to go out for public comment in November 2011, with the interim strategic vision to be completed in February 2012. A final strategic vision is required by July 2012.*
- *A key component of the CFWSV project includes examining past assessments of DFG and F&GC, examining the degree to which past recommendations have been implemented, and identifying relevant barriers to implementation.*
- *To accomplish this, CFWSV Planning Team staff are:*
 - *performing a literature review of past assessments of DFG and F&GC,*
 - *conducting targeted interviews with key state officials and other stakeholders to elicit additional information, and*
 - *conducting a supplemental survey to be made available to a wider group of agency officials and stakeholders both within and outside of DFG and F&GC.*
- *The primary purpose of the interviews is to provide feedback on how effective DFG and F&GC have been in the past in implementing recommendations for improvement.*
- *This interview will take approximately 45-60 minutes.*
- *These interviews will be summarized in a “Barriers to Implementation” report that will be incorporated into the broader Strategic Vision document.*
- *All of the interviews are confidential in that comments will not be attributed to specific individuals.*
- *Any questions before we begin?*

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Background and Perspective

1. In brief, please describe your past and present positions and roles relative to either DFG or F&GC.
2. Were you involved in past evaluations or assessments of DFG or F&GC? What was the nature of your involvement?
3. What do you see as the appropriate mission for DFG and F&GC?

Issues and Feedback

In the context of the time period you were working on DFG/F&GC issues and key DFG- and F&GC-related strategic planning and assessment documents (e.g., DFG Strategic Plans, F&GC Strategic Plans, Little Hoover Commission Report (1990), Legislative Analyst’s Office Reports, Bureau of State Audits Reports (e.g., 1995 on licenses, 2005 on accounting), Bay Delta Enhancement Stamp, Office of Spill Prevention and Response), please review the chart the interviewer will provide and confirm:

- *The assessment documents were in play at that time;*
 - *The political context when you worked on DFG/F&GC related issues.(For example, the Governor, Resources Secretary, DFG Director, on the F&GC, etc.);*
 - *Key recommendations regarding DFG/F&GC were being considered at that time.*
4. Have past assessment reports and recommendations influenced change in the DFG and F&GC? If so:
 - a. In general, have the recommendations been implemented?
 - b. If so, what has been implemented (please be specific)? Was it successful? What contributed to the success?
 - c. If not, what were the reasons for lack of implementation? *(Examples might include: : political climate, fiscal climate, relationships with the Governor’s office and the legislature, structural issues within DFG/F&GC, structural issues stemming from control agencies [e.g., Natural Resources Agency, Legislature, Office of Information Technology, Legislative Analyst’s Office], staffing conditions, etc.)*
 - d. *What was the result of the DFG/F&GC not taking, or being able to take, action on a recommendation?*
 5. Is the lack of implementation primarily due to internal constraints within DFG or F&GC or to external causes? Explain.
 6. Are there instances where DFG and F&GC have successfully implemented changes but have not done a good job communicating these successes, either within the organizations or to the public? If so, what have been the obstacles here?

Other Comments, Questions, or Advice

7. What other agency officials or stakeholder should be included as part of our core (“must have”) interviews?
8. Do you have any other questions, comments or advice for us? You are welcome to send us any additional thoughts by email at jmonaghan@ccp.csus.edu.

Thank you for your time!

Appendix D: Survey Questionnaire

CFWSV - Barriers to Implementation Assessment

Draft Survey Questions

November 15, 2011

Background and Perspective

1. Your name: _____
2. Please indicate your past and/or present positions and roles that relate to DFG/F&GC. Check all that apply and indicate your roles and the approximate years served at that position.

<u>Organization</u>	Role	Timeframe
<input type="radio"/> DFG	_____	_____
<input type="radio"/> F&GC	_____	_____
<input type="radio"/> NRA	_____	_____
<input type="radio"/> Department of Finance	_____	_____
<input type="radio"/> Legislature	_____	_____
<input type="radio"/> LAO	_____	_____
<input type="radio"/> Other?	_____	_____

3. During your tenure, were you aware of any reports or initiatives that assessed the performance of DFG and/or F&GC or recommended any changes to DFG or F&GC? If yes, please indicate which report(s): (To assist you, a list of reports produced between 1990 and 2011 can be found at the end of this survey.)

- Little Hoover Commission (1990)
- LAO Year: _____
- DFG Strategic Vision/Plan Year: _____
- F&GC Strategic Vision/Plan Year: _____
- Bureau of State Audits Year: _____
- CA Performance Review (2004)
- Treanor Report (2009)

4. During your tenure, please briefly describe the overall environment (political, fiscal, leadership):

Issues and feedback

We are interested in your views on whether and how past assessment reports and recommendations have influenced change in the DFG and F&GC.

5. On a scale of 1-6, where 1 is “not at all” and 6 is “thoroughly”, how well have the recommendations in the reports you are familiar with (Question 2 above) been considered?

1 2 3 4 5 6

6. On a scale of 1-6, where 1 is “not at all” and 6 is “thoroughly”, how well have the recommendations in the reports you are familiar with (Question 2 above) been implemented?

1 2 3 4 5 6

7. If recommendations were not implemented, was it due to:

- Internal Constraints
- External Constraints
- Other

Please explain:

8. Do you recall any recommendations what have been successfully implemented. For each, explain why.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

9. Were these successfully implemented recommendations communicated either within the organizations or to the public? Check the box.

- Yes
- No
- Not that I am aware of

Describe any obstacles that apply _____

Other Comments, Questions, or Advice

10. Do you have any other questions, comments or advice that you would like to share with us regarding a strategic vision for DFG and F&GC? [Type answer in box]

Thank you for your time!

Appendix E: Survey Participants

Name	Position
Steve Archibald	Principal Consultant to Assembly Appropriations Committee (1994–2008)
Chuck Bonham	DFG Director (2011–present)
Dirk Brazil	Former Deputy Director for Community Relations, DFG
David Bunn	Former Deputy Director for Administration, DFG
John Carlson	Executive Director, F&GC (2006–2010)
Helen Carriker	Deputy Director for Administration (2008–present)
Ruth Coleman	Legislative Director, Senator Mike Thompson (1994-1198); Director, State Parks and Recreation (1999–present)
Sandy Cooney	Former Deputy Secretary for Communications, California Natural Resources Agency; Assistant Director, Public Affairs, Department of Water Resources (current)
Catherine Freeman	Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee (2011–present)
Jennifer Galehouse	Deputy Secretary for Legislation, California Resources Agency (1999–2003); Chief Deputy Director for Assembly Member Services (current)
Diana Jacobs	Chief Scientist (1999–2003)
Don Koch	DFG Director (2008–2009)
Ann Malcolm	Chief Counsel, DFG (2005–2011)
John McCamman	Director, DFG (2010–2011)
Brendan McCarthy	Consultant, Senate Appropriations Committee (2009-present)
Ron Rempel	Former Deputy Director, DFG
Lester Snow	Secretary, California Natural Resources Agency (2009–2010)
Robert Treanor	Executive Director, F&GC (1990–2006)
Michael Valentine	Chief Counsel, DFG (1999–2003)
Doug Wheeler	Secretary, California Natural Resources Agency (1991–1999)