

Melissa Miller-Henson

From: Melissa Miller-Henson
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2011 8:32 AM
To: CFWSV_BRCC@lists.resources.ca.gov; CFWSV_SAG@lists.resources.ca.gov
Cc: 'Chorneau, Charlotte'; 'jmonaghan@ccp.csus.edu'; heidi@h2dcomm.org
Subject: Important updates!
Attachments: BRCC-SAG_Mtg_111006_MtgNotes_111007.pdf; CFWSV_Calendar_111007.pdf; StrategicPlanning_Definitions_111010.pdf

Dear BRCC and SAG members,

This message contains important information about this week's working group meetings, suggestions for "catching up" or just keeping up with the process, upcoming work sessions and meetings, and standardizing our nomenclature.

This Week's Working Group Meetings

Today marks the beginning of another round of working group meetings, with the science working group meeting this morning and the natural resource stewardship group meeting this afternoon (the other groups are regulatory and permitting Wed a.m., goals and mission Wed p.m., communication and education Thurs a.m., and sustainable financing Thurs p.m.). As mentioned last week, we encourage you to participate in working groups other than your own if you are able, or to provide your thoughts and suggestions in writing if you are not able to directly participate. Next week's work sessions (18th and 19th) will be another opportunity to share thoughts and suggestions across working groups (see below).

Keeping up with the Visioning Process

For those of you who are finding it difficult to "catch up" with all the work of the last few weeks, staff recommend you review the attached notes from last week's joint BRCC / SAG meeting, the updated issues frameworks presented at the meeting (listed under Oct. 6 at http://vision.ca.gov/stakeholder_advisory_group_meetings.html), and the meeting notes from each of the last working group meetings (same webpage, each listed under the specific working group for Sept. 22-24). You also have great resources within the SAG in your homework team members and homework meeting presenters (please ask if you do not know who they are). As always, there is a video/audio archive of the meetings listed under each meeting if you want to see/hear everything that was discussed in a meeting. We also plan to begin distributing within a week an electronic newsletter/update/brief to help keep the public informed about the process.

Upcoming Work Sessions and Meetings

Attached to this message is the calendar of meetings through February 2012. Next week are scheduled two work sessions for members of the BRCC and SAG to discuss potential recommendations for the draft interim strategic vision; these work sessions are intended to help prepare for your Oct 26 meeting in which your recommendations for the draft interim strategic vision will be finalized. You are not expected to attend both work sessions (though it is also not discouraged!); the goal is to have as many BRCC and SAG members as possible attend one of the two days to further prepare for the Oct. 26 meeting. Your recommendations will be delivered to the executive committee on Nov. 10. Please keep an eye out for an RSVP request for both the work sessions and Oct. 26 meeting; a number of SAG members have been shouldering much of the work in recent weeks and we encourage others to step forward and provide assistance as they are able to ease some of that burden in the next three weeks.

Standardizing our Nomenclature

During Thursday's joint meeting it was discussed that words and terms we are using in the process have different meaning for different people. To help ensure that we are all speaking a common language, attached is a "definitions" document that provides a general description of various words and terms we are or will be using in preparing the draft interim strategic vision; print copies of this document will be available at this week's working group meetings for those attending in person.

We hope you find this information helpful. Do not hesitate to contact me or other staff if you have any questions.

With regards,

Melissa, on behalf of the planning team

Melissa Miller-Henson, Director

Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project

California Natural Resources Agency

1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311

Sacramento, CA 95814

916.654.2506 office

916.208.4447 cell

Melissa@resources.ca.gov

Visit us at www.vision.ca.gov!

CALIFORNIA FISH AND WILDLIFE STRATEGIC VISION PROJECT

-- OCTOBER 6, 2011 MEETING NOTES --

JOINT MEETING OF THE BLUE RIBBON CITIZEN COMMISSION AND STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY GROUP

Revised October 7, 2011

1. Welcome, Introductions and Opening Remarks

Agenda item #7 being moved up in order to allow Deputy Director Kevin Hunting to make a presentation regarding unfunded and underfunded mandates.

7. California Department Fish and Game Presentation on Unfunded and Underfunded Mandates

See PPT and document posted to the vision website. Questions regarding level of “underfunded” and degree to which program goals are being met. List of “adequately” funded mandates to accompany the underfunded/unfunded mandates? DFG staff to provide additional information about the functions under the different programs, and also to meet with a SAG member to explore possible ways of sharing information about funding levels for programs. DFG willing to be part of discussions to help identify programs that perhaps are not contributing to the mission and goals of DFG. Additional questions to DFG should be sent to Melissa Miller-Henson.

2. Chair, Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission

Carol Baker was nominated and elected (4-0-1) as chair of the CFWSV Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission.

3. SAG Ground Rules

Staff provided summary of proposed changes. Question regarding facilitator being able to make adjustments to the agenda; response that adjustments more administrative in nature than content related. Question regarding media contacts and making statements pre-judging the outcome; staff offered examples. Question about greater participation of SAG members, continuity and ensuring sufficient participation for a quorum. Suggestion to find ways to re-engage some members. Please send suggestions to MMH. All participating SAG members indicated no opposition to the ground rules (second consecutive meeting); will use ground rules as if adopted by the SAG.

4. Project Participant and Staff Roles and Responsibilities;

5. Deliverables for Project; and

6. Calendar of Meeting

Staff summarized project participant roles and responsibilities document, deliverables for the project, and verbally provided specific dates. Suggestion to add work sessions week of October 17; to be sure consistent with Bagley-Keene Act, will be noticed as public meetings.

8. Reports from Homework Volunteers for the Stakeholder Advisory Group

Science Working Group

Graber reflection/comments: Want to be sure we take a balanced approach to addressing science. Uncomfortable recommending building internal capacity without looking at and discussing other alternatives. Science is a tool to achieve an end. Need to be sure to identify the problem we are attempting to address.

Diana Craig and Kathy Wood – overview of the table prepared by homework team.

Questions: Is science group recommending a division be added to DFG? Response was that group effort was to put ideas down on paper without any prioritization; much work still to be done next week. Any overlaps of science working group with other working groups? Any discussion about other groups that can help fill science need if not from within DFG? Any effort to address integrity of science if funded by external sources? (Want emphasis on biological science not political science). Yes discussed methods by which integrity can be maintained regardless of funding source. Looking for ways to bring more transparency in decision-making and how science was utilized in arriving at a decision. Need to make partnerships.

Recommendation to step back and center to clearly define, better articulate our objectives, priorities in the need for enhanced science and decision-making; need to narrow where we see shortcomings and prioritize where we see opportunities to address. Visioning process; think short-term, medium-term and long-term.

There are existing resources/activities devoted to science within DFG, but what is in table seems to assume starting from scratch; how is what is being proposed going to fit into the existing structure? F&GC also seems to be missing.

Ask big picture question: Does DFG become source of scientific expertise or good at applying other natural resource research and science to management and policy decisions.

Facilitator indicated that normalization of terminology to take place this next week with facilitation team so that working groups are speaking same language and we have common understanding of what is being discussed.

Communication, Education and Outreach Working Group

Debbie Byrne and Karen Buhr – overview of the table prepared by homework team, starting with statement at end of document.

Questions: One SAG member is using a personal symbol set for different issues as reviewing the different recommendations (No \$/\$/\$\$, Administrative/Constitutional/Legislative, Short/Medium/Long, +for potential level of agreement); may want to consider using globally for working groups.

Natural Resource Stewardship Working Group

Karen Buhr and April Wakeman – overview of the table prepared by homework team.

Skyli reflections: Will be submitting written comments to be more complete in sharing thoughts. Appreciate support for partnership between the California Ocean Science Trust and DFG, but not the

only model; lots of other good models to consider. Want to look closely at question of science integration versus science expertise.

Questions/comments: Beginning to see a lot of overlap across the working groups, especially in the table for this working group; this table seems to incorporate a lot of the ideas from other working groups.

Cross-pollination question about how best to increase. Additional participation in other working groups; can also submit written comments that can be shared with the SAG, working groups, BRCC and public. Perhaps some cross-pollination groups on specific topics?

Regulatory and Permitting

Noelle Cremers – overview of the table prepared by homework team.

Richard Frank's reflections/comments: Received lots of comments previously that the F&G code is unwieldy; seems like recommendation for the California Law Review Commission (LRC) is non-controversial and would be a good and promising collaboration. Question about CESA and FESA...do you mean better coordination between two statutes? If so, and you are recommending improved coordination between DFG and the US Fish and Wildlife Service, might want to also consider a recommendation about improving coordination with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/National Marine Fisheries Service on marine fisheries issues.

Questions/comments: If there is a legislative mandate to go through and clean up the Fish and Game Code, we can conceptually agree; give pause when it comes to CESA/FESA integration. Referral should be for a LRC technical review, rather than a substantive integration exercise. Encourage us to think about when using an action word, who exactly will do that thing? Someone has to do the work and need to define/think about when developing and refining recommendations. Example: Prioritization of DFG programs exercise could be working groups with DFG. Suggest further emphasize that DFG and F&GC only control one piece of the natural resource management puzzle in California; lots of other agencies with responsibilities. Perhaps terminology we should use is "alignment" of activities among various agencies.

Governance and Mission

Eileen Reynolds – overview of the table prepared by homework team. Measure mission against mandates (John Carlson looking at that question).

Carol Baker reflections/comments: Not much more to add since have already provided general thoughts and reflections as previous homework teams have presented their tables. Big thanks to the homework group for efforts on this document.

Questions/comments: Jennifer Fearing and Dan Taylor have completed a survey of some other state agencies and the governance structure used by those agencies; will share with governance and mission working group next Wednesday (Oct. 12).

Judicial system: Question about inadequacies with the judges or the prosecutors? Both. Circuit judges helpful as they can develop as expertise on wildlife issues. Wardens also need to have adequate training to help them develop strong cases. Request for Richard Frank's assistance with this working group given his expertise.

Sustainable Financing

Noelle Cremers – overview of the table prepared by homework team.

Questions/comments: Tension between development fee funding and other sources. Disaggregating this type of funding from other types important as some fees have more potential. Use technology to improve compliance, outputs, etc. and reduce costs. Aligning fee revenues with actual program field implementation costs. Also need to be cautious about that alignment exercise (example of commercial fishing and \$10 million gap in fees versus costs to implement) since there may be some programs where purposely chosen to underwrite costs of implementation. Would like to see improved cost understanding.

Challenge to find new revenue sources. Suggest putting improved efficiencies recommendations up front to show a commitment by DFG and F&GC to reduce costs/improve efficiencies. Improving relationships, greater integration of programs (example of land, water, marine being siloed) an example of one way to potentially improve efficiencies.

Long-term funding mechanisms? Make more sense to start with policy-focused discussion rather than jumping into specifics? Longer-term strategy probably necessary to be successful; evaluate in context of long-term vision for DFG and F&GC (i.e., not just "getting through" next couple of years).

California Wildlife Campaign – why didn't it work? Suggestion that it was detached from any strong effort to improve the image of DFG, so little support generated from constituencies. Build a strong coalition, starting with this process, to help make the "asks" when needed and then have broad support to make things happen.

Like other categories, need to think about short-, medium- and long-term goals.

9. Dialogue about Potential Recommendations for Draft Interim Strategic Vision

Cross-pollination important. Issues being raised that are not specific to one working group that need to be discussed in broader group; work sessions week of Oct. 17 one such opportunity. Staff encouraged SAG members to attend working group meetings in addition to their own next week (Oct 11-13) or to submit written comments to other working groups.

10. Public Comment

Perhaps build in stages of public comment during meetings rather than waiting until very end of meeting. The funding discussion is critical. Remember that if you build fees into program, those are a dedicated funding source. Concern about statement that no program is fully funded or fully functional.

Fees passed onto water agencies has been accumulating and becoming significant burden. Try to look at financing from both sides of coin, not just DFG perspective but also that of who is paying.

11. Follow up, Staff Direction, Future Meetings

Action words – when recommending an action, ask who and when to implement.

Potential big picture “assessment” scales for initially assessing potential recommendations.

Tone – as defining the problems, don’t belabor (be hard on the problem, soft on the people/organization). Why is something a problem? Ask if this is really the problem. “Peel the onion” until reach the true problem/source and not just a symptom.

Terminology – standardization or normalization to take place next week so that when we return with products we have a common language.

Defining terms – efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, etc. so we have shared meeting as we move forward.

12. Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:20 p.m.

California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project
Calendar of Upcoming Meetings
Updated October 7, 2011

Confirmed meeting locations are identified in parentheses. Please check the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project website (www.vision.ca.gov) for the most current information, including meeting times, agendas and materials, as well as past meeting information.

October 2011

- 6** Joint BRCC and SAG meeting (Sacramento and teleconference)
- 11-13** Working group meetings (Sacramento and teleconference) to further refine frameworks
- 18 and 19** Joint BRCC and SAG work sessions (Sacramento and teleconference) to discuss potential recommendations
- 26** Joint BRCC and SAG meeting (Sacramento and teleconference) to complete recommendations for draft interim strategic vision

November 2011

- 10** Exec Cmte meeting (Sacramento and teleconference) to adopt draft interim strategic vision for public review
- 18** Draft interim strategic vision released for public review

December 2011

- 5-8** Public meetings to provide input on draft interim strategic vision
- 14** Deadline for receiving comments on draft interim strategic vision

January 2012

- 5** Joint BRCC and SAG meeting (Sacramento and teleconference) to discuss recommendations for interim strategic vision
- 10-12** Potential working group meetings or joint BRCC / SAG work sessions (Sacramento and teleconference) to discuss recommendations
- 20** Joint BRCC and SAG meeting (Sacramento and teleconference) to discuss recommendations for interim strategic vision
- 24-26** Potential working group meetings or joint BRCC / SAG work sessions (Sacramento and teleconference) to discuss recommendations

February 2012

- 3** Joint BRCC and SAG meeting (Sacramento and teleconference) to complete recommendations for interim strategic vision
- 16** Exec Cmte meeting (Sacramento and teleconference) to adopt interim strategic vision
- 24** Interim strategic vision delivered to legislature, governor and public
- 27** Work begins on final strategic vision to be completed by July 1, 2012

California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project

Definitions for Commonly-used Planning Terms

October 10, 2011

During the October 6, 2011 joint meeting of the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group, it was highlighted that a variety of terms were being used that may not have shared meaning. To help facilitate a common understanding of terminology, this document provides definitions for various terms being used in developing the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision.

Organization: An organization is a person or group of people intentionally organized to accomplish an overall, common goal or set of goals. There are several important aspects to consider about the goal of the business organization. These features are explicit (deliberate and recognized) or implicit (operating unrecognized, "behind the scenes"). Ideally, these features are carefully considered and established, usually during a strategic planning process.

Mission: An organization operates according to an overall purpose, or mission. In government the mission is typically influenced by a mandated responsibility (e.g. statute, policy, etc.) and/or inherited values (e.g. good steward, etc.).

Vision: An image about how an organization should be working or how it should appear when things are going well; it is often expressed as a future, forward-thinking condition.

Strategic Vision: A picture or mental image of what an organization should look like in the future with strategic elements that support successful achievement of the vision under a variety of external and internal conditions.

Values / Core Values / Operating Principles: All organizations operate according to a set of explicit or implicit values; these represent priorities in the nature of how people within the organization should carry out their activities. These values create the culture or "personality" of the organization. It is important to note any discrepancies between stated and operating values.

Strategic Priorities: Overarching strategies that apply to everything an organization does, no matter the subject area or process (i.e., quality over quantity, simplified decision-making, internal and external excellence in customer service, empower employees, lead by example).

Goals: It is best if overall goals are defined by the overall impact desired (outcomes) to describe *what* an organization will achieve.

Objectives: Smaller goals that help achieve each overall goal. Objectives should be SMART: Specific (concrete action, step-by-step actions needed to make the goal succeed), Measurable (observable results from accomplishing the goal), Attainable (it is both possible and done at the right time with sufficient attention and resources), Realistic (the probability of success is good, given the resources and attention given), and Time-bound (goal is achieved within a specified period of time in a way that takes advantage of the opportunity before it passes by). Achieving several of the goals usually means you are achieving the goal.

Action: A specific task that, when carried out with other actions, helps to achieve the objective.

Strategies: These are methods by which to achieve objectives and goals; this is *how* an organization will achieve its goals. An organization will often use several, overall, general strategies (see strategic priorities) and then tailor appropriate, specific strategies to individual goals and objectives.

Organizational vitality: Measured in various areas, including vision, communication, decision-making, adaptability, leadership, productivity, integrity and quality.

Organization Systems and Processes: Organizations have major subsystems, such as departments, programs, divisions, teams, etc., with a particular way of doing things to achieve the mission and goals of the organization; plans, policies and procedures often define these systems and processes. Various inputs to these systems are processed in some way to create outputs and outcomes that, together, should accomplish the mission and goals of the organization.

- **Inputs** to the system include resources (e.g. raw materials, money, technologies and people). Inputs should be defined by who provides them and when they should be provided.
- **Outputs** are tangible results produced by processes in the system, such as products or services for consumers.
- **Outcomes** are the overall impacts of, or benefits received as a result of, the processes applied to inputs and resulting outputs.

Efficient: Acting or producing with a minimum of waste, expense, or unnecessary effort.
(TheFreeOnlineDictionary)

Effective: The degree to which objectives are achieved and the extent to which targeted problems are solved. In contrast to efficiency, effectiveness is determined without reference to costs and, whereas efficiency means "doing the thing right," effectiveness means "doing the right thing."
(BusinessDictionary.com)

Enhance: Heighten, increase; especially to increase or improve in value, quality, desirability or attractiveness.
(Merriam-Webster.com)

Improve: To enhance in value or quality: make better. To make more acceptable or to bring nearer a standard.
(Merriam-Webster.com)

Sustainable: Capable of being sustained. Of, relating to, or being a method of harvesting or using a resource so that the resource is not depleted or permanently damaged. (Merriam-Webster.com)