

CALIFORNIA FISH AND WILDLIFE
STRATEGIC VISION PROJECT

COMMENTS AND SUBMISSIONS FOR REVIEW

Through March 26, 2012

From: Dan Silver
Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2012 11:14 AM
To: Melissa Miller-Henson
Cc: CFWSV_BRCC@lists.resources.ca.gov; CFWSV_SAG@lists.resources.ca.gov;
CFWSV_DFG@lists.resources.ca.gov
Subject: Re: [CFWSV_SAG] March 28 and 30 meeting materials

Melissa:

Reading the **Potential Recommendations for the Strategic Vision for Consideration by the SAG on March 28 and BRCC on March 30, 2012**, I am concerned that there has been mis-categorization of some of the recommendations as having "unanimous, little opposition," or "broad" support. I have personally expressed contrary views on several occasions, but more fundamentally, a skewed subgroup of the SAG (those able to physically participate during a demanding process that has thwarted the participation of most) is being substituted for the view of the SAG as a whole (which due to the unwieldy number of members is virtually impossible to ascertain). This is not to detract from the *enormous* time and commitment put in by some – this must be applauded – but simply to recognize the serious problems in the structuring of the process.

Here are specific concerns:

F&GC and determined that a citizen's commission with today's powers and duties is preferable to Proposed SAG statement: "The SAG deliberated the merits of realigning the power and duties of the changing it at this time.

Rather than "unanimous or little opposition," there is substantial unhappiness on the part of some SAG members with the Commission's current powers and duties. There is sentiment for reform to a less politically-driven body that is competent in at least the management of hunting and fishing. As noted above, "unanimous or little opposition" is a reflection of those who have been able to be in the room.

[Reconsideration and Appeal Procedures], to provide for appeals of proposed permit standards, Amend Title 14, Section 783.8, terms or conditions.

• *Allow arbitration similar to 1600 arbitration for incidental take permits issued under CESA (consistency of application of standards).*

I recall one SAG discussion where these ideas were deemed *highly* controversial and shelved due to lack of significant consensus.

Seek statutory changes to the Fully Protected Species Act to allow the incidental take of fully protected species following review and Potential Statutes and Regulations Recommendation: Seek statutory changes to the Fully under specified circumstances related to certain management activities.

I recall that some conservation groups had concerns with this, though further discussion certainly warranted.

There is no problem with presenting these ideas to BRCC and others. It is simply to accurately describe the level of support in the context of the nature of the SAG process.

Thank you,
Dan

Dan Silver, Executive Director
Endangered Habitats League
8424 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite A 592
Los Angeles, CA 90069-4267

From: Nick Konovaloff [mailto:nkonovaloff@rcrcnet.org]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2012 3:20 PM
To: Melissa Miller-Henson
Subject: DFG PILT Issue

Melissa,

Following are some comments to shed some light on the PILT issue. The attachments regarding some of the PILT revenue originated from DFG. Thanks.

The failure of the Department to meet their in lieu fee obligation to counties pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 1504 remains a major concern. This section specifies that when income is derived directly from real property acquired and operated by the State as wildlife management areas, the Department shall pay annually to the county in which the property is located an amount equal to the county taxes levied upon the property at the time title to the property was transferred to the state.

The in lieu fees are intended to offset adverse impacts on county property tax revenue that result when the State acquires private property for wildlife management areas. It is our understanding the Department is currently in arrears of over \$19 million.

This shortfall in funding from the Department to the counties has lead to frustration at the local level, where county officials continue to bear the burden of providing mandated services to public lands that are not subject to local property tax. We are concerned that any further lapse in the payment of the in lieu fees will further exacerbate dissatisfaction with the State's land acquisition policies.

Cheers,

Nick Konovaloff
Regional Council of Rural Counties
1215 K Street, Suite 1650
Sacramento, CA 95814
Ph. (916) 447-4806
FAX (916) 431-0101

**California Department of Fish and Game
In-lieu Fees Owed for FY 2009/10 and
Additional Fees Owed for FY 2008/09, 2007/08, 2006/07**

County	2009/10 Fees	2008/09 Fees	2007/08 Fees	2006/07 Fees
Alpine	42,891.32	42,891.32	42,891.32	42,891.32
Butte	97,272.38	97,272.38	97,272.38	97,272.38
Colusa	3,551.21	3,551.21	3,551.21	3,551.21
Del Norte	59,847.50	59,816.00	58,739.36	57,196.13
Fresno	15,469.24	15,469.24	15,469.24	15,469.24
Glenn	59,150.37	59,150.37	59,150.37	59,150.37
Humboldt	35,631.30	35,631.30	35,330.85	33,928.57
Imperial	8,876.23	8,876.23	8,876.23	8,876.23
Inyo	858.20	858.20	858.20	858.20
Lake	16,883.15	16,883.15	16,883.15	16,883.15
Lassen	65,816.52	65,816.52	65,816.52	65,816.52
Madera	2,708.21	2,708.21	2,708.21	2,708.21
Marin	29,856.76	29,856.76	29,856.76	29,856.76
Merced	88,826.54	84,716.95	84,716.95	84,716.95
Modoc	45,623.36	45,623.36	45,623.36	45,623.36
Mono	28,136.19	28,136.19	28,136.19	28,136.19
Monterey	9,990.82	9,705.22	9,276.82	9,276.82
Napa	137,544.58	135,099.59	131,721.74	131,721.74
Nevada	9,131.01	9,131.01	9,131.01	9,131.01
Placer	15.66	15.66	15.66	15.66
Plumas	5,948.05	5,948.05	5,948.05	5,948.05
Riverside*	237,316.44	237,316.44	237,316.44	199,495.33
San Bernardino	5,488.80	5,488.80	5,488.80	5,488.80
San Diego*	48,366.54	48,366.54	48,366.54	48,366.54
San Luis Obispo	38.70	38.70	38.70	38.70
Shasta	11,651.76	10,564.85	7,122.96	7,122.96
Sierra	62,557.26	62,557.26	62,557.26	62,557.26
Siskiyou	51,252.25	51,252.25	51,252.25	51,252.25
Solano	43,670.77	43,670.77	43,670.77	43,670.77
Sonoma	19,902.25	19,902.25	19,902.25	19,902.25
Stanislaus	798.91	798.91	798.91	798.91
Sutter	20,629.58	20,629.58	20,629.58	20,629.58
Tehama	7,960.54	7,960.54	7,960.54	7,960.54
Tulare	444.03	444.03	444.03	444.03
Yolo	114,510.74	114,510.74	114,510.74	114,510.74
Yuba	48,668.29	46,049.37	44,444.23	43,950.19
Total	\$1,437,285.46	\$1,426,707.95	\$1,416,477.58	\$1,375,216.92

Riverside -- will increase for San Jacinto WA from 06/07 thru 09/10

San Diego doesn't include Hollenbeck Canyon acquisition of 6-23-04 as county would not provide values which will increase fees substantially

California Department of Fish and Game

In-lieu fees paid and owed from FY 1971-72 through FY 2009-10

Fees will increase due to delay in receiving deeds from WCB

FY	Paid	Owed	
2009/10		1,437,285	amount will increase as new parcels are acquired
2008/09		1,426,708	amount will increase
2007/08		1,416,478	amount will increase
2006/07		1,375,217	amount may change
2005/06		1,339,904	
2004/05		1,298,532	
2003/04		1,190,282	
2002/03		1,079,209	
2001/02	582,761	884,676	available funds \$582,761
2000/01	791,237	847,847	baseline \$820,000
1999/00***	785,989	821,099	baseline \$820,000
1998/99***	772,755	794,171	baseline \$820,000
1997/98*	791,455	791,455	BCP augmentation
1996/97	478,615	790,093	baseline restored to \$520,000
1995/96	443,962	764,567	baseline cut from \$520,000 to \$446,962
1994/95	537,669	694,051	
1993/94	514,861	674,660	
1992/93**	633,137	633,137	
1991/92**	604,063	604,063	
1990/91**	538,690	538,690	
1989/90	451,902	\$19,402,124	amt owed 1990/91 thru 09/10
1988/89	400,474		
1987/88	76,090	1,437,285	2009/10
1986/87	171,239	1,426,708	2008/09
1985/86	88,705	1,416,478	2007/08
1984/85	99,606	1,375,217	2006/07
1983/84	118,195	\$5,655,688	amt owed 06/07 thru 09/10
1982/83	97,753		
1981/82	91,195		
1980/81	51,883		
1979/80	41,598		
1978/79	44,348		
1977/78	56,435		
1976/77	49,117		
1975/76	47,137		
1974/75	46,501		
1973/74	48,096		
1972/73	45,884		
1971/72	46,949		
	\$9,548,301		

*** counties didn't submit invoice

Baseline was \$520,000 from 1992/93 thru 96/97, but cut to \$446,962 in 95/96

Baseline was \$820,000 from 1998/99 thru 2000/01

2001/02 funds decreased to \$582,761 & only 23 of 36 counties were paid

*A total of \$1,608,902 was paid in 1997/98 including unpaid amounts for 1994/95, 95/96, 96/97

** funds were available in 1992/93 to pay 90/91, 91/92, 92/93, however all counties did not send invoices or mailed them after July 1, 1993, into next FY