

**Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Stakeholder Advisory Group  
Science Working Group  
Summary Notes  
August 25, 2011**

*Disclaimer: This summary is not meant to be the official meeting minutes. These notes were taken by a scribe that was in attendance at this meeting and summarizes the discussions to the best of the scribe's ability.*

1. Welcome
2. Discussion of Group Structure and Need to Designate a Stakeholder Advisory Working Group Spokesperson
  - a. Working Group schedule and structure
    - i. Working groups will cover issues that are interdisciplinary in nature and those aspects of these issues may be worked in tandem by this group and others. Large group meetings will be an opportunity to further address those aspects.
    - ii. Groups will meet weekly until the end of September.
    - iii. Overall Stakeholder Advisory Group meetings will be held on Fridays and will be a place to discuss with the whole SAG what has been discussed in working groups
    - iv. Schedule:
      1. Two phases
        - a. End of September will be a tentative deadline for putting all the issues on the table and start of problem-solving.
        - b. After September, these issues will be dealt with more specifically leading to recommendations and refinement for an ultimate end product for presentation to the Executive Committee and the Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission.
  - b. Spokesperson
    - i. Some suggested options:
      1. Neutral spokesperson (not part of working group)
      2. Neutral spokesperson(s) (from within working group)
      3. Rotating spokespersons, dependent upon issues and expertise

4. Multiple spokespersons
- ii. Spokesperson does not have to be present, but can attend discussions and brief via teleconference and/or webex.
- iii. Comments:
  1. Flexibility should be available in choosing a spokesperson, particularly in reference to scientific expertise.
    - a. Defer approach.
  2. Would a spokesperson be needed for next weeks' meeting, and could that person be chosen at the end of next weeks' working group meeting?
    - a. Answer: Yes
  3. Rotation or a neutral spokesperson is preferred.

### 3. Issues

- a. What is the potential outcome for this process?
  - i. Improved efficiency
  - ii. Integration of policy and science
    1. Better communication.
  - iii. Better communication between all parties involved and in partnership with Fish and Game.
  - iv. Partnerships fostered with the resource users and organizations.
    1. Partners WANT to help with alleviating some of the burden of Fish and Game in the current era of deficient resources.
    2. Partners can work with the department to develop research and management plans that are efficient and effective.
  - v. Fiscal accountability.
  - vi. Independent science board.
    1. May already be a model in place.
    2. Full spectrum of scientific representation.
  - vii. Recognition and emphasis on science as an implement for resource management and a framework for management plans.
  - viii. Recognition given to a variety of scientific thought processes.

- ix. Partnerships with other organizations that perform similar tasks, such as inventories and surveying, offer cost-saving opportunities for all.
  - x. Coordination on science.
    - 1. It is difficult to find the science in Fish and Game
  - xi. Science review is critical.
  - xii. Use of educational partnerships to assist with scientific data collection.
  - xiii. Communicate with scientific community and partners as a group and how they can assist Fish and Game.
  - xiv. Review what “good science” is.
  - xv. Improved public perception of “best available” or “good” science.
- b. What are the threats to those outcomes?
- i. Budget, funding
  - ii. Fiscal accountability
  - iii. Micromanaging issues and policies in Fish and Game that will hinder them, as opposed to helping them.
  - iv. Schedule
  - v. Fish and Game buy-in.
  - vi. Self-interest.
- c. What are the opportunities for this process?
- i. Work with the department to develop research and management plans that are efficient and effective.
  - ii. Review of the amount of science playing a part in Fish and Game decisions. (See comments from DFG Chief Deputy)
  - iii. Improved decision making.
  - iv. Communication between diverse interests.
  - v. Great opportunity to work together; better chance of success.
  - vi. Communicate with DFG scientists and involve their opinion on improving the use of science within DFG.
- d. What are some solutions for dealing with those threats?
- i. Focus on general issues first and then delve into more minute issues.
  - ii. Partnerships and coordination between scientific research bodies that can offer cost-saving opportunities.

- iii. Make clear to SAG what the product should look like at the end of September, and give the members a clear schedule.
- iv. Leaving personal interests at the door.
- v. Active participation.
- vi. Cooperation.

e. Comments:

- i. DFG Chief Deputy- Can put together information on where science plays a part in decision making and how science is integrated within the department.

4. Public Comment

5. Other: Committee follow-up; future meetings

- a. Next working group meeting: Thursday September 1, 2011 9:00am  
Room 1320
- b. Stakeholders Advisory Meeting Friday September 2, 2011 9:30am  
Resources Auditorium
- c. Homework:
  - i. Give/Send Carol Baker a hardcopy of issues you wish to present to your group or other working groups by Friday so the appropriate DFG employees can be available for your reference.
  - ii. Suggested Readings:
    1. Previous Strategic Vision Plans for the Department of Fish and Game and the Fish and Game Commission.
    2. DFG Seven Strategic Initiatives
    3. AB 2376
    4. Legislative Analyst's Office July 21, 2011 report to the Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission (BRCC)
    5. July 21, 2011 stakeholder presentations made to BRCC (power points)
    6. July 21, 2011 BRCC archived video, overview of the Department of Fish and Game and Fish and Game Commission

7. Documents can be found under “Reports” and archived video can be found under “Meetings” on the Vision website [www.vision.ca.gov](http://www.vision.ca.gov).

d. Please RSVP to working group meetings by the Friday before the working group meeting.

6. Comments:

- i. Can we have the legislative bill history of AB 2376 made available to the group?
  - 1. Answer: yes
- ii. How can we distribute materials between group members in accordance with Bagley-Keene?
  - 1. Answer: Materials that are distributed to more than a quorum of the group, then the documents are public.