

California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision
Summary of BRCC/SAG Online Survey Regarding the Draft Interim Strategic Vision
January 5, 2012

In December 2011, California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision (CFWSV) Blue Ribbon Citizen Committee (BRCC) and Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) members were asked to provide feedback on elements of the November 2011 draft interim strategic vision to help prepare for and focus the January/February series of CFWSV Project meetings. This document summarizes the responses of BRCC and SAG members to that survey. A total of 25 BRCC and SAG members responded to the survey:

Brenda Berman
 Bob Bertelli
 Steve Brink
 Karen Buhr
 Debbie Byrne
 Rick Copeland
 Diana Craig
 Noelle Cremers

Jennifer Fearing
 Richard Frank
 David Fuller
 Kaitilin Gaffney
 David Graber
 Kamyar Guivetchi
 Curtis Knight
 Skyli McAfee

Cliff Moriyama
 Margo Parks
 Diane Pleschner-Steele
 Eileen Reynolds
 Dan Silver
 April Wakeman
 Brad Willis
 Kathy Wood

Question 1a: Does the current mission statement reflect the primary purpose of the California Department of Fish and Game?

Summary of Responses (On a scale of 1-5, where 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree):

1	2	3	4	5	Not sure / Don't know	Average rating	Response count
20.0% (5)	60.0% (15)	8.0% (2)	4.0% (1)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	2.08	24

Question 1b: “What would you suggest, if anything, be changed about the current DFG mission statement?”

Common Themes

- Many comments suggested that DFG’s role in the mission statement be expanded from simply managing resources to also protecting, enhancing, and restoring.
- Several comments recommended emphasizing DFG’s focus on “wildlife.”

Survey Responses

- Delete the word "fish" as fish are also "wildlife"

- "manage California's diverse fish, wildlife, and plant resources, and the habitats they depend on -- in partnership with other resource agencies and organizations -- for their ecological values, use and enjoyment by the public."
- It should reflect all of the authorities and responsibilities of the department including environmental protection and acknowledge both the terrestrial and marine components.
- I suggest the mission statement might include reference to insuring sustainable resources.
- Change to "protect, restore, and manage . . ."
- I could live with changing the name of the Department to CA Department of Fish and Wildlife to better reflect broader mandate
- Change name to Wildlife Department
- It should be modified to include the terms" protect and restore" in addition to "manage" to better reflect DFG's statutory and public trust responsibilities.
- Nothing.
- Legislative mandates over the years has broadened DFG's areas of responsibility
- This mission is crucial in focusing the priorities of the department. It is key to remember that the resources are maintained for the benefit of the public. The department has gotten off track, tending to focus more on the conservation of wildlife/plant habitat for its own benefit, not for the benefit of the public. The public is often barred from enjoying these resources once they have been marked as threatened or critical.
- "manage California's diverse wildlife resources and the habitats upon which they depend for their ecological values and for their use and enjoyment by the public."
- Add the words protect and enhance resources, not just manage.

Question 2a: Does the current mission statement reflect the primary purpose of the California Fish and Game Commission?

Summary of Responses (On a scale of 1-5, where 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree):

1	2	3	4	5	Not sure / Don't know	Average rating	Response count
16.0% (4)	40.0% (10)	24.0% (6)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	2.46	24

Question 2b: “What would you suggest, if anything, be changed about the current F&GC mission statement?”

Common Themes

- The comments differed depending on whether the respondent believed that the focus of the F&GC should be on ecological protection versus on consumptive uses.
- A few comments pointed out a lack of clarity around the meaning of the word “sustainability” in the F&GC mission.
- A few noted that the mission was too long.

Survey Responses

- Eliminate the "by" statements and also the word "fish." The end of the sentence should read the same as the Department's - "wildlife and plant resources and their habitats."
- "... ensure the long-term sustainability of California's fish and wildlife resources and the habitats they depend on by: ..."
- Yes but only in a vague manner.
- I would not change this, if the agency fulfills this mission statement.
- If the commission's purview were only hunting and fishing, it would be fine. But their current scope goes beyond "sustainable" management of "resources" into ecological protection and endangered species, etc. The purview of the commission should be limited to consumptive uses consistent with the current mission statement.
- The use of "sustainability" equals "harvest" to many people. If the role of the commission is to deal with hunting and fishing that fits the mission. If the commission is going to make decisions on endangered species and non game, the term sustainability may not be the correct terminology in the context of use in California today.
- It is too long for a true mission statement - the "by" statements should be moved to the Vision statement. In addition, I think that the word "sustainability" infers managing to the minimum/brink versus managing for healthy, thriving species/systems - I suggest changing it to something like "long term conservation"
- It should explicitly include the concepts of protection and restoration in addition to sustainability to better reflect the FGC's statutory and public trust responsibilities.
- Nothing.
- The commission and department should have the same mission and it should be short and to the point.
- This mission does not reflect the current purpose of the fish and game commission, as code is unclear as to the role of the commission in regards to the department. It is impossible to assume

that a non professional board can adequately set policy without undue influence from their DFG staff. The commission also has no real oversight with regard to the actions of the department.

- Drop "fish and" so that "wildlife" implicitly includes all free-living biota. The mission of CFGC would be appropriate if the commission were composed of professionals in the field of wildlife conservation and management. That is not the case now.

Question 3a: Is the current vision statement appropriate for the California Department of Fish and Game?

Summary of Responses (On a scale of 1-5, where 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree):

1	2	3	4	5	Not sure / Don't know	Average rating	Response count
16.0% (4)	52.0% (13)	20.0% (5)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.17	24

Question 3b: “What would you suggest, if anything, be changed about the current DFG vision statement?”

Common Themes

- A few comments recommended adding a statement about transparency in decision making.
- A few pointed out that the “desires of the public” referred to in the DFG Vision can come into conflict with other elements of the Vision.
- A few pointed out limitations in achieving the Vision.
- A few suggested including an increased emphasis on ecosystem protection and restoration.
- A couple recommended no change.

Survey Responses

- Nothing to be changed. However, just a comment that the department and its employees can only do what the law and regulations allow them to do.
- Yes, I think it is appropriate for the goals, but I don't think the DFG has the resources, staff time or ability to meet these goals. I therefore don't think it is meeting this goal.
- Add transparency.

- Eliminate "desires of the public," as that conflicts with using sound biological information. Eliminate the "empowerment" statement as it seems to be construed by the employees as the ability to interfere with private property rights.
- I like the current visions, in general.
- Needs to be much stronger on ecosystem protection and restoration -- should add this bullet.
- Include support for staff active involvement in field research and publication of scientific papers on CA natural resources (with adequate funding to enable scientific staff advancement).
- Does not reflect reality. I have trouble with resource decisions reflecting 'desires' of the public. Need science.
- It should include the concept of "effectiveness" - DFG's vision should be that it succeeds at protecting, restoring and managing public trust resources.
- Nothing.
- The statement needs to include a desire to create healthy ecosystems for long term sustainability (it seems as if sometimes the department looks at short term solutions that will require ongoing management and won't necessarily solve the problem).
- The department has gone above and beyond its mandate to anticipate the future. They frequently prohibit or diminish certain land use activities for fear that it may be future habitat for certain species. The remainder of the current vision statement is a lofty vision and something the department should certainly strive for. All of these priorities need to be held at the same level- the department should not have the discretion to pick and choose which mission/goal statements they wish to enact.
- "bases its resource management decisions on sound scientific information and the public interest." I would add an additional bullet: "makes its policy and management decisions openly and transparently."
- Broadly informed and transparent decision making.
- Suggest expanding the 2nd bullet to read "approaches management of our fish, wildlife and habitat resources on an ecosystem basis."

Question 4a: Is the current vision statement appropriate for the California Fish and Game Commission?

Summary of Responses (On a scale of 1-5, where 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree):

1	2	3	4	5	Not sure / Don't know	Average rating	Response count
12.0% (3)	48.0% (12)	16.0% (4)	16.0% (4)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	2.50	24

Question 4b: What would you suggest, if anything, be changed about the current F&GC vision statement?

Common Themes

- The theme of *sustainability* arose three times in the answers to this question. All three commenters agree that the word “sustainable” implies that the resources under discussion are harvestable. One commenter believes the term should be used, and that the F&GC should be limited to a concern for hunting and fishing. Another believes the opposite: that the word should be eliminated and that the scope of F&GC should include “ecological benefits”. The third commenter on this theme was neutral on that question, simply pointing out that, whether the focus of F&GC is on consumptive use or not, the language should be consistent with the focus.

Survey Responses

- Healthy functioning native ecosystems.
- The F&GC should be "directing" the department, not "partnering" with it. Also, eliminate "fish" and add "plant," and also add language about the habitats.
- " ... in partnership with the Department of Fish and Game, other resource agencies and organizations, and the public, is to assure California has sustainable and resilient fish and wildlife resources."
- Again, OK if there Commission were limited to hunting and fishing.
- See my answer to 2b. If the Commission is going to oversee sustainability of harvest (hunting and a fishing) then I agree.
- This reads more like a Mission statement - I suggest swapping this with the Mission statement, with the changes I identified in Section 2, so that the Vision & Mission statements of the Department and the Commission are more parallel.
- The vision should be of "healthy" and sustainable fish and wildlife. use of the terms "sustainable" and "resources" make it sound as if California's fish and wildlife are simply a

commodity to be used and managed rather than a public trust to be stewarded for its ecological benefits and for future generations

- Nothing.
- Consider changing to "sustainable native and desired non-native fish and wildlife resources"
- I like this vision much better than the department's. I also think the department and commission should have the same visions.
- The commission must rely on the agency if they are to meet this vision. I suggest the statement be modified to reflect their role in directing the agency to sustain these resources.
- This vision statement needs to be more strongly tied to the public. The commission ought to assure California's citizens are able to enjoy sustainable fish and wildlife resources.
- "to conserve California's wildlife resources for future generations" would embrace a broader public interest.
- Consider adding the words 'protect and enhance' in addition to sustainable.

Question 5a: Do the described core values define the desired organizational culture of the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Fish and Game Commission?

Summary of Responses (On a scale of 1-5, where 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree):

1	2	3	4	5	Not sure / Don't know	Average rating	Response count
25.0% (6)	58.3% (14)	12.5% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.91	23

Question 5b: What would you suggest, if anything, be changed about the potential core values?

Common Themes

- The theme of “science” arose three times among the answers to this question. All three commenters who mentioned science believe it should be a core value.

Survey Responses

- I have no suggestions.
- Add efficiently and cost effectively

- Personal Integrity.....Group integrity starts with personal integrity.
- Change label to "Teamwork & Partnerships:"
- I have asked that use of science (or scientific methods) be added to the core values. I like all the existing core values. I think the Department has a long history of basing policies on scientific findings and it's important to document the use of science as a core value.
- Commitment to science should be mentioned in the explanatory text of the Excellence and Integrity sections. There continues to be disputes among stakeholders over the role of science which the facilitation team has not resolved. This should be a focus.
- Absolutely essential to include 'best available science' as a core value -- upon which stewardship is based!! Best available science is a statutory mandate in CA legislation, i.e. MLPA, MLMA etc.
- Does not reflect legislated mandate of promoting outdoor recreation
- I think these are 'fine' but that core values should emerge from an internal process by the DFG staff. It's tricky to impose core values from the outside.
- Nothing.
- The concept of finding solutions is important (this is similar to the point I was making in regards to the department's vision). I would define innovation different, while I support encouraging creativity to meet challenges, sometimes the department uses the most complex "solution" when a much simpler one would succeed and often produce even better results.

Question 6a: Do the described common themes (underlying principles) represent the fundamental ways in which the public should experience the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Fish and Game Commission?

Summary of Responses (On a scale of 1-5, where 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree):

1	2	3	4	5	Not sure / Don't know	Average rating	Response count
37.5%	37.5%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.78	23
(9)	(9)	(5)	(0)	(0)	(0)		

Question 6b: What would you suggest, if anything, be changed about the potential underlying principles?

Common Themes

- “Best available science” needs to be better defined and clarified.
- The language is too generic.

Survey Responses

- #2 does not address the concept of "co-management" that DFG should be working within the resource and local communities to set coordinated goals. Also, no mention of collaborating across state agency lines. I think this needs to be specifically addressed. It is much different than just partnerships.
- Best-available biological science
- I do think we are missing, here and in the previous values question, the recognition that DFG is serving the public. That customer service counts.
- Many of us have issues with the term "best available science". It can and is often a very subjective term.
- I think these work great.
- Need another common theme which is the goal ecosystem protection and restoration. How can the dept. and commission function without this basic tenet? The issue of science is well addressed here, however.
- This vision document is obscuring the real issues: DFG has been overloaded with unfunded mandates and insufficient funding to accomplish all tasks. This was the most frequently reported common theme -- yet it does not appear as a simple theme statement.
- I have no suggestions.
- While I agree with the systems approach, when looking at jeopardy for a single species sometimes the natural system has been so altered and/or degraded that species will become extinct without intervention. The intervention may be artificial since the natural system is so impacted by past and present human activity. The cost can be great to the pocket book or to the species.
- Define "best available science"
- Themes reflect DFG/F&GC action -- not how 'public should experience' these organizations.
- I think this language is 'fine' but pretty generic and unlikely to actually make a big difference in how DFG operates on a day to day basis.
- Nothing.
- Recognition that they work for the taxpayer and thus everything they do should reflect that it's a worthwhile endeavor and cost-effective.
- Add to #4: ensure the public feels secure in the DFG decision making process by "engaging in broadly..." I don't think the role and importance of the public/user/taxpayer/customer can be stressed enough. If the public does not trust the department, regardless of the outcomes produced by the department, the agency is fundamentally in conflict with its mission and goal.

Question 7a: Are the potential goals and objectives described above, in aggregate,

what the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Fish and Game Commission should achieve as they pursue their missions?

Summary of Responses (On a scale of 1-5, where 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree):

1	2	3	4	5	Not sure / Don't know	Average rating	Response count
13.0% (3)	69.6% (16)	8.7% (2)	4.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.00	22

Question 7b: What would you suggest, if anything, be changed about the potential goals and objectives?

Common Themes

- It is not DFG’s responsibility to “develop sustainable funding.” This is up to the stakeholders, the strategic vision process, Legislature, and Governor.
- Define/clarify “adaptive management.”
- The goals need to be more specific and measurable.
- The language is too generic.

Survey Responses

- Not just share data, etc., but accept it from others when appropriate.
- Take the word "protect" out of Goal 2, item 1. This is a highly charged word that leads to "walling off" these valuable resources instead of managing them.
- Goal 3, Objective 3: Develop, align and communicate clear fish and wildlife statutes, regulations and governance.
- These are pretty well organized. As I mentioned before, I think these are really "goals" and "sub-goals" rather than "objectives". Objectives should be measureable (at best quantifiable and/or contain a timeframe). A strategic vision is really not a place for true objectives. I know, it's really semantics.
- The word "promote" should be eliminated from this text: "Promote and support public outdoor recreation, hunting and fishing." Promote connotes an unquestioning and unscientific approach. Mindless promotion of hunting has led the Dept. to introduce exotic, highly invasive game species into ecosystem in which they do not belong, e.g., wild turkeys in San Diego. We don't need any more of these "promotion" disasters. "Support" is sufficient.

- This is OK as far as it goes -- but where is the core value/goal/objective to make resource management decisions on best available science in fully transparent public processes? This critical omission needs to be included here. In addition, improvement is needed in fiscal accountability -- and this objective should be included under goal 4.
- The "examples" presented in parentheses after some of the objectives (e.g., Goal 2, Objectives 1, 2, 5, and 7) need additional language (perhaps verbs?) regarding how they link to the objective. Although I am very supportive of the objective statements in their current form, they do not really meet the "SMART" requirements (for example, they aren't really measurable nor are they time bound). The SAG would need to spend more time refining these for them to be true objectives, so that success could be measured and tracked.
- Need to review piece by piece.
- I think these are all 'fine' but pretty generic and wonky and unlikely to make a practical difference in how DFG operates on a day to day basis.
- Goal 2, Objective 5: Needs more discussion about what we mean by "adaptive management." It seems to mean different things to different people.
- Goal 4, Objective 5: I agree it is necessary to find a long-term funding source, but I don't think it is the job of DFG/F&GC to "develop adequate, stable and sustainable funding." That burden is with stakeholders (this strategic vision process) and the Legislature/Governor. DFG/F&GC can inform the process re: what could be cut and redirected.
- Goal 1: objective 3 seems undefined and not consistent with SMART, objective 6 - share data with whom? Goal 2: objective 1 should state fish, wildlife and habitat resources. Goal 3: objective 3 should include fish, wildlife and habitat resources (example: DFG is responsible for regulating gold dredging in streams).
- Goals should be separated from objectives. Objectives are the ways to achieve the goals.
- Goal 4: DFG does not "develop" their own funding. They develop programs that are consistent with the funding levels they are provided.
- Adaptive management needs explanation. It can't mean requiring stakeholders to keep committing more resources to solve a problem the department doesn't know how to solve.
- Many of these objectives do not meet the threshold of being specific or measurable, nor do some of them meet the requirement of relating to their goal, i.e. encourage creative problem solving, delegate authority commensurate with responsibilities, embrace and support diversity in employees. These objectives lack substance or any real meaning. These are "feel good" objectives that can't be quantified in any sort of end-user way."
- Goal 3 needs some sort of objective about holding employees accountable and rewarding them through performance plans.

Question 8: Seeking to Determine Support for Potential Actions

Question 8 was designed to elicit the level of support that is likely for each of a list of potential actions, sorted by themes. For each theme (sub-question), the results are presented in roughly descending order of support. The method for doing this was to subtract low-support votes from high support votes for each potential action, then to sort the items in the list by that value, descending. The secondary sort is the number of high-support votes (descending), and the third sort level is low-support votes, ascending.

Question 8A: Potential Ways to Achieve Goals and Objectives Related to Engaging in Clear and Compelling Communication, Education and Outreach

For this question, respondents were asked to indicate “high support” for no more than three potential actions on the list, and to indicate “low support” for no more than three items. “High support” means that the respondent believes the item is highest-priority AND could receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members. “Low support” means that the respondent the item should not be a priority OR is not likely to receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members.

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
7. Simplify regulations (makes it easier to communicate them more effectively)	10	0
8. Implement an online permit tracking system so that an applicant can follow an application from beginning to end	10	0
1. Identify a single point of contact in each regional office who can respond to inquiries about DFG and F&GC efforts	4	0
11. Develop an external communication plan (for communicating external to DFG and F&GC)	3	0
21. Partner with educational institutions (from elementary thru university levels) and existing environmental education programs (like the California Envirothon)	3	0
3. Provide information on regulations and events online and by phone -- with limited written materials	3	1
12. Develop an outreach and education plan	2	0
17. Expand community outreach and training to reduce human conflicts with wildlife	2	1
19. Partner with California State Parks to integrate public education efforts related to California wildlife and habitats	2	1
9. Offer more workshops to help in preparing permit applications	2	2
10. Develop an internal communication plan (for communicating within DFG and F&GC)	1	1
5. Allow more regional control in providing information to and interacting with the local public (fewer approvals needed form Sacramento)	2	3
18. Use public education specialists to help educate and inform the public about how DFG and F&GC use science (incorporate information about ongoing research as well as research findings)	1	2
20. Bring innovation to classrooms to attract students to the study of science	0	1
2. Increase DFG presence in the local community at public outreach events	1	3
4. Make information available in a regionally and culturally appropriate method, including written materials in geographic areas with limited Internet access	0	2
15. Enlist recognizable spokespersons to promote DFG and F&GC (to advertise the Outdoor California, conduct PSA's, produce documentaries, and briefly explain that every person in the state must be involved in natural resources)	0	3

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
13. Provide more interpreters to educate the public about California's resources	0	4
16. Highlight and expand distribution of DFG's Outdoor California magazine to educate public about DFG and wildlife resources	0	4
23. Rename DFG the Department of Wildlife Conservation and Management, which more broadly and succinctly describes its mission	2	7
6. Hire regional staff that more closely reflect the regional make up	0	5
22. Change the names of DFG and F&GC to reflect their mandates	3	9

Question 8B: Potential Ways to Achieve Goals and Objectives Related to Committing to Formal and Informal Partnerships and Collaboration

For this question, respondents were asked to indicate “high support” for no more than four potential actions on the list, and to indicate “low support” for no more than four items. “High support” means that the respondent believes the item is highest-priority AND could receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members. “Low support” means that the respondent the item should not be a priority OR is not likely to receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members.

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
15. Pursue formal and informal partnership/collaboration opportunities with all levels of government agencies (federal, tribal, state, local), stakeholder groups, private landowners, etc.	10	0
24. Simplify the permitting system for habitat restoration projects to expand partnership with private landowners	9	0
7. Enhance and re-establish partnerships with organizations that have scientific capacity (such as academic institutions, other credible scientific organizations and stakeholders, in order to expand ability to make decisions based on best readily available science)	6	0
25. Use more collaborative processes that combine regulatory agencies with landowners and conservation organizations (e.g., Lower Butte Creek Project, Partners in Restoration Program, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program) on restoration/ enhancement projects	6	2
1. Provide top-down encouragement to coordinate and partner with other agencies	4	0
16. Increase coordination with all levels of government agencies (federal, tribal, state, local), stakeholder groups, private landowners, etc.	4	0
6. Leverage existing networks, relationships, and multi-agency venues	4	1
8. Develop mechanisms to facilitate collaborative partnerships between DFG personnel and scientists from other state and federal agencies, academic institutions, and other appropriate third-party scientific organizations	3	1
10. Promote active involvement of DFG employees in the larger scientific community	3	1
17. Partner/collaborate with resources users in conducting field research and managing resources	3	1
23. Adjust the 1600 program fee schedule to make 1600 agreements affordable for restoration and enhancement projects	3	1
3. Develop and improve formal and informal relationships with partners	2	0
5. Develop and improve formal and informal information sharing	2	0
9. Encourage and facilitate partnerships with stakeholders (e.g., consumptive and non-consumptive resource users) to participate in data collection	2	0
13. More responses to stakeholder requests should be YES; when projects or requests are denied, indicate how to solve the issues or concerns, rather than just indicating NO	3	2
27. Work with land owners, both private and those who may operate on leased state-owned ground, to build positive, trusting relationships which are mutually beneficial	1	0

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
31. Encourage a broad-based coalition effort of environmental and conservation organizations to tap into their memberships to work with each other to focus on five significant topics: • combat poaching • combat pollution • combat the illegal sales of wildlife parts • promote habitat restoration • promote increased enforcement presence (via game wardens) to protect fish and wildlife resources	4	4
12. Consider public perception before utilizing potential partners to promote DFG and F&GC missions	1	1
26. Work with organizations that outreach to landowners to help create stronger relationships with private landowners (i.e., California Farm Bureau, California Cattlemen's Association, resource conservation districts)	1	1
29. For data/ information gaps, and filling monitoring needs, establish partnerships and determine who will gather scientific information (avoid duplication of efforts)	1	1
21. Ensure internal capacity to manage cooperative agreements and contracts (positive example is the Condor Program)	0	0
19. Collaborate with the University of California and California State University systems to facilitate modification and development of university curricula to help with DFG research, monitoring and evaluation needs	1	2
20. For peripheral areas not core to DFG/F&GC missions, use cooperative agreements or contracts with the University of California, California State University, and other government agencies (including tribes)	0	1
28. Streamline the process to establish memoranda of agreement/understanding	0	1
4. Identify needed capacity of partners (e.g., waterfowl endowment at UCD)	1	3
11. Utilize efforts by partners to promote the DFG/F&GC mission (i.e. The Humane Society enforcement efforts, resource conservation district land owner outreach) with firewalls and consideration of public perception of partners	1	3
2. Develop a potential partners list	0	2
14. Partner with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on school habitat projects	0	2
30. Reach out to the scientific community for assistance in designing management plans and conducting environmental reviews	0	2
22. Fund restoration and/or enhancement coordinators at resource conservation districts (similar to watershed coordinators) to help identify potential restoration/ enhancement projects and help applicants obtain permits	3	7
18. Have DFG regional offices set regional resource management priorities and implement actions in cooperation with local/regional resource professionals and landowners	1	6

Question 8C: Potential Ways to Achieve Goals and Objectives Related to Using Ecosystem-Based Management (multi-media, multi-species, multi-habitat), Informed by Best Available Science

For this question, respondents were asked to indicate “high support” for no more than three potential actions on the list, and to indicate “low support” for no more than three items. “High support” means that the respondent believes the item is highest-priority AND could receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members. “Low support” means that the respondent the item should not be a priority OR is not likely to receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members.

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
15. Prioritize research, monitoring and evaluation needs for species and habitat trends analysis (ensure that the review of efforts are coordinated with other federal and state review capacities)	8	0
4. To the extent possible, coordinate/integrate methods, guidelines, and policies with other scientific data collection and archiving efforts	7	0
13. Improve implementation timelines and local participation in Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program	6	0

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
1. Create an ecosystem services policy for California to create incentives for landowners to generate environmental services	7	2
5. Improve coordination with the University of California for increased science and data assistance	5	0
16. Develop Science Quality Assurance Plan to guide scientific efforts to produce timely, credible and objective results (Quality Assurance is rigorous internal and external review of study proposals, while Quality Control is rigorous administrative and peer review of completed studies)	5	2
14. Prioritize research needs	3	0
7. Establish a Research Branch (to promote scientifically rigorous studies and other data collection efforts)	6	4
9. Ensure that any science advisory panel adopts multidisciplinary approaches that include contributions from appropriate disciplines of population biology, oceanography, ecology, economics, statistics, modeling, and social sciences	3	1
2. Balance development/ecosystem services with natural resources goals/stewardship (natural resources when sustained provide ecological values/services)	2	1
10. Integrate the scientific method into DFG research, monitoring and evaluation of management actions (can include rigorous design and testing of null hypotheses, as well as incorporating other sources of scientific information as appropriate, such as descriptive studies, traditional ecological knowledge, strong inference, social science)	2	1
6. Establish an Office of Resource and Population Assessment (in support of scientifically rigorous modeling efforts)	2	4
8. Establish a Monitoring Branch as either standalone entity with direct integration with the Research Branch or as a sub-group of the Research Branch	1	3
12. Become active participants in future updates of the Environmental Goals and Policy Report (EGPR)	1	3
3. Increase the use of "other science" such as traditional ecological knowledge from Native Americans	1	7
11. Increase the use of consultants for scientific research and monitoring	0	6

Question 8D: Potential Ways to Achieve Goals and Objectives Related to Engaging in Broadly-Informed and Transparent Decision-Making

For this question, respondents were asked to indicate "high support" for no more than four potential actions on the list, and to indicate "low support" for no more than four items. "High support" means that the respondent believes the item is highest-priority AND could receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members. "Low support" means that the respondent the item should not be a priority OR is not likely to receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members.

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
9. Define a set of qualifications for the governor to consider in making appointments and the legislature to consider when approving appointments	11	1
24. Link to or post online at the DFG website all reports and publications from DFG-sponsored projects	6	0
2. Establish science advisory panel from multiple disciplines to advise DFG director on major issues	7	2
13. Establish an independent multidisciplinary Science Advisory Panel (i.e., SAP; or a Science and Biostatistics Committee) to provide independent scientific review and guidance on DFG planning products, management plans, monitoring designs, focused studies, and "best available" science (consult extant models used in other states and federal agencies)	5	0

*California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision
Summary of BRCC/SAG Online Survey Regarding Draft Interim Strategic Vision
January 5, 2012*

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
15. Establish mechanisms to promote rigorous, thorough, independent scientific review of DFG resource management, scientific studies and reports, and monitoring programs	5	0
26. Consult adopted state and federal agency standards and appropriate codes of ethical conduct to develop guidelines and formal rules to develop DFG codes to buffer DFG scientists, partners, and contracted third parties from political influence while promoting dialogue between scientists and policy makers.	4	0
27. Modify decision-making processes to facilitate integration across biological and physical scientific disciplines while promoting interactions between scientists and policy makers (i.e., balancing test for sufficient time versus efficiency; e.g. one-year status review under California Endangered Species Act) but ensuring independence of scientific programs from political influence	4	0
11. Use consistent applications of science and be transparent in the determination of listing a species and the areas of potential habitat mitigation needs	3	0
17. Establish methods, guidelines, and policies for collecting, analyzing, archiving, and serving data and other information generated by research, monitoring, and modeling efforts of DFG personnel	3	0
7. Make fish and game commissioners representative by geography (divide California into equal geographies and then commissioners each represent one of those geographies)	4	2
14. Define Best Available Science, Best Available Scientific Methods, and standards for applying them that conform to appropriate California and federal standards (statutory and common law)	4	2
10. Apply species mitigation in a more consistent way between the California Endangered Species Act and federal Endangered Species Act	3	1
18. Establish a standard procedure for data sharing	3	1
16. Establish mechanisms to promote rigorous, thorough, independent scientific review of methods and results of scientific studies conducted by third parties and adopted by DFG	2	0
1. Expand F&GC committee system to include a science committee to advise F&GC	5	4
8. Make fish and game commissioners representative of specific categories of interest or expertise (i.e., biology, hunting, fishing, non-consumptive users)	4	3
28. Provide scientific advisers to DFG and F&GC who are independent experts in economics and other social sciences, ecology and population biology	3	2
19. Publish guidelines for ensuring the quality, objectivity, utility and integrity of information used or disseminated by DFG	2	2
21. Improve and increase field research	1	1
22. Improve scientific support of harvest programs, ocean conservation, and measuring climate change effects	1	1
25. Develop scientific integrity policy to define ethical rules of conduct to ensure quality and credibility of information and procedures for investigating and disciplining misconduct	0	0
12. Clarify what is needed to benefit specific species under the California Endangered Species Act	0	1
23. Require that all data collected in sponsored scientific investigations be entered into BIOS or another appropriate accessible database	1	3
20. Require a procedural step of effects analysis or risk assessment in all agency determinations that rely on the use of information derived from scientific studies or use other sources of reliable knowledge (i.e., peer review)	0	2
29. Define and communicate the benefits of programs and who receives those benefits (i.e. permit applicant, broader public)	2	5
5. Make fish and game commissioners full-time professionals	1	4
6. Change the length and number of terms for fish and game commissioners	0	3
4. Increase the number of fish and game commissioners	1	5
3. Establish a suite of professional wildlife management employees guided by science to report to an elected body [commissioners elected by public?]	0	7

Question 8E: Potential Ways to Achieve Goals and Objectives Related to Integrated Resource Management (Interdisciplinary and Interagency)

For this question, respondents were asked to indicate “high support” for no more than three potential actions on the list, and to indicate “low support” for no more than three items. “High support” means that the respondent believes the item is highest-priority AND could receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members. “Low support” means that the respondent the item should not be a priority OR is not likely to receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members.

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
2. Review the California Fish and Game Code and Title 14 Code of Regulations, and coordinate them with the mandates of other fish and game resource management entities	8	0
18. Work jointly with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to improve the processes for issuing permits under the federal Endangered Species Act and the California Endangered Species Act	8	1
4. Support and participate in multi-agency collaboratives (Strategic Growth Council, California Biodiversity Council, California Ocean Protection Council, California Landscape Conservation Cooperative, Delta Stewardship Council, Water Plan State Agency Steering Committee, various conservancies, resource conservation districts, integrated regional watershed management groups, and regional blueprint planning groups)	7	0
3. Develop and improve information-sharing with federal, state, tribal and local government agencies	6	0
6. Better integrate policies and objectives across resource management agencies	6	0
19. Work jointly with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service to coordinate and partner on enhancement/recovery activities for listed species	6	0
16. Increase the use of natural resources agreements (e.g., Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement)	3	0
9. Utilize and support integrated resource management plans and documents from all levels of government agencies	2	0
17. Implement a “working landscapes” concept in managing fish and wildlife resources	2	0
21. Coordinate scientific determinations with other state and federal scientific bodies (i.e. PFMC Science and Statistical Committee)	2	0
1. Identify the potential to coordinate with other agencies by developing a matrix that describes the interactive hierarchical structure of California agencies and extant offices within DFG that use guidance from science in conserving and managing California’s natural resources	3	2
10. Support and expand “advanced mitigation” programs at state and local levels in support of integrated resource management projects	2	1
7. Build synergies on joint efforts to achieve like goals among federal, state, tribal and local government agencies	1	0
15. OSPR Administrator should have managerial authority over non-OSPR staff conducting oil spill related activities	1	1
22. Coordinate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in developing avian protection plans	1	2
5. Designate staff to participate in local and regional resource management activities	0	1
13. Execute an integrated resource management memorandum of understanding/agreement among “integrators” to implement joint action plans	1	3
8. Designate staff to participate in cross-cutting agency activities that leverage resources and existing processes	0	2
12. Jointly develop with other “integrators” integrated resource management plans (describing ways to align specific resource planning, policies and regulations, to share people/processes/tools, and suggest minor organizational improvements)	0	2

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
20. Large Fisheries Restoration Grant Program projects need to receive funding to move the planning process forward and start gathering needed monetary support to actually move projects into implementation	2	5
14. In partnership with other “integrators,” prepare and periodically update a strategic “California Biodiversity Plan” or “California Natural Resource Plan” similar to the California Water Plan (could incorporate other DFG and F&GC plans, like the Wildlife Action Plan, and would be informed by related state, federal, tribal and local companion resource plans)	1	4
11. Support and participate in an integrate the “integrators” intensive workshop (to describe existing challenges, lessons learned, common ground, overlaps, conflicts, drivers and trends, and potential responses/solutions)	0	9

Question 8F: Potential Ways to Achieve Goals and Objectives Related to Defining and Supporting Success

For this question, respondents were asked to indicate “high support” for no more than four potential actions on the list, and to indicate “low support” for no more than four items. “High support” means that the respondent believes the item is highest-priority AND could receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members. “Low support” means that the respondent the item should not be a priority OR is not likely to receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members.

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
5. Improve transparency and accountability of programs and budgets	10	0
15. Remove barriers to restoration related to permits—see Barriers of Restoration Report, Resources Agency 2003	7	0
3. Better articulate programmatic deliverables and define measures of success in advance	7	1
13. Improve consistency of permitting by project type and between regions and offices, while recognizing local differences	6	0
6. “Flatten” DFG (reduce the hierarchy)	5	0
17. Develop a programmatic 1600 streambed alteration permitting process for restoration, enhancement and rehabilitation projects (e.g., Marin Resource Conservation District)	5	0
18. Develop a smart permitting system (e.g., the system should know the difference between a highway project and a restoration project)	4	0
12. Review delegation of authority and place similar authorities in the legislature or F&GC, but not both (i.e., fees, fishing regulations)	4	1
25. Dedicate funding to monitoring	4	1
20. Have DFG develop a clear list of what an applicant needs to provide during a permit process	3	0
27. Adopt the DFG Seven Strategic Initiatives as priorities for a new strategic plan	3	1
24. Employ new technologies to enhance data management systems (i.e. GIS databases, MarineMap)	2	0
16. Have DFG staff available for pre-project planning on a timely basis (provide online tools as well as staff readily available to answer questions)	3	2
8. DFG Wildlife Division and Ecological Services Division should communicate and coordinate more thoroughly so that expertise is shared	1	0
22. Improve the timber harvest plan review process	1	0
14. Internally track the amount of time required to process a permit application; review findings to determine if the timing is acceptable, if timing differs among regions, and if any parts of the program need refining	2	2
19. Simplify/streamline the scientific collecting permitting process	2	2
4. Implement effective and efficient actions	0	0

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
11. Consider and make recommendations for delegating responsibilities and authorities among legislature, DFG and F&GC (using stakeholder working group)	1	2
21. Use the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (federal project related to water development) as model for better permit coordination	0	1
23. Better define who pays for DFG review of timber harvest plans	0	1
1. Use the same mission statement for DFG and F&GC	3	5
9. Unite the DFG Ecosystem Division and DFG Wildlife Division into a single division	1	3
26. Create and use a standing stakeholder advisory group to help DFG and F&GC develop and implement a strategic plan	1	3
10. Alternatively, consolidate personnel working on non-consumptive issues in the Ecosystem Division, and personnel working on consumptive uses in the Wildlife Division	2	5
2. Refine mission statement to include "protect" or "protect and enhance" and not just sustain/manage language	5	9
7. Restructure DFG based on consumptive and non-consumptive uses/activities	0	9

Question 8G: Potential Ways to Achieve Goals and Objectives Related to Laws and Regulations

For this question, respondents were asked to indicate "high support" for no more than three potential actions on the list, and to indicate "low support" for no more than three items. "High support" means that the respondent believes the item is highest-priority AND could receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members. "Low support" means that the respondent the item should not be a priority OR is not likely to receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members.

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
5. Request that the California Law Revision Commission "clean up" the California Fish and Game Code and Title 14 fish and game regulations ("clean up" meaning to eliminate redundancies, eliminate no longer applicable statutes and regulations, and simplify statutes and regulations where possible)	17	0
3. Review, clarify and prioritize responsibilities and mandates, starting with unfunded and underfunded mandates	13	0
14. Ensure the general public is provided with a permitting process that is transparent, consistent, efficient, and accessible	4	0
2. Review and align responsibilities of DFG with F&GC	4	1
20. Allow federal Endangered Species Act requirements to be sufficient for meeting California Endangered Species Act requirements	3	1
22. Review criteria for categorical California Environmental Quality Act exemptions for small-scale restoration projects and explore National Environmental Protection Act criteria (Fisheries Restoration Program is an example to use)	3	1
7. Identify necessary reforms to statutes or regulations that would facilitate greater public and private use of key regulatory programs that provide broad public and private benefits (i.e., Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program, streambed alteration permitting, landowner incentive programs, timber harvest plan review process)	2	0
18. Review the fully-protected species statute with California Endangered Species Act listing process and consider which species should be taken off the fully-protected list and/or moved to a California Endangered Species Act listing	2	0
4. Transfer mandates to other agencies if they are in a better or more appropriate position to implement those mandates	2	1

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
8. Identify and reduce gaps and overlaps in regulatory processes	1	0
9. Review and recommend ways to enable F&GC to fulfill current responsibilities which may not be currently addressed due to lack of resources, or expand authority	1	0
24. Change the way management is funded (i.e., from a focus on the number of marijuana plants eradicated to overall eradication and restoration of the natural environment)	1	0
12. Move California Endangered Species Act listing decisions from F&GC to DFG (consistent with making decisions based on objective, scientific expertise)	3	3
15. Coordinate permitting regulations with other agencies	1	1
17. Allow incidental take for fully-protected species, but only for habitat restoration and recovery work	1	1
6. Make more clear and concise the regulatory language used to implement statutes	0	0
23. Utilize technology to enhance regulatory programs and reduce costs (i.e., electronic monitoring of permitted activities to ensure goals are achieved)	0	0
13. Develop a list of all permits issued by DFG and permits issued by other agencies/ organizations that necessitate coordination with DFG	1	2
21. Allow an arbitration process under the California Endangered Species Act that would allow DFG and an applicant to mediate any dispute on permit conditions and related matters (see Section 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Program)	1	2
19. Abolish the fully protected species status and only list species under the California Endangered Species Act	0	2
11. Set regulations for ecological issues (i.e., reserves) with DFG (professional staff) rather than F&GC	1	4
10. Limit F&GC responsibilities to wildlife management for consumptive uses	2	7
16. Allow incidental take of fully-protected species under any circumstance	1	8
1. Require DFG director (and perhaps senior management) to be hired by, and report to, F&GC	2	10

Question 8H: Potential Ways to Achieve Goals and Objectives Related to Compliance

For this question, respondents were asked to indicate “high support” for no more than four potential actions on the list, and to indicate “low support” for no more than four items. “High support” means that the respondent believes the item is highest-priority AND could receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members. “Low support” means that the respondent the item should not be a priority OR is not likely to receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members.

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
13. Increase the number of DFG wardens	13	2
3. Have a point of contact in each regional office who can respond to inquiries about rules and regulations	6	1
5. Increase capacity of permit staff to work with permittees to ensure understanding of the permit standards (which improves compliance)	6	1
31. Assign DFG wardens to coordinate with California District Attorneys Association (CDAA) to ensure appropriate and consistent prosecution (could ensure consistency with all 58 counties and enhance Environmental Crimes Circuit Prosecutors Project, sponsored by the CDAA, a coalition of district attorneys cross-deputized in multiple counties to specialize in prosecuting poaching and other environmental crimes)	5	1
8. Increase permitting coordination with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other state and federal agencies (to provide more consistency to permit applicants and improve ease of compliance)	5	1
12. Increase communication and coordination with other law enforcement agencies	4	0
4. Provide automated information on regulations, permits, etc. online and by phone	4	0
7. Simplify regulations (to increase compliance)	4	0

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
16. Develop a system that allows internal DFG information systems to “talk” to one another	4	0
9. Offer an online permit tracking system so that an applicant can follow an application from beginning to end	3	0
23. Increase both fines and penalties for fish and game violations	3	0
6. Dedicate staff time to working with project applicants on pre-project planning (i.e., workshops to help prepare permit applications)	4	2
15. Provide wardens with functional equipment (i.e., some boats inoperable, planes limited, wardens and other peace officers using incompatible communication systems)	3	1
17. Improve the use of enforcement technology	2	0
18. Give wardens access to ALDS information (including violations) in the field	2	0
30. Develop a cadre of experienced prosecutors to charge and try fish and game cases (e.g. circuit district attorney system)	2	0
2. Increase DFG presence in the local community, including public outreach events	3	2
11. Educate other law enforcement agencies about fish and game code and regulations	1	0
22. Increase the size of the DFG Law Enforcement Division’s Special Operations Unit	1	0
27. Improve coordination with the California Attorney General’s Special Prosecutor	1	0
29. Educate district attorneys and judicial branch about fish and game laws and regulations	1	0
24. Use fines to pay for resource management programs	3	3
1. Participate in local and regional natural resource planning venues to increase education and collaboration on compliance	1	1
10. Allow for arbitration or mediation over permit standards (draft permit stage – before final)	1	1
26. Advertise DFG’s secret witness program, CalTIP (Californians Turn in Poachers and Polluters at 888-DFG-CalTIP)	0	0
28. Create special district attorney capacity focused on fish and game violations (housed in Sacramento) to assist all county district attorneys	2	3
34. Review types of violations to determine which should be raised from misdemeanor to felony (such as abalone violations)	2	3
20. Environmental Crimes Unit, specializing in investigations of Fish and Game Code sections 1600 and 5650 (water pollution and streambed habitat destruction)	1	2
21. Overt Detective Unit to lead complex statewide and interstate poaching investigations, streamline intelligence on repeat offenders, and use of specialized surveillance equipment to effectively apprehend serious poachers	1	2
14. Increase wardens’ ability to gather evidence as needed to enforce laws and win cases	0	1
25. Use fines to pay for communication programs (make sure everyone knows the laws and the consequences of breaking them)	0	1
32. Refine the Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedule – California Rules of Court (for the California Fish and Game Code and the Title 14 California Code of Regulations) and include additional code sections not mentioned in the Bail Schedule	0	2
19. Create specialty units within the DFG Law Enforcement Division, comprised of additional enforcement positions and funding for:	0	3
33. Require distribution of the California Fish and Game Code/Title 14 Bail Schedule to the respective courts in all 58 counties	0	3

Question 8I: Potential Ways to Achieve Goals and Objectives Related to Staff Development

For this question, respondents were asked to indicate “high support” for no more than five potential actions on the list, and to indicate “low support” for no more than five items. “High support” means that the respondent believes the item is highest-priority AND could receive substantial support among

BRCC and SAG members. “Low support” means that the respondent the item should not be a priority OR is not likely to receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members.

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
23. Conduct annual performance review/evaluations of all employees	8	0
8. Require customer service training for staff to better interface with the public and respond to questions	7	0
20. Establish and annually review work plans (including timelines, goals and objectives) for all employees, including regional managers, branch chiefs, deputy directors and program managers	6	0
6. Cross-train employees so that loss of an individual doesn't mean loss of all their knowledge	5	1
14. Mandate California Endangered Species Act and California Environmental Quality Act training across relevant staff to avoid inconsistent interpretation of the laws	5	1
29. Place DFG wardens in a law enforcement only bargaining unit for appropriate representation (comparable to other state and local law enforcement agencies)	5	1
24. Identify goals and measurable objectives for each area of management and programs	4	0
37. Recruit, hire, and retain personnel with expertise in designing scientific studies, conducting rigorous data collection, understanding and developing scientific models, analyzing data obtained from research and monitoring, and reporting and interpreting scientific studies generated from DFG staff and outside collaborators	4	0
3. Provide a thorough initial orientation with communication training (similar to what volunteers receive) and regular refresher training for all DFG/F&GC staff to learn about programs, policies, regulations, communication protocols and tools, etc.	5	2
25. Link the DFG/F&GC budgets to identified goals and objectives	5	2
28. Evaluate and ensure pay equity of DFG/F&GC employees to other government personnel classes and, for wardens, consistent with other law enforcement agencies for state and/or region	5	2
7. Require training for new F&GC members similar to that required of NOAA's fishery management council members	4	1
15. Improve staff accessibility to the public	4	1
10. Improve consistency of law enforcement and permitting staff training, understanding and application of laws and regulations	3	0
9. Mandate California Endangered Species Act training across staff to avoid different staff from making inconsistent interpretations of the law	3	1
30. Establish job performance standards (including related to how the job contributes to mission and, for scientific staff, that considers scientific contributions and application of science)	2	0
4. Train promoted employees (especially leadership training for those promoted to supervisors or managers)	3	2
13. Offer California Endangered Species Act and California Environmental Quality Act training to all staff	2	1
18. Document, review and update policies and procedures, ensuring adequacy and consistency	2	1
39. Allow and encourage publishing of scientific documents	2	1
1. Increase accuracy and timeliness, as well as staff accessibility to, program/project information by developing a repository of communication and outreach processes and tools (i.e., contact information, event schedules, program overviews and status, announcements)	1	0
17. Make processes easily accessible to the public	1	0
19. Make policies and procedures information easily accessible to the public	1	0
26. Annually evaluate programmatic goals and objectives	1	0
27. Evaluate and ensure internal pay equity	1	0
2. Create database of current employees with procedural (e.g., permit processing and issue; coordination of issues and needs among offices and external organizations) and substantive (e.g., assess needs for directed scientific studies; develop plans for scientific studies; conduct or collaborate in directed scientific studies) scientific roles in developing and implementing policy	2	2
16. Implement an anonymous “customer feedback” system where members of the public (including permit applicants) can rate their experience with DFG/F&GC	2	2

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
31. Establish basic requirements and appropriate incentives for science personnel to publish in peer-reviewed scientific journals and deliver reports of similar quality	2	2
32. Establish employee recognition/awards programs for superior work (including financial), and communicate them to motivate employees to perform superior work	2	2
34. Focus recruitment and retention on enforcement personnel	1	1
5. Examine the training approaches of other state agencies and departments, and implement those approaches as appropriate	1	2
11. Ensure that hiring policies are consistent with promoting those with applicable management experience and training	0	1
36. Establish mechanisms that enhance recruitment of personnel from University of California and California State University campuses	0	1
12. Require continuing education for all staff (including attendance at relevant scientific or technical conferences)	1	3
35. Focus recruitment and retention on biologists	0	2
38. Encourage technical personnel to pursue advanced degrees	0	4
40. Change the way management is funded, from focus on number of plants eradicated to eradication and restoration	0	4
21. Make employee work plans and reviews publically accessible	1	6
22. Allow public input into employee work plans	0	7
33. Required attendance at semi-annual meetings of Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (commissioners)	0	8

Question 8J: Potential Ways to Achieve Goals and Objectives Related to Adequate, Stable and Sustainable Funding

For this question, respondents were asked to indicate “high support” for no more than five potential actions on the list, and to indicate “low support” for no more than five items. “High support” means that the respondent believes the item is highest-priority AND could receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members. “Low support” means that the respondent the item should not be a priority OR is not likely to receive substantial support among BRCC and SAG members.

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
3. Review and prioritize mandates to determine which provide the most benefits and should be continued, which should be discontinued or removed as mandates, and which should be provided with greater funding (compare the multiple mandates to the missions)	13	0
6. Require that any new mandates be funded as a condition for approval	8	0
14. Partner with the private sector and not-for-profits to manage DFG-owned lands (e.g. AB 32, Huffman)	7	0
19. Improve transparency of budgets and actions (to reduce pressure for dedicated accounts)	5	0
38. Administratively establish a reasonable, consistent and equitable fee structure for key regulatory programs to ensure more sustainable funding (this might require some existing fees under legislative oversight to be moved to F&GC/DFG oversight)	5	0
2. Review and prioritize un-funded or under- funded mandates	4	0
17. Increase fiscal accountability	4	0
24. Review other states’ successes and failures in creating alternative revenue streams	4	0
1. Establish priorities based on goals and objectives, with resources allocated accordingly	3	0

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
15. Certain F&GC/DFG responsibilities may belong elsewhere, even if they are adequately funded (i.e., Office of Spill Prevention and Response)	3	0
40. Set fee structures such that they cover all costs to administer the applicable programs	3	0
47. Ensure firewalls are in place to prevent image of undue influence	3	0
49. Provide fee-for-service opportunities to non-consumptive users (to broaden revenue base)	3	0
22. Use performance-based budgeting	2	0
53. Continue working with consumptive users in their support of DFG/F&GC via purchasing licenses and stamps, as well as fundraising for DFG/F&GC	2	0
7. Create a feedback loop with the legislature, such that when a mandate is created there is some feedback on what the financial impacts are and what it is taking to implement the mandate	2	1
45. Leverage existing programs and partnerships to increase funding and in-kind contributions	2	1
52. Improve the DGF/F&GC accounting systems to enable tracking of funding income and outgo (e.g., by species complex) so that resource users can see how the funding is expended	2	1
11. Have DFG prioritize its responsibilities	1	0
16. Increase fiscal flexibility where appropriate	1	0
21. Use performance -based management	1	0
23. Adjust 1600 program staffing levels to prevent over-staffing during slow times (per DFG employee suggestion)	1	0
32. Use an alternative revenue stream that could be substituted for commercial permits to promote sustainability (e.g. commercial fishing permits)	1	0
34. Increase revenue from Warden Stamp Program with a public relations campaign	1	0
41. Use an open and transparent process to determine the costs to administer a program	1	0
42. Adjust user-based fees and fines for fish and game code violations for inflation	1	0
46. Expand existing financial partnerships (e.g. National Fish and Wildlife Foundation)	1	0
4. Create a working group of stakeholders, DFG and F&GC staff, legislative staff, and governor's office staff to examine DFG and F&GC priorities and communicate regarding potential or pending legislation and funding related to fish and wildlife and their habitats	3	3
25. Establish a broad sales tax for funding DFG/F&GC	3	3
8. Establish a set of criteria for prioritizing responsibilities (budget process is current proxy)	1	1
18. Create standardized policy for revenue collected for a specific use/delivery of service (e.g., level necessary to make a dedicated account cost effective)	1	1
28. Use Environmental License Plate Fund for funding DFG/F&GC	1	1
33. Create a California State Parks Foundation model (build constituency, able to advocate, supplement funding)	1	1
20. Use technology to improve efficiencies	0	0
31. Expand landing taxes/fees for funding DFG/F&GC	0	0
43. Align existing fee revenues with priorities	0	0
44. Utilize volunteer administered programs	0	0
48. Identify additional federal matching grant funding opportunities (e.g. Fisheries Restoration Grant Program)	0	0
50. Direct tidelands funding to conservation projects (at least in large part)	0	0
56. Establish financial partnerships	0	0
26. Establish a sales tax on outdoor gear for funding DFG/F&GC	2	3
12. DFG should continue to own lands, even if current funding and resources are not adequate for long-term management	1	2
9. Have the F&GC establish a set of policies for how to prioritize DFG responsibilities	0	1
36. Change the fee-setting process such that all fees are set administratively	0	1
51. Pursue the loan of federal agency personnel to DFG	0	1
54. Give F&GC its own budget	0	1
29. Establish a vehicle license fee for funding DFG/F&GC	1	3

*California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision
Summary of BRCC/SAG Online Survey Regarding Draft Interim Strategic Vision
January 5, 2012*

Potential Action	High Support	Low Support
55. Have F&GC formally review DFG budget and provide recommendations to governor/legislature	1	3
35. Pursue mitigation fees associated with a wide range of activities that adversely impact wildlife and habitat	0	2
37. Change the fee-setting process such that all fees are set legislatively	0	2
39. Work with the legislature to set fees to cover costs of administration for each program (permit, regulation, etc.)	0	2
5. Define what new mandates will look like when implemented and what they will cost to implement them	0	3
30. Establish a retail water user fee for funding DFG/F&GC	1	5
27. Establish a real estate transfer tax for funding DFG/F&GC	1	6
10. Have the F&GC prioritize responsibilities for DFG	0	5
13. DFG should continue to acquire lands, even if current funding and resources are not adequate for long-term management	0	8

Question 9: 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?

Common Themes

- The process is cumbersome; there is too much information to process.
- Some commenters believe it's important to move to action items at this point.
- Some commenters believe it's important to avoid low-level action items that would best be left to existing management or staff.

Survey Responses

- This survey design was deeply problematic and challenging as a user. I wish you'd asked us to just answer "low/med/high/I don't know" for each one of the actions and then let the chips fall where they fell on the overall ranking. Trying to pick 5 from 56 items in an online survey is simply too difficult. I don't have a lot of confidence in my own choices...
- We need to cut down on the verbose!
- This process is being rushed. Recognizing the reasons for the compressed timeline, the product will be less than it could be if a way could be found to take the time necessary to make this work product the best it could be. Perhaps the answer is to have the SAG/BRCC continue to provide recommendations into the future, and focus in this current process on recommendations that could be implemented soon. Then continue the process for more long-term and/or complex recommendations and/or that require financing that is currently unavailable.
- Whew !! -- this is a thorough survey. Thank you.
- It's important to move to tangible actions.
- Adopt a model similar to the federal Council system, with expanded in-house scientific expertise within the Department to develop management plans, advisory committees to provide recommendations on DFG and Commission plans and policies, qualified Commissioners representing diverse knowledge and expertise to adopt regulatory policies, and an independent science and statistical committee to peer review information based on best available science guidelines.
- There are many great ideas. There are some suggestions that should already be implemented e.g, employee performance reviews. Shocking if this is not happening. There is tremendous need for a clear understanding and refinement of the potential actions. Looking forward to the upcoming discussions in January.
- Your options were not consistent. If these reflect what we will work on in January I am very disappointed. Those suggestions weren't supposed to mean anything and now are you limiting us to them? Many are simply playing in the weeds that Chuck can and should implement immediately.

- I believe the Executive Committee should be playing a more hands on role with respect to prioritizing potential actions.
- There should be a recognition in the strategic vision document that not all recommendations will require a legislative or regulatory fix. Many recommendations--enhanced communication, use of partnerships, etc. can be accomplished with strong leadership, coordination and training.
- Question 8H was challenging to answer due to the technical nature of many of the recommendations, so prioritizing or gauging support was difficult. Limiting the number of low priority actions doesn't allow for a full accounting of what may not be broadly supported, but I expect that to come out at face to face meetings. Thanks for putting this together to help further discussion at future meetings.
- I believe we will make more progress by describing desired outcomes (e.g. "DFG budget is transparent and comprehensible to the public") than by prescribing how the outcome is achieved, which can look like high-handed micro-managing both to the Department and to the Legislature.