

California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project
BRCC February 6, 2012 Meeting Notes: Potential Recommendations to
Accompany the Interim Strategic Vision
Revised February 8, 2012

During the month of January 2012, the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision (CFWSV) Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission (BRCC) and Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) met numerous times to discuss six general topics: Common themes, compliance, funding, governance, science, and statutes and regulations. Individual BRCC and SAG members, as well as participating California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC) employees, volunteered to develop and refine text for potential recommendations to be considered by the BRCC and SAG.

This document contains meeting notes from the February 6, 2012 BRCC meeting, which have been added to the meeting notes from the February 3, 2012 BRCC and SAG meeting; in both cases potential recommendations to accompany the interim strategic vision were discussed. Important notations about changes in this document:

- Suggested additional text from homework volunteers, individual SAG members, and staff prior to the February 3 meeting is in blue, underlined text (like this).
- Suggested deletions from homework volunteers, individual SAG members, and staff prior to the February 3 meeting are in blue, strikethrough text ~~(like this)~~.
- Black, italicized, underlined text in brackets *[like this]* is explanatory text made prior to the February 3 meeting about whether the changes are proposed by homework volunteers or staff.
- Additional changes to the text made during the February 3 meeting, or by staff afterwards based on suggestions made during the meeting, are in red underline or ~~strikeout (like this)~~.
- A “**YES**” preceding the text of a recommendation indicates that members in attendance on February 3 agreed they could “live with” the recommendation being forwarded for consideration as part of the interim strategic vision.
- A “**NO**” preceding the text of a recommendation indicates that members in attendance on February 3 could not “live with” the recommendation being forwarded for consideration as part of the interim strategic vision in its current form (either the main text and/or the descriptive text). In some cases with a relatively small text change or two, a recommendation could have become a “yes” for those participating in the meeting, but there was not sufficient time to cover every potential recommendation. In other cases, significantly more discussion of a recommendation is necessary.
- **Meeting notes from the February 6 BRCC meeting are in dark green text (like this).**

February 3 BRCC and SAG meeting notes: Remove implementation assessment language? Globally remove the assessment language, though there will be exceptions where some of the language needs to be retained. Nomenclature change – what have previously been referred to as “common themes” in previous documents will now be referred to as “foundational strategies” to reflect the fundamental nature of the strategies to almost everything DFG and F&GC do in their work.

~~Potential Common Themes~~Foundational Strategies Recommendations

Motion: The BRCC offers conceptual support for the YES recommendations contained in this document, with the exception of two recommendations (name change and increasing number of wardens) which will be considered separately. First Rick Frank, second Dave Graber, carries (4-0).

Public comment: Support including in this motion the recommendation to increase the number of wardens. Suggestion to change language to say "...up to 50 wardens per year..." and "...with an eventual goal of 1,000 wardens" as well, which provides flexibility and clarifies that there is no an expectation that it will happen right way.

BRCC discussion moved to Potential Name Change Recommendation #1 on page 18.

BRCC discussion moved to Potential Enforcement Recommendation #3 on page 35.

BRCC comments: Are there additional potential recommendations we would like to discuss to see if we can come to consensus in the remaining meeting time? Already addressed the name change and warden recommendations. Perhaps a discussion about the OSPR recommendations and their status?

Want the record to reflect that we are not done with our work. There are additional recommendations that the BRCC will be considering as we move forward; this is the best opportunity to advance our thinking in advance of Feb. 16, but more will be coming.

What does phase 3 look like in terms of structure? BRCC invites SAG members, based on these recommendations, to go back and develop *specific details of these or any other recommendations in various stages of group discussion, and develop them over the appropriate time frame*. Suggest a concurrent process by which BRCC encourages candid views of DFG and F&GC on these and other issues of concern to them. Want to have the benefit of that expertise, and those recommendations within a sufficient time frame, so BRCC members can meaningfully deliberate, as we have today, and then provide recommendations to the executive committee.

A SAG member suggested that the more BRCC members can participate and integrate ideas early in SAG deliberations/meetings the better for the final product.

February 16 executive committee mtg – Rick Frank to present on behalf of the BRCC. SAG members receiving this afternoon an email message requesting volunteers for the Feb. 16 meeting to play a similar role.

End of BRCC meeting notes (except two recommendations noted above on pages 18 and 35).

YES Potential ~~Common Theme~~Foundational Strategy #1: Engage in clear and compelling communication, education and outreach, both internally and externally

Implementation actions~~recommendations~~ include:

- A. Develop a communications plan
 - i. Internal
 - ii. External
 - iii. Identify high-level branding and recognition strategies to enhance recognition of DFG by the general public

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

- B. Designate Place a communications person in each region. Not only would this person be responsible for generating media stories and answering media calls, but they will also be an “expert” of sorts in the region and know all about projects, programs, etc. This person will communicate regularly with headquarters

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

- C. Enhance Education and Outreach
 - i. Develop an outreach and education plan that includes using partnerships

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

- D. Improve community relations with the help of organizations such as the Natural Resource Volunteer Program to educate the public on issues such as Keep Me Wild, Conservation Education, marine protected area boundaries, enforcement information, regulation clarification, etc.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

YES Potential ~~Common Theme~~ Foundational Strategy #2: Commit to Formal and Informal Collaboration and Partnerships

[Meeting note: The language inserted immediately below this note will replace the previous partnership recommendations and descriptions, which are in strikethrough below the insertion.]

Description and Definition

Throughout SAG and BRCC discussions during the strategic vision process, there has been a consistent emphasis on the value of partnerships and collaboration; these concepts are included in chapter 3 of

the draft interim strategic vision as a core value, as a common theme, and under goals 1 and 3. DFG would significantly benefit from improving both its internal culture of collaboration and external forms of collaboration with a wide range of partners. The SAG defines a partnership as a mutually beneficial arrangement (whether formal or informal) that leverages DFG resources to achieve shared goals between the partners. Partnerships should be based on mutual respect and genuine appreciation of each partners' contribution DFG staff members have noted that partnerships require staff time and resources, labor contracts may preclude the use of 'volunteer' labor in some instances, and that insurance and liability issues may create further barriers to some types of partnerships. Nonetheless, the SAG believes that improved collaboration and increased use of partnerships is critical to the long-term success of DFG.

YES Formal and Informal Collaboration and Partnerships Recommendation 1: DFG should strive to create an internal culture that supports partnerships, encourages collaboration, and promotes cooperation.

Meeting notes: Could this recommendation be combined with IRM recommendation #2? Are they closely related enough?

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

YES Formal and Informal Collaboration and Partnership Recommendation 2: DFG and F&GC should create, foster and actively participate in effective partnerships/collaborations with and among other agencies and stakeholders to achieve shared goals.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

Potential Partnership Recommendation/Common Theme #2: Actively participate in and create partnerships/collaborations among other agencies, stakeholders and within the organizations [both DFG and F&GC].

~~Implementation recommendations could include:~~

- ~~A. Create a culture of coordination and collaboration~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

- ~~B. Reach out to other groups within the department or commission. [an example would include enforcement/biologist interaction]~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~C. Those departments with more staff and/or more specific expertise in public works contracts, or that have higher or less stringent delegated authority should coordinate with those who do not.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~D. Partner with and/or enter into agreements with other agencies/organizations, such as for focused species and habitat assessments or work (e.g. vegetation mapping recently or currently done by DFG's Biogeographic Data Branch for California State Parks, San Diego Association of Governments, etc.). This can include pursuing formal agreements with state and federal natural resource management, local agencies, permitting, and action agencies and/or multi-agency/user natural resource stakeholder groups to establish multi-agency collaboratives that will effectively promote natural resource conservation (see selected characteristics below).~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~E. Reach out to other boards and commissions.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~F. Establish a standing stakeholder advisory committee.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~Description: The intent of this action is to create a culture of coordination and collaboration using methods such as clear and consistent commitment by leadership, employee encouragement and incentives, and providing sufficient resources and time within DFG and F&GC to coordinate within and partner with other agencies. State agencies and employees have specific expertise in some areas but not others, and should utilize each other as resources as needed. In addition, often an agency's or a DFG program authority extends over only part of the natural resource issue, solution, or problem. By working together, global solutions can be found and implemented. Examples include:~~

~~A. Departments under the Natural Resources Agency (and those state agencies with a resources and/or regulatory nature) should meet to determine how they can effectively partner to achieve common goals specific to education, restoration, land acquisition, land management, and species and habitat monitoring. Additionally, those agencies with expertise not found in or~~

~~very limited within DFG but needed for the implementation of DFG projects (e.g. archaeology, engineering, hydrology, landscape architecture and facility planning) should be able to be conducted by other agencies/organizations in partnership with DFG to conduct necessary tasks.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~B. Use more collaborative processes that combine regulatory agencies with landowners and other stakeholders, conservation organizations and local agencies and organizations on restoration/enhancement and other natural resource programs.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~C. Work with organizations that outreach to landowners to help create stronger relationships with private landowners~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~Implementation Assessment (previous, for overall recommendation)~~

- ~~• Method: DFG, F&GC, and Natural Resources Agency administrative~~
- ~~• Timeline: Short-term, continuing~~

~~Ties to Strategic Plan: Common Theme #2, Goal 1, Objective 2; Goal 2, Objective 2; Goal 3, Objective 1~~

~~**Partnerships (moved from compliance discussion topic)**~~

~~Definition: The SAG has used the term “partnerships” as a very general concept rather than solely relationships based on a formal MOU or other legal agreement. It is intended to include all forms of collaboration, both formal and informal.~~

~~Barriers: While stakeholders view their offers to help as adding to DFG’s capacity, at times these arrangements may use more resources than they replace, due to training, supervision and other DFG involvement. Additionally, labor laws may preclude the use of ‘volunteer’ labor in some instances. Insurance and liability issues create further barriers.~~

~~Partners: Potential “partners” include federal, state, and local agencies as well as non-governmental organizations, landowners, businesses, and individuals.~~

~~**Potential Partnerships Recommendation #1: Utilize partnerships to promote the DFG/FGC mission**~~

~~Description: DFG's stakeholders can also be the biggest supporters. The department should utilize this support by encouraging and enabling stakeholders to educate lawmakers regarding DFG programs. This could include proposed legislation or budget issues. When developing such a program the perception of favorable treatment for partners should be a considered. This would also leverage local resources.~~

~~Implementation recommendations include:~~

- ~~• Create a State Parks Foundation type organization~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~Implementation Assessment (previous, for overall recommendation)~~

- ~~• Method: Administrative, perhaps budgetary~~
- ~~• Timeline: Continuing~~

~~Ties to Strategic Vision: Common Themes #2; Goal 4, objectives 3 and 4~~

~~**Potential Partnerships Recommendation #2: Encourage a broad-based coalition effort of outdoor organizations [both consumptive and non-consumptive] to tap into their memberships to support the DFG/FGC mission [B:31]**~~

- ~~• Combat poaching~~
- ~~• Combat pollution~~
- ~~• Combat illegal sales of wildlife [parts]~~
- ~~• Promote habitat restoration~~
- ~~• Promote increased enforcement presence to protect wildlife resource~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: Administrative, perhaps budgetary and legislative in future years~~
- ~~• Timeline: Continuing~~

~~Ties to Strategic Vision: Common Themes #2, Goal 1 Objectives 1 and 9~~

~~**Potential Partnerships Recommendation #3: Foster effective partnerships to better meet DFG mission (creating/sustaining partnerships)**~~

~~Implementation recommendations include:~~

~~Regional Staff will meet semi-annually to define and assess new and existing partners through a common ground or SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats/constraints) assessment and develop and maintain a list of partners. With each partner, both DFG and the partner should~~

~~define their respective roles, purposes and desired outcomes, Develop memorandums of understanding (MOUs) where appropriate, communicate on a frequent basis and work toward achieving deliverables/products.~~

~~Types of Partners~~

- ~~• Stakeholder Groups~~
- ~~• Other Resources Agencies~~
- ~~• Other Regulatory Agencies~~
- ~~• Land owners~~
- ~~• NGOs~~
- ~~• Interested Parties~~
- ~~• Universities~~
- ~~• Internal~~
- ~~• Local Jurisdictions~~
- ~~• Elected officials~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~Implementation recommendations include:~~

~~Regions and HQ staff will meet annually to integrate regional partnership efforts with Statewide Strategic Initiative #4 and DFG's vision effort.~~

- ~~• Specific recommendation: Revisit DFG's Partnership Strategic Initiative; revamp and implement on a statewide basis.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~Implementation recommendations include:~~

~~Department personnel will strive for efficiency while developing and sharing partnership templates (MOUs, MOAs, Cooperative Agreement, contracts,) check lists, or other documents prepared under current mutually beneficial partnerships. Federal grant forms and templates can be used as a starting point.~~

- ~~• Specific recommendation: Revamp DFG Volunteer Coordinator Program and have a regional and branch staff person act as the designated point of contact.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~Implementation Assessment (previous, for overall recommendation)~~

~~• Method: Administrative, perhaps budgetary~~

~~• Timeline: Continuing~~

~~Ties to Strategic Vision: Common Theme #2~~

Potential Integrated Resource Management (IRM) Recommendations^{*}

~~*For specifics see below potential IRM recommendation #2 for suggested selected characteristics of effective “targeted” multi-agency collaboratives.~~

~~[Staff note: The topic of integrated resource management (IRM) was a subtopic of the natural resource stewardship and compliance discussions; the IRM recommendations are suggested to be moved here because IRM is generally a form of partnerships. However, these recommendations could reside elsewhere.]~~

Meeting notes: There was some discussion about whether IRM is a form of partnerships and belongs in this section. May be discussed further in third phase.

~~Definition of IRM: “A planning and decision making process that coordinates resource use so that the long-term sustainable benefits are optimized and conflicts among users are minimized. IRM brings together all resource groups rather than each working in isolation to balance the economic, environmental, and social requirements of society.” [Nova Scotia, Canada, Department of Natural Resources, from California Natural Resources Agency, “The Future of Natural Resource Management”, December 2010]~~

YES Potential IRM Recommendation #1: Engage in effective integrated resource management (IRM¹) processes.

~~Implementation recommendations include~~ [Meeting note: A-D now move to the end of the description text below]

¹ For these purposes IRM is defined as “A planning and decision making process that coordinates resource use so that the long-term sustainable benefits are optimized and conflicts among users are minimized. IRM brings together all resource groups rather than each working in isolation to balance the economic, environmental, and social requirements of society.” [Nova Scotia, Canada, Department of Natural Resources, from California Natural Resources Agency, “The Future of Natural Resource Management”, December 2010] Please see “IRM” in the glossary for or examples of suggested, selected characteristics of collaborations that engage in IRM.

~~A. DFG fully commit to a leadership role on the steering committee for the National Fish, Wildlife and Plants Climate Adaption Plan.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~B. DFG involvement in leadership role in Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) committees.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~C. DFG participation on the State Agency Steering Committee for preparing California Water Plan Updates.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~D. DFG participation in the Renewable Energy Policy Group established by the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor's Office and the California Natural Resources Agency as well as under its aegis, the Renewable Energy Action Team, comprised of USFWS, BLM, CEC, DFG and the California Natural Resources Agency, among others.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

Description: Current processes fall short and result in inefficient or unsatisfactory results. The intent of this action is for DFG and F&GC to support and participate in "targeted" multi-agency collaboratives that will effectively promote IRM among state and federal natural resource permitting, and action agencies and/or multi-agency/user natural resource stakeholder groups to achieve: Improved sharing of data, information, tools and science among agencies; better alignment of planning, policies and regulations across agencies; coordinated and streamlined permitting; regulatory certainty; increased coordination with all levels of government agencies (federal, tribal, state, local), stakeholder groups, private landowners, and others; and increased effectiveness through leveraging of existing networks, relationships, and multi-agency venues.

Potential opportunities that were presented during SAG meetings but were not deliberated upon by the SAG include:

- a leadership role on the steering committee for the National Fish, Wildlife and Plants Climate Adaption Plan,
- a leadership role in Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) committees,

- participation on the State Agency Steering Committee for preparing California Water Plan Updates, and
- participation in the Renewable Energy Policy Group established by the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor's Office and the California Natural Resources Agency as well as under its aegis, the Renewable Energy Action Team, comprised of USFWS, BLM, CEC, DFG and the California Natural Resources Agency, among others.

Implementation Assessment (~~previous, for overall recommendation~~)

- Method: DFG, F&GC, and Natural Resources Agency administrative, budgetary
- Timeline: Short-term

Ties to Strategic Plan: Goal 1, Objectives 2 and 9; Goal 2, Objective 2; Goal 3, Objective 1

NO Potential IRM Recommendation #2: Use more collaborative processes that engage regulatory agencies with landowners, conservation organizations, and local agencies on restoration/enhancement projects.

Meeting notes: Suggestion that these (IRM recommendations #2 and #2) are examples of partnerships above and should be a subset of partnerships recommendations; need to be combined. Another member suggested that IRM is a multi-disciplinary approach to resource management, not just about partnerships; DFG can take an IRM approach without actually engaging in partnerships. Some participants believe this is already captured in partnerships and collaboration recommendation #1.

Implementation ~~actions~~recommendations include:

- Example is the conservation assessment partnership between CalTrans and DFG

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

- Work with organizations that outreach to landowners to help create stronger relationships with private landowners

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

- Variation: work with landowners themselves to provide solutions to common issues [e.g. invasive species]

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

NO Potential IRM Recommendation #3: State agencies have specific expertise in some areas but not others, and should utilize each other as resources as needed.

Implementation ~~actions~~~~recommendations~~ include:

- Departments under the California Natural Resources Agency (and those state agencies with a resources and/or regulatory nature) should meet to determine how they can effectively partner to achieve common goals specific to education, restoration, land acquisition, land management, and species and habitat monitoring. Additionally, those agencies with expertise not found in or very limited within DFG but needed for the implementation of DFG projects (e.g. archaeology, engineering, hydrology, landscape architecture and facility planning) should be able to be “contracted out” to conduct necessary tasks.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~Method: ?~~
- ~~Timeline: ?~~

- DFG staff should also be able to be “contracted out” more so for focused species and habitat assessments or work (e.g. vegetation mapping recently or currently done by BDB for California State Parks, San Diego Association of Governments, etc.)

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~Method: ?~~
- ~~Timeline: ?~~

- Those departments with more staff and/or more specific expertise in public works contracts, or that have higher or less stringent delegated authority should coordinate with those that do not.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~Method: ?~~
- ~~Timeline: ?~~

~~Implementation Assessment (previous, for overall recommendation)~~

- ~~Method: Administrative, perhaps budgetary and legislative in future years~~
- ~~Timeline: Continuing~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: ?

YES Description of IRM: Suggested, selected characteristics of ~~effective “targeted” multi-agency collaboratives that encourage engage in integrated resource management in achieving natural resource stewardship include:~~

Meeting notes: How does this description fit within the flow of the document now if the entire document is an appendix? Add “these are examples of characteristics of ...” just under the definition of

IRM when first provided and then refer to the glossary for the examples below. Move all text below, as well as the bolded, italicized text above, to the glossary as part of the IRM definition.

Multi-agency collaboratives, whether formally established or ad hoc “task forces”, have structural and functional characteristics that make them more effective in furthering the mandates and missions of each participating agency and employing integrated resource management in achieving natural resource stewardship. Some of the characteristics include:

- A clear statement of purpose and development of short- and long-term goals and objectives; action plan and specific strategies; ongoing evaluation of work and attainment of goals; and continual review of progress and new opportunities.
- A shared recognition of the benefits accrued through joint action(s), especially when faced with limits on individual organizational resources.
- Sufficient alignment, information sharing, and mutual understanding of core values, resource planning, policies, and regulations of the collaborating agencies.
- Clear, strong, and sustained political support and direction from leadership at the federal, state, and local levels (e.g., executive orders that articulate policy direction largely common to all participating agencies and/or legislation).
- Agreements, such as memoranda of understanding or agreements, reflecting policy direction that clearly describe mutually agreed on commitments, roles and responsibilities, dispute resolution, objectives, and statements of mutual support and collaboration.
- A stable cadre of professionals from each agency that is dedicated to multi-agency collaboratives, which receives sustained and adequate support, even in the face of budget cycles and leadership changes, to achieve objectives stated in multi-agency agreements such as MOU/MOAs.
- A “targeted” or focused resource or use sector (e.g., wildlands, agriculture, water, oil and mineral development, urban growth, transportation, energy) that is geographically focused (e.g., ecoregion, coastal areas, Central Valley, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, urban areas, desert region) in which the collaborating agencies engage.
- A designated lead agency while shared leadership is maintained; an executive committee; and interagency/inter-disciplinary structure that helps collaboratives move forward toward attainment of group goals.
- Internally aligned agency hierarchical structures, including policy/leadership, management and planning, and technical levels, with clear demarcations of roles and responsibilities.
- Sufficiently frequent meetings of agency representatives at various levels to provide forums for identifying problems and barriers, monitoring progress, and documenting success.

YES Potential Common Theme Foundational Strategy #3: Use “ecosystem-based” management² informed by credible³ science as an approach that recognizes the full array of interactions in a system, including humans, rather than single issues, species or services in isolation.

[Staff note: See chapter 3 suggested edits document for proposed revisions to Common Theme #3.]

Definition of ecosystem based management — use the West Coast Governor’s Agreement definition?:

Ecosystem-based management (EBM) is a process that integrates ecological, social, and economic goals, recognizes humans as key components of the ecosystem, and considers ecological boundaries while acknowledging political borders. The goal of EBM is to maintain a healthy ecosystem in a healthy, productive, resilient condition that can provide services humans want and need [for the benefit of all organisms]. Further, an EBM approach assesses cumulative impacts from various sources and strives to balance conflicting users with ecosystem health. It accounts for complexity and uncertainty of natural processes and social systems, incorporating adaptive policies in the face of uncertainties. Using this approach to manage resources requires the consideration of multiple factors such as pollution, coastal development, harvest pressure, ecological interactions, and watershed management. EBM therefore requires engaging multiple stakeholders to help define problems, incorporate scientific, social, and economic understanding, set goals, and find solutions.

Meeting notes: Suggestion that, while some like the proposed edits in chapter 3, would prefer to keep with a consistent definition through all various parts of resource management; would like to make that the West Coast Governor’s Agreement definition. Another member suggested that a missing component of the West Coast Governor’s Agreement definition is that EBM is not just about incorporating human needs, but balancing the needs of all components/elements of an ecosystem. The goal is therefore not just what humans want and need, but also for the organisms themselves. The definition from WCGA seems to have some glaring omissions; it seems to be all about management and not about ecosystems. At the very least, don’t need “healthy” twice. Another member suggested that we seem to be making this more complex (nearly a treatise) and prefer simplicity, being succinct. See the chapter 3 footnote for simplicity. Another member suggested that it is not possible to manage the system for “all” organisms; some will necessarily benefit above others and some may even be harmed to help others. A proposal made to, for now, use in this recommendation the footnoted definition in chapter 3 at the bottom of page 4. Will revisit this definition in phase three.

Implementation actions recommendations include:

² Ecosystem-based management is an environmental management approach that recognizes the full array of interactions within an ecosystem, including humans, rather than considering single issues, species, or ecosystem services in isolation (Christensen et al. 1996, McLeod et al. 2005).

³ “Credible” is used here to also represent “best-available science” also known as “best scientific information available” (BSIA), which according to the National Research Council should not be overly prescriptive due to the dynamic nature of science, but should include the evaluation principles of relevance, inclusiveness, objectivity, transparency, timeliness, verification, validation, and peer review of information as appropriate.

- A. DFG and F&GC use EBM to inform resource management decisions. Examples:
- Manage ecosystems as a whole rather than an individual species
 - When dealing with endangered species take into account the effect on other species.

YES Potential ~~Common Theme~~ Foundational Strategy #4: Engage in Broadly-Informed and Transparent Decision-Making

Potential Transparency Recommendation: DFG and F&GC will be transparent about their functions, programs, and activities

Implementation ~~actions~~ recommendations include:

- Science and information used throughout the decision-making process (and communicate that information used to inform those decisions)
- ~~DFG and F&GC~~ provide timely public access to data collected or used by DFG and F&GC

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~Method: ?~~
- ~~Timeline: ?~~

Potential Science Recommendations

[Staff note: There were no homework volunteers identified on January 20, 2012 to revise the science recommendations. Edits to the science section are from an individual SAG member.]

YES Potential Science Recommendation #1: Decisions made by managers and policy-makers are informed by credible⁴ science in fully transparent processes.

Implementation ~~actions~~ recommendations include:

- A. Managers and policy-makers use science that employs the standard protocols of the profession (peer review, publication, science review panel, etc.).

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~Method: ?~~
- ~~Timeline: ?~~

⁴ "Credible" is used here to also represent "best available science" also known as "best scientific information available" (BSIA), which according to the National Research Council should not be overly prescriptive due to the dynamic nature of science, but should include the evaluation principles of relevance, inclusiveness, objectivity, transparency, timeliness, verification, validation, and peer review of information as appropriate.

- B. Decision-making incorporates adaptive management to the extent possible (i.e., outcomes are tracked and new knowledge permits course corrections).

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

- C. Where the body of ~~legitimate~~credible science informing the topic is in disagreement or is incomplete, those uncertainties or differences of opinion are identified, and an explanation is provided for the science selected. ~~Likewise, where the body of science is incomplete to support a necessary decision, standard and transparent means, such as 'expert judgment' are used to advance management.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

- D. Scientific professionals in DFG are held to and protected by a DFG Science Quality Assurance and Integrity Policy

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

Ties to Strategic Vision

- Goal 1: Strong Relationships with Other Agencies, Organizations and the Public: Objective 6: Share data, processes, tools, knowledge, expertise and information
- Goal 2: Highly Valued Programs and Quality Services Objective 7: Engage in broadly-informed and transparent decision-making (multiple sciences, public attitudes, traditional knowledge, etc.)

NO – RECONSIDER IN THIRD PHASE. Potential Science Recommendation #2: DFG can provide⁵ credible science for management and policy-makers.

[SAG member comment: This is not strong enough – DFG’s own strategic initiative’s as well as earlier versions of the science framework placed enhancing restoring scientific capacity as a high priority. This

⁵ “Provide” here is not meant to imply that DFG has only the internal capacity to provide science for management and policy-makers. Rather that DFG determines the best way to provide scientific information in a variety of ways – some of which would be internally developed, some through the use of scientific information gathered through external means, and/or a combination of both.

section needs to be strengthened to include this as a CFWSV goal: To enhance DFG capacity (as well as credibility) by more than just a cost-benefit analysis. This is a vision!]

Meeting notes: Discussion about the internally- versus externally-generated science question. If science recommendation #1 is moving forward, the ideas in science recommendation #2 may already be encompassed, making recommendation #1 unnecessary.

Implementation ~~actions~~recommendations include:

- A. Request a cost-benefit analysis of what is involved in internal versus external development of science as well as barriers to improvement/making changes and include an identification of gaps and needs in scientific capacity, such as integrated resource management.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

B. DFG has in-house scientists 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.

B.C. DFG has in-house experts who are skilled at supporting, developing and cultivating scientific partnerships.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

~~C. DFG has in-house scientists who are skilled at interpreting science and data to be effectively utilized by DFG.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

D. Scientific professionals in DFG are held to and protected by a DFG Science Quality Assurance and Integrity Policy

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

E. Increase the use of existing and available science, such as access to JSTOR

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

Ties to Strategic Vision

- Goal 2: Highly Valued Programs and Quality Services, Objective 7: Engage in broadly-informed and transparent decision-making (multiple sciences, public attitudes, traditional knowledge, etc.)

Potential Name Change Recommendation

YES Potential Name Change Recommendation #1: Ask the DFG director to conduct an analysis for a potential DFG name change to inform further SAG discussions

February 6 BRCC meeting notes: A BRCC member suggested that this recommendation needs to go further and simply suggest making a name change. Don't need additional reports or information to know it is needed. The broader recommendation for a name change will be discussed with Rick Frank's suggested recommendations. As such, Potential Name Change Recommendation #1 is not adopted by the BRCC.

Description: While there was significant discussion among the SAG/BRCC about the pros and cons of changing DFG's name, additional information is still needed before a recommendation can be made. As such, the SAG/BRCC is requesting specific information regarding costs and benefits (tangible and intangible) associated with a possible name change in order to inform further SAG/BRCC deliberation.

Implementation Assessment

- Method: DFG administrative
- Timeline: Short-term (requested deadline of 60 days)

Description of Previous Discussions Related to a Name Change

There was general agreement during discussions that the name "California Department of Fish and Game" reflects the historical origins of DFG (and F&GC) as an agency primarily concerned with managing hunting and fishing. The existing name does not accurately reflect the modern, broad mandates of DFG to manage species and habitats for a variety of purposes both ecological and utilitarian. DFG manages seven major program areas: biodiversity conservation; hunting, fishing and public use administration; management of department public lands; enforcement; communications, education and outreach; spill prevention and response, and the California Fish and Game Commission. Clearly this range of responsibilities extends far beyond regulation of hunting and fishing as the current name implies. Notably, AB 2376 itself establishes a process to develop a California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision. DFG is supported by the California Wildlife Foundation and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. California is one of only a small number of states that continue to use the term "game" with most state resource management agencies having replaced the game with the more

inclusive term “wildlife.” Potential names that have been suggested include Department of Wildlife Conservation and Management, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Wildlife and Habitat, or Department of Wildlife.

Implementation benefits include:

- Improved alignment between DFG’s name and the DFG’s current broad range of duties (see above).
- Improved understanding from the wider public of the mission and work of DFG,
- Improved appreciation and increased support for DFG from the public.
- Future financial support (via future bond, sales tax or other funding measure on ballot, etc). Any broad scale funding mechanism will require significant public support. DFG’s name (and the impression it gives of DFG’s responsibilities being limited to managing hunting and fishing) would be a significant impediment to the success of any future public funding campaign. Polling efforts, leading up to the 21 campaign (November 2012), demonstrated that the term “wildlife” and protection of wildlife attracted wider support from diverse constituency groups than virtually any other term/concept.

Implementation drawbacks include:

- Questions whether a name change was necessary or a high priority for the strategic vision process.
- Potential public confusion between DFG and the USFWS if the DFG changed its name to use the term “wildlife”.
- Costs involved in making a name change.
- A risk of alienating DFG’s hunting constituency if a name change is viewed as agency movement away from the agency’s historic support of hunting and fishing.

[SAG member comment: This name change discussion is simply a small band-aid applied to a gaping wound. There is a risk of alienating both hunting and fishing constituencies. The vision process should focus on the core issue: DFG has too many unfunded mandates – what happened to the concept of prioritizing?]

- ~~Continuing the on-going mission creep of DFG whose current responsibilities already far outstrip the revenue available.~~

[SAG member comment: Suggest adding this bullet about mission creep because the assumption of the need for a name change is based on continuing mission creep for a department that is already saddled with a list of pages of unfunded mandates. There is no need for a name change. There is a need to throttle-back on the mission creep to get “back to basics”.]

Miscellaneous: Some noted that both the Natural Resources Agency and CalFire recently changed their names and suggested exploration of why, how and any costs associated with these recent name changes could be helpful as DFG considers this issue. CalFire, in particular, structured its name change

process to minimize costs by allowing a gradual replacement of the name and logo on vehicles, signs, buildings, and elsewhere. Also, much of the funding for “re-branding” could be potentially be raised outside DFG from diverse groups – further underscoring the breadth of support for a more inclusive term to communicate the work of the agency.

Implementation Assessment from Previous Discussions

- Method: The California Constitution does not mention the Department of Fish and Game, but DFG’s name is established by statute. Specifically, Fish and Game Code section 700 states: "There is in the Resources Agency a Department of Fish and Game administered through the director." For this reason, a change in DFG's name would require the California State Legislature to amend the Fish and Game Code, but would not require any changes to the Constitution. Article 4, Section 20(b) of the California Constitution states: "There is a Fish and Game Commission of 5 members...." Because the Constitution specifically defines the official title, it would require a constitutional amendment to change it.
- Timeline: Medium-term as it would require legislative action

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 1, objectives 1 and 2; Goal 2, objectives 1 and 2; Goal 4, Objective 5

Potential Fish & Game Commission Member Qualifications Recommendations

Vision: Successful natural resource stewardship will depend upon a capable and representative California Fish and Game Commission.

NO Potential F&GC Member Qualifications Recommendation #1: Request that the Governor when making appointments and California State Senate when confirming said appointments consider these criteria for potential members to the California Fish and Game Commission:

- A. The degree to which the appointee will enhance the diversity of background and geographic representation of the Commission***
- B. The appointee’s demonstrated interest and background in wildlife and natural resources***
- C. The appointee’s previous experience in public policy decision making***
- D. Potential conflicts of interest of the appointee with subject matter under the jurisdiction of the F&CG***
- E. A commitment by the appointee to both prepare for and attend meetings and subcommittee meetings of the F&GC***
- F. The diversity of knowledge of natural resource issues including outdoor recreation and related scientific disciplines***

Description: The California State Constitution decrees the existence of FG&C, its size (five members), terms (six years), and appointment authority (Governor with California State Senate approval). [See California State Constitution, Article 4(b) below.] The California State Constitution is silent, however, regarding the qualifications of the appointed members. The scope and responsibilities of F&GC have significantly expanded over the years as the size and diversity of California's population has grown. The five volunteer F&GC members are expected to make complex public policy and biological decisions on behalf of all Californians based on volumes of often very technical information. Creating a defined set of qualifications including education, expertise, and experience to help guide the Governor's selection of members and the senate's confirmation process may elevate the discussion and result in decisions that improve the public's and legislature's confidence. A Little Hoover Commission report [1990] specifically noted this lack in that there was "no clear publicly understood criteria for selection and appointment of Fish and Game Commissioners."

"CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE 4 (b) There is a Fish and Game Commission of 5 members appointed by the Governor and approved by the Senate, a majority of the membership concurring, for 6-year terms and until their successors are appointed and qualified. Appointment to fill a vacancy is for the unexpired portion of the term. The Legislature may delegate to the commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. A member of the commission may be removed by concurrent resolution adopted by each house, a majority of the membership concurring."

~~Implementation Assessment:~~

- ~~• Method: Legislative or administrative~~
- ~~• Timeline: Short-term~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 1, Objective 5; Goal 3, objectives 6 and 7

YES Potential F&GC Member Qualifications Recommendation #2: Create greater stakeholder input and exchange, and a better understanding of issues by F&GC members and all involved prior to formal F&GC hearings by expanding the use of committees and holding issue-specific public workshops

Description: The five volunteer members of the F&GC are expected to make complex public policy decisions on numerous and diverse issues at their meetings that occur only once per month. Because so much must be accomplished in such a short time at these meetings, there is limited opportunity for stakeholders and the public to be heard, and the potential for constructive interaction between F&GC members and the public is severely constrained. Currently, two (sub)committees at F&GC have proven successful—marine resources, which is focused on marine issues and is mandated by law, and Al Taucher Preserving Hunting and Fishing Opportunities, which was created administratively by F&GC to address the concerns of hunters and fishermen. Each of these (sub)committees has one or two assigned F&GC members, allowing them to build a better understanding and expertise in the area of the (sub)committee. In addition, stakeholders are appeased by participating in a process where all can be heard outside of a formal public hearing where time is compressed. These outcomes also could be

accomplished with focused, issue-specific public workshops on controversial issues that are coming before F&GC if an ongoing (sub)committee process is infeasible or unnecessary.

~~Implementation Assessment:~~

- ~~• Method: F&GC/DFG administrative and/or legislative~~
- ~~• Timeline: Short term if administrative; medium term if legislative~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 1, objectives 2, 3, 6 and 7; Goal 2, Objective 7; Goal 3, objectives 2, 5, 6 and 7 (*need to reduce to more specific goals and objectives to be achieved*)

Potential Defining Success Recommendations

YES Potential Defining Success Recommendation #1: Develop performance metrics to define success, tie performance to DFG's and F&GC's mission statements, and match DFG's and F&GC's goals with funding (priorities).

Description: Measuring success is not just a matter of staff development, such as job descriptions, work plans and performance evaluations, although staff development is important for enabling employees to have a sense of purpose and to ensure that the employees are pursuing departmental goals, not individual goals.

In the big picture, defining how to measure success by developing high quality performance measures that are relevant, specific, consistent and timely will enable DFG to provide information that will assist in determining the extent to which DFG's many statutory responsibilities are being fulfilled and what resources it is using to do so.

From the Legislative Analyst's Office Report dated July 21, 2011 --

Department of Fish and Game: Budget and Policy Overview

"Planning and Evaluation of DFG's Activities"

"The Issue: The department issued a strategic plan in 1995 and has issued updates periodically. The plan identifies goals and strategies to meet those goals, but the plan's impact on the activities of the department is unclear. In addition, prior LAO analyses have identified a lack of evaluation of the effectiveness of those strategies and of the department's activities generally. The department has historically had difficulty providing information to the Legislature on the workload it is accomplishing, making it difficult to determine the extent to which the department's many statutory responsibilities are being fulfilled and what resources it is using to do so."

From the Legislative Analyst's Office Report dated September 14, 2011

Fish and Wildlife Agency Structures and Best Practices: A Study of Florida, Texas, Washington and New York

“Program Evaluation Requires High-Quality Performance Measures”

“Criteria for high quality performance measures are relevance, specific, consistency and timeliness. Identifying measures that are unambiguous and relevant to the desired outcomes can be particularly challenging for fish and wildlife agencies... Current performance measures do not often meet the criteria that they be relevant and specific. Using multiple measures to track a single objective can mitigate the negative effects of poor measures.”

~~Implementation Assessment:~~

- ~~• Method: Administrative~~
- ~~• Timeline: Short-term~~
- ~~• Cost: Relatively low (may result in better reception from the legislature to funding requests and possibly even increased funding support from the legislature)~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: ?

Potential Statutes and Regulations Recommendations

NO Potential Statutes and Regulations (and Governance) Recommendation #1: Review the California Fish and Game Code and Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations to identify and make recommendations to: (1) resolve inconsistencies; (2) eliminate redundancies; (3) eliminate unused and outdated code sections; (4) consolidate sections creating parallel systems and processes; and (5) restructure codes to group similar statutes and regulations.

Implementation steps include:

- Make legislative request to the California Law Revision Commission to review and recommend, in cooperation with the work group, “clean-up” of Fish and Game Code and Title 14.
- Establish a work group made up of DFG staff and stakeholders.
- Obtain priorities for regulatory and statutory review from stakeholders.
- Review Title 14 of California Code of Regulations.
- Review California Fish and Game Code.

Description: The California Fish and Game Code and Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations both need to be reviewed to reduce redundancy and improve consistency and clarity. The director of DFG should create a work group to consist of a representative each from the DFG Legislative Office, the DFG Office of General Counsel, and the DFG Law Enforcement Division, as well as several (4-6) individuals from different programs within DFG (e.g., wildlife, fisheries, marine, habitat conservation, etc.) to review the DFG/F&GC portions of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations and, subsequently, the California Fish and Game Code.

[The changes proposed in the next five paragraphs of this recommendation are from the statutes and regulations homework volunteers.]

~~Because there are numerous regulations within Title 14 that address matters more appropriately dealt with in the Fish and Game Code, it may be advisable to review Title 14 first and, in so doing, prepare a list of sections to delete from Title 14 and add to the Fish and Game Code. Proceeding in this manner may also reduce the scope of substantive amendments to Title 14, which, unlike revising the Fish and Game Code, requires costly and time-consuming compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.~~

At the outset of this process and periodically throughout, the work group would meet with stakeholders to ascertain their opinions and suggestions for “clean-up” of the Fish and Game Code and Title 14 pursuant to this recommendation~~amending, repealing, consolidating, and simplifying the codes. For particularly complicated or controversial areas, it may be useful to establish ad hoc groups comprised of both DFG staff and stakeholders to work through possible revisions.~~The work group would also consult with and utilize other DFG staff as needed and, where appropriate, with representatives of state and federal agencies with parallel or overlapping jurisdiction to identify opportunities to coordinate different statutory schemes. Coordination with other agencies should also look at eliminating duplicative mandates (8E:2).

The work group would ultimately prepare a proposed plan for revising the codes. Although the subject-matter expertise of DFG staff and stakeholders would be critical at the earlier phases, it is advisable to consult the California Law Revision Commission (CLRC) early in the process to ensure the approach followed is appropriately structured to facilitate a large-scale code revision. At a minimum, once the plan is prepared and approved by DFG management the work group would consult and work with CLRC to determine the best approach to and to draft the actual code revision to follow.

~~This process could also proceed in phases by focusing first on less controversial and complicated areas such as redundancies and regrouping code sections and then proceed to more difficult issues like merging parallel processes (e.g., consolidating the California Environmental Quality Act, the Native Plant Protection Act, and the fully protected statutes). Ultimately, simplified regulations will make it easier to communicate and improve compliance (8A:7).~~

Finally this recommendation only addresses review of existing regulations and code. Further discussion is necessary to improve the regulatory development process for DFG/F&GC and stakeholders. In addition, because this recommendation is limited to “clean-up” of the code and regulations, and does not address the prioritization, consolidation or elimination of mandates, whether funded, underfunded, or unfunded, it may be necessary to create a future complementary process to address the tougher issues of substantively reforming the codes and regulations.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: Administrative, regulatory, statutory~~
- ~~• Timeline: Medium-term/long-term~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 3, objectives 1 and 3

NO Potential Statutes and Regulations Recommendation #2: ~~Make~~Evaluate potential statutory changes to the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) to improve the permitting process: Uniformity in permitting process, efficiency in permitting, consistency in the application of CESA standards, and opportunity for applicants to appeal DFG decisions.

[SAG member comment: I don't think there is agreement that all of these things [in recommendation #2] should proceed or at least there is concern about the 'details' of implementation. I think members of the SAG as a whole would be more comfortable with a recommendation to evaluate such changes than a recommendation to MAKE them.]

Implementation ~~actions~~recommendations include:

- Provide the ability for DFG to allow incidental take for threatened species through regulations (as opposed to individual permits), similar to federal 4(d) rule and incidental take for candidates.

[Homework discussion: Suggest holding as high priority for discussion during third phase.]

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

- Create an internal appeals process that an applicant can invoke when unable to reach agreement on terms for an incidental take permit.

[Homework discussion: Suggest including with recommendation #2 now.]

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

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

[Homework discussion: Suggest holding as high priority for discussion during third phase.]

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

NO Potential Statutes and Regulations Recommendation #3: Allow the incidental take of fully protected species following review and under specified circumstances.

[Homework discussion: Suggest holding recommendation #3 as high priority for discussion during third phase.]

Implementation ~~actions~~recommendations include:

- [Only allow take for defined restoration projects or agreed upon beneficial projects.](#)
[Proposed change from individual SAG member]
- Reviewing status of fully protected species to determine the need for protection.
[SAG member comment: This is not necessarily needed. If we create a take process for fully protected species it would be done on a case by case basis. Main concern is recommending something that will be costly and time intensive.]
- Eliminate fully protected status or alternatively list under CESA depending on status review.
[SAG member comment: Elimination is controversial and I don't necessarily see a lot of support for it.]

Description: The fully protected species statute is outdated and needs addressing. Until the statutory change made in 2011, there was no way to allow for take of fully protected species. This caused challenges for projects throughout California and deterred habitat improvement projects that could benefit fully protected species because of the risk of take during the restoration project. While some would support abolishing the fully protected species statutes completely, broader support could be gained by moving species needing protection to CESA and eliminating it for those that don't ~~need~~warrant protection. However, [DFG has stated that its workload would be significantly less](#) it would be much easier for DFG if the statutes were eliminated, rather than requiring the review and listing of current fully protected species.

[Suggested edits in description paragraph from homework volunteers.]

[SAG member comment on original language: I don't agree with the last two sentences of the description.]

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~Method: Statutory and possibly administrative~~
- ~~Timeline: Mid-term / long-term~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 3, Objective 3; Goal 4, Objective 2

YES Potential Statutes and Regulations Recommendation #4: All DFG policies are in writing and employees are trained in the proper implementation of policies.

Implementation ~~actions~~recommendations include:

- Identify all unwritten policies
- Formalize all policies in writing.
- Make written policies accessible to the public, including posting to the Internet and allowing for public comment during policy development.

Description: Currently there seems to be significant differences between regions on permitting standards. There are also instances of policies changing seemingly overnight when employees change. This is concerning to stakeholders and diminishes trust in DFG and its decisions. Ensuring all policies are in writing will improve transparency and improve the permitting process by allowing regulated entities to understand what will be asked of them when they apply for a permit.

~~Implementation Assessment:~~

- ~~• Method: Administrative, statutory~~
- ~~• Timeline: Mid-term~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 2, Objective 7; Goal 4, Objective 2

Potential Permitting Recommendations

NO Potential Permitting Recommendation #1: As part of a broader improvement to the permitting process, provide adequate resources to DFG for assisting applicants with pre-project planning in advance of submitting a permit application (e.g. state incidental take permits and streambed alteration agreements)

Implementation ~~actions~~recommendations include:

- A. DFG staff holds regular workshops for members of the public to inform project planning and permit applications.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

- B. Fund dedicated staff time to serve as project pre-planners to aid with planning and application preparation.

[SAG member comment: Where's the funding going to come from? No new fees!]

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

- C. DFG permitting staff hold "office hours" to allow dedicated time to interface with project proponents.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

- D. Create a user-friendly manual and or on-line information that helps guide project applicants through the planning and permitting process including information on when best to engage with DFG staff.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

- E. Update and maintain appropriate DFG contact information on the DFG website.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

Description: Efficiencies are captured when DFG and project proponents communicate about projects often and well in advance of preparing and submitting a permit application (e.g. state incidental take permits and streambed alteration agreements). During such early consultations, DFG staff is able to visit proposed project sites and clearly communicate project features necessary to meet statutory requirements and permit issuance criteria; project proponents are better able to submit successful applications. Both DFG and applicants spend less time and resources during application preparation, submittal, and review and during the permit preparation process.

Constraints: At current staffing levels DFG staff does not have adequate time to spend with project proponents engaging in such proactive and desirable actions. This is because of the statutory time limits for permit review; available staff must focus on permit issuance to satisfy permitting deadlines as opposed to pre-project planning. In addition, for state incidental take permits issued to satisfy the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), there is insufficient funding of staff for review or issuance of these permits (with the exception of some renewable energy projects); the number of staff funded by General Fund (GF) or Environmental License Plate Fund (ELPF) have dwindled due to past cuts. These GF and ELPF funded positions have multiple responsibilities and time for the above potential actions is limited. Additional staffing and/or alternate allocation of staff time is needed to realize the strategic goals of better communication, efficiency, collaboration, and transparent decision making.

~~Implementation Assessment (previous, for overall recommendation)~~

- ~~• Method: Administrative and legislative (funding)~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 4, Objective 1; Goal 4, Objective 2

YES Potential Permitting Recommendation #2a: Establish an inter-agency coordination process in the review of CESA incidental take permit applications, streambed alteration agreements, and other appropriate permits and agreements.

Implementation ~~actions~~~~recommendations~~ include:

- A. Use or create where necessary joint state, federal, and local review teams that bring all the permitting agencies to the table at the same time to review a proposed project and any associated permit applications.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

- B. Develop legislation that encourages the formation/use of such joint review teams that either offers incentives or requires agencies to come to the table.

[SAG member comment: Why legislation? There's no legislation needed to produce joint review teams.]

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

YES Potential Recommendation #2b: Make the application review and permit preparation process more consistent and transparent to applicants.

Implementation ~~actions~~~~recommendations~~ include:

- A. Have DFG develop and maintain an online permit tracking system so that applicants are able to follow their DFG permit through the review process.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

- B. Provide CESA and permit issuance training for DFG staff to ensure consistent review of permits.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

Description (note that portions of this text may apply to both 2a and 2b; may ultimately need to be split): Review of permit applications and preparation of permits such as state incidental take permits and streambed alteration agreements (for DFG) consumes the time of the agency project lead, leaving little time for advanced coordination. In addition, applicants find it difficult to plan projects that meet the needs of all permitting agencies (state, federal, and local) given that staff from different agencies often give conflicting requirements, in part due to differences between the various applicable laws. Improving the coordination between the various permitting agencies, allowing the applicant to engage with all of the permitting agencies simultaneously, and making the permit requirements more transparent to the permittee would realize great efficiency. One model of a multi-agency review group

that has proven successful is dredging permits in the San Francisco Bay where permit applications are reviewed by all permitting agencies at one time. There is a perception that DFG staff handles the permitting process inconsistently. Having a training program in place would aid in consistency and would give applicants more confidence in staff determinations.

Constraints (note that portions of this text may apply to both 2a and 2b; may need to be split): Agencies are often unwilling or unable to come to the table, and setting up a joint review process may take several years and may require formal encouragement. The state is not able to force the federal agencies to participate and may not be able to force local agencies to participate in a joint review process. Instituting and maintaining an online tracking system would require funding/staffing and time. Ongoing training requires staff time and some expense. Established timelines under statute may limit ability to convene joint review teams.

~~Implementation Assessment (previous, for overall recommendation)~~

- ~~• Method: Legislative, budgetary, and administrative~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 3, Objective 1; Goal 4, Objective 2

YES Potential Permitting Recommendation #3: Remove permitting barriers to “small scale” restoration and other appropriate projects

Implementation ~~actions~~recommendations include:

- A. Create a statutory exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for small scale restoration projects

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

- B. Create a Programmatic Streambed Alteration Agreement and associated process under Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et. seq.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

- C. Create an affordable fee structure for restoration projects pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et. seq.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

- D. ~~Discussion: The statutes and regulations discussion participants suggested that a new bullet be added here that says “Investigate other projects where a targeted CEQA exemption would be valuable.” This is intended to broaden beyond small-scale habitat restoration projects.~~

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: ?~~
- ~~• Timeline: ?~~

Description: Proponents of small scale restoration projects often have difficulty in obtaining the necessary permits despite the environmental benefits associated with such projects; this is due in part to the timelines and expense of the CEQA process and associated document preparation. While there is an existing categorical exemption (CE) under CEQA for small scale (<5 acres) restoration projects, a CE cannot be used if there is a potential for significant environmental impacts, including but not limited to potential impacts to special status species. Since issuing a streambed alteration agreement pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et. seq. is a discretionary action under CEQA, a CEQA analysis and associated document preparation either by DFG as a lead agency or as a responsible agency is necessary. There is currently not a Programmatic Streambed Alteration Agreement under Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et. seq., and master streambed alteration agreements are cost prohibitive to entities like resource conservation districts who often are trying to obtain programmatic type permits to facilitate small landowner restoration projects on private property.

Discussion: The statutes and regulations discussion participants suggested that the description include new language: “The fee for programmatic agreements needs to be low and DFG needs to keep its costs low on these agreements. The costs of the programmatic agreements should not be passed onto other users.” Participants also suggested the possibility of merging the two descriptions. Additional description language from the former (Jan. 18, 2012) Potential Statutes and Regulations Recommendation #6:

“There is currently a categorical exclusion under CEQA for small scale habitat improvement projects. However the exclusion is not useable in areas in or near the habitat of listed species. Many of these improvement projects are designed to improve habitat for listed species rendering the categorical exclusion useless. The statutory exemption would need to include a much wider range of improvement projects to make it worthwhile. There are other projects permitted by DFG where discussion would be valuable regarding agreement on other targeted statutory CEQA exemptions.”

Constraints: Legislative process and associated timelines. There may be environmental group opposition to such an approach because of the inability to participate in the environmental review (CEQA) process.

~~Implementation Assessment (previous, for overall recommendation)~~

- ~~• Method: Legislative~~
- ~~• Timeline: Mid-term~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 2, Objective 2; possibly Goal 3, Objective 1 [Potentially add Goal 2, Objective 1; Goal 4, Objective 2 from the former (Jan. 18, 2012) Potential Statutes and Regulations Recommendation #6.

YES Potential Permitting Recommendation #4: Develop a set of criteria and implementation guidelines for “beneficial” projects.

Description: DFG projects on DFG properties are often restoration, habitat enhancement, maintaining or protecting species or habitat and can fall under a general descriptor of “beneficial projects.” Beneficial projects are also often proposed by private landowners in conjunction with grants received, and where not part of a compensation or mitigation effort, should be considered differently than a project that is impacting a species or habitat and causing a loss or a take. Methods, timing of projects, best management practices and a post-project greater value should be considered during the permitting stage of the project.

Implementation ~~actions~~**recommendations** include:

- DFG to work with the California Coastal Commission on those projects in the Coastal Zone that meet criteria for beneficial project so that permitting timelines and permit conditions are not so onerous that the projects cannot be accomplished.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~Method: Administrative, perhaps budgetary and legislative (Coastal Act changes?) in future years~~
- ~~Timeline: Continuing~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: ?

Potential Integrated Resource Management Recommendations

[The text and potential recommendations on integrated resource management have been incorporated into Partnerships, which has been moved into Common Themes.]

Potential Partnerships Recommendations

[The text and potential recommendations on partnerships have been moved into Common Themes.]

Potential Enforcement Recommendations

Overarching Enforcement Recommendation (outcome): Effective Enforcement

YES Potential Enforcement Recommendation #1: Ensure successful recruitment and retention of California fish and game wardens

[SAG member comment: So how many wardens need to be given up in order to cover these proposed increased costs? There is no new money. Are you going to implement this by reducing the warden workforce by 30%?]

Implementation ~~actions~~~~recommendations~~ include:

- A. Move California fish and game wardens into a peace officer only labor union

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

- B. Develop equitable pay and benefit formulas

~~Implementation Assessment~~

~~• Method: ?~~

~~• Timeline: ?~~

Description: The current pay structure for game wardens is significantly lower than that of other California law enforcement agencies of similar or greater in size. This discrepancy is further exacerbated by the fact that DFG's sworn officers are required to have a college education and have greater level of independent responsibility in completing their duties. An example of this discrepancy is illustrated by the fact that the DFG chief of patrol, who has responsibility for the management of almost 400 sworn officers annually earns less than a first-line supervisor (sergeant) in the CHP; to further illustrate, an assistant chief earns less than a rank and file traffic officer with the CHP.

Justification for pay parity and benefits include but are not limited to:

- To allow for more commutative recruitment of highly qualified applicants.
- To attract and recruit highly qualified law enforcement professionals for employment.
- Maintain retention of highly qualified and trained officers
- Minimize the migration and improve retention of officers leaving high cost living areas.
- Allow new officers who gain experience in high cost coastal areas dealing with complicated marine regulations to remain in the area and provide for consistent and knowledgeable service to the public.
- Improve and enhance the recruitment of diversified workforce.
- Minimize the need for secondary employment of existing officers.
- Improve and enhance interest in upward mobility of highly qualified personnel.
- Motivate enforcement personnel to maintain and improve their educational skills and abilities for the benefit of DFG.

~~Implementation Assessment (previous, for overall recommendation)~~

- ~~• Method: Legislative/administrative~~
- ~~• Timeline: Short-term/medium-term~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 2, Objective 1

NO Potential Enforcement Recommendation #2: Seek ~~authority or sponsor legislation~~ statutory changes to create effective deterrents to illegal take.

[Suggested edits to recommendation #2 from homework volunteers.]

Some ideas discussed as ways to deter illegal take include:

- (1) establish egregious and illegal commercialization cases as felony statutes;
- (2) increase penalties for certain misdemeanors up to and include lifetime privilege revocation;
- (3) include FGC violations in criminal histories; and,
- (4) limit diversion to once per two years per violator.

Description: Current criminal penalties are not sufficient to deter illegal wildlife crimes, particularly when the resource has a high commercial value. In many cases, the illegal take penalty is far less expensive than a legal means to take a species. **Insert new example: Some traffic fines are more expensive than fines for bear poaching.** While a felony statute is the priority, given the legislature's past resistance to creating new crimes leading to state prison, other ideas are included here to create additional deterrents and to assure our laws and their enforcement are improved to allow for adequate protection of the resources. A serious wildlife poacher would rather pay a fine than to lose his or her privilege to hunt or to lose their prized firearm.

The option of diversion is practiced in many counties. When a prosecutor sends a person caught violating wildlife laws to diversion, they pay a small fee to the DA's office, pay a nominal fee to take an ethics course (like "traffic school") and avoid a conviction for a wildlife crime. The violation therefore does not count toward a possible loss of privileges if caught in subsequent years.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: Legislative~~
- ~~• Timeline: Short-term/medium-term~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 2, Objective 1

YES Potential Enforcement Recommendation #3: Increase the number of DFG warden positions by 50 per year until the force totals 1,000.

[SAG member comment: Where is the money coming from? There is no new money.]

Meeting notes: In this current fiscal and economic climate, not sure how this recommendation can move forward and be taken seriously. Conceptually agree that recommendation is good and that an increase in the number of wardens is necessary, but timing is an issue due to funding.

Another BRCC member wants to know from where the funding would come before agreeing to this recommendation. DFG needs substantially more resources devoted to resource protection, but with respect to exactly how to deploy those resources is outside my knowledge based.

A SAG member comment that this recommendation came directly from DFG and the chief of enforcement. This was not simply SAG members setting arbitrary goals, but came from DFG leadership.

BRCC comments: Not just concerned with the number of wardens but also other enforcement actions. Moving this recommendation forward does not identify the funding source and could potentially starve another important mandate of DFG. Want to be sensitive to the dialogue among SAG members and their work; is it possible to link our ideas to the recommendation made by SAG members? Need to address the funding issue; DOA (dead on arrival) if the BRCC makes recommendation without identifying the source of funding.

Motion: Amalgam motion. First Skyli McAfee, second Rick Frank, [NEVER ADOPTED BY BRCC]

Description: California has a population of 37 million people yet our warden force remains at 1970s level when our population was 20 million. California's population has a great effect on the resource. Hunter and angler numbers may have decreased, but that has been replaced by greater population impact on the environment. California is confronting increased human-wildlife conflicts, depredation, development, renewable energy, non-consumptive recreational use, and pollution and water quality issues. Additionally, with more awareness of environmental issues the legislature has, on a yearly basis, passed more laws and mandates such as the MLPA, condor lead shot ban, and mandatory pollution response that have affected our law enforcement staff.

More and more with increased communication and improved technology there is an expectation on the part of the public and other department employees that DFG provide 24/7 year-round service. Without adequate warden staffing levels this is all but impossible. To even approach this level of public and department service and, without a staffing study, we believe we would need 1,000 sworn officers who are adequately supported administratively. These officers will provide immediate relief to current staff and allow for more timely response, the ability to focus on more investigations, greater permit compliance monitoring and an increased capacity to work with department staff to ensure regulatory mandates are carried out.

With current staffing levels, there has been created a situation where wardens, other DFG employees and the public are frustrated with the level of enforcement response and resource protection. Officers feeling obligated to DFG and the community cancel vacations, work extended shifts in excess of 18 hours, and create situations where supervisors are forced to give mixed messages such as get it done but manage your time. These extended hours and canceled vacations lead to burned out employees, anger, lower morale and, in some cases, diminished performance; this leads to more personnel

complaints to the legislature and DFG and a breakdown in communication between law enforcement and other department functions.

An increase in wardens would also allow wardens to work with biologists and environmental scientists on projects that require long-term, concentrated efforts due to the complexity and investigation time required to put together a strong case. Without an adequate number of officers, the constant demand of day-to-day calls does not allow adequate time needed to follow up on more complex investigations.

In states like Texas and Florida, the warden force is already in the 700-1200 officer range. California's natural resources deserve comparable protection.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: Budgetary~~
- ~~• Timeline: Long Term~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 2, Objective 1

YES Potential Enforcement Recommendation #4: Establish a state wildlife crimes prosecutorial/~~judicial~~ task force (including DFG, California Attorney General's Office, California District Attorneys' Association, ~~Judicial Council~~, U.S. Attorney General's Office, etc.) to identify new approaches to shared or specialized adjudication of environmental/wildlife crimes.

[Homework note: The change in the recommendation language was made since it is not appropriate for a task force to include both prosecutors and judges.]

Description: There is a tremendous disparity across California in the adjudication of environmental/wildlife crimes, with some jurisdictions either incapable (due to workload or lack of familiarity with the codes) or unwilling to process FGC violations to the level desired by Californians. The CDAA's circuit prosecutor project functions to support district attorneys (DA) in a number of counties for such crimes, but its staff is limited both by the short supply of prosecutors and by the necessity for invitation by a DA. The task force would be convened to review and evaluate the existing situation and to propose and implement improvements in prosecutions. The task force should include public participation and targeted outreach.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: DFG and/or F&GC administrative; Legislative~~
- ~~• Timeline: Short term/Medium term~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 2, Objective 1

NO Potential Enforcement Recommendation #5: Dedicate administrative support in each law enforcement district

[SAG member comment: How will this be paid for? There's no new money.]

Description: Currently, approximately 20% of peace officer time is spent on administrative activities. When the “straightline” re-structuring of the DFG Law Enforcement Division (LED) occurred in 2004, adequate support staff was not part of the transition; support activities were going to be provided by the regions. However, support provided by the regions is limited and many times non-existent. This is a result of not having direct support personnel under the reporting structure of the LED chief.

A comparison to other existing law enforcement departments with approximately the same number of officers has a much larger support structure. CHP has 30% to 35% of direct support staff to sworn officer. LED currently has 392 officers and 10 (2.6%) support staff that report directly to LED. Given the existing DFG administrative structure, for LED to function in a comparable fashion an immediate increase to between 118 and 137 administrative staff would be required. As sworn staff levels increase, administrative staff would need to increase accordingly; this can be achieved through new positions or through reallocation of existing DFG administrative staff, as long as reporting authority is clear.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: DFG and/or F&GC administrative~~
- ~~• Timeline: Short term/Medium term~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 2, Objective 1

Potential Funding/Efficiencies Recommendations

Developing Funding Sources

Vision: Successful natural resource stewardship depends upon stable, adequate funding.

Potentially three recommendations under this category:

- ***NO A. Identify program costs (noting funding authorities and stability of funds over time) and identify where fees do not cover costs***
- ***NO B. DFG should work with stakeholders to evaluate the potential stable funding options (see appendix for list of ideas that have been suggested in this process and/or used elsewhere)***
- ***NO C. Require open and transparent accounting within DFG to build public confidence in how funds are managed***

[Note: Previous meeting participants believe it is important that the stable funding and the efficiencies recommendations stay together when moving forward.]

[SAG member comment: I do not support any increase in existing fees or any new fees. DFG needs to throttle back to live within its appropriations and recognize that the ability to continue to receive bond

funding may be about over. DFG needs to get “back to basics”; structurally change the size of DFG and the way it does business to live within its appropriation.

Description: As noted in the Treanor Report (page 26-27), the California State Legislature realizes that DFG has been underfunded for at least the last three decades. (See Fish and Game Code Sections 710, 710.5, 710.7). Fish and Game Code Section 711 states “It is the intent of the legislature to ensure adequate funding from appropriate sources for the department.” Unfortunately, while there appears to be near universal recognition that DFG and F&GC do not have the resources they need, increasing funding is politically challenging. There is a need to both review the adequacy/appropriateness of existing funding streams and broaden the base of funding for DFG to include additional funding sources to include all who benefit from DFG’s programs.

Specific funding streams each have their own limitations: general funds can vary from year-to-year, bonds are also variable and can only be spent on capital costs, and fees are typically constrained to very specific uses and can result in very high administrative costs. ~~From DFG’s perspective, as new funding sources are developed over time,~~ DFG staff identified the burden of administering multiple, highly specialized accounts and noted that it would be preferable to consolidate them into relatively fewer accounts with more flexibility in terms of how monies can be spent.

[Suggested edit to description text from homework volunteers.]

Note that if this recommendation moves forward, the three lists of specific funding mechanisms that could be explored is suggested as an appendix.

Potential new funding mechanisms that have been suggested in this process or elsewhere include:

General Funding

- Sales tax on outdoor gear (could be statewide or at local or regional level).
- Water fee or tax (all wildlife needs water, and water transport and delivery fuels development and associated wildlife impacts).
- Wildlife tax on license plates, vehicles, or fuel due to mortality of wildlife on roadways and the impact on habitat.
- Boating or shipping fee (similar to above for cars).
- Dedicated portion of state sales tax.
- Real estate transfers fee.
- Develop campaign around nominal (\$1), voluntary (or opt out type fees) for hotels, aquaria, natural history museums, zoos, outdoor gear retailers (REI), etc. that focus on wildlife and/or habitat preservations. For example, ask each visitor to an aquarium if they’d like to contribute \$1to help preserve California ocean habitat (or 50 cents, to be matched by aquarium!). Similar hotel room based programs have been successful in areas around national parks, the Smithsonian Museums use this approach in their gift shops, etc.

- Develop a mechanism whereby DFG can easily accept donations of money, land or equipment – potentially using the California Wildlife Foundation or other support foundation.

Fee Based Funding

- Fee for service to support the Conservation Banking Program.
- Develop fee to support Natural Communities Conservation Planning Act Program.
- Fee for California Endangered Species Act (CESA) compliance.
- Fee or tax on large vessels to help fund invasive species work.
- Fee to be paid by certain appropriate industries that generate spill response activities to fund DFG's water pollution investigation and cleanup program or authorize diversion of a portion of the Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR) fees/funds to non-OSPR pollution cases (based on nexus of fuel as significant portion of inland spill responses). Note: SAG/DFG concerns raised about ‘robbing Peter to pay Paul’ and need for NEW funds versus redistributing existing insufficient funding.
- Develop a campaign to encourage non-hunters to purchase stamps (e.g. duck stamp) to support wetland conservation activities at DFG, even if they’re not required to have the stamp on their person to conduct non-hunting activity (e.g. bird watching). Note: this may not be a major money maker and changing the name of the stamp to “wetland restoration stamp” might be necessary.
- Develop fee on bird seed/bird feeders and other non-consumptive wildlife type products. Could be a huge money maker but past attempt met with opposition from bird groups.
- Require users to pay for parking/use of wildlife areas or ecological reserves. The state of Washington passed legislation for a “Discover Pass” program (“Your ticket to Washington’s great outdoors!) and expects to raise \$10-20 million annually. [Georgia also recently instituted its Georgia Outdoor Recreational Pass, which is now required to access certain wildlife management areas.](#) The most visited California-managed outdoor areas are likely to be state parks which also need stable funding, but the DFG share from such an initiative might still be significant. Might look at that model as an option (see <http://discoverpass.wa.gov/> for more information) or other state department’s funding sources. Note, important to make it EASY to pay such fees. Requiring non-consumptives to provide a copy of their driver’s license, purchase such passes in person, etc. is a major disincentive. Such items must be easily available on-line and day passes must be available on-site.

[Suggested edits to description text above from homework volunteers.]

- Create user fee of some kind (stamp, entry fee, fee on SCUBA tank refills, etc) to help fund marine protected areas (MPAs)/marine programs. Note: the challenge in obtaining fees from non-consumptive users is the cost necessary to assess fees or enforce the need for stamps or licenses on non-consumptive users.
- Fees on scientific collecting permits/research users.

- DFG is not funded for nuisance wildlife efforts. Consider a development fee or building permit fee in areas that are newly developed. (Given the new wildfire fee for urban/rural interface homes, this proposal could be politically challenging).
- Southern California has been hit hard in the recent past by wildfires. Consider an OSPR-type program that would include a team of experts to assess impacts associated with wildfires and tap fire related fees to fund (potential use of special assessment districts). Revisit Fish and Game Commission and Board of Forestry joint policy on pre-, during, and post-fire consultation and actions.
- Fines and/or legal settlements for harmful acts in marine environments should be directed to DFG for marine conservation.
- Costs to enhance marine life should be part of any new or renewed license or other regulatory permission for industrial activities with identified adverse impacts to the marine environment.
- Once-through cooling mitigation funds. (Note: this program was established by the State Water Resources Control Board).

Potential enhancements of existing funding streams:

- Continue to pursue federal conservation funding. Note: usually requires state match.
- Pursue additional bond funds.
- Raise California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) fees to recover DFG costs.
- Adjust user-based fees to ensure they are set appropriately and structured to keep up with inflation. Note: some on SAG think this should be responsibility of DFG (administrative) others think it should be done legislatively.
- Ensure fees cover costs of administrating program.⁶ For example, commercial fishing fees currently only cover an estimated 25% of the costs of managing commercial fisheries in California, scientific collecting fees do not cover management costs, non-consumptive users fund DFG through general funds monies but not directly via user fees, etc.

[SAG member comment: DFG needs more effective and efficient accounting of commercial fishing costs; need to account for revenues/costs by fishery groups. For example, the CPS complex includes sardine, anchovy, mackerels and squid; most CPS fishermen and processors harvest the entire complex. DFG receives \$12.60 per ton landing tax for sardine, which is managed by NMFS, not the state. DFG has admitted that it makes money on sardines – those funds could be applied to squid management costs or reduce sardine landing tax and increase

⁶ See Fish & Game Code, § 711 (2) The costs of commercial fishing programs shall be provided out of revenues from commercial fishing taxes, license fees, and other revenues, from reimbursements and federal funds received for commercial fishing programs, and other funds appropriated by the Legislature for this purpose.

(3) The costs of hunting and sportfishing programs shall be provided out of hunting and sportfishing revenues and reimbursements and federal funds received for hunting and sportfishing programs, and other funds appropriated by the Legislature for this purpose. These revenues, reimbursements, and federal funds shall not be used to support commercial fishing programs, free hunting and fishing license programs, or nongame fish and wildlife programs.

squid. Squid permit fees are the highest in the state at \$2,500, while most fishing permits are only 20% of that cost, or less.] Review and adjust fines and develop fine schedule that automatically keeps up with inflation.

- Increased waste discharge fees, access State Water Resources Control Board pollution funds for DFG activities with a nexus to this fund.
- Increase use of big game fundraising tags.
- Mitigation bank contributions should provide adequate ongoing operation and management funds through endowment or otherwise.

~~Implementation Assessment~~

- ~~• Method: All depend upon specific solution~~
- ~~• Timeline: Depends on action pursued~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 2, objectives 2, 4, 5 and 7; Goal 4, Objective 5

Creating Efficiencies

Vision: An efficient organization focused on its core functions.

NO Potential Creating Efficiencies Recommendation #1: Review DFG/FGC responsibilities/mandates to determine whether or not they should be combined, eliminated or transferred elsewhere.

~~**Outcome: Ensure an efficient organization that is focused on its core functions and has adequate, stable resources needed to meet ALL its mandates.**~~

[Suggested vision and edits to outcome text from homework volunteers.]

[SAG member comment: I do not agree to creating an organization that meets All its mandates. There are lists of pages and pages and pages of unfunded mandates that will never be funded and should not be funded through fees. DFG needs to "throttle-back" to live within its appropriation.]

Implementation ~~actions~~**recommendations** include:

- Create workgroup of DFG/FGC staff to review current responsibilities of DFG/FGC and make recommendations on potential transfer, combination, or elimination.
- Work with stakeholders to get their recommendations on potential transfer, combination, or elimination of responsibilities.
- Work with other state and federal agencies to investigate feasibility of transfer, combination, or elimination of responsibilities.
- Work with the legislature (members and staff) to gain support for transfer, combination, or elimination of responsibilities.

Description: DFG/FGC has an incredibly broad mandate, which creates challenges in efficiently implementing all the programs over which it has responsibility. With the current interest in reviewing Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations and the California Fish and Game Code to identify: (1) inconsistencies; (2) redundancies; (3) unused and outdated code sections; (4) sections creating parallel systems and processes to be consolidated; and (5) opportunities to restructure the codes to group similar statutes and regulations; ~~and (6) other opportunities for amendment, repeal, consolidation, and simplification of sections of the code.~~ It ~~would~~may be worth ~~incorporating~~ considering ~~eliminating/ or transferring~~ some responsibilities outside of DFG; ~~For example OSPR may be better placed elsewhere and some examples that have been raised in discussions are placement of OSPR within DFG, the role of the California Ocean Protection Council, and whether~~ some of the water branch's activities may be more appropriate with the State Water Resources Control Board.

[Suggested edits to description text in paragraph above from homework volunteers.]

~~Description: Fully protected species statute is outdated and needs addressing. Until the statutory change made in 2011, there was no way to allow for take of fully protected species. This caused challenges for projects throughout California and deterred habitat improvement projects that could benefit fully protected species because of the risk of take during the restoration project. While some would support abolishing the fully protected species statutes completely, broader support could be gained by moving species needing protection to CESA and eliminating it for those that don't need protection. However, it would be much easier for DFG if the statutes were eliminated, rather than requiring the review and listing of current fully protected species.~~

[SAG member comment: This descriptive text in paragraph above belongs under statutes and regulations, not funding.]

Implementation Assessment

- ~~• Method: Administrative, regulatory, statutory~~
- ~~• Timeline: Long term~~

Ties to Strategic Vision: Goal 4, Objective 3.

NO Potential Creating Efficiencies Recommendation #2: Convene a committee to evaluate program efficiencies, level of service delivery (adequate versus optimal Cadillac or Pontiac?), and viable funding.

[Suggested edits to recommendation #2 from homework volunteers.]

Implementation ~~actions~~recommendations include:

- Create workgroup of DFG/FGC staff and stakeholders to evaluate program efficiencies, level of service delivery, and viable funding.
- Work with other state and federal agencies to investigate coordination of programs to improve program efficiencies.

Description: DFG's broad mandates have, at times, prevented it from reviewing programs with the intent of improving efficiencies. It is necessary to review DFG's programs to improve efficiencies, determine the appropriate level of service ~~necessary~~ for each program, and identify viable funding sources to operate these programs. These efficiencies could be found both through internal changes and through improved coordination with other agencies and departments.

[Suggested edits to description text above from homework volunteers.]

Implementation Assessment

- Method: Administrative, regulatory, statutory
- Timeline: Mid-term, long-term

Ties to Strategic Plan: Goal 3, Objectives 1; Goal 4, Objectives 3 and 4