

California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project
Examples of Potential Third Phase Recommendation Subjects
February 14, 2012

A series of recommendations have been forwarded to the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision (CFWSV) Executive committee for consideration in this phase of the project, including recommendations supported jointly by the CFWSV Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission (BRCC) and members of the CFWSV Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG), recommendations adopted by the BRCC, and recommendations from members of the SAG.

With a limited amount of time to develop recommendations during the second phase of the project, a number of potential recommendations were not considered in recognition that they would require more time than was available. Other recommendations were partially developed and not completed. And, recommendations have been adopted by the BRCC with the request that SAG members develop more specific details in the next phase. This document provides examples of all three types of recommendations.

Example Subjects

DFG/F&GC visions, missions and names: Specific changes to the visions, missions and names of both organizations to better reflect their mandates.

F&GC members and function: Specific number of members; professional qualifications.

Science: DFG can provide¹ credible science for management and policy-makers.

Statutes and Regulations: Potential statutory changes to the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) to improve the permitting process and create uniformity in the permitting process, efficiency in permitting, consistency in the application of CESA standards, and the opportunity for applicants to appeal DFG decisions; allow the incidental take of fully protected species following review and under specified circumstances.

Enforcement: Dedicate administrative support in each law enforcement district; address nuisance wildlife.

Funding: Identify program costs (noting funding authorities and stability of funds over time) and identify where fees do not cover such costs; work with stakeholders to evaluate potential stable funding options; require open and transparent accounting within DFG to build public confidence in

¹ "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.

how funds are managed; criteria for funding partnerships; creating more ways for the general public to support DFG/F&GC.

Creating efficiencies: Review DFG/FGC responsibilities/mandates to determine whether or not they should be combined, eliminated or transferred elsewhere; evaluate program efficiencies, level of service delivery (adequate versus optimal), and viable funding.

Integrated resources management: Use more collaborative processes that engage regulatory agencies with landowners, conservation organizations, and local agencies on restoration/enhancement projects; state agencies greater utilize the expertise of other agencies.