

**From:** cfwsv\_pteam-bounces@lists.resources.ca.gov [mailto:cfwsv\_pteam-bounces@lists.resources.ca.gov] **On Behalf Of** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 11, 2011 7:06 PM  
**To:** Aaron Newman; Annette Whiteford; April Wakeman; Christopher Voight; Dan Silver; Daniel Taylor; Deborah Byrne; Eileen Reynolds; James Bradley Willis; Jennifer Fearing; John Carlson, Jr.; Kaitilin Gaffney; Margo Parks; Marty Fortney; Nita Vail; Patrick Christman; Walter Duffy  
**Cc:** CFWSV Planning Team; Jodie Monaghan  
**Subject:** [CFWSV\_PTeam] Alternative Fish and Game Commission models for discussion

Governance and mission members, please see attached document from April Wakeman regarding alternative F&GC models for discussion during your working group meeting this week.

With regards,

Melissa

---

**Melissa Miller-Henson, Director**  
*Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project*  
*California Natural Resources Agency*  
*1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311*  
*Sacramento, CA 95814*  
*916.654.2506 office*  
*916.208.4447 cell*  
*Melissa@resources.ca.gov*  
*Visit us at [www.vision.ca.gov](http://www.vision.ca.gov)!*

## Fish and Game Commission Alternatives for Discussion

1. Assuming that the Commission Model of wildlife management is appropriate (see FGC materials).
2. Assuming that the Commission should be empowered
3. Goal of ensuring Commissioners are “qualified” and representative

Potential changes to FGC [define which are constitutional and which are legislative/administrative changes]

Issue	Pro	Con
<b>Number of Commissioners</b> - Currently five, should this be increased?	Increase to how many? 7, 9, ? Increase in workload and if FGC moves to more subcommittees, need more commissioners. More likely to have quorum at meetings	Requires amendment to constitution. Unless positions better compensated could be difficult to find more willing/qualified candidates.
<b>Term</b> - Currently staggered 6 year terms, should this be changed? Should there be term limit?	Term set longer than Governor’s term to isolate political influence and prevent instant turnover at elections	Can result in FGC majority that is out of touch with changing priorities of new Administration.
<b>Representation</b> - Currently at Governor’s discretion, should this be changed?	Representation could be based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interests (fishing, hunting, conservation)</li> <li>• Geographic area</li> <li>• Other: e.g., at least one scientist</li> </ul>	At Governor’s discretion but informal attempt to balance interests. Hard wiring membership may not always be in best interest of state, may result in Commissioners with a narrow view of their “constituency”.
<b>Qualifications</b> - Currently no specific formal qualifications required	Suggest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience serving on public board</li> <li>• Interest and expertise with fish and wildlife or management</li> </ul>	How to define and recommendation to appointing party or hardwire
<b>Professional or Citizen Commission?</b>	Question biases of professional staff - citizen commission more likely to represent varied interests	Responsibilities and time required by position has outgrown ability of part-time citizen commissioners.
<b>Appointing Authority</b> - Currently by	Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase seats with new seats appointed by</li> </ul>	Governor unlikely to want to give up

Governor, should this be changed?	legislature? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elected body?</li> <li>If professional then hired by whom?</li> </ul>	Is legislature any less politically motivated?
<b>Confirmation</b> - Currently must be confirmed by Senate within one year of appointment	Provides check and balance to Governor's appointment authority.	Recently experienced high number of never confirmed commissioners who nonetheless voted on important issues. Concurrent issue - no appointment so sitting commissioner continues without review.
<b>Subcommittees</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marine by statute</li> <li>Taucher</li> <li>Aquaculture</li> <li>Budget</li> </ul>	Marine subcommittee very effective: in part due to professional commission staff (contract). Committees can be organized by interest group (Taucher - hunters) or subject (marine). Consider committees open to all (marine) or membership (Taucher and Aquaculture)	Need additional staff and probably commissioners if any new committees formed.
<b>Training</b> - Currently no formal training provided (confirm this)	Recommend mandatory training for new commissioners (fishery council model) Continuing education - attend Western Assoc. of Fish and Wildlife Agencies meetings?	Additional time requirement for FGC. Additional cost?
<b>Meetings</b> - Currently 10/year, only 2 in Sacramento	Moving meetings around state, particularly based on issues to be discussed, intended to allow more public participation.	Increased cost and inconvenience: travel bans become very disruptive to FGC business. Results in meetings in remote locations that are challenging for public, staff and FGC to attend/may not meet its goal.
<b>Staffing</b> - Currently 8, need more!	Mean and lean	Must use DFG as research staff. Hoover found DFG recommendations slanted. DFG overworked and may not be able to respond in as timely manner as FGC wants.
<b>Responsibilities</b> - Set Policy - Only powers are those delegated by the legislature		Incomplete delegation by legislature, e.g. fee setting [60% legislature, 39% FGC, 1% DFG] If don't like FGC decision, work around is to get the legislature to pass a law. Fragmented authority interferes with effective management.

<b>DFG Director</b> - appointed by Governor	DFG and FGC responsibilities not parallel. DFG has far more than FGC so may not be appropriate for FGC to appoint Director.	FGC appoint in order to improve coordination between FGC/DFG.
<b>Budget</b> - Currently FGC is line item in DFG budget	Give FGC responsibility for own budget	
<b>Budget</b> - Currently DFG part of Governor's budget		Allow FGC to review and make recommendations