



Background Information to Accompany the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision

April 20, 2012



How to cite this document:

California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project. *Background Information to Accompany the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision*. April 20, 2012.

California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project
California Natural Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814
<http://www.vision.ca.gov/>
StrategicVision@resources.ca.gov

How to Use this Document

This document has two purposes:

1. To provide background materials to help readers understand the reasons for the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision (CFWSV) Project.
2. To provide a brief history of the project and the context within which materials were developed.

While this document may be read from cover to cover, it serves as a reference document as well, allowing readers to research various aspects of the background and process of the CFWSV Project.

Other Important Documents

In earlier phases of the CFWSV Project, material similar to that included in this document was included with other important documents that have since been separated. The two most important of these are:

- The *California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision: Recommendations for Enhancing California's Fish and Wildlife Management Agencies*, encompassing the strategic vision and accompanying recommendations adopted by the CFWSV Executive Committee.
- The *California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision: Barriers to Implementation Report*, which contains the results of two studies about what impediments may exist to prevent successfully implementing a strategic vision.

Both the strategic vision and barriers to implementation report are available on the CFWSV Project website (www.vision.ca.gov)

Acronyms and Abbreviations

For the sake of readability, many names and phrases in this document have been shortened to abbreviations or acronyms. Each abbreviation or acronym is spelled out on its first occurrence, and there is a full listing of acronyms and abbreviations on the last page of this document.

Contents

How to Use this Document	iii
Chapter 1. The Strategic Visioning Process	1
1.1 The Goal	1
1.2 An Overview of the Process and Products.....	1
1.3 The Natural Resources Agency’s Response to AB 2376.....	2
1.4 Phase 1: Developing the Draft Interim Strategic Vision	5
1.5 Phase 2: Developing the Interim Strategic Vision.....	7
1.6 Phase 3: Strategic Vision and Completing the Project.....	7
1.7 Input from Management and Employees of DFG and F&GC.....	8
1.8 Helping Ensure Success and Next Steps	10
Chapter 2. Background to the Strategic Vision Process	11
2.1 Framework for the State’s Care of Fish and Wildlife Resources.....	11
2.2 History of Strategy Relative to Stewardship of Fish and Wildlife	11
2.3 The Mandate of AB 2376	14
Chapter 3. Summary of Public Comments.....	17
Appendix A Full Text of AB 2376	27
Appendix B Calendar of Key Dates in Project	31
Appendix C Members of CFWSV Groups	35
C.1 Executive Committee.....	35
C.2 Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission	35
C.3 Stakeholder Advisory Group.....	36
Appendix D Assignment of Themes to Working Groups.....	39
Appendix E Summaries of Selected Historical Documents.....	43
E.1 Report on Survey of DFG, 1958	43
E.2 Department of Finance Review of Nongame Activities (1976).....	44
E.3 Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy Report (1990).....	44
E.4 Legislative Analyst’s Office: A Review of the Department of Fish and Game (1991)	46
E.5 DFG, 1990’s and Beyond (1993)	47
E.6 DFG Strategic Plan: Where Do We Want To Be? (1995).....	48
E.7 Fish and Game Commission Strategic Plan (1998)	49
E.8 Bureau of State Audits: California’s Wildlife Habitat and Ecosystem (2000)	49
E.9 Bureau of State Audits Report on DFG (2005).....	50

E.10	Department of Fish and Game: Seven Strategic Initiatives (2006).....	51
E.11	Bureau of State Audits Report on Office of Oil Spill Prevention and Response (2008).....	51
E.12	Bureau of State Audits Report on DFG (2008).....	52
E.13	The Treanor Report (2009)	53
E.14	Bureau of State Audits Report of January, 2010	53
E.15	Compilation of Analysis from the Legislative Analyst’s Office.....	54
	Commonly Used Acronyms and Abbreviated Terms.....	59

Chapter 1. The Strategic Visioning Process

1.1 The Goal

The goal of the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision (CFWSV) Project is to fulfill the mandate of Assembly Bill 2376 (Huffman, 2010) (AB 2376). AB 2376 calls for creating a strategic vision for the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC). In fulfilling this mandate, several principles have guided the project: transparency, a highly participatory process, and thoroughness of execution. To date the project has successfully engaged a diversity of viewpoints, and created the opportunity to discuss, understand, and address those viewpoints, starting with a diverse stakeholder advisory group. Contributing to those multiple voices and perspectives has been a blue ribbon citizen commission, which brings decades of policy-making experience to help guide the robust discussions. Importantly, the very organizations being discussed, DFG and F&GC, have also contributed to the ideas being generated and the ensuing discussions to help ensure real and lasting improvements. Together with the ideas and feedback received from the public, the project has led to several important products to help meet the goal of improving and enhancing the ability of DFG and F&GC to fulfill their public trust responsibilities for protecting and managing the state's fish and wildlife.

1.2 An Overview of the Process and Products

In response to AB 2376 (see Appendix A), Secretary for Natural Resources John Laird in 2011 began the effort to develop the CFWSV. The first stages of the project involved developing the groups that would do the work: the CFWSV Executive Committee (Committee), CFWSV Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission (BRCC), and CFWSV Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG). These groups were supported by staff drawn from the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), DFG and a small group of contractors.

In November 2011 the *Draft Interim Strategic Vision*¹ was published and served as the basis for public dialogue through early January. After the *Draft Interim Strategic Vision* was published, the process followed two courses: (1) developing recommendations to accompany the strategic vision, based on the public dialogue, and (2) data-gathering toward developing a report identifying barriers to successfully implementing past recommendations that could also be potential barriers to implementing a new strategic vision. In February 2012, continuing work resulted in an interim strategic vision with the first suite of recommendations for ways to help implement the strategic vision. At the same time, DFG Director Charlton Bonham announced that DFG would begin a strategic planning effort in the spring of 2012 and that the strategic vision recommendations would be an important component of that effort.

¹ The full title is *Draft Interim Strategic Vision: Potential Recommendations for the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Fish and Game Commission*

The final result of the CFWSV Project includes two products in addition to these background materials: the *California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision: Recommendations for Enhancing California's Fish and Wildlife Management Agencies*, and the *California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision: Barriers to Implementation Report*. In total, over 50 public meetings were held to develop the various products through the CFWSV Project (see Appendix B for complete calendar of dates).

1.3 The Natural Resources Agency's Response to AB 2376

In 2011, in response to AB 2376, Secretary for Natural Resources John Laird began the effort to develop the CFWSV. In establishing the process for developing the strategic vision, the secretary identified several principles intended to guide the actions of the Committee, BRCC and SAG: transparency, a highly participatory process, and thoroughness of execution.

Transparency

Process transparency was deemed to be a high priority for ensuring that all Californians could follow and understand how the strategic vision was developed and, if desired, participate in the public dialogue. A project website (www.vision.ca.gov) was easy to navigate for all users and is compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), making process information accessible. The website hosts video recordings and written summaries of project meetings, as well as materials developed for those meetings and public comments provided about the process. The project director and other associated staff were accessible through publicly available contact information, and all materials could be requested in print form or on CD through the CFWSV Project office.

Regarding stakeholder and decision-maker discussions, the entire project was to take place within the requirements of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. All meetings were publicly noticed with a draft agenda provided at least ten days in advance; the various iterations of meeting materials were available on the project website and in print form at the meetings. Held in publicly accessible and ADA-compliant facilities, meetings were designed and facilitated to foster maximum interaction between participating appointed members, and to provide opportunities for public input.

Participatory Process

The strategic visioning process represented a milestone opportunity for a diverse set of interests to influence a mutually beneficial future for DFG and F&GC. Recognizing that this diversity can only be capitalized upon if a reasonable cross-section of interests have equal voices, the enabling legislation required that a stakeholder advisory group be created. Beyond that mandate were the specific steps taken to ensure that the CFWSV groups function in a transparent and participatory process. The process to develop the strategic vision was therefore based in consistent opportunities for the members of the Committee, BRCC and SAG and the public to meet and discuss, review, revise, and address to the extent possible diverse perspectives.

Thoroughness of Execution

The aim of the secretary was to develop a strategic vision that would include the seeds of its own success. Understanding that there may be numerous barriers to successfully implementing a strategic vision, the vision itself is accompanied by a review of such potential barriers and a set of recommended implementation actions aimed at allowing the vision to make a real and positive difference. Thus, as part of the strategic visioning process, *California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision: Barriers to Implementation Report*, was prepared, with the intent of identifying potential barriers when implementing the recommendations from the strategic visioning process.

The Plan for Developing the Strategic Vision

The Committee having been effectively formed by AB 2376 (see Appendix C for list of members), the plan called for forming two other two bodies named in the statute: the BRCC and SAG. At the first Committee meeting in summer 2011, the secretary issued a charge to each of the three mandated groups: the Committee, BRCC, and SAG. Both CNRA and DFG assigned staff to work on the project to support the work of the Committee; ultimately a small group of contractors joined to provide additional assistance. Working with the secretary, project staff developed a plan that included several iterations of effort and feedback leading to the strategic vision, including working groups of the SAG, DFG employee input, and public participation. Beginning with the initial meeting of the Committee, and bearing in mind the three guiding principles, the CFWSV process got underway in the summer of 2011. Project staff and the Committee developed a plan that included several iterations of effort and feedback leading to the strategic vision.

Formation and Work of the BRCC

The BRCC consisted of seven members of the public representing a diverse range of experience and perspectives, and included strategic problem-solvers with expertise in policy, management, scientific and fiscal issues (see Appendix C for the list of members). The Committee sought members who were visionary but also pragmatic. So as not to overlap directly with the SAG, it was determined best to appoint BRCC members who were not affiliated with a specific fish and wildlife organization, but who deeply cared about the state's fish and wildlife resources. Members of the BRCC were appointed by the Committee.

The BRCC worked independently as well as directly with the SAG to develop findings and recommendations for the strategic vision. The BRCC reviewed and provided input on draft work products from the SAG working groups; related, each BRCC member was asked to track and advise one SAG working group in the initial phases. The BRCC assisted the Committee to achieve the various levels of document development and public meeting milestones.

BRCC members sought a high level of agreement in their potential recommendations. When unanimous agreement was not possible, the BRCC made decisions by a simple majority vote of a quorum. If disagreements occurred on particular issues informing development of the strategic vision, this information was to be presented to the Committee in the BRCC's findings and recommendations.

The BRCC provided to the Committee a separate report from the SAG on proposed recommendations and content for the strategic vision where there was not agreement with the SAG members.

Formation of the SAG

To form the SAG, interested parties were asked to submit an application consisting of 22 questions related to 1) experiences/values regarding fish and wildlife, 2) interest group dynamics, and 3) decision-making challenges. The application was designed to capture desired characteristics for the overall group and for individuals.

For overall group characteristics, the Committee was looking for, among other things, 1) balanced representation, 2) collaborative problem solving, 3) diversity, 4) geographic coverage, and 5) a manageable size. For individual member characteristics, the Committee was seeking, among other things, individuals who 1) are operational and pragmatic; 2) could engage constructively among others who may have differing views; 3) are open to fresh, new ideas, approaches and/or solutions; 4) are committed to active communication with their constituencies to bring those interests and concerns to the process; and 5) could work actively to ensure that potential agreements emerging from the SAG deliberations were understood and supported by their constituents. Approximately 130 applications were received.

To help ensure to the extent possible that all stakeholder interests would be included in the deliberations, 17 categories of interests were identified and filled by multiple individuals (7 identified in AB 2376 plus 10 others):

- Sport Fishing
- Commercial Fishing
- Hunting
- Nonprofit Conservation Organizations
- Non-consumptive Recreational Users
- Landowners
- Scientific and Educational
- Agricultural
- Business and Industry
- Tribal and Environmental Justice
- Labor
- Marine Resources
- Water
- Local Government
- State Government
- Federal Government

- Other

Initially, 51 SAG members were appointed by the Committee; provision was made that vacancies could be filled by the chair of the Committee, and several vacancies were filled partway through the process. The list of SAG members provided in Appendix C includes all who served, even if they did not serve for the entire time; for those who served for only part of the process, the dates on which they began or ended service are given.

The SAG worked directly with the BRCC to provide advice, support and recommendations to the Committee for the strategic vision. In particular, SAG members considered and identified issues and problems concerning the subject areas, and would offer potential recommendations about how these issues and problems could be addressed. SAG members coordinated the input of individuals and organizations beyond their own, but that share similar interests and objectives. Like the BRCC, the SAG supported the Committee to reach the various document development and public meeting milestones.

Formation of Working Groups

The Committee and project staff determined that the initial work of the SAG could best be achieved by breaking it into six working groups which would bear much of the effort of developing potential recommendations for the strategic vision. SAG working groups were developed based first on the issue areas identified in the enabling legislation, and then supplemented to reflect input from previous DFG and F&GC planning efforts, suggestions from a coalition of non-governmental organizations, input from the Legislative Analyst's Office, and presentations from a variety of regulated entities and other interest groups. What resulted was a list of common themes that were then used to create working groups based on logically related subjects. The resulting working groups were Communication, Education and Outreach; Natural Resource Stewardship; Regulatory and Permitting; Governance and Mission; Science; and Sustainable Financing. Appendix D shows the themes that were identified and the subject groups to which they were assigned.

Work of the SAG

SAG members were directed to seek a high level of agreement in their potential recommendations, with the intent to develop recommendations that would earn broad-based, cross-interest support. The SAG was not to function as a representative voting body and no single SAG member could prevent recommendations from moving forward. After appropriate discussion, SAG members would indicate their level of support for an item under discussion. Support was defined as equal to or better than "I can live with it." If an item received a high level of disagreement, the SAG continued working to reach agreement or until it appeared a resolution was not timely, necessary, or attainable. At that time, the SAG recorded the differences in their perspectives. This input would then be used to describe the extent to which there was shared perspective about items being considered.

1.4 Phase 1: Developing the Draft Interim Strategic Vision

Phase 1 of the project was characterized by intense stakeholder participation and numerous meetings. Between the project's inception in June 2011, and the publication of the *Draft Interim Strategic Vision*

in November 2011, the Committee met four times (once jointly with the BRCC), the BRCC and SAG met five times jointly and separately two additional times each, and the SAG working groups each met at least five times. In addition to the publicly-noticed Committee, BRCC, SAG, and SAG working group meetings, some BRCC and SAG members also met informally in “homework teams” (see description below).

Developing Potential Strategic Vision Recommendations

The focus of the early meetings in the summer months was on providing Committee, BRCC, and SAG members with a comprehensive background of their roles in the CFWSV project and on the mission, mandates, accomplishments, and challenges faced by DFG and F&GC. In September 2011, SAG members began developing draft content for potential recommendations and worked closely with the BRCC during October to refine this content to be presented to the Committee for consideration at its November 2011 meeting.

The SAG working groups met regularly in August, September and October to begin identifying potential recommendations for the strategic vision. To support this process, project staff prepared a standardized table to capture working group feedback about issues related to their topics. Titled “issues framework,” these tables were developed by the working groups with guidance from neutral facilitators to identify issues and associated problem statements, related goals and objectives, and examples of potential actions that could help achieve these goals; the primary focus of this work was on developing and refining problem statements and potential goals.

Homework Teams

The working group members self-nominated to create small “homework teams” that further prepared ongoing iterations of the issues framework documents for their respective working groups. As these documents were revised, they were periodically presented to the full SAG and BRCC for review and discussion. Public work sessions were held by the BRCC and SAG as a means to combine the efforts of the working groups and to identify common themes that were emerging among the groups. The purpose of these sessions was to compare and discuss themes that were similar and thus might potentially be combined as more unified recommendations for Committee and public consideration.

The BRCC and SAG also discussed items identified by the working groups that may not be characterized as common but were nonetheless important to consider and potentially advance for public review. Lastly, the BRCC and SAG discussed ideas that reflected diverse and potentially conflicting perspectives among the stakeholders.

Public Input

Efforts to develop communication and outreach plans for further engaging the public in the strategic visioning process included a number of tools. One communication tool was the hosting of public meetings via teleconference and webinar, allowing members of the public to participate from anywhere in the world where there was access to a telephone or the Internet. Another important tool

added to the strategic vision website was an interface by which the public could easily comment on the draft interim strategic vision, as well as the overall process.

Members of the public were invited to provide input throughout the process by providing comments at meetings or by submitting comments in writing. Members of the public also had an opportunity to participate in four public meetings in December 2011 and three virtual office hours in November and December, to learn more about the strategic vision process and provide additional feedback on potential recommendations and the *Draft Interim Strategic Vision*.

1.5 Phase 2: Developing the Interim Strategic Vision

Phase 2 lasted from December 1 through February 10, and focused on developing the next iteration of the strategic vision, the *Interim Strategic Vision*². Public workshops in December and public comment submitted through mid-January provided input and ideas for the project participants. CFWSV Project staff summarized the comments for the benefit of the CFWSV groups, and all public comments were compiled and placed on the project website at least every two weeks.

The work of the BRCC and SAG intensified during this period. Between December 1 and February 10, the BRCC and SAG held eleven meetings focused on discussion topics, in addition to four joint meetings. In addition, although the SAG working groups no longer met during this phase, self-appointed homework volunteers did a great deal of work to prepare materials for the plenary SAG and BRCC meetings. Phase 2 ended with publication of the interim strategic vision on February 10, 2012.

1.6 Phase 3: Strategic Vision and Completing the Project

The third phase included activities similar to those of Phase 2. The important differences were:

- The SAG and BRCC followed the Committee's request that, in order to take advantage of the current legislative and budgetary cycles, as well as maximize their contribution to the upcoming DFG strategic planning effort, they focus on four specific topic areas:
 1. statutes and regulations
 2. funding and efficiencies
 3. mandates
 4. F&GC and its role and relationship to DFG
- The public workshops held in Phase 3 differed from the earlier ones in two respects: (1) Each workshop was topic-specific, focusing on one of the four topics just listed. (2) While the December workshops had been primarily aimed at informing the public about the CFWSV project, and soliciting feedback on the *Draft Interim Strategic Vision*, these workshops were

² The full title is *Interim Strategic Vision: Potential Recommendations for the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Fish and Game Commission*

planned with the idea that members of the BRCC and SAG would interact with the public to generate fresh input to be processed at their own, later meetings.

In Phase 3, the BRCC and SAG met once jointly, and each group met separately twice. In addition, the homework volunteers of the SAG continued their work of preparing material for consideration at the full meetings of the SAG and BRCC. The third phase culminated in the delivery of final BRCC and SAG member recommendations for the strategic vision and the barriers to implementation report to the Committee on April 9.

1.7 Input from Management and Employees of DFG and F&GC

Early in the CFWSV Project, Assemblymember Jared Huffman's office indicated a strong interest in DFG and F&GC input into the strategic vision, and particularly stressed the importance of hearing from DFG and F&GC employees. A similar sentiment was expressed by members of the Committee, BRCC and SAG. Project staff, consistent with this input and the secretary's guidance that successfully implementing the strategic vision would depend on organizational elements within DFG and F&GC, worked with DFG and F&GC staff to consider how to optimize the internal communication processes within DFG and F&GC. The aim here was twofold: to facilitate the process by which DFG and F&GC employees could give input to developing the strategic vision, and to begin constructing a suite of expectations, processes, and tools designed to prepare for a future guided by the strategic vision.

The CFWSV Project has benefited in a number of ways from DFG and F&GC input. As BRCC and SAG members have crafted their recommendations, they have received various forms of input from DFG and F&GC; this input in some cases has confirmed SAG and/or BRCC members' ideas for future change, and in other cases has been a factor in adjusting or abandoning draft recommendations. DFG and F&GC participation in the project has also contributed to greater understanding within DFG and F&GC about the strategic vision process and what their constituencies are seeking; that increased understanding may ultimately contribute to increased support for the resulting recommendations.

DFG and F&GC management and employees contributed to and heard about the CFWSV project in a variety of ways.

Survey

DFG and F&GC administered a survey to their employees to invite comment on the CFWSV process. The survey included 20 different topics as identified in the legislation mandating the strategic vision, each followed by an open-ended comment area. Employees could comment on as few or as many of the topics they wished, and many chose to make their contributions anonymously. Staff forwarded the comments to members of the Committee, BRCC and SAG so that the input could help shape the strategic vision recommendations. The survey spanned the first two phases of the project and concluded in January 2012; the input received helped shape the outcomes of the project in the third phase and continues to inform DFG management.

Employee Meetings

In early December 2011, after release of the draft interim strategic vision, DFG conducted five meetings throughout California to educate and hear from DFG staff on the subject of the CFWSV Project. The main purpose of the meetings was to receive employee feedback on the draft interim strategic vision, and related potential recommendations to accompany the strategic vision. Another purpose was to answer questions about the process and substance of what the various CFWSV advisory bodies were addressing. DFG worked with a consultant specializing in organizational change management to organize the meetings and capture DFG staff input. Staff input that was captured was then distributed to the CFWSV advisory bodies for their consideration; the comments also continue to serve as a resource for DFG management.

DFG and F&GC Employee Direct Participation in BRCC and SAG Meetings

Early in the process, upper-level management from both DFG and the F&GC attended meetings of the BRCC and SAG. Over time, participation by staff changed in two ways: First, staff attending meetings came to include more employees from various branches, regions and locations. Second, whereas in the early stages it was typical that agency staff gave input only when explicitly asked, later the process became more interactive, with DFG and F&GC more often offering input whenever it seemed helpful.

In mid-January approximately 30 DFG and F&GC employees, representing various classifications and locations throughout the state, participated directly in BRCC and SAG discussion topic meetings related to draft potential recommendations. BRCC and SAG members welcomed DFG and F&GC participation in the meetings. The DFG and F&GC employees who participated provided important information on current procedures, practices and improvements already underway, as well as challenges faced in day-to-day operations. Many of the employees said they gained valuable insight into stakeholder perceptions and the rationale behind the content of the draft interim strategic vision. Similarly, many stakeholders expressed appreciation for the insight they gained into DFG and F&GC operations and challenges.

Communication Tools

DFG management has communicated with its employees throughout the CFWSV Project to provide updates and perspective on the process. The DFG executive office has used email, face-to-face meetings, conference calls, and podcasts to keep all levels of management and staff informed about events related to the CFWSV Project, DFG's input into the process, and methods for DFG staff to participate.

The benefits of DFG and F&GC employee input and participation in the CFWSV Project are twofold. Their contributions, grounded in the realities they face in their work, have been valuable in enhancing the recommendations that will emerge from the CFWSV Project. Also, it's likely that their input and participation will result in increased acceptance of those recommendations by DFG and F&GC staff members who will ultimately be responsible for helping ensure successful implementation of many of the recommendations.

1.8 *Helping Ensure Success and Next Steps*

An essential element in the strategic visioning process has been preparation of a report, entitled *California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision: Barriers to Implementation Report*, which suggests what impediments have existed in the past and may still exist, to implementing plans such as those expected to result from the CFWSV Project.

For the barriers report, an assessment was conducted examining past evaluations of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and Fish and Game Commission (F&GC), and the degree to which recommendations from those evaluations were implemented. The purpose of the assessment was to provide feedback on how effective DFG and F&GC have been in implementing past recommendations for improvement and identify any barriers that have constrained or prohibited implementation of such recommendations. In concert with the assessment, a literature review was conducted to identify and describe commonalities and differences in the barriers that government agencies (particularly those with public trust roles for protecting natural resources) encounter in their efforts to fulfill their responsibilities. The barriers report is a separate document available on the CFWSV website.

The barriers to implementation report and background materials in this document provide important information to accompany the strategic vision as the governor, legislature, DFG and F&GC determine how best to implement the strategic vision and its recommendations. An important opportunity for considering implementation will begin in the spring of 2012 when DFG is expected to begin its strategic planning effort.

Chapter 2. Background to the Strategic Vision Process

2.1 Framework for the State’s Care of Fish and Wildlife Resources

In 1927 California’s governor established the Division of Fish and Game within the Department of Natural Resources, to be administered by the Fish and Game Commission (F&GC). In 1951, the division was elevated to department status and became the Department of Fish and Game (DFG). Since that time, the Department of Natural Resources has been renamed the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), and remains the parent organization overseeing DFG. These three entities – CNRA, DFG and F&GC – bear various responsibilities for stewardship of fish and wildlife at the state level.

While DFG continues to administer the policies and regulations set by the F&GC, the California State Legislature (Legislature) has also mandated other policies and program responsibilities to DFG. Over the years, DFG’s responsibilities have been expanded from traditional fish and game management to now include such diverse areas as oil spill prevention and response, endangered and threatened species regulation, management of marine resources and ecological reserves, and natural community conservation planning. DFG also has roles as lead, responsible, and trustee agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The mission of F&GC is, on behalf of California citizens, to ensure the long-term sustainability of California’s fish and wildlife resources. While F&GC may be considered by some members of the general public as synonymous with DFG, F&GC is a separate entity that has been involved in the management and wise use of California’s fish and wildlife resources since 1870. Between 1870 and 1940, individual commissioners served at the pleasure of the Governor; however, in 1940 the California electorate added a constitutional amendment that provides for a five-member F&GC, where members have six-year staggered terms, are appointed by the governor, and are subject to confirmation by the California State Senate. The constitutional amendment also empowered the Legislature to delegate to F&GC powers related to protecting, propagating and preserving fish and game.

The Legislature has delegated to F&GC a variety of powers, some general in nature and some very specific. A major responsibility of F&GC is the formulation of general policies for the conduct of DFG, while the director of DFG is responsible for administering DFG’s activities in accordance with these policies. F&GC’s policies concern fisheries and wildlife management, introduction of exotics, use of DFG-administered land, and a variety of other subjects.

2.2 History of Strategy Relative to Stewardship of Fish and Wildlife

Historically, CNRA, DFG and F&GC have been concerned, as have outside entities, with their strategy, that is, with how they might structure their organizations, set priorities, and align their resources in order to best fulfill their missions. Over the years, a number of documents have put forward visions or recommendations for these agencies at the level that could be called strategic. As long ago as 1958, a

report mandated by Senate Concurrent Resolution (SCR) Number 126 included among its recommendations for DFG the following:

Clarify F&GC role as a policy-formulating body for DFG; improve DFG planning activities; revise departmental organization for further improvements; improve teamwork among DFG personnel; and establish better management controls. (Legislative Budget Committee, 1958)

Since then a number of studies, both internal and external, have made additional observations or recommendations for DFG and/or F&GC at the strategic level. Some examples include:

A Department of Finance Review of Nongame Activities (1976)³ identified the continuing struggle of identifying and funding activities between “game” and “nongame.”

The “Little Hoover Commission” report (1990)⁴ was a review of F&GC and DFG, undertaken by request of then-Assemblyman Stan Statham (R-Oak Run) because he was concerned about the efficiency of DFG (LA Times June 24, 1989). The report made a number of observations at the strategic level. For example, it stated, “F&GC has not, and as presently structured, cannot adequately exercise its statutory authority over DFG.” It also noted that F&GC did not work in a vacuum, but “...has difficulty meeting its mandate because of external pressures and factors outside of its control...” and noted the important relationships among the F&GC, CNRA, Legislature, and governor’s office.

The Legislative Analyst’s Office’s “A Review of the Department of Fish and Game” (1991) noted such structural and strategic issues as “lack of clarity of DFG’s mission”, “organizational problems”, and fiscal concerns.

A Vision for the Future (1993) was an internal study undertaken by DFG to review its organizational structure and begin the process of developing and articulating the future direction of DFG⁵. The major conclusion of the organization committee that conducted the study was that DFG needed a more effective system for anticipating and responding to change and carrying out its mission. The organization committee’s consensus was that DFG had been “more reacting instead of acting. DFG lacked an effective and systematic method of anticipating change or for reworking program and budgets as priorities change.”

DFG Strategic Plan: Where Do We Want To Be? (1995) was the culmination of the process begun by the organization committee that had produced “A Vision for the Future.” The strategic plan for DFG stated that for successful implementation DFG “must: 1) align the structure of DFG’s budget and the

³ Full title of report: *Department of Finance: A Review of Nongame Activities The Department of Fish and Game: A Staff Reference Report (1976)*

⁴ Full title of report: *Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy: Report on California’s Fish and Game Commission and the Department of Fish and Game (1990)*

⁵ Full title of report: *Department of Fish and Game: Department of Fish and Game, 1990’s and Beyond: A Vision for the Future: the Department of Fish and Game, Its Mission, Values, and Goals to Meet the Challenge of the Future (1993)*

strategic plan so that it can evaluate the cost implications of modifying efforts in various areas; 2) formalize and implement the budgetary and planning cycles so that strategic and operational decisions affect the budget, and not vice-versa; and 3) begin the steps leading to action plans (for the budget year) to implement identified strategies.”

Fish and Game Commission Strategic Plan (1998) was the result of F&GC’s own strategic planning effort, begun in 1997. The plan was “strongly influenced” by public input solicited during focus groups and workshops held throughout California. The plan focused on California’s diminishing fish and wildlife resources, their importance to California, their management, and the role of F&GC in meeting this challenge. The plan includes a strategic agenda – vision, mission, critical initial strategic challenges, goals, and implementation strategies – and a commitment to ensure the future sustainability of the state’s fish and wildlife resources. This plan continues to be relevant to F&GC’s activities.

Department of Fish and Game: Seven Strategic Initiatives (2006) was the most recent effort by DFG to develop its own strategy. The DFG director assembled a team of staff, middle managers, and executive team members to participate in a structured process to solicit, capture and assemble ideas – ultimately initiatives – that represented a direction for DFG. The group was challenged to look beyond day-to-day activities, however vital, and consider what legacy they would leave for wildlife, the public and DFG employees. They were tasked with determining how to maximize existing resources and capitalize on new funding sources to best insure this inheritance and to identify where organizationally the responsibility for these efforts would reside.

From this effort emerged the Seven Strategic Initiatives, each identifying current pertinent issues and goals/objectives/desired outcomes:

1. Enhance communications, education and outreach.
2. Develop statewide land stewardship based upon resource needs.
3. Develop strong water resource management program.
4. Develop/enhance partnerships.
5. Improve regulatory programs.
6. Enhance organizational vitality by focusing on employees and internal systems.
7. Expand scientific capacity.

The Treanor Report (2009) was a study funded by a private foundation which surveyed wildlife stewardship organizations in other states as potential models for considering modifications to California’s wildlife management structures and processes. The study focused primarily on the relationship between DFG and F&GC, noting that

California has a tri-furcated system of wildlife management that is divided among the Commission, the Department, and the Legislature. Theoretically, the Fish and Game Commission sets policy and the Department of Fish and Game implements it. The Commission makes regulations and the Department enforces those regulations. In reality things are much more complicated.

The report went on to make a number of specific recommendations concerning both agencies.

Other studies and reports on DFG and F&GC have not been as explicitly strategic in their focus, but nevertheless highlight strategic issues. For example, two reports from the Bureau of State Audits have strategic implications: First, an audit of DFG's Office of Spill Prevention and Response, in its response to the 2007 Cosco Busan oil spill in San Francisco Bay, made recommendations touching on interactions with local governments, staff training, and funds management. Another, an audit of DFG's management of programs related to fish stamps required for sportfishing in the San Francisco Bay and delta, touched on such matters as DFG's ability to "identify, approve, and fund viable projects" for which fish stamp revenues were earmarked.

Similarly, the Legislative Analyst's Office has studied DFG on numerous occasions, on topics ranging so broadly as to include departmental reorganization, funding and fiscal management, and CEQA review processes.

A number of assessments and recommendations in these and other reports suggest the need for DFG and F&GC to develop and implement updated strategies to optimize their organizational capabilities and effectiveness. In addition, the legislation mandating the CFWSV notes that reforms may be necessary "to take on the challenges of the 21st century," including climate change and adaptation, and renewable energy needs.

2.3 The Mandate of AB 2376

In response to reviews of past and current activities of DFG and F&GC, and in recognition of changing contexts within which the agencies are now acting, California State Assemblymember Huffman introduced AB 2376, which was signed by the governor on September 28, 2010. It is this bill that mandates development of a strategic vision.

AB 2376 requires the California Natural Resources Agency to convene a cabinet-level committee to develop a California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision (strategic vision) for DFG and F&GC, and submit it to the governor and Legislature before July 1, 2012. This legislation is intended to establish a strategic vision for DFG and F&GC that addresses, among other things, improving and enhancing their capacity and effectiveness in fulfilling public trust responsibilities for protecting and managing the state's fish and wildlife.

The strategic vision is also intended to address the breadth of issues and mandates that constitute the purview of DFG and F&GC. AB 2376 requires that the strategic vision address the following subject areas:

1. Improving and enhancing capacity of the DFG and F&GC to fulfill their public trust responsibilities to protect and manage the state's fish and wildlife for their ecological values and for the use and benefit of the people of the state.
2. Comprehensive biodiversity management, including conservation planning and monitoring.
3. Sustainable ecosystem functions, including terrestrial, freshwater, and marine habitat.

4. Opportunities for sustainable recreational and commercial harvest of fish and wildlife.
5. Permitting, regulatory, and enforcement functions.
6. Science capacity and academic relationships, including strategies to protect and enhance the independence and integrity of the science that forms the basis for department and commission policies and decisions.
7. Education, communication, and relations with the public, landowners, nonprofit entities, and land management agencies.
8. Reforms necessary to take on the challenges of the 21st century, including, but not necessarily limited to:
 - A. Climate change and adaptation.
 - B. Meeting California’s future renewable energy needs while protecting sensitive habitat.
 - C. The restoration of the state’s native fish species.
 - D. Implementing and updating the state’s Wildlife Action Plan.
9. The development and deployment of technology to meet DFG’s mission, including data modeling, collection, and online reporting.
10. Budget and fiscal development, accounting, and management.
11. Coordination among state agencies.
12. Recommendations for institutional or governance changes, including clarification of the roles of F&GC and DFG.
13. Strategies for identifying stable funding options to fulfill the mission of DFG while reducing dependency on the General Fund.
14. Other recommendations deemed desirable by the Committee.

The bill requires that the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Executive Committee (Committee) seek input from elected officials, governmental agencies, and interested parties, and to review existing reports and studies on the functioning of DFG and other state models for fish and wildlife governance.

AB 2376 also requires the governor or Executive Committee to appoint a “blue ribbon” citizen commission or task force, a stakeholder advisory group, and any other group the governor or Executive Committee deem necessary or desirable to support the Executive Committee in developing the strategic vision.

The full text of AB 2376 is provided in Appendix A.

Chapter 3. Summary of Public Comments

The CFWSV project comprised three phases, each resulting in a new version of the primary document, the strategic vision for DFG and F&GC. Phase 1 culminated in the publication, on November 22, 2011, of the *Draft Interim Strategic Vision*⁶, and the second phase resulted in the *Interim Strategic Vision*⁷ on February 10. The third phase led up to the publication in April 2012, of the project's final product, the strategic vision.

In each phase of the project, members of the public submitted comments on the vision process and ideas being discussed. On two occasions (January 8 and February 10), CFWSV staff provided the Committee with summaries of public comments received as of the day the summaries were compiled. The present chapter updates those two summaries by incorporating additional comments received through April 1 into a single summary. Comments were received through the following four channels:

- submitted online through the CFWSV website, where a form was created for this purpose
- emailed to CFWSV staff at strategicvision@resources.ca.gov
- mailed in hard copy to the CFWSV office
- hand-written and submitted at one of the four public meetings held between December 5 and December 8, 2011 in San Diego, Ontario, Fresno, and Redding.

A total of 138 comment documents were received through April 1, 2012. This does not, however, indicate the number of persons who have commented. A small number of persons submitted multiple documents and several documents were submitted by organizations representing varying numbers of stakeholders. The comments are available on the project website at <http://vision.ca.gov/reports.html>.

An earlier version of this summary was created as a free-standing document on January 8, 2012, based on comments received before January 2. The earlier summary was intended to support Committee, BRCC, and SAG deliberations at their January and February meetings.

In reviewing the comments, CFWSV staff has discerned a number of themes. The criteria for identifying these themes were as follows: either (1) a theme recurred enough times to become salient simply by virtue of repetition, or (2) a theme was represented by at least one statement that was relevant to the core work of the CFWSV project, was clear and specific, and was based on and responsive to the draft interim and interim strategic vision documents.

The themes in this summary have been organized into the following four main groups:

⁶ Full title: *Draft Interim Strategic Vision: Potential Recommendations for the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Fish and Game Commission.*

⁷ Full title: *Interim Strategic Vision: Recommendations for the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Fish and Game Commission.*

- 1) Core Values and Core Mission
- 2) Ecosystem Specifics
- 3) Efficiency and Fulfillment of Mission
- 4) Visioning Process

A Note on Acronyms and Editorial Marks

Staff has done minimal editing of the comments included as examples here. However, the acronyms used for the California Department of Fish and Game and the Fish and Game Commission have been changed to conform to the following:

California Department of Fish and Game	DFG
Fish and Game Commission	F&GC

Most other editorial changes to comments are designated by [square brackets] for insertions, and ellipses (...) for deletions. In a few cases, spelling has been corrected without being called out.

Quotations taken directly from comments are enclosed in double quotation marks.

Theme Group 1: Core Values and Core Mission

The most common theme in the comments related to the core values and to the mission of DFG and F&GC.

Theme: Legislative Mandates

Comments received during January included a letter from two members of the legislature to the California Law Revision Commission, asking the commission to review and recommend changes to update, clarify and improve the California Fish and Game Code and, in particular, make suggestions for clarifying the scopes of responsibility for DFG and F&GC. This letter, over the signatures of the chairs of the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee and the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee, includes the following statement:

“As part of the Law Revision Commission's review, it would also be particularly helpful if the Commission could provide a list of all of the mandates and responsibilities of the Department and the Fish and Game Commission, identify areas where particular mandates and responsibilities may overlap with the mandates and responsibilities of other agencies, and identify programs that lack identified funding sources.”

This request is similar to a potential recommendation being considered through the strategic vision process. The legislative clarity that may result from such a review is germane to the context within which the strategic vision will be implemented. The importance of rationalizing legislation was repeated in public comments received in the third phase of the project (i.e., in response to the *Interim Strategic Vision*).

Theme: “Game” versus “Wildlife”

A large number of comments weighed in on the question of whether, or to what degree, DFG and F&GC should focus on issues other than those related to the consumptive use of wildlife. In particular, many of these comments were directed toward whether these entities should focus on “game” or on “wildlife”. The matter was stated in a number of ways. For example, several comments mentioned the name of DFG, suggesting either that its keyword “game” should be changed to “wildlife”, or, on the other hand, that it should not be changed, and that DFG’s mandate should remain as it has been, with a focus on wildlife used for consumptive purposes. Other comments focused on the mission statement rather than the name, but with a similar intent, and also in fairly large numbers.

Favoring inclusion of a non-consumptive focus:

In favor of a focus on non-consumptive issues, comments suggested that since certain work unrelated to consumptive uses has already fallen to DFG, the mission statement should acknowledge this and further entrench this focus. It was also suggested that the twin consumptive and non-consumptive focus of DFG should be balanced in line with the percentages of Californians who hunt and fish as opposed to those who don’t. It should be noted that few if any comments clearly suggested that the consumptive focus of DFG should be eliminated entirely.

Within this theme of consumptive versus non-consumptive focus, many of the comments are represented by these examples:

- a) “The core values need to recognize that a fundamental mandate is to support both non-consumptive and consumptive public uses.”
- b) “...acknowledge the huge legislative requirements for DFG to perform environmental reviews (as trustee and responsible agency under CEQA), conduct and administer endangered species assessments and permitting, and lead natural community conservation planning for the state...”
- c) “We urge a Strategic Vision (SV) outcome to include changing the name of DFG to ‘Department of Fish and Wildlife’ or ‘Natural Resources Stewardship Department.’”
- d) “Why don't you re-state the mission to protect species from extinction and maintain healthy viable wildlife populations?”

Opposing (or favoring limited) non-consumptive focus:

Just as few commenters suggested that consumptive focus should be eliminated, few comments suggested that consumptive uses should be the exclusive focus of DFG and F&GC. A large number of comments did suggest, though, that the consumptive focus should be kept primary. In many cases such statements conveyed a fear that fishing and hunting were on the way to being eliminated in California, and the commenters felt strongly that DFG should be mandated to keep hunting and fishing as a core value. Some examples of comments favoring a consumptive focus are:

- a) “The advocacy and support of hunting and sport fishing should be a core value of the DFG.”

- b) "I think the Department of Fish and Game should focus much less on environmental issues."
- c) "Please support and promote more hunting and fishing areas in California."
- d) "I find important that the strategic vision promotes sport hunting as a recreational opportunity, as well as a wildlife management tool in California."
- e) "...I recommend that these mission and visions statements, as well as the rest of the document, be revised to specifically include hunting and fishing in a way to ensure their retention in our state."

Theme: Specific Comments on Language in Mission and Vision Statements

A number of comments focused on language, especially on the importance of clear and specific language in statements of mission, vision, and core values. These comments suggested that the language of the mission statement should be concrete, and also that the mission statement should be brief enough to keep DFG and F&GC employees mindful of their focus. Examples of comments along these lines are:

- a) "The missions of the DFG and F&GC as stated are not specific and too long to be of use to any person in the department from top to bottom. You need a concise mission that everyone can repeat in 15 seconds or less. This is why they come to work every day!"
- b) "The current mission statements are way too generic and could lead to anything... Again an example: 'a clear understanding of the desires of the public' could allow the desire for a complete reversal of past policies, precluding hunting and fishing."

Within this theme, there were a substantial number of comments expressing differing views on the meanings of key terms, and taking stands on whether certain terms should even be used in vision and mission statements. In particular, terms related to *ecology* were mentioned frequently, and commenters differed as to whether humans should legitimately be regarded as part of ecosystems. (Few commenters opined that humans are not part of ecosystems.) Examples of comments related to this issue are:

- a) "...mission statements [should] make clear that the shared core mission of the two entities is to '*protect, restore and manage California's* diverse fish, wildlife and plant resources and the habitats upon which they depend, for their ecological values and for their use and enjoyment by the public.'"
- b) "In the DFG mission statement the words 'ecological values' are vague and should be replaced by the phrase 'for their sustainability to the global natural ecosystem'."

While there have been some voices within the SAG calling for a single mission statement for DFG and F&GC, one comment explicitly argued against this, and in fact called for a clear division of responsibility between the two agencies. This comment stated, in effect, that the professional training of DFG employees equips them to perform functions for which commissioners may lack the needed expertise:

“Limiting the Commission’s role to consumptive use matters is realistic and manageable. Relieving it of non-consumptive management would undoubtedly improve its functioning ... the decision whether to list or not list a species under CESA... rests wholly on the law and the assembled scientific data. It is a technical decision that should be made objectively and professionally by the Department. It is not a policy decision, as is more typically within the Commission’s purview.”

Theme Group 2: Ecosystem Specifics

A number of comments suggested specific goals as to how ecosystems should be managed. Before February, this group of themes boiled down to a single issue: non-native flora and fauna. In response to a specific potential recommendation included in the *Interim Strategic Vision* in February, however, some comments were received regarding how DFG should deal with the California Endangered Species Act (CESA).

Theme: Non-Native Species

Perhaps the most common single message in the comments was that DFG should take responsibility for containing or eliminating non-native and invasive species. However, there were a smaller but still substantial number of comments directly opposing this view, and there was a minor correlation between the latter position and support for consumptive uses. Most comments concerning non-native species, however, were largely independent of any particular stand on other issues. Examples of comments related to non-native species are:

- a) “Invasive weeds are important to control. Large infestations can destroy the biodiversity of places we love and cost California hundreds of millions of dollars in control costs and lost productivity annually. [We] strongly encourage the DFG and Natural Resources Agency to... take a lead role in addressing invasive plants in California wildlands...”
- b) “The DFG needs to abide by the decisions of the F&GC, especially with regards to the importation of non-native frogs and turtles. This importation must stop immediately.”
- c) “Provide incentives for landowners to tackle invasive species.”
- d) “The preference for native plants is based on the fallacy that they provide preferred habitat for native animals, despite evidence to the contrary. Native birds are seen using non-native ‘weeds’ for food, cover, and nesting areas; Himalayan blackberry, for instance, is a valuable habitat species for songbirds.”

Theme: Endangered Species

In Phase 3, endangered species became a topic of interest to many commenters. In particular, there were differences of opinion as to whether DFG should expend its resources enforcing CESA. One commenter stated that the federal ESA was sufficient protection for endangered species. Others pointed out, in response to a potential recommendation included in the *Interim Strategic Vision*, that

incidental take of fully-protected species under certain circumstances would unnecessarily weaken CESA protections, and that enacting this recommendation would have unforeseen policy implications.

Theme Group 3: Efficiency and Fulfillment of Mission

Theme: Science

A number of comments concerned how science should be applied to policy in the execution of the work of DFG and F&GC. In the first two summaries of public comment, this topic was not mentioned because these comments tended to lack any concrete guidance; there were only vague suggestions that best-available science ought to be carefully defined. In phase 3, however, a commenter submitted a copy of a policy statement on “Scientific Integrity” of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) as a model for DFG and F&GC to follow.

Theme: DFG’s Performance

A number of commenters noted, in varying ways, the past performance of DFG in fulfilling its existing mission. These comments may be divided into two classes: those that simply note the performance, and those that make specific suggestions for improved or enhanced performance in the future.

Among comments noting past performance, the matters that were commented on include land use and the performance of DFG staff. Regarding land use, some comments noted that too little land has been made available for hunting, or that fishing access is too restricted. On the other hand, other comments suggested that DFG has fallen short on its responsibility to preserve land and ecosystems. Regarding DFG staff performance, the primary focus of comments was on enforcement personnel. Although such comments are few, they cover a wide spectrum, from stating that personnel misuse their authority to stating that they are “very professional.”

Examples of comments noting past performance are:

- a) “DFG has acquired considerable land over the past several years but has not opened enough of it to public hunting to increase the ‘market base’ and help to increase revenue.”
- b) “... local enforcement officers carry guns, intimidate individuals and landowners and otherwise use their authority to carry out what often appears to be personal agendas and philosophies!”
- c) “In my interaction with DFG personnel I have found them to be very professional.”
- d) “The F&GC is to ‘ensure the long term sustainability’. I do not believe the commission is fulfilling this part of its mission. Habitat is rapidly being lost...”

Comments providing specific suggestions for future performance improvement mentioned a variety of issues and areas of effort. These included:

- increased and improved use of information technology, especially to educate and inform the public

- overlapping with the above, improved accounting systems to track costs and funding
- prioritization of needs and projects, and advocacy to ensure that high-priority needs receive continued funding and other resources.

Funding

A key sub-theme under DFG performance is the matter of funding. A number of comments dealt with how fees are set and how revenues from fees are spent.

As noted in the section on Vision and Mission in this summary, commenters favoring a strong focus on consumptive uses seldom suggest that this focus should be exclusive. But they do suggest, in a number of cases, that fees for non-consumptive uses of public lands should be instituted or increased as a source of funding. Like the comment in the last bulleted line above, several comments concerned funding and accounting for funds. A single example gives the flavor of these comments:

“I think fees should be established/increased for non Hunting and Fishing stakeholders. They seem to have a large amount of influence for contributing little or nothing towards resources managed by fees collected from hunters and fisherman.”

Another recurring concern regarding funding was that DFG lacks discretionary control over the spending of funds it takes in. Examples of comments on this topic are:

- a) “...there didn’t seem to be an incentive to make this a continuing priority... because collecting the unpaid [CEQA] fees did not translate to any spending authority. In other words [collecting the fees] didn’t mean DFG was able to use the money to meet needs in relevant programs.”
- b) “The proliferation of special funds within the Department/Commission structure creates significant administrative burdens and limits the effective use of available resources... imposing significant restrictions on the Department’s ability to manage its resources effectively.”

Statewide Coordination

A recurring theme in the comments was that regulation is too complex, largely because it is not approached in a statewide manner aimed at consistency and simplicity. Most comments dealing with this theme suggest that hunting and fishing regulations are a patchwork. One commenter, for example, stated that fishing is made difficult when an activity may be legal in one place and illegal very nearby: “...you can have different regulations on one river and step across a line in that river and be out of compliance.” A related but somewhat distinct theme was that there seems, at times, to be little coordination between Sacramento and the regions in terms of program priorities and staffing.

Personnel, Personnel Practices, and Staff Quality

Many comments focused on how to improve the personnel practices of DFG and F&GC. These ranged from the very high-level matter of how commissioners are appointed, to more commonplace matters such as the training of DFG employees. Comments included specific recommendations as to possible new staff functions. Suggestions include:

- The director of DFG should be appointed by F&GC without input from the governor or legislators, perhaps borrowing models of appointment procedures from other states.
- There should be more legal staff, providing for legal advocacy for DFG's mission.
- Add a "new issues" responsibility within F&GC and/or DFG tasked with annually projecting strategic shifts based on changing needs foreseen on 10- and 20-year horizons.
- Ensure that staff and management have a least a minimal understanding of the role of agriculture in California.

A number of commenters expressed concern that DFG staff is stretched thin. A single example of such a comment is:

"Our organizations are deeply concerned that California's current limited enforcement capacity puts wildlife and habitat at risk. We view increasing the number of game wardens and providing them the administrative support and tools they need to be effective must be a high priority that also directly affects public faith and confidence in the work of the Department."

Coordination and Interaction with Other Entities

Another common theme was that performance can be improved through coordination with other entities. Specifically, the following suggestions were made:

- Charge and require DFG and F&GC to work closely with the state legislature, actively advocating for their mission.
- Partner with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as a means of mitigating funding constraints, including the fostering of educational programs carried out by NGOs (such as hunters' and fishers' organizations).
- Work with the state's university systems so that they will teach skills needed for DFG personnel.
- Work with American Indian tribes, "not only for education of treaty rights, but also cultural concerns that a warden or fish and game biologist might not understand." Additionally, "When describing partnerships or collaboration the [draft interim strategic vision] commonly refers to 'other agencies, organizations, and stakeholders'... I ask the group to consider always including 'tribes' in the list explicitly." (This commenter states a number of ways in which tribes are unique among stakeholders.)
- Increase volunteer programs.

Theme Group 4: The Strategic Visioning Process

Theme: Strategic Versus Tactical

Several commenters believed that the content of the draft interim strategic vision focused too much at the level of individual actions to be taken, rather than at the more appropriate level of big-picture principles and objectives. One commenter referred to this by recommending that the strategic vision focus less on “tactics” and more on “strategic” matters, which they see to be the fundamental focus of the vision project:

“Focusing on the Strategic: The matters which the Project has undertaken to address are numerous and their interaction is complex. To optimize the potential for success from the Project, I encourage the members to step-back at this time to review the list of draft problem statements in Appendix B [of the draft interim strategic vision]. The purpose of this review is specifically to consider whether matters are ‘strategic’, rising to the level of mission and challenges of the 21st century, or are ‘tactical’. Those matters which are tactical are likely good thoughts and important work, but should be removed from the report to the Governor and the Legislature and provided by the project to DFG and F&GC for their handling.”

Although few other commenters explicitly mentioned the distinction between strategic and tactical matters, a similar type of thinking may be represented by comments noting the complexity, abundance, and lack of specificity of the potential recommendations given in the report. Comments included:

- a) “As the strategic visioning process advances it will be necessary to narrow and prioritize this long list of potential actions into a more strategic set of achievable activities.”
- b) “We believe narrowing the brainstormed list down to achievable objectives is the difference between another bookshelf plan and success.”

Theme: Concerns about Outreach and Transparency

Some commenters suggested that, despite the efforts made to publicize the CFWSV Project, there may be stakeholders who have not been made aware of it, and may thus not have had the opportunity to provide input. Suggestions along these lines ranged from the general, such as one that noted that quite a few biologists and sportspersons were unaware of the process, to specific suggestions such as that the CFWSV Project be given a more prominent place on the DFG website, or that the CFWSV Project provide longer notice of public meetings than the state-mandated ten days.

Other comments concerning DFG’s public interface were meant to apply not only to the visioning process, but to the department’s ongoing work. As an example, one observation was that public education and outreach are much more challenging in the new era of fragmented audiences using a variety of media, than in the passing era of mass media and mass audiences. Several commenters stressed the importance of outreach and education. An example of such a comment is this:

“To build trust and awareness of [DFG] services, community outreach is critical. This means developing rapport and relationships with various demographics such as and not limited to ethnic groups, people with disabilities, and young adults. This takes planning, time for development, and a long-term commitment. Many more staff hours are needed for this.”

Theme: Concerns about Stakeholder Representation

A large number of comments were focused on the composition and representation of the SAG. Some argued that not all appropriate stakeholders were represented; others stated that certain constituencies were not represented as they should be. Still others questioned the legitimacy of some stakeholder representatives.

There was, of course, no consensus as to which groups ought to be included or excluded, or for what reasons. Many comments suggested that groups with any anti-hunting bias should be excluded from consideration. Some comments were received suggesting that a SAG member be removed because a DFG investigation determined that illegal activities had taken place on its property.

Many of these commenters were concerned that the representation by groups they regarded as illegitimate would lead to poor outcomes. It was also suggested, without naming any groups, that the effort to provide representation to all stakeholders has resulted in the SAG being too large and diverse to offer hope of arriving at consensus on a clear and concise strategic vision. On the other hand, others applauded the diversity of views represented in the project. Another comment was that trying to please all constituencies is not only a problem for the visioning process, but is incompatible with DFG’s and F&GC’s work on an ongoing basis. The work of actively managing resources, this commenter states, will necessarily require decisions in matters on which there is contention.

Other Comments

This summary is staff’s effort to bring forward those themes that are salient due to their frequency in comments, or due to their relevance, specificity, and responsiveness to the draft interim and interim strategic vision documents; it does not pretend to represent all the comments received. The entire body of public comments were provided to the Committee, BRCC and SAG, and are available on the CFWSV Project website.

Appendix A Full Text of AB 2376

Assembly Bill No. 2376

CHAPTER 424

An act to add Section 12805.3 to the Government Code, relating to fish and wildlife.

[Approved by Governor September 28, 2010. Filed with Secretary of State September 28, 2010.]

Legislative Counsel's digest

AB 2376, Huffman. Fish and wildlife: strategic vision.

The California Constitution establishes the Fish and Game Commission and provides for the delegation to F&GC of powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game. Existing statutory law delegates to F&GC the power to regulate the taking or possession of birds, mammals, fish, amphibians, and reptiles in accordance with prescribed laws. Existing law establishes the Department of Fish and Game in the Natural Resources Agency, and generally charges DFG with the administration and enforcement of the Fish and Game Code.

This bill would require the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency to convene a committee, with membership as prescribed, to develop and submit to the Governor and Legislature, before July 1, 2012, a strategic vision for DFG and F&GC that addresses specified matters relating to state fish and wildlife resource management.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 12805.3 is added to the Government Code, to read:

12805.3. (a) The Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency shall convene a committee to develop and submit to the Governor and the Legislature, before July 1, 2012, a strategic vision for the Department of Fish and Game and the Fish and Game Commission.

(b) The committee members shall include all of the following:

- (1) The Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency.
- (2) The Director of Fish and Game.
- (3) The president of the Fish and Game Commission.
- (4) The chair of the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission.
- (5) A representative of the University of California.

(6) Representatives of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service, if they choose to participate.

(c) The strategic vision shall address all of the following matters:

(1) Improving and enhancing capacity of the department and F&GC to fulfill their public trust responsibilities to protect and manage the state's fish and wildlife for their ecological values and for the use and benefit of the people of the state.

(2) Comprehensive biodiversity management, including conservation planning and monitoring.

(3) Sustainable ecosystem functions, including terrestrial, freshwater, and marine habitat.

(4) Opportunities for sustainable recreational and commercial harvest of fish and wildlife.

(5) Permitting, regulatory, and enforcement functions.

(6) Science capacity and academic relationships, including strategies to protect and enhance the independence and integrity of the science that forms the basis for department and commission policies and decisions.

(7) Education, communication, and relations with the public, landowners, nonprofit entities, and land management agencies.

(8) Reforms necessary to take on the challenges of the 21st century, including, but not necessarily limited to:

(A) Climate change and adaptation.

(B) Meeting California's future renewable energy needs while protecting sensitive habitat.

(C) The restoration of the state's native fish species.

(D) Implementing and updating the state's Wildlife Action Plan.

(9) The development and deployment of technology to meet the department's mission, including data modeling, collection, and online reporting.

(10) Budget and fiscal development, accounting, and management.

(11) Coordination among state agencies.

(12) Recommendations for institutional or governance changes, including clarification of the roles of F&GC and the department.

(13) Strategies for identifying stable funding options to fulfill the mission of the department while reducing dependency on the General Fund.

(14) Other recommendations deemed desirable by the committee.

(d) The committee shall seek input from elected officials, governmental agencies, and interested parties, and shall review existing reports and studies on the functioning of the department and other state models for fish and wildlife governance.

(e) For the purposes of carrying out this section, the committee may also seek input from other policy and resource leaders.

(f) (1) The committee, its members, and state agencies represented on the committee may contract for consultants to assist in the preparation of the strategic vision.

(2) Contracts entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) shall terminate no later than December 31, 2011.

(3) Contracts entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be exempt from Part 2 (commencing with Section 10100) of Division 2 of the Public Contract Code.

(g) The Governor or the committee shall appoint a “blue ribbon” citizen commission or task force, a stakeholder advisory group, and any other group that the Governor or the committee deems necessary or desirable to assist in carrying out this section. A stakeholder advisory group appointed pursuant to this section shall be broadly constructed to represent a diverse range of interests affected by state policies that govern fish and wildlife, including, but not necessarily limited to, persons representing fishing and hunting interests, nonprofit conservation organizations, nonconsumptive recreational users, landowners, scientific and educational interests, and other interests or entities dedicated to habitat conservation and protection of public trust resources. The committee convened pursuant to subdivision (a), in developing the strategic vision, shall take into account the recommendations of any group appointed pursuant to this subdivision.

(h) (1) The requirement for submitting the strategic vision imposed under subdivision (a) is inoperative on January 1, 2015, pursuant to Section 10231.5 of the Government Code, or on the date that the strategic vision is submitted, whichever date is later.

(2) The strategic vision shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.

Appendix B Calendar of Key Dates in Project

The meetings and milestones referenced here are from June 2011 through April 2012. Please visit the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project website (www.vision.ca.gov) for more detailed information, including meeting times, agendas and materials.

June 2011

28 Executive Committee meeting

July 2011

21 Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission meeting

August 2011

10 Executive Committee meeting

18 Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission meeting

19 Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting

23-25 SAG Working Groups meetings

30-31 SAG Working Groups meetings

September 2011

1 SAG Working Groups meetings

2 Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting

6-8 SAG Working Groups meetings

14 Joint Executive Committee and Blue Ribbon Citizen Committee meeting

20-22 SAG Working Groups

October 2011

6 Joint Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting

11-13 SAG Working Groups meetings

12 SAG Governance and Mission Working Group meeting

18-19 Joint Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group meetings

25 SAG Governance and Mission Working Group meeting

26 Joint Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting

November 2011

- 8** Joint Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting
- 10** Executive Committee meeting
- 18** Draft interim strategic vision released for public review
- 29** Virtual office hour for public to ask questions and provide input on draft interim strategic vision

December 2011

- 2** Virtual office hour for public to ask questions and provide input on draft interim strategic vision
- 5-8** Public meetings to provide input on draft interim strategic vision
- 13** Virtual office hour for public to ask questions and provide input on draft interim strategic vision
- 14** Requested deadline for receiving comments on draft interim strategic vision

January 2012

- 5** Joint Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting
- 10-12** Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group discussion topic meetings
- 12** Executive Committee meeting
- 17-19** Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group discussion topic meetings
- 20** Joint Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting

February 2012

- 3** Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting
- 6** Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission meeting
- 16** Executive Committee meeting
- 24** Interim strategic vision released

March 2012

- 1** Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting
- 15** Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting (morning) and Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission meeting (afternoon)
- 28** Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting
- 30** Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission meeting

April 2012

- 9** Executive Committee meeting
- 23** California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision, background materials, and barriers to implementation report released – delivered to governor and California State Legislature

Appendix C Members of CFWSV Groups

C.1 Executive Committee

John Laird, Chair

Secretary, California Natural Resources Agency

Charlton “Chuck” Bonham

Director, California Department of Fish and Game

Dan Dooley

Senior Vice President, External Relations, University of California

Jim Kellogg (until 2/2012)

President, California Fish and Game Commission

Alternate: Sonke Mastrup, Executive Director, California Fish and Game Commission

Ren Lohofener

Pacific Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Alternate: Richard Kearney, Assistant Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Rod McInnis

Southwest Regional Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Daniel Richards (beginning 2/2012)

President, California Fish and Game Commission

Robert Weisenmiller

Chair, California Energy Commission

Alternate: Robert Oglesby, Executive Director, California Energy Commission

C.2 Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission

Carol Baker, Chair (appointed 9/2011)

Former Senior Policy Consultant /Deputy Budget Director, California State Assembly Speaker’s Office

Richard Frank

Director, California Environmental Law and Policy Center, UC Davis School of Law

David M. Graber, PhD (appointed 8/2011)

Chief Scientist, Pacific West Region, National Park Service

Dennis Hollingsworth

Member, Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board and former State Senator, 36th District

Skyli McAfee, Interim Chair (2012; appointed 8/2011)

Executive Director, California Ocean Science Trust

Pedro Nava

Former Assemblymember, 35th District

Mary Salas

Former Assemblymember, 79th District

Anne Sheehan, Chair (until 9/2011)

Director of Corporate Governance, CalSTRS

C.3 Stakeholder Advisory Group

Sport Fishing

Robert Gallia, *Golden Gate Fisherman's Association*

Curtis Knight, *California Trout*

April Wakeman, *The Sportfishing Conservancy*

Commercial Fishing

Zeke Grader, *Institute for Fisheries Resources*

Aaron Newman, *Humboldt Fishermen's Marketing Association*

Diane Pleschner-Steele, *California Wetfish Producers*

Hunting

John Carlson, Jr., *California Waterfowl Association*

Rick Copeland, *Wilderness Unlimited*

Bill Gaines, *California Outdoor Heritage Alliance (until 1/2012)*

Jason Rhine, *California Outdoor Heritage Alliance (beginning 1/2012)*

Nonprofit Conservation Organizations

Mark Biddlecomb, *Ducks Unlimited (until 1/2012)*

Chris Unkel, *Ducks Unlimited (beginning 1/2012)*

Kathy Wood, *Tulare Basin Wildlife Partners*

Jay Ziegler, *The Nature Conservancy*

Non-Consumptive Recreational Users

Kim Delfino, *Defenders of Wildlife*

Jennifer Fearing, *The Humane Society of the United States*

Daniel Taylor, *Audubon California*

Landowners

Steven Brink, *California Forestry Association*

Eileen Reynolds, *Tejon Ranch Company*

Nita Vail, *California Rangeland Trust*

Science/Education

Walter Duffy, *Humboldt State University*

Dennis Murphy, *University of Nevada, Reno*

Jeff Self, *Retired Teacher/ Salmonids in the Classroom Coordinator (until 1/2012)*

Brent Stewart, *Hubbs-Seaworld Research Institute*

Local Government

Deborah Byrne, *Yuba County Fish and Game Commission*

Marty Fortney, *Inyo County Board of Supervisors*

Mark Marshall, *Colusa County Board of Supervisors*

Water

Brenda Burman, *State Water Contractors*

David Guy, *Northern California Water Association*

Tim Quinn, *Association of California Water Agencies (until 1/2012)*

Mark Rentz, *Association of California Water Agencies (beginning 1/2012)*

Agriculture

Noelle Cremers, *California Farm Bureau Federation*

Karen Buhr, *California Association of Resource Conservation Districts*

Margo Parks, *California Cattlemen's Association*

Business & Industry

Cliff Moriyama, *California Building Industry*

Diane Ross-Leech, *Pacific Gas & Electric Company*

David Moser, *Ebbin Moser + Skaggs LLP (until 1/2012)*

Tribal/Environmental Justice

Jesse Gonzalez, *Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians*

Craig Tucker, *Karuk Tribe*

Thomas O'Rourke, *Yurok Tribe*

Labor

Christopher Voight, *California Association of Professional Scientists*

Jerry Karnow, Jr., *California Fish and Game Wardens' Association*

Brad Willis, *Service Employees International Union Local 1000*

Marine Resources

Bob Bertelli, *California Sea Urchin Commission/California Fisheries Coalition*

Kaitlin Gaffney, *Ocean Conservancy*

Deborah Self, *San Francisco Baykeeper*

Federal Government

Patrick Christman, *U.S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps Installations West*

Diana Craig, *U.S. Forest Service*

David Fuller, *U.S. Bureau of Land Management*

State Government

Kamyar Guivetchi, *California Department of Water Resources*

Annette Whiteford, *California Department of Food and Agriculture*

Other

John Finger, *Hog Island Oyster Company*

Dan Silver, *Endangered Habitats League*

Darla Guenzler, *California Council of Land Trusts*

Appendix D Assignment of Themes to Working Groups

This appendix shows the result of the analysis of themes and their assignments to working groups.

The listing of all themes on the first page of all themes uses different bullets to indicate from where the themes were identified. The following key identifies the originating documents.

- DFG Seven Strategic Initiatives
- Fish & Game Commission Strategic Plan
 - AB 2376
 - ❖ Coalition Letter Delivered to BRCC
 - ◆ LAO 7-21-11 Report
- ± Presentations

On the next page that lists “All Themes,” the capital letters at the end of each theme are in reference to the common theme(s) that emerged from the source and are shown on the second page.

ALL THEMES

- Enhance communications, education and outreach. A
- Develop statewide land stewardship based upon resource needs. C
- Develop strong water resource management program. D
- Develop / enhance partnerships. F
- Improve regulatory programs. G
- Enhance organizational vitality by focusing on employees and internal systems. H
- Expand scientific capacity. I
- Develop a resource policy for California's fish and wildlife resources that assures resource sustainability. J
- Fully implement F&GC's roles and responsibilities. H, J
- Improve the F&GC's organizational effectiveness. H
- Improve F&GC outreach. A
 - Improving and enhancing capacity of the department and the commission to fulfill their public trust responsibilities to protect and manage the state's fish and wildlife for their ecological values and for the use and benefit of the people of the state. J
 - Comprehensive biodiversity management, including conservation planning and monitoring. J
 - Sustainable ecosystem functions, including terrestrial, freshwater, and marine habitat. J
 - Opportunities for sustainable recreational and commercial harvest of fish and wildlife. K, L
 - Permitting, regulatory and enforcement functions. G, M, S
 - Science capacity and academic relationships, including strategies to protect and enhance the independence and integrity of the science that forms the basis for department and commission policies and decisions. I
 - Education, communication, and relations with the public, landowners, nonprofit entities, and land management agencies. A, F
 - Reforms necessary to take on the challenges of the 21st century, including, but not necessarily limited to climate change and adaptation, meeting California's future renewable energy needs while protecting sensitive habitat, the restoration of the state's native fish species and implementing and updating the state's Wildlife Action Plan. J
 - The development and deployment of technology to meet the department's mission, including data modeling, collection, and online reporting. I
 - Budget and fiscal development, accounting, and management. O
 - Coordination among state agencies. P
 - Recommendations for institutional or governance changes, including clarification of the roles of the commission and the department. H
 - Strategies for identifying stable funding options to fulfill the mission of the department while reducing the dependency on the General Fund O
- ❖ Scientific expertise on the CFWSV Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission. I
- ❖ Independent scientific review panel for AB 2376 process. I
- ❖ Stakeholder protocols and procedures.
- ❖ Establish process for including review and advice from DFG and F&GC employees.
- ❖ CFWSV Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission should clearly articulate goals of process rooted in AB 2376.
- ❖ CFWSV Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission should hold meetings around CA – one in each region.
 - ◆ Multitude of mandates and responsibilities, with no clear priorities. Q
 - ◆ Disconnect between funding structure and funding priorities. O
 - ◆ Adequacy of land management staffing and funding. C
 - ◆ Multiple processes affect DFG's activities in the Bay-Delta ecosystem. D
 - ◆ Funding the Marine Life Protection Act over time. E, O
 - ◆ Planning and evaluation of DFG's activities. R
 - ◆ DFG's renewable energy activity. J
 - ◆ Multiple fee-based funding sources make DFG's funding unnecessarily complex and inflexible. O
 - ◆ Opportunities to shift funding from the General Fund to fees (e.g. CESA and NCCP.) O
- ± Coordination and collaboration between regulatory agencies to reduce cross-regulation. G, P
- ± Staffing and funding flexibility to be innovative. O
- ± State leadership (actionable planning; advance mitigation). G, H, P
- ± Future funding. O
- ± Overlapping responsibilities with other agencies. G, P
- ± Reactive, project by project. G, H
- ± Lack of actionable planning. G, H
- ± Lack of permitting ability for "fully protected". G
- ± Level of CEQA document. J
- ± Resources to respond. O
- ± Recognize the financial benefits of hunting and fishing. O
- ± Recognize the conservation benefits of hunting and fishing. A, C, D
- ± Maintain commitment to traditional users. T
- ± Promote greater hunting and fishing opportunities. A, T
- ± Increase funding from non-hunting and non-fishing interests. O
- ± Promote partnerships with non-hunting and non-fishing interests. F
- ± Improving scientific capacity both human capacity and procuring better information I
- ± Improving regulatory structures while not undermining underlying protections C, D, E, G, M
- ± Ensuring a sustainable and transparent financing structure O, R
- ± Improving landscape-scale stewardship and resource protection C, D, E
 - ± Improving communication and partnerships A, F

COMMON THEMES

- A) Communications, outreach and public relations
- B) Education
- C) Land resource management
- D) Water resource management
- E) Marine resource management
- F) Partnership enhancement (Relevant to all Working Groups)
- G) Regulatory reform
- H) Organizational flexibility, effectiveness and change
- I) Science capacity and use of technology
- J) Sustainable resource management and public trust role
- K) Recreation
- L) Commercial harvest
- M) Permitting programs
- N) Academic relationships
- O) Fiscal / Funding flexibility and priorities
- P) Coordination among State agencies
- Q) Prioritization of multiple mandates
- R) Internal evaluation and external reporting of effectiveness
- S) Enforcement (Relevant to all Working Groups)
- T) Commitment to Traditional Users

WORKING GROUPS



Appendix E Summaries of Selected Historical Documents

This appendix summarizes some of the past strategic planning efforts and studies that have evaluated the programs, management, organization, and fiscal affairs of DFG and F&GC.

E.1 Report on Survey of DFG, 1958

This report⁸ was mandated by Senate Concurrent Resolution (SCR) Number 126. SCR 126 states that the survey should include but not be limited to studies of five defined subjects. Primary conclusions as noted in the Executive Summary are as follows:

1. Determination of relative levels of department effort for artificial propagation and improvement of natural habitats: 1) Increase the emphasis and attention given to improvement of habitat and natural conditions but hold artificial propagation programs at present levels; 2) improve the habitat of present land available and acquire more land for hunting; 3) take steps to enlarge the fish-producing capacity of reservoirs, lakes and streams; 4) improve ability to handle water projects and pollution; 5) reduce artificial propagation program costs; and 6) improve salmon and steelhead programs.
2. Appraisal of departmental administration: 1) clarify F&GC role as a policy-formulating body for DFG; 2) improve DFG planning activities; 3) revise departmental organization for further improvements; 5) improve teamwork among DFG personnel; and 5) establish better management controls.
3. Evaluation of departmental conservation education programs: 1) improve departmental in-service training; 2) enlarge the information staff within DFG; 3) strengthen the conservation education program; and 4) increase the information program on the opportunities for hunting and fishing given to the public.
4. Consideration of the effectiveness of Federal Aid expenditures.
5. Survey of predatory animal control.

⁸ Full title: *Report on Survey, Department of Fish and Game: Report of Booz, Allen and Hamilton to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (1958)*

E.2 Department of Finance Review of Nongame Activities (1976)

This report⁹ was a review of the “nongame” program of DFG. Initiated at the request of the Governor, the objective of the study was to determine the appropriateness of General Fund expenditures for nongame activities. The report did not examine to any depth either strictly game programs or environmental activities which encompass both game and nongame. Essential to this study was an investigation into the distinction between “game” and “nongame” activities, the methodology by which such program costs were charged, and a determination of the beneficiaries of such programs.

Given the different program and fiscal conditions that existed in 1976 as compared to the present, it is unclear how much relevancy remains in this report. But in principle, the report symbolizes the continuing struggle of identifying and funding activities between “game” and “nongame.”

E.3 Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy Report (1990)

The Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy’s¹⁰ [Little Hoover Commission (LHC)] purpose is “to speak to the effectiveness and efficiency of California State public agencies. More specifically, the LHC mandate aims toward maximizing the effectiveness and efficiency of State agencies through independent analysis of State agency policies, practices and operations.” (p. 1 LHC report) The LHC consists of 13 members from all walks of life and from diverse appointment authorities. Five are appointed by the Governor, two by the Speaker of the Assembly and two by the Senate Rules Committee. Rounding out the membership are two sitting Senators and two sitting Assembly members. By statute no more than five of the nine public members may be from the same party, and legislators from each body must be from different parties.

The request to have the LHC review DFG and F&GC was made by then-Assemblyman Stan Statham (R-Oak Run) because he was concerned about the efficiency of DFG (LA Time June 24, 1989). In order to prepare its 1990 “Report on California’s Fish and Game Commission and Department of Fish and Game”, LHC conducted a 10 month investigation, two public hearings with constituent groups and interviews with Department of Fish and Game and Fish and Game Commission officials. (For full descriptions of the LHC’s finding and recommendations, please see its 1990 report.)

⁹ Full title *Department of Finance: A Review of Nongame Activities The Department of Fish and Game: A Staff Reference Report (1976)*

¹⁰ Full title of report: *Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy: Report on California’s Fish and Game Commission and the Department of Fish and Game (1990)*

The LHC findings and recommendations were as follows:

1. **Composition of the Commission:** There are no clear or publicly understood criteria for selection and appointment of Fish and Game Commissioners. With the assistance and advice of the Legislature, the Governors Office and representatives of the appropriate State control agencies, the Resources Agency should convene a special task force to develop criteria for membership on the F&GC.
2. **Commission Viability:** F&GC has not, and as presently structured, cannot adequately exercise its statutory authority over DFG. F&GC should become part of a formal Resources Agency Oversight Task Force, composed of one executive member from each of the major resource-related commissions and departments within the agency.
3. **Commission Operations and Decisions:** F&GC Operations and Decisions: F&GC has difficulty meeting its mandate because of external pressures and factors outside of its control. The Resources Agency, Legislature and the Governor's Office should assess the F&GC's future performance in light of its recent stated rededication to fulfilling its mandate.
4. **Departmental Negotiations with Related Agencies:** DFG has exercised inappropriate bargaining tactics with respect to habitat mitigation. DFG should create a separate staff unit, to provide timely and consistent identification of issues and practices related to mitigation actions involving external agencies.
5. **Departmental Acquisition and Stewardship of Land:** DFG has been inconsistent in its acquisition and maintenance of State refuge lands. 1) State acquisition of property should be made dependent on public notice of the intent to purchase the land; 2) DFG should require at least two appraisals of land value; and 3) legislative and executive branch budgetary policies should be modified to provide for a direct tie between land acquisition funds and maintenance funds in the year the land is purchased.
6. **Departmental Internal Administrative Capacities:** DFG has not comprehensive management information system (MIS). 1) DFG management and fiscal information needs should be analyzed and a plan formulated to improve DFG's MIS; 2) the Resources Agency should reconcile expenditures to dedicated fund sources for BY 1990-91 and report to the Legislature on the results on the future viability of the present system of dedicated fund sources; and 3) DFG should be directed to set up empirically defined, consistent systems for measuring legal and illegal taking of game and fish by both sporting and commercial agents.
7. **Departmental Internal Allocation of Resources:** DFG is not capable of appropriately allocating resources. The Resources Agency should push for greater resources for DFG, especially in DFG's Environmental Services Division, and should promote better relationships between its own commissions and departments.
8. **Departmental Oversight and Authority Over Fish and Game Regional Administrators:** DFG does not have adequate oversight and authority over Fish and Game Regional administrators. DFG should tighten its control over the regional operations and continue its recent commitment to systematic training of field staff.

E.4 Legislative Analyst's Office: A Review of the Department of Fish and Game (1991)

The Legislature directed the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) in the Supplemental Report of the 1990 Budget Act to conduct a study that would provide background and guidance to solve DFG's fiscal and other problems. This document, "A Review of the Department of Fish and Game; Issues and Options for Improving its Performance," was the result of that direction.

The LAO focused on three key issues that they found hampered DFG's performance. These issues included:

1. Lack of clarity of DFG's mission: DFG's mission statement reflect a dual and sometimes conflicting roles between the traditional (hunters and fishers) and general habitat protection and endangered species protection.
2. Organizational problems: DFG's organizational structure has drifted gradually away from its original, decentralized form to a more centralized organization. Communication problems pervade the organization, as staff struggle with balancing directives from headquarters and those from regional managers, thus hampering effectiveness of staff to implement programs.
3. Fiscal concerns: DFG's fiscal problems include short-term difficulties in accurately estimating revenues, and a longer-term problem in that anticipated future revenues will be insufficient to keep pace with projected program demands. Additionally, complex statutory funds serve to distort the budgeting process and obstruct effective policy implementation.

To address these issues, the LAO recommended that:

1. The Legislature should reconcile the dual missions.
2. DFG should re-evaluate how it structures its organization and allocates staff.
3. DFG should continue to make improvements in its revenue-estimating methodologies.
4. The Legislature should, when appropriating funds for support of DFG's programs, establish a policy of 1) considering the level of uncertainty in DFG's revenue estimates and 2) establishing prudent reserves which reflect the level of uncertainty.
5. The Legislature should consider a number of options to address DFG's long running fiscal problem of program demands exceeding available resources.
6. DFG should institute a planning process to determine long-term objectives and set annual program priorities.
7. The Legislature should 1) continue to support departmental operations primarily from special funds and 2) repeal various overly narrow statutory and constitutional constraints currently placed on the use of these funds.

E.5 DFG, 1990's and Beyond (1993)

In 1990 a DFG organization committee, consisting of 14 upper level managers, was formed to review DFG's organizational structure and begin the process of developing and articulating the future direction of DFG¹¹. In addition, a 12 member advisory committee of DFG employees provided ideas and suggestions to the organization committee. The organization committee met 11 times over three months to develop a draft that was then circulated for broader employee input and input from interested individuals and groups. The organization committee considered all comments and created a final version based on consensus between all members.

The major conclusion of the organization committee was that DFG needed a more effective system for anticipating and responding to change and carrying out its mission. The organization committee's consensus was that DFG had been more reacting instead of acting. DFG lacked an effective and systematic method of anticipating change or for reworking program and budgets as priorities change. The organization committee determined that DFG needed to generate a number of strategies to resolve a myriad of issues that it would be facing at the start of that decade." Thus began DFG's strategic vision process.

In 1993, DFG published its strategic vision, *A Vision for the Future.*" The major recommendation out of that effort was that "the department adopt a comprehensive, formal planning system to include both strategic (long-term) planning and operational (short-range) planning" – to improve DFG and better prepare it for the future. The vision included statements of its mission, value and goals with recommendations for action in seven subject areas. (To review the recommendations for action by subject area, please refer to the 1993 DFG strategic vision document.)

The seven subject areas were:

1. Implement a comprehensive management system
2. Establish a task force to examine all spending priorities, funding alternative, and needs as related to strategic plans
3. Conduct an audit of internal communications
4. Develop an external communication plan
5. Improve its stewardship/public trust responsibilities
6. Improve training opportunities
7. Determine if the organization is structured effectively to carry out its responsibilities

¹¹ Full title of report: *Department of Fish and Game: Department of Fish and Game, 1990's and Beyond: A Vision for the Future: the Department of Fish and Game, Its Mission, Values, and Goals to Meet the Challenge of the Future (1993)*

E.6 DFG Strategic Plan: Where Do We Want To Be? (1995)

As a follow up to the 1993 “Vision for the Future” document, in late 1993, the director of DFG appointed a Strategic Planning Team (SPT) to develop a strategic plan¹² based on DFG’s newly created strategic vision and previous input from employees about DFG priorities. The process included statewide focus group meetings with external stakeholders. Based on input from both DFG employee and stakeholders, four major themes emerged. (To review the recommended strategies to achieve each of the goals, please refer to DFG’s 1995 strategic plan.)

The four major themes were:

1. **Public Service, Outreach, and Education:** DFG must work to improve communication with and inform the public about fish and wildlife and their value to the State, and provide better service.
2. **Cooperative Approaches to Resource Stewardship and Use:** DFG needs assistance from the public, other agencies, landowners, project proponents, and volunteers to help better manage the State’s fish and wildlife and their habitats.
3. **Manage Wildlife From a Broad Habitat Perspective:** DFG must ensure the future existence of viable habitats for a variety of species.
4. **Organizational Vitality:** DFG recognizes that its employees are its most important asset. DFG will examine its organizational structure to determine the most effective way to implement its strategic plan, improve understanding among employees about DFG operates and makes decisions, and give employees the support and freedom to meet challenges without stifling initiative.

In order to begin implementing the plan, the team determined that DFG “must: 1) align the structure of DFG’s budget and the strategic plan so that it can evaluate the coast implications of modifying efforts in various areas; 2) formalize and implement the budgetary and planning cycles so that strategic and operational decisions affect the budget, and not vice-versa; and 3) begin the steps leading to action plans (for the budget year) to implement identified strategies.”

This strategic plan will guide DFG the better part of the next 10 years.

Since its release, DFG’s strategic plan has had four progress reports:

1. August 1997, Strategic Focus Item Projects Progress Report
2. September 2000, Five Year Strategic Plan Review Office of Program Management (part of a Governor’s Office review)
3. May 2004, Review by the California Performance Review Audits Team

¹² Full title: *Department of Fish and Game: Strategic Plan: Where Do We Want To Be? (1995)*

4. July 2006, Strategic Plan Final Update and Addendum Per October 2005 Five Year Review of Strategic Goals and Strategies

E.7 Fish and Game Commission Strategic Plan (1998)

The F&GC Strategic Plan was “strongly influenced” by public input solicited during focus groups and workshops held around California.

In 1997, F&GC embarked on its strategic planning efforts. After five focus group meetings with the public, four basic needs arose:

1. There is a need for F&GC to set effective management policies aimed at assuring a sustainable resource base
2. F&GC must be innovative in addressing the challenges presented by the many changes impacting fish and wildlife resources and their habitat
3. F&GC must become more effective through adequate staffing, adequate funding and a workable structure
4. F&GC must continue to build communication bridges to the public, particularly partnerships, to effectively manage resources”

With this as the primary basis, F&GC identified four major strategic challenges. Nested within each of these challenges are identified goals and strategies to implement those goals. Since its release in 1998, this is the strategic plan that informs the F&GC’s actions. (To review the recommended strategies to achieve each of the goals, please refer to F&GC’s 1998 strategic plan.)

The F&GC’s strategic challenges are as follows:

Strategic Challenge 1: To develop a resource policy agenda for California’s fish and wildlife resources that assures resources sustainability

Strategic Challenge 2: To fully implement F&GC’s roles and responsibilities

Strategic Challenge 3: To improve F&GC’s organizational effectiveness

Strategic Challenge 4: Improve commission outreach

E.8 Bureau of State Audits: California’s Wildlife Habitat and Ecosystem (2000)

While the scope of this audit was larger than DFG, it nonetheless included it as it is a major holder of state land for restoring the ecosystem and preserving wildlife habitat. As such, the bureau noted that DFG had not completed management plans for many of its properties. Management plans, the

essential first step of proper land management, identifies the natural resources present and the goals or strategies for maintaining each property for the purpose it was intended.

To ensure that DFG adequately manages its lands, the key recommendations were:

1. Prepare management plans for all properties, update older plans, and then follow them.
2. Continue to request additional funding so that land acquired for ecosystem restoration and wildlife habitat preservation is kept in its desired condition.

E.9 Bureau of State Audits Report on DFG (2005)

The focus of the bureau's study¹³ was on the administration of the Fish and Game Preservation Fund (FGPF). The FGPF accounts for about one-third of DFG's revenues and is spent for the protection and management of birds, mammals, fish, reptiles and amphibians. The FGPF's major source of revenues is from the sale of hunting and fishing licenses. Of the amount deposited in the fund, about 15 percent goes into dedicated accounts and can only be spent for specific programs according to statutes. DFG may use the remaining funds to support other FGPF programs.

The key recommendations were as follows:

1. To mitigate against the effects of budget reductions and fluctuations in program revenues, DFG should take a more strategic approach to evaluating its financial needs. It should update its strategic plan and develop annual operational plans with specific measurable goals and objectives.
2. To reduce the reliance on fund reserves and borrowing from dedicated resources, DFG should take measures to ensure that revenue streams are sufficient to fund each of its programs.
3. To ensure that dedicated resources are being used for their intended purposes, DFG should avoid borrowing from these accounts to fund expenditures of other accounts.
4. DFG should identify those dedicated accounts that have been used to pay for expenditures from other accounts, and pay them back.
5. To make the resources available for FGPF programs and to properly account for its fund balance and liabilities, DFG should seek resolution for the advance from the FGPF to the Native Species Conservation and Enhancement Account through administrative or legislative means.
6. To prevent inequitable distributions of indirect costs and administrative expenses, DFG should review and update the percentages used in its allocation method annually.

¹³ Full title: *Bureau of State Audits: Department of Fish and Game: The Preservation Fund Comprises a Greater Share of Department Spending Due to Reduction in Other Revenues (2005)*

E.10 Department of Fish and Game: Seven Strategic Initiatives (2006)

In early 2006, DFG leadership took a collective pause to envision DFG five, 10 and 15 years into the future. The director assembled a team of program staff, middle managers, and executive team members to participate in a structured process to solicit, capture, and assemble ideas – ultimately initiatives – that represented a direction for DFG. The team was challenged to look beyond day-to-day activities, however vital, and consider what legacy they would leave for wildlife, the public and DFG employees. They were tasked with determining how to maximize existing resources and capitalize on the new funding sources to best insure this inheritance and to identify where organizationally the responsibility for these efforts would reside.

From this effort emerged the Seven Strategic Initiatives. Each initiative identifies the current pertinent issues and goals/objectives/desired outcomes. The seven initiatives are:

1. Enhance communications, education and outreach
2. Develop statewide land stewardship based upon resource needs
3. Develop strong water resource management program
4. Develop/enhance partnerships
5. Improve regulatory programs
6. Enhance organizational vitality by focusing on employees and internal systems
7. Expand scientific capacity

E.11 Bureau of State Audits Report on Office of Oil Spill Prevention and Response (2008).

The Bureau of State Audits prepared a report¹⁴ in response to the November 2007 oil spill which resulted when an outbound container ship, the Cosco Busan, hit a support on the San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge and released 53,600 gallons of oil into the bay. Such spills are multijurisdictional events and typically require a coordinated response by federal, state, and private entities. DFG’s Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR) along with contingency plans it oversees, fits into a national framework for preventing and responding to oil spills, with entities at every level of government, as well as private entities, handling some aspect of the planning effort. Thus, a three-part unified command consisting of representatives from the spill office, the party responsible for the spill, and the U.S. Coast Guard responded to the Cosco Busan oil spill.

While numerous recommendations were made, the key ones were:

¹⁴ Full title: *Bureau of State Audits: Office of Oil Spill Prevention and Response: It Has Met Many of Its Oversight and Response Duties, but Interaction With Local Government, the Media, and Volunteers Needs Improvement (2008)*

1. The OSPR update the state plan and incorporate references to the regional and area contingency plans.
2. The OSPR work with local governments to improve participation and better integrate local plans with the response activities on an up-to-date basis.
3. The OSPR should ensure it has adequate procedures and a sufficient number of trained staff for all activities including performing liaison duties, spill volume calculations, and other recovery activities.
4. Additionally, the OSPR should ensure the proper use of its funds earmarked for oil spill prevention activities.

E.12 Bureau of State Audits Report on DFG (2008)

The Bureau of State Audits prepared this report¹⁵ in response to concerns about DFG’s management of fish stamps. The background of the report is as follows: Since January 2004, a person must first purchase a fish stamp—the Bay-Delta Sport Fishing Enhancement Stamp (fish stamp)—to sportfish in the San Francisco Bay and Delta. Fees collected from fish stamp sales are deposited in a restricted account within the preservation fund, which is administered by DFG, and can only be used for activities that promote sportfishing opportunities or that provide long-term, sustainable benefits either to the primary sportfishing population or to anglers in the areas defined as bay-delta regulated waters. A fish stamp advisory committee (committee) identifies and recommends projects, while DFG administers all the fees, recommends and approves projects for funding, and funds and monitors the projects.

Key recommendations were:

1. DFG should work with the committee in developing a spending plan to identify, approve, and fund viable projects. We also recommended that Fish and Game adequately track and report project costs within its accounting system and ensure that its project managers reconcile their files to the accounting records.
2. DFG should provide the committee with accurate financial and project information, such as actual project costs, detailed information on project status, and administrative expenditures.
3. DFG should ensure only appropriate activities are paid with fish stamp revenue, and it should correct inappropriate charges it previously made.

¹⁵ Full title: *Bureau of State Audits: Department of Fish and Game: Its Limited Success in Identifying Viable Projects and Its Weak Controls Reduce the Benefit of Revenues From Sales of the Bay Delta Sport Fishing Enhancement Stamp (2008)*

E.13 The Treanor Report (2009)

The authors of “The Treanor Report”¹⁶ reviewed the form of other wildlife agencies, previous reports on DFG and F&GC, and interviewed Directors, Commissioners and stakeholders in California and other states.

For F&GC, the report’s recommendations include

1. Increase the number of Commissioners from five to seven.
2. Establish a separate budget for the F&GC.
3. Increase the staff for F&GC itself.
4. Mandate F&GC appoint the director of DFG.
5. Give F&GC oversight/approval of DFG’s budget.
6. Change the name of F&GC to the Fish and Wildlife Commission.

For DFG, the report’s discussion items include:

7. appointment of the director of DFG by the FG&C,
8. the scope of responsibilities of DFG,
9. when F&GC should either review or approve DFG’s budget prior to submission to the Governor,
10. alignment of funding sources with responsibilities and providing adequate funding, and
11. changing the name to the Department of Fish and Wildlife.

E.14 Bureau of State Audits Report of January, 2010

This report¹⁷ is a follow-up to the Bureau of State Audits reports of 2008 mentioned above.

The Bureau of State Audits’ (bureau) mission is to promote the efficient management of public funds and programs by providing citizens and government independent, objective, accurate, and timely evaluations of state and local governments’ activities. The bureau fulfills its mission by conducting

¹⁶ Full title: *The Treanor Report: A Look at the California Department of Fish and Game and Fish and Game Commission* (Treanor, Robert. 2009)

¹⁷ Full title: *Bureau of State Audits: Recommendations Not Fully Implemented After One Year: The Omnibus Audit Accountability Act of 2006* (January, 2010)

audits and making recommendations to state and local agencies. The bureau's efforts bring the greatest returns when agencies act upon its recommendations.

The Omnibus Audit Accountability Act of 2006 (Accountability Act) requires state agencies to report annually to the bureau on the status of their implementation of the bureau's recommendations. Using state agencies' responses, the bureau has created this report on recommendations that are not fully implemented, as required by the Accountability Act.

In August 2008 the bureau conducted an audit of DFG's Office of Spill Prevention and Response in its response to the oil spill resulting from the 2007 Cosco Busan oil spill in San Francisco Bay. That audit was entitled: *Office of Spill Prevention and Response: It Has Met Many of Its Oversight and Response Duties, but Interaction With Local Government, the Media, and Volunteers Needs Improvement*. Based on the auditee's most recent response and at the time of the release of this 2010 audit, of the 15 recommendations made in the audit, eight recommendations were not fully implemented and 5 remained outstanding.

In October 2008 the bureau conducted an audit of DFG's Bay-Delta Sport Fishing Enhancement Stamp (fish stamp) program. The Joint Legislative Audit Committee asked the bureau to independently develop and verify information related to the fish stamp program. Based on the auditee's most recent response and at the time of the release of this 2010 audit, of the 8 recommendations, one recommendation was not fully implemented and one remained outstanding.

E.15 Compilation of Analysis from the Legislative Analyst's Office

Analysis of the 1998-99 Budget Bill: Reorganization in Progress: An Overview (1998). DFG is undergoing a reorganization designed to 1) eliminate duplication of work performed by different divisions and regions; 2) address policy inconsistencies; 3) eliminate fragmentation; and 4) change a deficient reporting system. While the LAO believes that reorganization to achieve these ends has merit, the details of the reorganization plan remained unclear. Consequently, the LAO recommends that DFG provide the Legislature, prior to budget hearings, details about the elements of this reorganization and when the department expects it to be completed.

Analysis of the 1999-2000 Budget Bill: Department's Reorganization Plan: An Update (1999). The LAO recommends DFG report at budget hearings on whether it plans to continue the reorganization under the new administration. To the extent the reorganization effort continued, DFG should present an update of its progress to date and the expected time line for full implementation. The LAO further recommends that DFG advise the Legislature at budget hearings what it plans to accomplish in the budget year given its reorganization efforts to date.

Better Protection of Fish and Wildlife: Improving Fish and Game's CEQA Review (2002). This report: 1) directs DFG to establish a prioritization matrix for project review and comment; 2) directs DFG to standardize the type of information provided in its comments on proposed projects; 3) directs DFG to improve data management by ensuring that its data tracking system, currently under development, tracks specific information necessary for legislative oversight and program management; 4) requires

DFG to assess the effectiveness of a sampling of widely used mitigation measures; 5) reexamines the current fee structure; and 6) recommends that DFG submit the annual report that is currently required by statute.

A Framework for Financing Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) (2003, Presented to Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee). Key issues examined include: 1) NCCP State expenditures are not specifically identified in the Governor’s budget display; 2) future costs and funding sources are unspecified; and 3) funding is not provided from all beneficiaries. Key recommendations include: 1) require crosscut budget display of NCCP expenditures; 2) require DFG and the other state agencies implementing the NCCP program to develop a long-term funding plan for acquisitions and support costs of NCCPs; 3) evaluate appropriate funding allocation between general purpose funds and fees; and 4) evaluate fee mechanism to raise the fee revenues.

Analysis of the 2003-04 Budget Bill: Resource Assessments: Improving Effectiveness and Creating Savings (2003). A number of departments within the Resources Agency engage in resource assessment activities intended to determine the condition of natural resources in the State. The LAO reviews the resource assessment activities of DFG and the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, as well as the Secretary for Resources, and identifies opportunities for funding shifts and program reductions, some of which will create General Fund and Environmental License Plate Fund savings. The LAO also discusses opportunities to increase the value of the information collected.

Department of Fish and Game: Funding Issues (2005, Presented to Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 2). Key issues examined include: 1) There are existing fee collection issues related to the Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement Program and AB 3158 CEQA fees; 2) DFG has been overspending certain accounts within the FGPF; 2) DFG has borrowed about \$11 million from dedicated accounts; 3) without corrective action, the FGPF will be out of balance beginning in 2006-07; and 4) borrowing from dedicated accounts could be due to the difficulties resulting from funding restrictions. Key recommendations include: 1) DFG should resubmit its budget proposal for the Fish and Game Preservation Fund (FGPF) – consistent with existing statutory direction or include proposals to amend the statutory restrictions on the use of the FGPF, and 2) the enactment of legislation requiring that the annual fund condition displayed in the Governor’s budget for the FGPF should include a breakout of both the dedicated and non-dedicated sources.

Analysis of the 2006-07 Budget Bill: Fiscal Problems Abound at Fish and Game (2006). The LAO discusses a number of issues related to DFG’s budget proposal. The LAO reviews DFG’s proposal to balance the Fish and Game Preservation Fund and its funding plan to implement recent legislation (Chapter 689, Statutes of 2005, AB 7, Cogdill). The LAO also identifies technical errors in the display of the budget bill and recommends DFG’s federal fund expenditure authority be reduced due to over-budgeting.

Analysis of the 2007-08 Budget Bill: Department’s Fiscal Management Improving; Budget Transparency Still Needs Work (2007). DFG has a history of fiscal management problems, particularly with respect to the Fish and Game Preservation Fund (FGPF). While DFG has made progress in complying with legislative requirements for improved fiscal management and budget transparency, the

LAO identifies opportunities to further improve the clarity and the accuracy of FGPF fund condition statements. The LAO also recommends a reduction in the expenditure authority of one FGPF account, to better align revenues and expenditures and create a prudent fund reserve.

Fish and Game Warden Staff and Compensation (2007, Presented to the Assembly and Senate Budget Committees). Key comments in this report include: 1) Pay increases alone are not likely to solve vacancy problem; 2) substantial changes to hiring process are needed; 3) increasing warden staffing substantially requires more funding; 3) what is the right amount of warden staffing?; 4) substantial hikes in warden pay may have a labor market effect; and 5) LAO recommends ending all automatic pay formulas. Recommendations to reduce warden vacancies or increase staffing include: 1) expand the size and frequency of cadet classes; 2) expand recruitment staff, primarily with non-uniformed personnel; 3) expand staff to process applications and speed hiring process, especially background checks; 4) Legislature should ensure that DFG has sufficient budget resources to fill currently authorized positions; and 5) these efforts should be attempted before considering pay increases or other departmental budget augmentations for warden staffing.

Analysis of the 2008-09 Budget Bill: LAO Recommended Fee Proposals Can Partially Offset Budget-Balancing Reductions and Generate Additional Savings (2008). As part of its budget-balancing reduction proposal, the administration proposes to reduce DFG's General Fund budget by \$1.7 million in the current year and \$8.4 million in the budget year. The LAO recommends the Legislature increase fee or create new fees for regulatory programs and shift funding for law enforcement activities to a special fund to offset the Governor's General Fund reductions for these activities and create additional General Fund savings. The LAO also recommends that the Legislature partially reject the proposed General Fund reduction for administrative activities. The net effect of its recommendations would be an additional \$6.1 million.

Analysis of the 2008-09 Budget Bill: Funding Timber Harvest Plan Review and Enforcement (2008). The LAO recommends the enactment of legislation to create a fee on timber operators to fully fund the review and enforcement of timber harvest plans by several state agencies. This would result in additional General Fund savings of \$21.2 million beyond the Governor's proposed General Fund budget-balancing reductions, with no reduction in program activity.

Department of Fish and Game: Funding Regulatory Programs With Increased Fees (2008, Presented to Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 2). 1) Recommends the Legislature increase of establish new fees to offset the proposed General Fund reductions that concern regulatory program activities and general additional savings (California Endangered Species review, NCCP review, Timber Harvest Plan review), and 2) recommends that the Legislature shift funding for the game warden positions proposed for reduction to an available special fund balance.

Funding Timber Harvest Plan Review and Enforcement (2008, Presented to Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 2). Recommends the State move towards simpler and more flexible funding: 1) where appropriate, consolidate funds; 2) tie fee revenues to the Budget Act; and 3) rely less on bond funding, particularly constrained bond funds.

Department of Fish and Game: 2010-11 Budget and Policy Overview (2010, Presented to Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee). Legislative issues for consideration: 1) disconnect between funding structure and funding priorities; 2) land acquisition management staff adequacy; 3) voluntary process is driving protection of the Bay-Delta ecosystem; 4) funding the Marine Life Protection Act over time; 5) DFG's renewable energy activity; and 6) is performance-based budgeting appropriate for DFG? Funding recommendations include: 1) consolidate fee-based funds to provide more funding flexibility, and 2) pursue opportunities to shift funding from General Fund to fees (LAO's 2009-10 Budget Analysis Series: Resources and Environmental Protection).

Department of Fish and Game: Budget and Policy Overview (2011, Presented to the CFWSV BRCC). Issues for consideration: 1) multitude of mandates and responsibilities with no clear priorities; 2) disconnect between funding structure and funding priorities; 3) funding the Marine Life Protection Act over time; 4) planning and evaluation activities; and 5) DFG's renewable energy activities. Funding recommendations include: 1) consolidate fee-based funds to provide more funding flexibility, and 2) pursue opportunities to shift funding from General Fund to fees.

Commonly Used Acronyms and Abbreviated Terms

APA	Administrative Procedure Act
Bay-Delta	San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary
BCDC	San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
BLM	U.S. Bureau of Land Management
BRCC	CFWSV Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission
Cal/EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
CCNM	California Coastal National Monument
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDF	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CDFA	California Department of Food and Agriculture
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERES	California Environmental Resources Evaluation System
CNRA	California Natural Resources Agency
Committee	CFWSV Executive Committee
CSU	California State University
CFWSV	California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision
DFG	California Department of Fish and Game
DOC	California Department of Conservation
DPR	California Department of Parks and Recreation, also known as California State Parks
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
EIR	environmental impact report
EIS	environmental impact statement
ELPF	Environmental License Plate Fund
ESA	Endangered Species Act (CESA = California, FESA = federal)
F&GC	California Fish and Game Commission
FMP	fishery management plan
FRGP	Fisheries Restoration Grant Program
GIS	geographic information system
IRM	integrated resource management
IRWMP	integrated resource watershed management plan

LCC	landscape conservation cooperatives
Marine Region	Marine Region of the California Department of Fish and Game
MLMA	Marine Life Management Act
MMA	marine managed area
MOU	memorandum of understanding
MPA	marine protected area
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service (also known as NOAA Fisheries)
NMSP	National Marine Sanctuary Program
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
OPC	California Ocean Protection Council
OSPR	Office of Spill Prevention and Response of the California Department of Fish and Game
OST	California Ocean Science Trust
PFMC	Pacific Fishery Management Council
PRC	California Public Resources Code
PSFMC	Pacific States Fishery Management Commission
P-Team	CFWSV Project Planning Team
RWQCB	regional water quality control board
SAG	CFWSV Stakeholder Advisory Group
SLC	California State Lands Commission
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
Title 14	Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations
UC	University of California
U.S.C.	United States Code
U.S.C.A.	United States Code Annotated
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey