

Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Stakeholder Advisory Group
Sustainable Financing Working Group
Summary Notes
August 25, 2011

Disclaimer: This summary is not meant to be the official meeting minutes. These notes were taken by a scribe that was in attendance at this meeting and summarizes the discussions to the best of the scribe's ability.

1. Welcome
2. Discussion of Group Structure and Need to Designate a Stakeholder Advisory Working Group Spokesperson
 - a. Working Group Structure
 - i. Working groups will be meeting once a week, every week until late September
 - ii. Overall Stakeholder Advisory Group meetings will be held on Friday mornings for interdisciplinary discussion and presentations of working group discussions.
 - b. Schedule:
 - i. Two phases
 1. End of September will be a tentative deadline for putting all the issues on the table and start of problem-solving.
 2. After September, these issues will be dealt with more specifically leading to recommendations and refinement for an end product for presentation in February/March of 2012 (goal).
 - ii. The end products of both phases will be presented to the Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and the Executive Committee at the end of each phase.
 - iii. Working group meetings will be on a regular and consistent schedule each week.
 - c. Due to the interdisciplinary nature of the working group issues, Friday overall Stakeholder Advisory Group meetings will provide an opportunity to communicate between working groups on these cross-cutting aspects.
 - d. Spokesperson
 - i. Possible options:
 1. Neutral spokesperson (from outside the working group)

2. Neutral spokesperson (from within the working group)
 3. Multiple spokespersons
 4. Rotating Spokespersons, based on expertise or issues being addressed.
- ii. Spokesperson does not have to be present, but can attend discussions and brief via teleconference and/or webex.
 - iii. Comments:
 1. Chair or vice chair option
 - a. Would people feel represented and comfortable with these representatives?
 - b. May have quorum-based issues.
 2. Work plan/program for each group and/or meeting.
 - a. Thinking two weeks out to be able to satisfy Bagley-Keene.
 - b. Allot time at the end of each meeting to schedule needs for next meeting two weeks out.
 - i. Particularly to address knowledge needs on particular funding issues (bonds and particular funding sources).
 3. How can we make these meetings most efficient?
 4. Argument for rotating spokespersons.
 5. Because of the specific nature of this group, informational gaps will particularly need to be addressed.

3. Issues

- a. What is the potential outcome for this process?
 - i. Enhanced Stewardship
 - ii. Greater scientific influence
 - iii. Clarified role of Fish and Game Commission and relationship with the Department of Fish and Game
 - iv. Improved partnerships with a variety of organizations to improve conservation and management plans.
 - v. Species protection is held to the highest standard and accountability is upheld with that.
 - vi. State/federal integrated data sharing.
 - vii. Modernization of funding streams.

1. Clarity of source and end. (Transparency)
 2. Efficient utilization of funds.
- viii. Cultural shift in relationship between landowners and Fish and Game
- ix. Holistic ecosystem approach.
 - x. Simple solutions to solve ecosystem issues.
 - xi. Creative thinking on management.
 - xii. Increased efficiency.
 - xiii. Greater public support for Fish and Game
 - xiv. Greater transparency in funding decisions.
 - xv. Holistic perspective in funding decisions.
 - xvi. Greater accountability in decision-making.
 - xvii. A broad base funding proposal for the department.
 - xviii. Recommendations for matching money from various sources.
 - xix. Possibility of granting greater fee control to Fish and Game.
- b. What are the threats to those outcomes?
- i. Timeline
 1. Meaningful end product
 2. Building trust
 3. Ambitious
 - ii. Buy-in from Fish and Game
 - iii. Inability to reach consensus
 - iv. Conflicting interests
 - v. Disagreements on funding sources.
 - vi. Budget
 - vii. Legislative control
- c. What are the opportunities for this process?
- i. Wider dialogue by diverse group of stakeholders will bring greater number of issues to light.
 - ii. State/federal integrated data sharing.
 - iii. Integrated management planning as an organizational principle in framing the work of the department.
 - iv. Input from stakeholders on what is important functions and responsibilities of Fish and Game.
 - v. Greater public support for Fish and Game
 - vi. Sustainable finance has greatest ability to affect long term success.

- vii. Establishing a broad coalition that can make a large and diverse suite of recommendations.
- viii. A decision based on consensus from this group would be powerful with the greatest impact on the department and chance of success.
- ix. A broad base funding proposal for the department.
- d. What are some solutions for dealing with those threats?
 - i. Minority report; secondary plan
 - ii. Focus on agreements over disagreements.
 - iii. Open-minded and respectful discussions.
 - iv. Putting aside personal interests and focusing on the greater good for the department as a whole.

4. Public Comment

a. Speaker:

- i. Sport fishing and angling provide a large amount of funding and provide a sustainable funding source
 - 1. Want this to be recognized.
 - 2. Want to be able to see their funding addressing the issues they are concerned with.
- ii. Many issues facing the wardens
 - 1. Insufficient number of wardens, resources to consistently provide enforcement.
 - 2. A limiting factor for growth of the Warden Core is the mixed nature of Bargaining Unit 7 (the unit includes both Sworn peace officers versus unsworn peace officers)
- iii. Project timelines are unrealistic for this work group
 - 1. All the results of all the other work groups will eventually come through this work group.
 - 2. Please defer the deliberations of this working group until the other working groups complete deliberation.

b. Speaker:

- i. This is going to be a difficult process
- ii. Former endeavors lacked a holistic look as a part of a broader strategic vision
- iii. Priorities will be able to be set and dealt with in a holistic process

- iv. Outcomes hoped for:
 - 1. Begin with a common baseline
 - 2. Ability to set fees in one place
 - 3. Identification of innovative funding sources
 - a. Where value of ecosystem services are considered
- v. Advice:
 - 1. Don't reinvent the wheel
 - a. Use partners and look at what has already been done
 - 2. Use your expertise
 - 3. Build on guidelines that already exist

- c. Speaker:
 - i. Sustainable finance is the lynchpin
 - 1. Reason why things aren't working in the department
 - ii. Contradiction between establishing stable funding options and reducing dependency on general fund.
 - 1. General Funds is the only way to tap into the tax base of the vested interest of the general public.
 - 2. User fees are already being used to their furthest extent.
 - 3. Analyses of other states' funding options.
 - a. Answer: this information is sought by many Fish and Wildlife agencies across the country and has yet to be compiled in its entirety.

- d. Speaker:
 - i. Suggestion of possible revenue source: Fee on state water project water

- e. Speaker:
 - i. Budget trend information made available on Fish and Game Commission as well as the Department Fish and Game?
 - 1. Commission budget is a line item in Department budget.

- 5. Other: Committee follow-up; future meetings
 - a. Next meeting: Working group meeting: in the Resources Building, Fish and Game Commission Conference Room. Room 1320, Thursday, September 1, 2011 at 1pm.

- b. Stakeholders Advisory Meeting Friday September 2, 2011 9:30am
Resources Auditorium
 - c. Homework:
 - i. Give/Send Carol Baker a hardcopy of issues you wish to present to your group or other working groups by Friday so the appropriate DFG employees can be available for your reference.
 - ii. Suggested Readings:
 - 1. Previous Strategic Vision Plans for the Department of Fish and Game and the Fish and Game Commission.
 - 2. DFG Seven Strategic Initiatives
 - 3. AB 2376
 - 4. Legislative Analyst's Office July 21, 2011 report to the Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission (BRCC)
 - 5. July 21, 2011 stakeholder presentations made to BRCC (power points)
 - 6. July 21, 2011 BRCC archived video, overview of the Department of Fish and Game and Fish and Game Commission
 - 7. Documents can be found under "Reports" and archived video can be found under "Meetings" on the Vision website www.vision.ca.gov.
 - d. Please RSVP to working group meetings by the Friday before the working group meeting.
6. Comments related to future working group meeting:
- a. Overview of Fish and Game funding, particularly trend information.
 - i. Fish and Game agreed to provide such information.
 - 1. i.e. Fish and Game 2007 Fee Schedule study
 - b. Disentangling nature of dedicated fees that the department collects may have Prop 26 issues.
 - i. Where can these financing issues be addressed without having issues with Prop 26?
 - c. Request for a matrix of Sources, Uses of, and Restrictions on revenues.
 - i. Fish and Game will also identify other restrictions on funds.
 - d. Responsive Management also has collected data on other states' fish and wildlife agencies funding strategies.

- e. Teaming with Wildlife funding document- profiles 10-15 states on how they fund their wildlife programs.