

**Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Stakeholders Advisory Group
Communications, Education and Outreach Working Group
Summary Notes
August 23, 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 Group Working Group Spokesperson
 - a. Suggested Structure:
 - i. Meetings through September with end product being an initial draft of ideas.
 1. First, bring issues to light and next, do problem solving on these issues.
 2. Ultimately, we will make a set of recommendations that deal with the issues we identify.
 - ii. Communication will continue in meetings between working groups on Fridays.
 - b. Presentation by the Department of Fish and Game Deputy Director for Communications
 - i. Current Initiatives and Programs
 1. Media relations
 2. Publications: Outdoor Newsletter
 3. Website management
 4. Community meetings
 5. Communication with local governments
 6. Education department:
 - a. Project Wild,
 - b. Growing up Wild,
 - c. Classroom Aquarium,
 - d. National Archeries in School,
 - e. Interpreters,
 - f. Trout Openers,
 - g. Wildlife Justice,
 7. Press releases for Commission,

- 8. Restoration events (Hunter education is under enforcement)
- ii. Request for media packet to better explain current Fish and Game outreach, background information.
 - 1. Department of Fish and Game agreed to provide information.
- iii. Regional offices do not have Communications staff. However, Interpreters are in place for education and events.
- c. Spokesperson: Will be determined at next meeting.
- d. Protocol question: Can a stand-in be present in place for a stakeholder member?
 - i. Currently, the draft rules stipulate that alternates are not able to participate in place of a stakeholder member.

3. Issues

- a. What do you feel or believe are the potential outcomes for this process?
 - i. Fiscal accountability and transparency
 - ii. More effective on-the-ground communication.
 - iii. Stronger community links.
 - iv. Make greater amounts of resources available to Interpreters so as to allow local Interpreters to offer outreach to a greater variety of groups.
 - v. First communication with Department of Fish and Game tends to be in the sector of regulation and permitting. How can this process and communication be more effective, clear and favorable?
 - vi. Communication is critical for the approval of and completion of local/community projects.
 - vii. Increase awareness of the Communication, Education and Outreach endeavors of Department of Fish and Game.
 - viii. Identifying revenue sources.
 - ix. Using local Department of Fish and Game staff for increased outreach.
 - x. Greater county involvement in Department of Fish and Game educational programs.
 - xi. End product should help promote integrated resource planning and management approaches at the regional level.

1. Implementation should occur at the regional/local level due to the diversity of the state, in both people, management tools, resources and ecosystems.
 2. Headquarters gives a proposed outcome, while regional offices are given freedom in how to implement programs to reach these outcomes.
 - xii. Formal communication plan should be established.
 - xiii. Greater engagement with public.
- b. Threats and issues with this process?
 - i. Schedule is compressed/ambitious.
 1. Rushing might make group miss out on the ultimate benefits of this process.
 - ii. Complexity of membership
 - iii. Revenue sources
 1. Sportsmen's groups are heavily taxed as a revenue filler.
 2. Can we find a more efficient, science based resolutions, with finding more diverse revenue streams.
 - iv. Communication, Education and Outreach will be the first on the chopping block.
 - v. Lack of awareness of these Communication, Education and Outreach endeavors of Department of Fish and Game.
 - vi. Preconceived outcomes, without giving due attention to stakeholder recommendations.
 - vii. Decentralized governance between Department of Fish and Game and other agencies.
 - viii. Headquarter office creates plans and delegates to regional offices. Make this opposite.
 - ix. Losing sight of representing the people of California, as opposed to stakeholders. Local Fish and Game commissions are the representatives of the people.
- c. How can we address these threats?
 - i. Ask legislature to give list of prioritized mandates.
 - ii. Can timeline be shifted?
 - iii. Deadline can be beneficial to getting the best thoughts out quickly.
 - iv. October as interim Phase 1 deadline, then refining product by end of the year.

- v. Give large group meetings an opportunity to discuss Natural Resource Stewardship early on in process.
 - vi. Increased regional communication.
 - vii. Better communication with those who best represent the people of California (the local Fish and Game commissions who are often elected officials).
 - viii. Better communication with sportsmen that are a revenue source, and conservation activists for Department of Fish and Game.
 - ix. Protecting rural California.
4. What are the opportunities available with this process?
- a. Offer a possible training program in communications for Department of Fish and Game employees, particularly in the division of regulation and permitting.
 - b. Education has been critical in helping schools with decreased funding for sciences, and increasing student test scores.
 - c. Aquarium Program helpful for increasing student interest in sciences.
 - d. Do inventory of agencies capable of implementing local initiatives (?).
5. Public Comment:
- a. Speaker
 - i. Fish and Game has too many responsibilities, and there is a hope that any recommendations for DFG helps to restructure, simplify, or relieve some of the burden of DFG.
 - ii. Revenue will be an important factor in the implementation of these recommendations. Be careful when looking at new fiscal opportunities.
 - b. Speaker
 - i. Address invasive plants.
 - ii. Suggests an opportunity for DFG and other natural resource partners. Interagency collaboration in addressing invasive plant species, particularly for regional projects.
 - iii. Use network of locally established groups to help deal with this aspect of Fish and Game.
 - c. Speaker associated with Sea Grant
 - i. Wishes to become a partner with DFG in education.
 - d. Speaker

- i. Restructure of regional contact with DFG, after loss of regional media staff. Particularly, for local issues, regional staff needs to know what information should be expressed to media.
- ii. DFG documents are less easily available, and could hopefully be improved.
- iii. Information about Fish and Game Commission actions are less easy to access for media.
- iv. It is difficult to get information from agencies. Process to inform employees on media information that can be released.
- v. Increase public and private partnerships for projects for fish and game so as to look less like it is a government project, or funding will increase if a project looks more like a non-profit project, as opposed to raising funds for a government project.
- vi. Look at State Parks Foundation-like revenue fundraising and infrastructure associated with public-private partnerships (Friends Group).
- vii. Name change of department. Fish and Wildlife is a more inclusive title. This is a critical communications issue.
- viii. Role of local, county fish and game commissions:
 - 1. Builds local community base.
 - 2. Increases local education/outreach.
 - 3. Local implementation.
 - 4. Connections with state Fish and Game.
- ix. Citizen group follow up is critical to implementation.
- e. Speaker
 - i. These meetings will be archived.
 - ii. Audio has been improved.
 - iii. Speakers, be sure to identify themselves.

6. Final Comments:

- a. Next working group meeting will be at Tuesday, August 30, 2011 9:00am. Resources Building: Fish and Game Commission Conference Room. Room 1320.
- 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.