

**California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project**  
**Sustainable Financing Working Group Issues Framework**  
*September 22, 2011*

**1. Sustainable Funding Stream – Recognize role of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) in protecting public trust resources and identify broad based funding sources**

- a. Other states' methods of developing secure funding sources (e.g. broad sales tax, sales tax on outdoor gear, real estate transfer tax, environmental license plates, vehicle license fee, retail water user fee, landing tax expansion)
- b. Fees to fully recover costs of uses of DFG lands and services (e.g. filming commercials)
  - i. Recognizing certain fees will be complicated to charge full value (e.g. commercial fishing licenses)
  - ii. Alternative revenue streams that could be substituted for commercial permits in order to promote sustainable fishing practices (expand model to other areas?)
- c. Financial partnership opportunities
  - i. Identifying areas where there are opportunities to leverage state, local, private and nonprofit funds to advance long term conservation funding with better predictability
  - ii. Maximize in-kind contributions/opportunities (e.g. federal government, NGOs)
  - iii. State Parks Foundation model
    - Builds constituency of supporters
    - Respond more nimbly
    - Able to advocate
  - iv. AB 42 (Huffman) model – partnering with local governments or NGOs to manage DFG's lands
  - v. Financial/supporting partnerships (ensure proper firewalls to prevent image of undo influence)
  - vi. Federal position funding option
    1. Federal loan of personnel to DFG (California Department of Water Resources has loaned personnel to DFG, get more information from state agencies on their practices)

**2. Management of Programs/Existing Resources**

- a. Costs of doing business
  - i. Statutory overhead rates
  - ii. Local fees and assessments related to land ownership
    - Mosquito abatement
    - Dam inspections
    - Water fees
    - Payments in lieu of taxes
- b. Science – ensure integrated science program are fully and appropriately funded
- c. Financial analysis for regulations and land acquisition (recognizing significant improvements in land acquisition have already been made)
- d. Improved integration between headquarters and regions

### **3. Evaluation and Opportunities for Improvement (Efficient Operations/Feedback Loops)**

- a. Fiscal flexibility to track changing priorities over time
  - i. Dedicated vs. non-dedicated accounts
  - ii. Standardized policy for revenues collected for a specific use/delivery of service (i.e. if groups want to advocate for dedicated funding streams, develop policy to ensure benefits outweigh costs)
- b. Apparent and realized disparities between funding and service
  - i. Unfunded/underfunded mandates or unbudgeted obligations (e.g. litigation)
  - ii. Identify priorities (e.g. do fewer things well)
- c. Overall evaluation and reporting effectiveness
  - i. New component drill – outputs and outcomes
  - ii. Transparency and accountability
  - iii. Utilize information generated from identifying opportunities to leverage additional funding to improve efficiencies and effectiveness
  - iv. Work plans; performance-based management/performance-based budgeting
  - v. Use technology to better monitor permit compliance and improve permitting systems (i.e., how do we Googlize DFG)
- d. Fee setting authority
  - i. Who is best to make that decision
  - ii. Oversight
- e. Use of technology to more efficiently manage and retrieve fiscal information
- f. Improve communication to limit duplicative actions (both within DFG and with other agencies)