

California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project
Sustainable Financing Working Group Issues Framework
Revised October 24, 2011

All items highlighted in grey have been moved to the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group common themes document dated October 24, 2011; the highlighted items remain in this document to help provide a record of from where information was gathered and the context within which it was developed. For the draft interim strategic vision, staff recommends that highlighted goals be removed from this document and retained only in the common themes document. Underline and strikeout text represent changes (additions and deletions, respectively) since the last version released to the public, dated October 17, 2011.

Working Group Notes

Showing value of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) to the public – this will be different for different people

Establishing funding goals depends on the scope of the department's work (programs, mandates, etc.) –what you want?

- Need an agreement on what the delivery should look like (define that end point and until then you cannot measure the progress)
- Costs depend on the idea of what delivery looks like and can vary greatly from one perspective to another
- Should the finance work group be reacting to what other work groups are recommending?
- Once programs are defined then you can figure out how it should be financed

Goal: Better articulate/define DFG and California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC) programmatic outcomes, identify deliverables and define measures of success

Problem statements:

- DFG operations and program management are not always efficient or as effective as possible.
- There is a disparity between desired and required outcomes and current funding levels - underfunded mandates
- Lack of trust between stakeholders and DFG (and within DFG)

Objectives:

- Analysis of existing mandates:
 - o First define what delivery of programs should look like
 - o Need a process for prioritizing existing mandates
 - o to look at the priorities and make recommendations on that (possibly through this process)
 - o could look at the underfunded mandate list provided and change the language to be more specific
- Defining what new mandates will look like when implemented and what they will cost to implement
- Feedback loop for new mandates:

- Greater transparency in articulating what mandates will cost
- When a mandate is created there should be some feedback to the legislature on what the financial impacts are and what it would take to implement the mandate
- vision: legislature is collaborative in nature allowing this feedback to take place during the mandating process

Goal: Ensure adequate and sustainable funding to achieve the programmatic objectives (and mandates)

Problems:

- Lack of revenue
- Existing fees do not always cover the full cost of programs
- There is a disparity between desired and required outcomes and current funding levels - underfunded mandates

Objectives:

- achieve diversity in the funding –
- achieve stable funding/baseline stream for long term;
- reserves (working capital) for incremental projects

Goal: Increase/encourage fiscal flexibility where appropriate

Problems:

- there is not enough flexible finding for programs (programs should not fully depend on dedicated funds)
- in many cases staff is supported by dedicated funding and they cannot work on other projects or efforts
 - Groups lobby the legislature to secure DFG funding and budget allocations to particular projects/ initiatives.
 - This creates an inability to change funding allocations as priorities shift.

Objective:

Funding should be made as flexible as possible to be adaptive where appropriate

Increase transparency

Types of Funding / Levels of Funding

- Fundamental baseline investments for the state to fulfill that mission – baseline monitoring and basic information of those resources needs to be stable (these are those elements that benefit the general public)
- Conservation planning efforts

- Special programs – the cost of providing that program based on the baseline monitoring and information– beneficiary pays / e.g. user fees – some programs have benefits for the broader general public

Overarching recommended action: Creating a partners program [Recommendation captured in the Common Themes document]

Table 1: Revised Regulatory and Permitting Working Group Issues Framework								
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	Goal (Preceded by SF #)	Objectives	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL	TIE(S) TO DFG STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	IMPLEMENTATION SCALE CRITERIA	TIME SCALE CRITERIA	FINANCIAL SCALE CRITERIA
<p><u>Unbudgeted obligations</u></p> <p><i>Moved goal 1 to Common Themes Table 7: Defining and Supporting Success</i></p>	<p>There is a disparity between desired and required outcomes and current funding levels - underfunded mandates</p>	<p>1. Better articulate/define DFG and F&GC programmatic outcomes, identify deliverables and define measures of success</p>	<p>Match DFG's activities with necessary funding</p>	<p>- Review and prioritize un or under- funded mandates. <i>How do you attempt to prioritize these?</i></p> <p>- Define what new mandates will look like when implemented and what they will cost to implement</p> <p>Feedback loop with legislature-- when a mandate is created there should be some feedback to the legislature on what the financial impacts are and what it would take to implement the mandate</p>				
<p>Alternative Revenue Sources (as opposed to general fund)</p> <p><i>Moved goal 2 to Common Themes Table 1: Partnerships</i></p>	<p>Lack of revenue</p>	<p>2. Ensure adequate and sustainable funding to achieve the programmatic objectives (and mandates)</p>						
	<p>""</p>	<p>""</p>	<p>Explore alternative revenue streams</p>	<p>- Review other states' successes and failures of creating alternative revenue streams</p> <p>o <u>Broad sales tax</u></p>				

Table 1: Revised Regulatory and Permitting Working Group Issues Framework								
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	Goal (Preceded by SF #)	Objectives	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL	TIE(S) TO DFG STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	IMPLEMENT- ATION SCALE CRITERIA	TIME SCALE CRITERIA	FINANCIAL SCALE CRITERIA
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>Sales tax on outdoor gear</u> o <u>Real estate transfer tax</u> o <u>Environmental license plate</u> o <u>Vehicle license fee</u> o <u>Retail water user fee</u> o <u>Landing tax expansion</u> <p>- California State Parks model (builds constituency, able to advocate)</p>				
	""	""	Consider/analyze other states' methods of developing additional funding sources as possible options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —Broad sales tax —Sales tax on outdoor gear —Real estate transfer tax —Environmental license plate —Vehicle license fee —Retail water user fee - Landing tax expansion 				
			Attempt to implement based on the analysis					
Moved this objective to Common Themes Table 1: Partnerships	""	""	(adopt) Establish more financial partnerships with federal government, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), private sector and other states.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partner with private sector, non-profits, NGOs, to manage DFG lands (e.g. AB 42, Huffman) - Leverage existing programs or partnerships - Create California State Parks Foundation model of dedicated supporters - Ensure firewalls are in place to prevent image of undue influence 				

Table 1: Revised Regulatory and Permitting Working Group Issues Framework								
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	Goal (Preceded by SF #)	Objectives	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL	TIE(S) TO DFG STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	IMPLEMENT- ATION SCALE CRITERIA	TIME SCALE CRITERIA	FINANCIAL SCALE CRITERIA
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify additional federal matching grant funding opportunities (e.g. Fisheries Restoration Grant Program) - Maximize in-kind contributions - Federal loan of personnel to DFG 				
<p>Finding ways to fund programs or projects that benefit a subset of the overall population:</p> <p>One way to fund is Fees</p> <p>Another way is to utilize volunteer administered programs</p>	Existing fees do not always cover the full cost of programs (do we have any metrics on this?)	3. Ensure adequate and sustainable funding to achieve the programmatic objectives (and mandates)	Sustainable user based fee programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis of opportunities to adjust user-based fee structures - Align existing fee revenues with DFG priorities - Alternative revenue streams that could be substituted for commercial permits to promote sustainability (e.g. commercial fishing permits) - <u>Utilize volunteer administered programs</u> - Assessment of fees that are collected and establish an open process for determining fees, process should include: - Assessment of cost for efficient programs - Define benefits of programs and who receives benefits (i.e. permit applicant, broader public) 				
Flexibility in funding	Groups lobby the legislature to secure DFG funding and budget allocations to particular projects/ initiatives. This creates an inability to change	4. Increase/encourage fiscal flexibility where appropriate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identifying where this is appropriate and where it is not. 	Establish fiscal flexibility to track changing priorities over time. Balance flexibility with accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create standardized policy for revenue collected for a specific use/delivery of service (e.g., level necessary to make a dedicated account cost effective) - Improve transparency of budgets and actions to reduce pressure for dedicated accounts 				

Table 1: Revised Regulatory and Permitting Working Group Issues Framework								
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	Goal (Preceded by SF #)	Objectives	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL	TIE(S) TO DFG STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	IMPLEMENT- ATION SCALE CRITERIA	TIME SCALE CRITERIA	FINANCIAL SCALE CRITERIA
	funding allocations as priorities shift.	- Increasing accountability						
Improve Efficiencies	DFG operations and program management are not always efficient or as effective as possible.	5. Better articulate/define DFG and F&GC programmatic outcomes, identify deliverables and define measures of success	Manage programs and available resources efficiently and effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use technology to improve efficiencies (tease out permit effectiveness and monitoring) - Create work plans and targets for staff - Use performance based management and/or performance based budgeting 				
			Integration between headquarter and region to improve operational costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve communication to ensure regions and headquarters are working towards the same goal and not duplicating efforts 				
			Improve integration between DFG and other state or federal agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish financial partnerships - Build synergies on joint efforts to achieve like goals 				
Trust and Transparency Moved goal 6 to Common Theme Table 2: Decision-Making	Lack of trust between stakeholders and DFG (and within DFG)	6. Better articulate/define DFG and F&GC programmatic outcomes, identify deliverables and define measures of success	Improve accountability and transparency of programs and budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New component drill – outputs and outcomes - Utilize information generated from identifying opportunities to leverage additional funding to improve efficiencies and effectiveness - Consider creating advisory committees for more DFG programs (create these a possible process to analyze existing/new mandates and what program delivery should look like) 				