

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

Possible future agenda item/presentation/discussion – analysis of Prop 26 – fees and direct benefit definition?

“Paying for pollution” by UCLA – on the website background information page under submitted comments. AG’s office was doing a follow up analysis; if available the working group would like access to any report.

Vision – where do we want the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC) to be in future?

Goals – how can we achieve this vision, what should we pursue?

**1) Establish Sustainable Funding Stream through public recognition of DFG’s role in protecting public trust resources and identify broad based funding sources**

Notes:

- Consider public providing resources for the special benefits
- Links to how do you communicate the benefit to the public, especially when they benefit indirectly
  - a. Look at 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). See the submitted documents section of website for a number of resources, including the University of Michigan’s [“Investing in Wildlife: State Wildlife Funding Campaigns”](#) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s [“Broadening Constituencies of State Fish and Wildlife Agencies.”](#)
  - b. Fees to fully recover costs of uses of DFG lands and services (e.g. filming commercials)
    - i. Recognizing certain fees will be complicated or difficult 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 (possibly 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, non-governmental organizations)
    - 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 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to manage DFG’s lands

- v. Financial/supporting partnerships (ensure proper firewalls to prevent image of undue influence)
- vi. Federal position funding option
  - Federal loan of personnel to DFG (the 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

Notes: What would the vision be?

Example: Managing programs and available resources more efficiently and effectively

- An organization that efficiently and effectively utilizes available/adequate resources.
- Adequate resources to achieve the mission
- Possibly combine #2 and #3 – programs and operations streamlined to be most effective and efficient

F&GC and DFG – separate funding and budget in the future?

- a. Costs of doing business
  - i. Statutory overhead rates
  - ii. Local fees and assessments related to DFG's land ownership
    - Mosquito abatement
    - Dam inspections
    - Water fees
    - Payments in lieu of taxes
- b. Science – ensure integrated science programs 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 to ensure efficient use of resources
- e. Statewide consistent enforcement – example of fish and game code...while still providing flexibility for the diverse state
  - i. Should not be selective enforcement
  - ii. One size does not fit all
  - iii. Example is design the program to match the resources protected in the region

## 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)
  - iii. Balance flexibility with accountability
- 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 and/or 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 the DFG and with other agencies)

**Volunteers for Next Round of Revisions**

Zeke Grader, Noelle Cremer, Curtis Knight