

Options for Fish and Game Commission Quorum

Option	Description	Pros	Cons & Action Items
1. Status Quo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request appointing organizations and Board members to fill vacant Commission appointments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires no action of the Board. No changes to current practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on past attendance this option may not solve the quorum problem into the future. Outside organizations must act to increase member attendance.
2. Reduce the number of meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Commission can meet annually or semi-annually. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less frequent meetings may increase attendance. Minimal modification of current practices. Support costs will be reduced with fewer meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on past attendance this option may not solve the quorum problem into the future. Outside organizations must act to increase member attendance.
3. Reduce the number of Commission members and amend membership appointment rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the membership from 12 to five members. Fewer members may result in more meetings where a quorum is achieved. All members would be appointed by the Board. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since 2011, Board appointees attended 71% of meetings. Outside appointees attend 55% of meetings. Appointees would be accountable directly to a member of the Board for attendance and participation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires significant structural change to the Commission. Reduces direct input on Commission affairs by the current six appointing organizations.
4. Modify the responsibilities or practices of the Commission requiring a quorum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay grant awards until a certain level of funding is achieved. Eliminate the Fish and Game Commission's recommendation for the expenditure of fine revenues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimize the need to achieve a quorum by modifying the Commission's responsibilities rather than try to increase attendance. Expenditure of fish and game fine revenues would not require the Commission to meet and prepare a recommendation to the Board. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces Commission responsibilities and input for the expenditure of fine revenues. Requires the development of a new procedure for the expenditure of fine revenues. Options include: funding the District Attorney for prosecution of fish and game crimes; grants may be allocated under Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund grant model.
5. Dissolve the Fish and Game Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State law does not require the County to create a Fish and Game Commission. Oversight and management of the Fish and Game Fund would be at the direction of the County Executive Officer under the direction of the Board of Supervisors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminates support costs for Commission activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminates the formal input from the Commission to the Board. Eliminates a forum for the public to address Fish and Wildlife issues. Requires the development of a new procedure for the expenditure of fine revenues. Options include: funding the District Attorney for prosecution of fish and game crimes; grants may be allocated under Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund grant model.