

## Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission

### STANDING COMMITTEES

August 2017

<u>COMMITTEE</u>	<u>MEMBERSHIP</u>	
<p><b><u>Executive</u></b> Review Commission operation, effectiveness, and rules affecting Commission function; lead the development of Director performance measures, and review budget, licensing issues and related matters.</p>	<p><b><u>Commission</u></b> Brad Smith (chair) Larry Carpenter Jay Kehne</p>	<p><b><u>Department</u></b> Jim Unsworth Joe Stohr  cc: Tami Lininger, FWC &amp; Irene Goldenberger, DO</p>
<p><b><u>Enforcement / Habitat</u></b> Review policy issues associated with the Enforcement Program and the regulatory aspects of the Habitat Program.</p>	<p><b><u>Commission</u></b> Brad Smith (chair) Barbara Baker Jay Kehne Bob Kehoe</p>	<p><b><u>Department</u></b> Jeff Davis- Habitat cc: Lynette Wickett, Habitat  Chris Anderson – Enforcement  cc: Layce Joanen</p>
<p><b><u>Marine &amp; Freshwater Fish</u></b> Review all marine and migratory species related fish conservation and management issues. Review all lake and resident stream fish conservation and management issues.</p>	<p><b><u>Commission</u></b> Larry Carpenter (chair) Bob Kehoe Dave Graybill Kim Thorburn</p>	<p><b><u>Department</u></b> Ron Warren  cc: Cathy Davidson, Fish</p>
<p><b><u>Wildlife &amp; Lands</u></b> Review all wildlife, hunting, recreation, access, damage and related issues. Review land acquisition, habitat management &amp; enhancement activities, potential income generation, relations/agreements with other landowners, easements, land exchanges &amp; related matters.</p>	<p><b><u>Commission</u></b> Jay Kehne (chair) Jay Holzmilller Kim Thorburn Barbara Baker</p>	<p><b><u>Department</u></b> Eric Gardner  cc: Chelsea Harris, Wildlife</p>
<p><b><u>Big Tent</u></b> Seeking common ground and promoting collaborative work among fishers, hunters, wildlife appreciators, and the conservation community.</p>	<p><b><u>Commission</u></b> Kim Thorburn (chair) Brad Smith Barbara Baker</p>	<p><b><u>Department</u></b> Nate Pamplin  cc: Tami Lininger</p>

## **COMMISSION COMMITTEES:** *(Updated Feb. 2007)*

The Commission establishes standing committees from time to time as well as ad hoc or special committees when the need arises. Committees are advisory in nature and do not set policy for the full Commission.

The Commission Chair, subject to Commissioner consensus, appoints members of committees. Appointments should be made in January of odd numbered years following election of the Commission Chair and otherwise only as necessary. Standing committees typically will include two (2) to four (4) Commission members. Committee members select the committee chair and vice chair, if necessary. Committees should meet as often as necessary, as determined by the committee chair or a majority of the committee members. The Commission Chair can also request a committee to meet. The Department shall designate a Department employee to facilitate the committee's work, including scheduling, keeping the committee apprised of relevant issues and coordinating staff or other presentations at committee meetings.

Within their purview, committees are to address issues brought by the Department, referred by the Commission or raised at the committee level. Items originating with the committee shall not involve or result in significant staff or committee time and effort until the committee has received Commission approval to proceed.

The purpose of established committees is to allow a more detailed analysis of issues than can be accomplished during regular Commission meetings. Committees are designed to provide a forum that allows for more informal discussion with staff, interested individuals or groups. Committees may evaluate issues to determine if the full Commission should hear and consider them. Committees should explore potential impacts of suggested policies or direction and when appropriate, explore alternatives.

Committee chairs shall provide regular reports, at scheduled Commission meetings, regarding the committees' activities. Such reports should include topics addressed, policy direction considered, alternatives explored and committee recommendations. Committees cannot make decisions binding on the Commission. Rather, committee decisions or agreements are merely recommendations for full Commission consideration or action at open public meetings.

**NOTE:** If the committee process is to work effectively, it is absolutely critical that there be a considerable level of trust among and between Commission members. Committee makeup should include, where possible, members with diverse views. Committee members need to be willing to consider various proposed alternatives or directions. The Commission must have faith that the committees will examine details, ramifications and alternatives, and present the committee views fairly and completely to the Commission.

If the necessary level of trust does not exist, it will result in the full Commission making its own evaluation. This will render the committee's work and time of little value. This does not imply that the Commission should not ask questions to understand the issues. However, if the committee work is replicated at the Commission level, it will negate the need and usefulness of the committee structure.

# WASHINGTON FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSION COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND PROCESS OPTIONS

10/2/17 draft

Option	Pros	Cons
<p><b>1. Status Quo - Closed Committee Meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As per Rules of Procedure, page 10 (Updated 2007)</li> <li>• 4 Commissioners and staff only. No other Commissioners or members of the public allowed to be present</li> <li>• Committee recommendations brought forward for Commission vote</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows for full discussion of sensitive issues between Committee Members and staff</li> <li>• Reduced workload for the full Commission</li> <li>• Allows some processing of problem statement and development of recommendation for solutions prior to full FWC meeting</li> <li>• Sets benchmark of low staff workload: no work needed to comply with OPMA requirements, allows for less formal preparation and more casual presentations to Committee Members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less transparency to the public</li> <li>• Limits awareness of most Commissioners to the issue and may result in less than full discussion during FWC meeting</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Open Committee Meetings to the Public.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain maximum of 4 Commissioners as voting Committee Members but allow public/other Commissioners in audience</li> <li>• All other Committee protocols are the same as Option 1 – Status Quo</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows for full transparency with public on the basis of Commissioner understanding of issues and recommendations to the full Commission</li> <li>• Allows interested Commissioners not on the Committee to hear the discussion</li> <li>• Allows some processing of problem statement and development of recommendation prior to full FWC meeting</li> <li>• More streamlined agenda for FWC meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May inhibit full discussion of sensitive issues</li> <li>• Additional staff work to support committee e.g. availability of materials under discussion, responding to questions/concerns, explaining status of decision making process</li> <li>• Additional Committee members time for longer meetings</li> <li>• Additional costs for meeting rooms, etc.</li> </ul>

# WASHINGTON FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSION COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND PROCESS OPTIONS

10/2/17 draft

Option	Pros	Cons
<p><b>3. Closed Committee Meetings with Mandatory Committee Reports</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status quo but individual Committees report out to the full Commission and develop “operating principles” or charter for each Committee (topic scope, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Option 1</li> <li>• Increased awareness of public and full Commission to Committee issues under review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved but not full transparency;</li> <li>• Improved Commission awareness but potentially still limiting a complete understanding of non-Committee Members prior to a FWC discussion</li> <li>• Requires effort to assure sufficient agenda time is available for reports to occur</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. No Committee Meetings</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full transparency of Commission deliberations and decisions</li> <li>• Less staff work at Committee meetings</li> <li>• All Commissioners receive same interpretation and participation in policy development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More staff work for full FWC meeting and as staff members reach out to Commission members individually to apprise them of sensitive issues</li> <li>• Some Commission agenda items will require more time for resolution</li> </ul>