

First Supplement to Memorandum 2013-11

Fish and Game Law (Proposed Organization of Code)

Earlier this month the staff contacted representatives of all of the stakeholder groups that had participated in the recent Fish and Game strategic visioning process, which was conducted by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency pursuant to Assembly Bill 2376 (Huffman) (2010). The staff invited those groups to join our mailing list, review our materials, and comment on any aspect of the study.

We have received our first stakeholder comment. Diane Pleschner-Steele wrote on behalf of the California Wetfish Producers Association. Her email is attached as an exhibit.

Ms. Pleschner-Steele feels strongly that the word “fish” should be included in the name of a recodified Fish and Game Code. In addition, she indicates general agreement with the recommendations made by staff in Memorandum 2013-11.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Hebert
Executive Director

Any California Law Revision Commission document referred to in this memorandum can be obtained from the Commission. Recent materials can be downloaded from the Commission’s website (www.clrc.ca.gov). Other materials can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s staff, through the website or otherwise.

The Commission welcomes written comments at any time during its study process. Any comments received will be a part of the public record and may be considered at a public meeting. However, comments that are received less than five business days prior to a Commission meeting may be presented without staff analysis.

**EMAIL FROM DIANE PLESCHNER-STEELE,
CALIFORNIA WETFISH PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION
(MARCH 12, 2013)**

I just scrolled through Memo 11 - proposed organization, and would like to submit an early comment on the following discussion:

Nonetheless, it may be that use of the word “fish” is valued as a matter of tradition or to emphasize an important constituency of the administering agencies. Removing the term from the title of the code or the name of the Department might be a controversial change for those reasons. Moreover, **the Legislature just took the opportunity to rename the Department and in doing so, chose to retain the word “fish.” The Commission should perhaps defer to that very recent decision.**

With all of that in mind, the Commission should consider changing the name of the code to “Fish and Wildlife Code.” **The staff invites public comment on the merits of doing so. Comment on whether the word “fish” needs to be retained would also be helpful.**

As a SAG member representing the lion’s share of the commercial fishing industry in CA, I strongly encourage you to follow the Legislature’s lead, based on consensus of the SAG, and retain the word “fish” in the title of the code, for all the positive reasons you enumerated. California’s fishing industry is among the top five in the nation, and its importance should continue to be recognized by the State, independently from wildlife.

Overall I can support the remainder of staff recommendations re: organization as logical and well-conceived. More comments will follow as I have time to peruse the rest of the documents.

Meantime, thanks very much for considering this plea for recognition.

Best,
d.

