

**Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Stakeholder Advisory Group  
Natural Resource Stewardship Working Group  
Summary Notes  
August 23, 2011**

*Disclaimer: This summary is not meant to be the official meeting minutes. These notes were taken by a scribe that was in attendance at this meeting and summarizes the discussions to the best of the scribe's ability.*

1. Welcome
  - a. Working Group Structure:
    - i. These are not stand-alone working groups.
    - ii. It is expected that working groups will have discussions about cross-cut issues.
  - b. Name of working group discussion.
    - i. Program Director Carol Baker change name of group to Natural Resource Stewardship Working Group.
  - c. Schedule
    - i. Working group meetings weekly until late September.
2. Discussion of Group Structure and Need to Designate a Stakeholder Advisory Working Group Spokesperson
  - a. Spokesperson does not have to be present, but can attend discussions and brief via teleconference and/or webex.
  - b. Comment: opportunity for more than one spokesperson for different issues, and wait until discussions begin occurring.
3. Issues
  - a. What is the potential outcome for this process?
    - i. Ensuring resource sustainability.
    - ii. Create a plan that the legislature will be able to act on and accommodate.
    - iii. DFG become more connected to local communities and resource conservation districts.
    - iv. Improve communication for the sake of implementing local projects.
    - v. Tap into current networks to facilitate action on local level.
    - vi. Limit duplication between programs, projects, mandates.
    - vii. An integrated planning and management across the agency.

- viii. Regional implementation and input. Headquarters gives a proposed outcome, while regional offices are given freedom in how to implement programs to reach these outcomes.
  - ix. Clarification of the commission and department's roles.
  - x. Total resource management.
  - xi. Name change to Fish and Wildlife.
  - xii. Delegating authority of habitat and wildlife conservation with Fish and Game oversight.
  - xiii. Evolve department to reflect broader needs and issues that the department needs to address.
  - xiv. Consensus proposal in stakeholder recommendations, with a possible minority report.
  - xv. Fixing institutional impediments between good science and outcomes.
  - xvi. Clearer connections between science and agency decisions.
  - xvii. Efficiency and change towards forward-thinking.
  - xviii. Integration of policy.
  - xix. Using partners to help alleviate limited resources.
  - xx. Greater fiscal accountability.
  - xxi. Dedicated funding vs General Fund.
  - xxii. Greater partnerships with resource users.
- b. What are the threats to those outcomes?
- i. Funding.
    - 1. Proportional funding sources (sportsmen, commercial fishing unequally burdened).
  - ii. Time line, schedule
    - 1. Lack of specific goals
  - iii. Lack of consensus.
  - iv. Fish and Game has a reputation as an enforcer versus as a partner.
  - v. Clarity on process products
  - vi. Lack of integration of policy and science.
  - vii. Variety of interests involved will make consensus difficult.
  - viii. Micromanagement and less big picture ideas will hinder ability of legislature to act on these recommendations.
- c. What are the opportunities for this process?
- i. Financial efficiency.

- ii. Partnerships offer increased revenue increasing and cost saving opportunities
  - iii. Partnerships
  - iv. Time line can be used to establish milestones for different phases in working towards goals. Phase 1 for a draft. Phase 2 for polishing recommendations.
  - v. Be a leading working group to help hone other working groups' activities and direction.
  - vi. Identify companion federal and state plans.
  - vii. Identify current bodies that can assist Fish and Game with its communication to a large host of other councils, agencies and groups.
  - viii. Constitutional/Process reform and dedicated revenue stream.
  - ix. Delegating authority for habitat improvement and conservation goals.
  - x. Deeper understanding of Fish and Game's goal
  - xi. Evolve department to reflect broader needs and issues that the department needs to address.
  - xii. Restructure (with request for clarification).
  - xiii. New funding opportunities.
  - xiv. Natural Resources Stewardship working group should act as a focal point for recommendations.
- d. What are some solutions for dealing with those threats?
- i. Diversity
  - ii. Partnerships
  - iii. Utilizing existing planning efforts from the state and federal levels to help facilitate the process (i.e. the Strategic Growth Council, California Biodiversity Council, and the Blueprint Process, etc.).
  - iv. Use the Natural Resource Stewardship Working Group for directing the outcome of all working groups.
  - v. Two phases in order to address scheduling difficulties.
  - vi. Including the entire stakeholder advisory group in large group meetings so as to have all possible input.
  - vii. Consensus report, with minority report also presented to BRCC.

- viii. Recommendations that have agreement are put into plan, while disagreements take second stage.
- ix. Responsibility matrix to include prioritizing, headquarters, local and partner capabilities in aiding Fish and Game with these responsibilities.

#### 4. Public Comment

- a. Improve audio for teleconference and webex users.
  - b. Speaker:
    - i. Importance of Bagley-Keene and possible issues with the agenda and actionable items.
    - ii. Requests that actionable items be expressly listed in agenda, 10 days prior to meeting being held.
  - c. Speaker:
    - i. Is there a process for lengthier public comment in a written form?
      1. Answer: Exhibits or handouts must be given 5 days prior to meeting to be available to the group.
  - d. Speaker:
    - i. Webex is working for this user.
    - ii. Summary notes will be posted on website.
- #### 5. Other: Committee follow-up; future meetings
- a. Important to get out all of the issues for next week's meeting, then begin addressing solutions to underlying problems.
    - i. Tackle low-hanging fruit issues first, and then address deeper issues.
  - b. Phase 1: September goals
    - i. Initial draft of ideas.
  - c. Phase 2: End of year goals
    - i. Refining recommendations for presentation to Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission
  - d. Next Natural Resource Stewardship Working Group meeting, Tuesday August 30, 2011 1:00pm; Resources Building, Fish and Game Commission Conference Room. Room 1320.
  - e. Stakeholders Advisory Meeting Friday September 2, 2011 9:30am Resources Auditorium
  - f. Homework:

- i. Give/Send Carol Baker a hardcopy of issues you wish to present to your group or other working groups by Friday so the appropriate DFG employees can be available for your reference.
- ii. Suggested Readings:
  - 1. Previous Strategic Vision Plans for the Department of Fish and Game and the Fish and Game Commission.
  - 2. DFG Seven Strategic Initiatives
  - 3. AB 2376
  - 4. Legislative Analyst's Office July 21, 2011 report to the Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission (BRCC)
  - 5. July 21, 2011 stakeholder presentations made to BRCC (power points)
  - 6. July 21, 2011 BRCC archived video, overview of the Department of Fish and Game and Fish and Game Commission
  - 7. Documents can be found under "Reports" and archived video can be found under "Meetings" on the Vision website [www.vision.ca.gov](http://www.vision.ca.gov).
- g. Please RSVP to working group meetings by the Friday before the working group meeting.

*Meeting materials as presented by Kamyar Gitechchi for group reference: The Future of Natural Resource Management: A White Paper and Action Plan. December 2010.*