

**California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project**  
**Natural Resources and Stewardship Working Group Issues Framework**  
*Revised October 24, 2011*

All items highlighted in grey have been moved to the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission and Stakeholder Advisory Group common themes document dated October 24, 2011; the highlighted items remain in this document to help provide a record of from where information was gathered and the context within which it was developed. For the draft interim strategic vision, staff recommends that highlighted goals be removed from this document and retained only in the common themes document. A previous version of the table is included (see Table 3) to allow comparison to the last version released to the public, dated October 17, 2011.

<b>Table 1: Revised Natural Resources Stewardship Working Group Issues Framework</b>							
<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>PROBLEM(S)</b>	<b>GOAL(S) Preceded by NRS #)</b>	<b>EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL</b>	<b>TIE(S) TO DFG STRATEGIC INITIATIVES</b>	<b>IMPLEMENT- ATION SCALE CRITERIA</b>	<b>TIME SCALE CRITERIA</b>	<b>FINANCIAL SCALE CRITERIA</b>
Overarching/Big/ Broad issue:	The California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) is not meeting its mission.	1. DFG mission: The mission of the DFG is to manage California's diverse fish, wildlife and plant resources and the habitats upon which they depend for their ecological values and for their use and enjoyment by the public.					
Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and Fish and Game Commission (F&GC)  <i>Goal 2 moved to Common Themes Table 7: Defining and Supporting Success</i>	Sustainable resource stewardship is challenged by escalating and increasingly complex at times conflicting societal needs/wants.	2. Sustainable (healthy and vibrant) natural resources stewardship by maintaining and protecting current and future public benefits from California's ecological (or natural) heritage, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring ecological integrity now and into the future</li> <li>• Conserving species and features of particular priority or concern</li> <li>• Ensuring adequate water &amp; stream flow of sufficient quality for state&amp; federal trust resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use ecosystem based management</li> <li>• Implement Effective and efficient actions</li> <li>• Have the same overall mission for DFG and F&amp;GC-should have the same overall mission.</li> </ul>				

Table 1: Revised Natural Resources Stewardship Working Group Issues Framework							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S) Preceded by NRS #)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL	TIE(S) TO DFG STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	IMPLEMENT- ATION SCALE CRITERIA	TIME SCALE CRITERIA	FINANCIAL SCALE CRITERIA
<p>What are the attributes of natural resource stewardship?</p> <p><b>Moved to Common Themes Table 7: Defining and Supporting Success</b></p>	<p>Use and enjoyment versus ecological values</p> <p>Sustainable resource stewardship is challenged by escalating and increasingly complex times conflicting societal needs/wants.</p>	<p>3. Attributes: (could separate these onto one line each and list specific action items for each)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Maintenance of Sustain</u> biodiversity</li> <li>• <u>Maintenance of Sustain</u> appropriate trophic levels</li> <li>• Sustain native species and their habitats and avert their extinction</li> <li>• Adaptively manage fish, wildlife and plant resources for their ecological values</li> <li>• <u>Maintain-Promote</u> resilient and healthy ecosystems and the services they provide.</li> <li>• Support use and enjoyment of the resources by the public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Balance development/ecosystem services with natural resources goals/stewardship.</li> <li>• Natural resources when sustained provide ecological values.</li> <li>• <u>Reach out to the scientific community for assistance in designing management plans and conducting environmental reviews</u></li> </ul>				
<p><b>Integrated Resource Management (IRM)</b> is an approach for <u>conducting</u> natural resource stewardship as described above. The Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources has defined IRM as:</p> <p><i>“A planning and decision making process that coordinates resource use so that the long-term sustainable benefits are optimized and conflicts among users are minimized. IRM brings together all resource groups rather than each working in isolation to balance the economic, environmental, and social requirements of society.”</i></p>							
<p><b>Integrated Resource Management</b> recognizes that no one agency (including DFG</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncoordinated resource governance and responsibilities among numerous federal, tribal,</li> </ul>	<p>4. <u>Use existing organizational structures among resource management agencies and organizations to:</u></p>	<p><u>Opportunities that can be leveraged:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growing <u>recognition-acceptance</u> of IRM approach</li> <li>• Collaborative planning efforts <u>are</u> having</li> </ul>				

Table 1: Revised Natural Resources Stewardship Working Group Issues Framework							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S) Preceded by NRS #)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL	TIE(S) TO DFG STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	IMPLEMENT- ATION SCALE CRITERIA	TIME SCALE CRITERIA	FINANCIAL SCALE CRITERIA
<p>or F&amp;GC) has sufficient responsibility, authority, expertise, or resources to ensure natural resource stewardship throughout California</p> <p><b>Moved goal 4 to Common Themes Table 3: Integrated Resource Management</b></p> <p><b>Moved goal 4 to Common Themes Table 2: Decision-Making</b></p> <p><b>Moved goal 4 to Common Themes Table 1: Partnerships</b></p>	<p>state &amp; local agencies and organizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unaligned patchwork of resource planning, policies &amp; regulations</li> <li>Inadequate sharing of data, information &amp; knowledge (silos)</li> <li>Duplication of effort, expertise &amp; resources</li> <li>Unintended consequences from mismatching or conflicting policies or regulations</li> <li>Focus on single purpose or single species projects</li> <li>Inadequate partnerships among federal, tribal, state, local, private &amp; non-profit organizations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve communication, coordination &amp; collaboration</li> <li>Align resource planning, policies &amp; regulations for aquatic, terrestrial &amp; marine ecosystems (and associated land, watershed &amp; coastal management)</li> <li>Share processes, tools, data, information, knowledge &amp; expertise</li> <li>Find collaborative, place-based solutions based on best available science and traditional knowledge</li> <li>Focus on ecosystem-scale, multi-benefit resource stewardship programs to solve multiple resource issues</li> <li><b>Leverage-Promote, encourage and support</b> public-private partnerships to advance all aspects of natural resource stewardship (planning, project implementation, financing, monitoring, data collection &amp; exchange, analytical methods &amp; tools, research, technology, and science)</li> </ul>	<p>successful outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater efficiencies <b>are being realized</b> by sharing information, expertise &amp; resources across organizations</li> <li>Numerous emerging multi-agency collaboratives/venues <b>that</b> are acting as integrators</li> </ul> <p><b>Leverage-Support and participate in multi-agency collaboratives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic Growth Council</li> <li>California Biodiversity Council</li> <li>Ocean Protection Council</li> <li>CA Landscape Conservation Cooperative</li> <li>Delta Stewardship Council</li> <li>Water Plan State Agency Steering Committee</li> <li>Conservancies</li> <li>Resource conservation districts</li> <li>Integrated regional water management groups</li> <li>Regional blueprint planning groups</li> <li>Others</li> </ul> <p><b>A next step to Integrate the Integrators, (with DFG and F&amp;GC participation):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct intensive workshop(s) to describe existing challenges, lessons learned, common ground, overlaps, conflicts, drivers &amp; trends, and potential responses/solutions</li> <li>Develop joint IRM action plan describing ways</li> </ul>				

Table 1: Revised Natural Resources Stewardship Working Group Issues Framework							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S) Preceded by NRS #)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL	TIE(S) TO DFG STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	IMPLEMENT- ATION SCALE CRITERIA	TIME SCALE CRITERIA	FINANCIAL SCALE CRITERIA
			<p>to align resource planning, policies &amp; regulations; to share people, processes &amp; tools; and if needed to make minor organizational improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Execute IRM memorandum of agreement among integrators to implement the joint IRM action plan</li> </ul> <p><b>Other actions to promote IRM:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In partnership, DFG and F&amp;GC lead preparation and periodic updates of a strategic "California Biodiversity Plan" or "California Natural Resource Plan" [similar to the California Water Plan]. Plan could incorporate other DFG and F&amp;GC plans (like the Wildlife Action Plan), and would be informed by related state, federal, tribal and local companion resource plans. As a strategic plan, it would include findings and recommendations in the form of a vision, goals, guiding principles, objectives, actions, and an implementation/finance plan.</li> <li>DFG and F&amp;GC are active participants in future updates of the Environmental Goals &amp; Policy Report (EGPR)</li> <li>DFG regional offices set regional resource management priorities and implement actions in concert with local/regional resource professionals and landowners</li> <li>DFG and F&amp;GC partner with tribal governments and utilize and support their</li> </ul>				

Table 1: Revised Natural Resources Stewardship Working Group Issues Framework							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S) Preceded by NRS #)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL	TIE(S) TO DFG STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	IMPLEMENT- ATION SCALE CRITERIA	TIME SCALE CRITERIA	FINANCIAL SCALE CRITERIA
			written integrated resource management plans and documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFG and F&amp;GC partner with resource users, including industry in both field research and resource management</li> <li>• DFG and F&amp;GC support and expand "advanced mitigation" programs at state and local levels in support of IRM projects</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Theme: Partnerships -- Use partnerships extensively to maximize program development and delivery</b></p>							
<b>Partnerships</b> Moved goals 5 and 6 to Common Themes Table 1: Partnerships	Limited staff to build community partnerships.	5. Facilitate collaboration amongst co-managers and partners to conserve, restore, and manage natural resources.  6. Continue working with consumptive users in their support via purchasing licenses and stamps, as well as fundraising.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designate staff to participate in regional planning efforts like IRWMs</li> <li>• Increase use of natural resources agreements (e.g., Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement)</li> </ul>				
<b>Partnerships</b> Moved goals 7 and 8 to Common Themes Table 1: Partnerships	There currently are obstacles to implementing conservation projects on private land: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of clear species/area priorities</li> <li>• Cumbersome and expensive permits</li> </ul>	7. Collaborative processes that combine the regulatory agencies with landowners and conservation organizations (e.g., Lower Butte Creek Project)  8. Partners in Restoration Program (Sustainable Conservation and Resource Conservation Districts) needs to be implemented on a					

Table 1: Revised Natural Resources Stewardship Working Group Issues Framework							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S) Preceded by NRS #)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL	TIE(S) TO DFG STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	IMPLEMENT- ATION SCALE CRITERIA	TIME SCALE CRITERIA	FINANCIAL SCALE CRITERIA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient staff</li> </ul> (Insufficient community outreach)	larger level 9. Working landscapes concept					

Table 2: Items to Potentially Move to Other Working Group(s) [The TOOLS described in this table could be considered by other working groups. The tools can be considered specific tactics to help achieve larger goals described above.]							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL				
<b>Theme: Tools to Promote Natural Resource Stewardship</b>  <b>A) Enforcement</b> [The Enforcement Tool is related to the Regulatory & Permitting WG]  <i>Moved this goal to Common Themes Table 5: Staff Development and Common Themes Table 4: Compliance</i>	Staff not able to enforce regulations; improvement and standardization of enforcement methods is needed	Provide sufficient funding to attract, maintain adequate enforcement branch	Seek additional funding				
	Need to better address resource concerns and damage (e.g., chemical poisoning to wildlife, safety issues for hunters) related to		Change the way management is funded, from focus on number of plants eradicated to eradication and restoration				

<b>Table 2: Items to Potentially Move to Other Working Group(s)</b> [The TOOLS described in this table could be considered by other working groups. The tools can be considered specific tactics to help achieve larger goals described above.]							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL				
	the proliferation of marijuana on public lands, in partnership with other land managers.						
<b>Tools</b> <b>B) Licenses</b> [The Licenses and Fees Tools are related to the Regulatory and Permitting WG and the Funding WG]	Fiscal accountability: DFG needs more efficient fiscal accountability related to revenue received from resource users (e.g. licenses, landing taxes, permits etc.).  [This isn't stated as a problem. What are we trying to solve with fiscal accountability?]	Improve accounting system to enable it to track funding income and outgo (e.g., by species complex) so that resource users can see how much is required and how the funding is expended.					
<b>Tools</b> <b>C) Fees</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lake and Streambed Alteration Program fees are an issue</li> <li>- Fiscal accountability is needed related to fees, including dedicated funding vs general fund.</li> <li>- Appropriate fee setting process is needed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Programmatic permits for stream rehabilitation (e.g., Marin Resource Conservation District)</li> <li>- Improve accounting system to enable it to track funding income and outgo (e.g., by species complex) so that resource users can see how much is required and how the funding is expended.</li> </ul>					
<b>Tools</b> <b>D) Communication &amp; Outreach</b> [The Communication & Outreach Tool is covered by CEO WG]	Insufficient outreach to the community related to conservation on private lands.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leverage existing networks/relationships</li> <li>- Network at local, regional, state level.</li> </ul>					
<b>Tools</b> <b>E) Regulations</b> [The Regulation and	Inter-agency coordination is needed regarding regulations, including contradictory requirements (e.g., Water	Review the DFG code and coordinate it with other entities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revise the Fish &amp; Game Code and Title 14 Regulations</li> <li>- Adopt DFG Strategic Plan Initiative 5 priorities</li> </ul>				

<b>Table 2: Items to Potentially Move to Other Working Group(s)</b> [The TOOLS described in this table could be considered by other working groups. The tools can be considered specific tactics to help achieve larger goals described above.]							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL				
Permits Tools are related to the Regulatory and Permitting WG] <i>Moved this goal to Common Themes Table 6: Fish and Game Code</i>	Rights Laws).						
<b>Tools</b> <b>F) Permits</b>	Permits are cumbersome, expensive and time consuming and need to be streamlined for natural resource programs.	Develop smart permitting system (e.g., the system should know the difference between a highway project and a restoration project). [This is a specific example. The goal should be something along the lines of “reform the permitting system to make it more responsive to DFG’s major substantive goals and legal requirements.” Specific examples could be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Develop or procure smart permitting software that does x, y, and z</li><li>• Streamline the scientific collection permitting process to provide for x, y, and z]</li></ul>	Streamline scientific collection permitting process (Isn’t this already being considered? Is it duplicative)				
<b>Tools</b> <b>F) Permits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Fully protected species status makes it nearly impossible to do conservation projects for fully protected or other protected species</li> <li>– [Is the problem that “fully protected status for many species can make it difficult to prioritize when developing conservation plans or conducting</li> </ul>	Coordinate permitting regulations with other agencies					

<b>Table 2: Items to Potentially Move to Other Working Group(s)</b> [The TOOLS described in this table could be considered by other working groups. The tools can be considered specific tactics to help achieve larger goals described above.]							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL				
	conservation projects?” Or is the problem that “fully protected status for many species can introduce to conflicting demands or requirements on the same places and people.”] – Insufficient staffing to process permits						
<b>Tools</b> <b>G) Incentives</b> [The Incentives Tool is related to Sustainable Financing WG]	– Need to build trust – Barriers to conservation easements presented by DFG policies (contracting and wage and labor requirements and overall expense of compliance requirements) – Prompt payment issues; sometimes reimbursements take over a year – Need for a functioning Safe Harbor Program, which is currently not well used – Improvements are needed to the FRGP (Fisheries Restoration Grant Program): Awards under take too long to for effective implementation; there is a lack of clear project prioritization, and a lack of funding for monitoring.		– For barriers: Ecosystem services markets promise to provide restoration projects up and down the state, fulfilling DFG’s mission. – For FRGP: Large FRGP projects need to be factored in to receive some funding to move the planning process forward and start gathering needed monetary support to actually move projects into implementation. Dedicated funding needs to be established for monitoring.				
<b>Tools</b> <b>H) Funding</b> [The Funding Tool is related to Sustainable Financing WG]	Lack of sufficient funding for long-term basic management and maintenance.	Develop broad-based funding streams that include general public as well as resource users.					

<b>Table 2: Items to Potentially Move to Other Working Group(s)</b> [The TOOLS described in this table could be considered by other working groups. The tools can be considered specific tactics to help achieve larger goals described above.]							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL				
<b>Tools H) Funding</b>	Unfunded mandates.	Require new mandates to be fully funded as a condition for approval.					
<b>THEME: Science and Technology</b> [The Science and Technology Tools are being considered by the Science WG]	Need to integrate multi-disciplinary approach to science-based resource management	Develop a science & biostatistical committee, including population biology, ecology, oceanography economics and social sciences to review and advise DFG and Commission on ‘best available science’ [Developing an advisory group is one way to achieve a specific goal of including sound, independent science in informing management decisions. HOW this body is used is critical - forming the body is not the end point. a problem statement. Should this be “Many outside parties see DFG’s use of science as difficult to understand.” The goal would then be “promote transparency and accessibility with respect to DFG’s requests for and use of science to inform management decisions”]	Science advisers to DFG, F&GC, must include independent experts in economics and the social sciences as well as ecology and population biology, etc. (workgroup should focus on DFG and F&GC)				
<b>Science and Technology</b>	Political implications – Ensure that science conclusions are not “dictated” by policy-makers	Establish mechanism to separate science findings from policy decisions	Fix institutional impediments between good science and outcomes (e.g. establish an independent science & biostatistical committee to peer review and advise on ‘best available science’)				
<b>Science and Technology</b>	Transparency and accessibility	Establish separate ‘research unit’ within DFG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Establish clearer connections between science and agency decisions (e.g. establish an independent science &amp; biostatistical committee to review and advise on ‘best available science’)</li> <li>– Improve scientific support of harvest programs,</li> </ul>				

<b>Table 2: Items to Potentially Move to Other Working Group(s)</b> [The TOOLS described in this table could be considered by other working groups. The tools can be considered specific tactics to help achieve larger goals described above.]							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL				
			ocean conservation, and measuring climate change effects				
<b>Science and Technology</b>	<p>DFG authority and expertise to conduct science-based management of marine resources needs to be restored.</p> <p>[This is not a problem statement. It's a goal that is better stated in the form of "seek the restoration of DFG's authority ..."</p> <p>What would the problem statement in this case be? That DFG lacks sufficient authority to conduct science-based management? Or that DFG lacks the human resources to conduct science, reach out consistently to the scientific community for help, etc.? Or both?]</p>	Partner with resource users, universities, Tribes, other agencies, etc. (i.e. memoranda of understanding).					
<b>Science and Technology</b>	There is a need for increased use of spatial tools.		Support and expand use of GIS tools such as Marine Map.				
<b>Science and Technology</b>	There is a need for data and technology to be accessible to the general public.	Establish methods, guidelines and policies for collecting, analyzing and archiving data and other information generated by research, monitoring and modeling efforts by DFG personnel	Integrate methods, guidelines and policies with other scientific data archives, to the extent possible.				
<b>Science and Technology</b>	There is a need to build on existing tools						

<b>Table 3: The IRM and Partnership sections in this table are from the October 11, 2011 version and are replaced with Table 1.</b>							
<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>PROBLEM(S)</b>	<b>GOAL(S)</b>	<b>EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL</b>				
Theme: IRM or Partnerships	A patchwork of natural resource management by local, state and federal agencies that do not coordinate well with each other has created policies, regulations and planning that are not aligned. There is duplication of efforts/inefficient use of resources. There are also conflicts between agencies and answers are different depending on which agency you ask.	Integrate resource management	Partnerships, coordination, communication and funding should be geared toward success of the mission.  Highlight the different strengths of the various agencies.  To be successful is to know the strengths of each organization and capitalize on them.				
Example of specific problem and the options for solving it.	Water: Does DFG have its own water division or should it be an active participant in the water plan?						
<b>Theme: Integrated Resource Management (IRM) (species and habitat)</b>	DFG has difficulty maintaining basic resource conservation and management functions related to mission, due to a combination of factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Increased, non-prioritized responsibilities</li> <li>– Unfunded mandates</li> <li>– Overworked and under-available staff</li> <li>– Lack of sufficient funding for long-term basic management and maintenance</li> <li>– Multiple programs, too many within one agency, without clear vision or prioritization</li> </ul> Difficulty in maintaining conservation of species under requirements of various laws	Overarching: The mission of the department of Fish and Game is to manage California’s diverse fish, wildlife and plant resources and the habitats upon which they depend for their ecological values and for their use and enjoyment by the public.  (Define wildlife*)  Need the capacity to achieve the mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Provide adequate resources to DFG to achieve its goals.</li> <li>– DFG should develop a matrix of internal departments and external agencies w/ jurisdictions and responsibilities; identify who is doing what, identify duplications and overlaps, and streamline / integrate management policies. Then, with input from stakeholders, DFG employees and other state agencies, identify programs for which DFG should be the lead agency and programs for which it should be a consultant.</li> <li>– Give DFG the resources (funding and statutory mandate) to fully participate in existing local, regional, and statewide land planning efforts [e.g., California Biodiversity Council, Strategic Growth Council, Ocean Protection Council, landscape conservation cooperatives (LCCs), integrated resource watershed management plans (IRWMPs), Regional Blueprint</li> </ul>				

<b>Table 3: The IRM and Partnership sections in this table are from the October 11, 2011 version and are replaced with Table 1.</b>							
<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>PROBLEM(S)</b>	<b>GOAL(S)</b>	<b>EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL</b>				
	(e.g., SB X 1-2 , the CA Renewable Energy Resources Act)		Process from Caltrans and BTH, Western Regional Partnership, Joint Ventures], marine spatial planning and federal fishery/ecosystem management processes (including out-of-state travel).				
<b>IRM</b>	Too many responsibilities without funding to accomplish them.  What belongs elsewhere? What is appropriate / direct relation to the mission.	DFG has adequate resources to fulfill its mission.  DFG needs to focus its mission to conserve California’s resources in the interest of the public trust or receive sufficient funding to accomplish the expanded responsibilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Identify additional funding resources.</li> <li>– Consider broad-based funding from public at large to help conserve California’s natural resources</li> <li>– Evaluate overlap with other agencies to determine where functions can be parsed out.</li> </ul>	Also ties to Sustainable Financing Workgroup	Potentially statutory		
<b>IRM</b>  <b>Move to partnerships section</b>		Seek productive partnerships with common means and objectives to support the mission.  Capacity, willingness,  Dept is open and has ability to partner to achieve its goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Accountability for conservation outcomes</li> <li>– Partnerships with resource users, including industry, can and should include collaboration in both field research and management</li> <li>– Tribal resources could be leveraged for land, water, and marine management purposes</li> <li>– Need for assessment of values for ecological services and climate change</li> <li>– Collaborative prioritization of restoration needs/actions so that limited resources are most efficiently used</li> <li>– Employ traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) in management decisions (e.g., Karuk Tribe’s Ecological Resource Management Plan, fishermen’s ecological knowledge)</li> </ul>				
<b>IRM</b>	Resource management should be at the top, with the others supporting the goals – there is a need to do a gap analysis.	The funding needs to support the goals and mission – not the other way around.					

<b>Table 3: The IRM and Partnership sections in this table are from the October 11, 2011 version and are replaced with Table 1.</b>							
<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>PROBLEM(S)</b>	<b>GOAL(S)</b>	<b>EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL</b>				
		The mission is correct. The goals are that the dept is open, transparent, willing to work with others, creative, etc.					
<b>IRM</b>	The need to ensure there is adequate water of sufficient amount and quality for the full variety of state and federal trust resources requires working with multiple water-management related agencies.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fully fund the unfunded instream flow study requirements of Public Resources Code 10000</li> <li>- Give DFG the resources (funding and statutory mandate) to fully participate in the existing water plan process.</li> <li>- Facilitate, prioritize, and empower DFG to enforce existing Fish and Game Code provisions that address water (e.g., Section 5937).</li> </ul>				
<b>IRM</b>	Integration of policies and agency jurisdiction (state and federal) is needed to achieve better science-based approach and management efficiency (e.g., integration between Marine Life Management Act and Marine Life Protection Act, MLPA), and between state and federal management (The MLPA is specific legislation (law) which does not consider subsistence needs; they aren't part of the law. Suggest that subsistence needs may need to be considered in designing MPAs as part of MLPA implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop a matrix re: who has responsibility for what resources – and who is doing what research and management activities – to foster increased communication and collaboration</li> <li>- Clarify what authorities can be delegated to whom</li> <li>- Clarify role of F&amp;GC versus DFG</li> <li>- Work with federal scientists in the CA Current Ecosystem Plan Development process to include the Southern CA Bight in the California Current Ecosystem Plan</li> <li>- DFG strategic plan should specifically address management of marine resources, and integrate fishery management w/ ecosystem management</li> <li>- DFG should collaborate with NMFS on state/federal fishery/ecosystem management science &amp; policies</li> </ul>				
<b>IRM</b>	DFG is challenged with meeting its land management responsibility, including lack of resources for managing the land it owns, yet	Land management should be in partnership with local communities (e.g., grazing leases) or other					

<b>Table 3: The IRM and Partnership sections in this table are from the October 11, 2011 version and are replaced with Table 1.</b>							
<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>PROBLEM(S)</b>	<b>GOAL(S)</b>	<b>EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL</b>				
	continues to try to acquire more land without identifying funding sources to manage new land	partners					
<b>IRM</b>	There is a need to identify a structure and process for building and managing a biodiversity conservation strategy for California.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Management focus: the whole ecosystem rather than by individual species, issue type,</li> <li>– Identify ecosystem services functions,</li> <li>– Ensure resource sustainability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Clarify and prioritize state natural resource management issues</li> <li>– Work in partnership with other state, county, and federal agencies and the California Biodiversity Council to build a “California Biodiversity Plan”) (e.g, like the California Water Plan)</li> <li>– Consider subsistence needs within the Marine Life Protection Act</li> </ul>				
<b>IRM</b>	Differences in the responsibilities between DFG and F&GC that have developed over time have created coordination and efficiency problems		First determine DFG’s responsibilities and then coordinate with F&GC’s responsibilities				
<b>IRM</b>	Need to maintain and increase implementation of IRM	Continue to implement IRM in conjunction with Department of Conservation Watershed Program and Dept of Water Resources IRWMPs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Example: meadow restoration in the Sierra Nevada</li> <li>– DFG should jointly identify California Species of Conservation Concern with partner agencies (e.g., U.S. Forest Service)</li> </ul>				
<b>IRM</b>	Need to prioritize DFG goals and responsibilities. DFG has multiple programs, too many within one agency, without clear vision or prioritization. Some programs duplicate those of other agencies.  DFG should focus on integrating roles among agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Clarify and prioritize DFG vision, goals and functions (e.g., land management, water management, marine management)</li> <li>– Separate out some of the missions (e.g., separate management from biological research, as U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Geological</li> </ul>	Clarify and prioritize state natural resource management issues				

Table 3: The IRM and Partnership sections in this table are from the October 11, 2011 version and are replaced with Table 1.							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL				
		Survey have done)					
IRM	There is a lack of clear qualifications and standards for appointments  <u>[What is the problem here?]</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Eliminate duplication between programs, projects, mandates</li> <li>– Use integrated approach for planning, management and policy across DFG</li> <li>– Address regional implementation and input (flexibility and autonomy) and role of headquarters to develop proposed outcome</li> <li>– Ensure an efficient, proactive and forward thinking agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Create clear standards for appointments</li> <li>– There is a need to include local DFG staff input when making decisions</li> </ul>				
IRM	DFG needs to improve fiscal accountability  <u>[Suggestion: Problem statement could be: “DFG has a reputation for poor fiscal accountability.”]</u>	Legislative oversight for private funding used for public resource management (manage perceptions)  <u>[Goal statements could then be: (1) improve fiscal accountability and (2) demonstrate improvements in accountability on a continuing basis”]</u>	Develop detailed accounting for revenues, expenditures by category				
IRM	Current names for DFG and F&GC do not accurately reflect expanded missions and responsibilities		Consider a new name for DFG and F&GC (e.g. California Fish and Wildlife Department and Commission)				
<b>Theme: Partnerships</b> <b>Leverage partnerships to maximize program development and</b>	There is a need for more coordination of restoration needs/efforts across various land and resources managers in the state.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Build collaboration at the statewide level on setting watershed restoration priorities for various species</li> <li>– Increase collaboration with other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– For increasing collaboration: Assess and build upon CALFED and the Little Hoover Commission.</li> <li>– For partnerships: Expedite processes to develop MOUs and receive research permits</li> </ul>				

Table 3: The IRM and Partnership sections in this table are from the October 11, 2011 version and are replaced with Table 1.							
ISSUE	PROBLEM(S)	GOAL(S)	EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL				
delivery  [This partnership problem and goal is covered in the IRM section above]		state and federal land (and marine resource) managers – Set regional priorities in concert with local resource professionals – Utilize, support and partner with written integrated resource management plans or similar documents from tribal governments – Partnerships with resource users, including industry, can and should include collaboration in both field research and management					
Partnerships	No staff to build community partnerships.	– Facilitate collaboration amongst co-managers and partners to conserve, restore, and manage natural resources. – Continue working with consumptive users in their support via purchasing licenses and stamps, as well as fundraising.	– <u>Designate</u> staff to participate in regional planning efforts like IRWMs – Increase use of natural resources agreements (e.g., Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement)				
Partnerships	There currently are obstacles to implementing conservation projects on private land: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of clear species/area priorities</li> <li>• Cumbersome and expensive permits</li> <li>• Insufficient staff</li> <li>• Insufficient community outreach)</li> </ul>	– Collaborative processes that combine the regulatory agencies with landowners and conservation organizations (e.g., Lower Butte Creek Project) – Partners in Restoration Program (Sustainable Conservation and Resource Conservation Districts) needs to be implemented on a					

<b>Table 3: The IRM and Partnership sections in this table are from the October 11, 2011 version and are replaced with Table 1.</b>							
<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>PROBLEM(S)</b>	<b>GOAL(S)</b>	<b>EXAMPLE(S) OF WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOAL</b>				
		larger level – Working landscapes concept					
<b>Partnerships</b>  <b>[Now covered in the CEO table]</b>	Staff needs to be part of the project formulation project and serve as partners in restoration projects rather than the red line that sends projects back  Perception of DFG in the community needs to be improved.	– Biologists and permitting staff should have training in communication skills and should be trained to work with the local public – Increase transparency and accountability – Legislative oversight for private funding used for public resource management processes (manage perceptions)					