

Prioritize “functions”; many “functions”, inadequate funding

Landowners: Who are the responsible parties?

- Better communication

- Trust issues

DFG set priorities re: land management

- Multiple departments and/or agencies; no single set of state priorities

Partners:

- Clear priorities

- Communicating them well with the partners who are well positioned to accomplish DFG’s priorities

- Partner with resource users as well as NGOs

Regulatory streamlining

Conservation project obstacles

- Lack of staff

- Lengthy permit process

- Sometimes costly permit process

Review of existing and potential fees to determine appropriateness; not just resource users but the general public

- Possible third party review

Ecosystem services affect a broad public sector

No one state agency has authority to manage state's nature resources

Coordination essential

50% direct federal; private lands;

Partnerships are important

Difficult for DFG and Commission to single-handedly manage

Identify other planning efforts – state, federal and others

Encourage to look at “The Future of Natural Resource Management” – integrated resource management

Funding, communications, outreach

Concern with unfunded mandate; need revenue stream

Easements versus purchase of lands

Science based versus political bases

Inland watershed ecosystems (Sierras) lead to marine ecosystem; interconnectedness

Look at administrative remedies; save legislation for “have to” items

How to ensure that the DFG and Commission are proactive versus reactive

Species management versus habitat management

Scientific collection process – revenue neutral, more effective

Accessibility of science information

Efficiency potential that data and scientific information is available –  
spatial management tool

- Easy access by general public

- Build on existing tools – marine life maps

Working landscape concept

- DOD lands are places for recovery of certain species

- Avoidance of future planning

- Sufficient funds to manage lands

Clearer guidelines on public-private partnerships

- Transparency

- Accountability

- Legislative oversight of the funding (perceptions)

- 1) Tribal rights – especially in regard to meeting subsistence needs within MLPA areas
- 2) Implementation of natural resource agreements that have been reached between diverse user groups; such as the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement and the Klamath Hydro-electric Agreement
- 3) Collaboration amongst co-managers and partners to conserve, restore, and manage natural resources; especially during time of limited financial resources
- 4) Collaborative prioritization of restoration needs/actions to conserve, restore and manage natural resources; especially during times of limited financial resources
- 5) Shared visions/goals for natural resource management so that limited resources are most efficiently used
- 6) Ecosystem, rather than singles species (typically ESA driven) management

- 
- a) Water Management and provision of water for fish and wildlife (e.g., in-stream flow, water acquisition)
  - b) Land Management including public uses, funding for long-term basic management and maintenance; invasive species
  - c) Marine Management including recreational and commercial harvest program management and delivery, marine life reserves, and ocean conservation