

Eileen Reynolds, Tejon Ranch

We seemed to have universal agreement that, in addition to increased training of DFG personnel, work plans and performance reviews are a good idea. I don't see that reflected in the notes.

Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League

Clarification on Dept. organization:

Thanks for the opportunity to clarify the recommendation to shift some personnel currently in the Wildlife and Fisheries Division to the Ecosystem Conservation Division. The clarification is that this applies solely to personnel working on *non-hunted/non-fished* species.

Here's an example of the problem. The Ecosystem Conservation Division handles habitat planning and project permitting. A key species of concern here is the burrowing owl. Yet, the DFG personnel actually *responsible* for the burrowing owl reside in Wildlife and Fisheries. The Ecosystem personnels' decisions on the owl are *not* informed what is going on at Wildlife and Fisheries because these divisions are *functionally* separate. It makes more sense to shift those responsible for the burrowing owl to Ecosystem so that they can help handle the planning and permitting for this species. Note that the burrowing owl is not hunted. There is no real reason for it to be placed in Wildlife and Fisheries.

Another example is the speckled dace. This is a non-fished species housed in Fisheries and Wildlife yet Bay-Delta planning - which involves the speckled dace - goes on in Ecosystem.

In addition, budget-wise, Wildlife and Fisheries is funded under Program 25 - Hunting, Fishing, and Public Use, which derives revenues from fees for hunting and fishing. At least conceptually, these fees should support hunted and fished species. (Ecosystem Conservation is Program 20 - Biodiversity Conservation.)

Finally, the work in Wildlife and Fisheries is primarily harvest-related rather than overall habitat management. Indeed, game species are often poor indicators of ecosystem health (e.g., deer) and should not guide ecosystem management.

I should have been clearer as to which personnel were being recommended for shifting and sorry for the confusion (though people may still disagree with the recommendation, of course!). I hope the recommendation makes more sense now than before. Please circulate as appropriate and stakeholders are free to contact me (if OK under the various laws, of course).

David Fuller, U.S. Bureau of Land Management

From my perspective the bulk of the issues that were discussed are either a direct or secondary effect of a long-term lack of funding for the Department of Fish and Game. I think it is great that one of the workgroups established clear definitions of "unfunded mandate" and "underfunded mandate" which makes it possible to move forward and gather together lists of mandates that are either unfunded or underfunded. This could

help clarify the current status of the Department and inform the strategic vision. I appreciate the comment that one of the stakeholder members made about structuring the Department in a way that reflects what the citizens of the state are willing to pay for - although I do not completely agree with this comment it is worthy of further discussion. One additional comment regarding funding: in my contact with Department staff I have seen a negative effect on staff morale after years and years of dealing with the on- the-ground effects of unfunded and underfunded mandates -- the cumulative effects have been taxing on Department staff.