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A. Major Repeated Themes Raised in the Discussion. A grouping of ideas repeated with some frequency in the session and brought up again during the group summation process. Also includes diverging views and/or questions about the topic.

- Look at things from a big picture and shared vision  
  - Longer timelines  
  - More reality and honesty in shared vision  
  - Watershed perspectives  
- Need adaptive management  
  - There because we want government to be flexible  
  - Successful at the site level- Ex. Walla Walla watershed  
- Recognize site or regional specific needs  
- Patience, honesty, reality  
- Certainty critical to keep people at table.  
- Have clear authorities – roles and responsibilities identified  
- Minimize risk to keep people at the table  
  - Particularly with institutions- politics, regulations  
- Treat all partners as equals (a basic ground rule)  
  - Say it because it antithetical to the normal  
- Be results focused  
- Be clear with regulations and regulatory standards and all must understand and follow rules- the regulated and the administration  
  - Hold decision-makers accountable  
- Unintended consequences need to be considered and identified upfront (alternative view was that unintended consequences are not unintended b/c someone in policy wanted those outcomes- want to regulate what people are doing- Ex. SCS to NRCS  
- Changes of administration forces the collaborative process to start all over again.

B. National-level Practical Actions that could be taken by the Federal government, national NGO’s, and other national organizations. Diverging views and/or questions are also noted.

- Treat all partners as equals  
- Have incentives to bring people to the table  
- Need a culture change within agencies from the top down

This document represents the views of the individual participants and does not reflect group consensus.
• Too many people don’t have experience working in sectors they’re regulating, so encourage employee exchanges between local groups, private sector to see things from others perspectives
  i. Rancher following agency around for 10 days and vice versa
• Minimize risk of participation (ex. Agency coming back and changing things at end of process)
• Have maximum flexibility and minimum risk
• One-stop shopping; removing of silos (NGOs, Feds, etc.)
  i. How? Network of governance- Fed and non-fed all at table
  ii. Can’t function well with too many involved; have to deal with issues of your own first

C. **Local-level Practical Actions** that could be taken at the local or community level by Tribes, state and local communities, private citizens, and local organizations. *Diverging views and/or questions are also noted.*

• One-stop shopping; removing of silos (NGOs, Feds, etc.)
  o How? Network of governance- Fed and non-fed all at table
  o Can’t function well with too many involved; have to deal with issues of your own first
• Can there be one entity to call the shots with all agencies involved?
  o Have to come to an agreement on that
• Ex. Habitat Conservation Plans; Ex. Natural Heritage Areas with NPS- they’re an equal player not a driver

D. **Particularly insightful quotes from participants** that capture the essence of key points made during the group’s discussion.

• There’s a tension between the desire for flexibility and the need for rules.
• They took the white hat off and put the black hat on. (Moving from local, technical assistance to a regulatory approach.)
• It’s going to take a generation or more to establish that trust again.
• Recognize that collaboration should not be the same as policy and politics as historically practiced.
• 15 or 20 years ago, the focus was on consensus and today it’s on solving problems.
• Coming to agreement to solve the problem often takes longer and more resources than consensus building.
• Consensus is easy, solving the problems is difficult.
• A vision without action is a daydream, and action without vision is a nightmare. (From Mayor Anthony Williams)
• Good governance means good stewardship.
• The private sector deals with the good stuff, the gov’t deals with the bad stuff, and the NGOs deal with what even the gov’t doesn’t deal with.
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