

Delta Conservation Framework

September 2017 PUBLIC DRAFT

Guiding Questions for Review of the Delta Conservation Framework Document

The idea of using a landscape-scale approach to conservation, as outlined in the Delta Conservation Framework, is to implement projects at the regional level, integrating management practices and desired outcomes with the perspectives of the local communities, yet tie their functional connectivity together across the entire Delta.

As you are reading this document, please think about the following questions:

1. Do you agree with the goals, strategies and objectives throughout Sections II-V? Why or why not? What would you add or change?
2. Do the vision statement and guiding principles in Section I adequately balance agriculture and local communities with conservation over the long-term?
3. Does Section II adequately cover who should be involved, and how to ensure that the community is well represented in these planning partnerships?
4. Our assumption is that multi-benefit projects are the best way to proceed in the Delta. Would you add anything to the list of benefits that we are trying to achieve in the Delta with our projects? Not all projects have to achieve all goals. Multi-benefit projects benefit ecosystems and people by integrating conservation with:
 - levee maintenance and flood management
 - recreation
 - wildlife-friendly agriculture
 - reversing subsidence through carbon farming
 - invasive aquatic weed control
5. Do the ideas based on historical ecology and ecosystem function presented in Section III adequately reflect your understanding of/viewpoints about:
 - a. How Delta conservation projects can best be implemented across the landscape to reestablish ecological processes at small and large scales?
 - b. How Delta conservation practices can best tie in with local community priorities, coexist with, and support private landowner and Delta community needs relative to agriculture, recreation and tourism?
6. Does Section IV effectively demonstrate the current capacity of Delta Science and the continued need for science coordination in the context of conservation related decision-making? What is missing?

Delta Conservation Framework

September 2017 PUBLIC DRAFT

7. Does Section IV adequately reflect the idea that long-term adaptive management informs conservation projects, and allows adjustments into the future? How could the presentation of this be improved?
8. Do you think Section V adequately describes strategies that will help conservation project managers obtain necessary permits and move conservation along faster in the Delta?
9. Strategies to support conservation project permitting include dedicating staff resources at regulatory agencies, establishing a permitting ombudsman position, or developing regional permits. Does Section V provide suitable examples of the permits that are the primary limiting factor in launching conservation projects in your area?
10. Do you think Section V adequately explains the need for long-term funding to manage State-owned conservation lands, and improve neighbor-to-neighbor relationships between agencies and private landowners? What could be improved, or added?
11. In Section VI and throughout the document, do you agree with the goal of using planning partnerships as a path forward? Why or why not?
12. How well do the proposed Planning Partnerships and associated **Regions** capture distinct portions of the Delta with unique land uses and communities?