

DRECP Framework Conservation Strategy Report

Comment Form

Commenter (Your Name)	Comment #	Comment Location:					Reviewer Comment (e.g., organization, content, grammatical comments)
		Chapter	Section #	Page #	Paragraph	Paragraph (from top)	
Garry George	1	OVERAL L					OVERALL: It is our opinion that the process of providing a draft of a document prepared by consultants for review and comment by stakeholders is not useful. From our review and from initial comments by Defenders of Wildlife, it is clear that the document is flawed in many ways, and it appears that it has not been given the serious consideration, review or input of the conservation planning, eco-assessment, or biological sections of the REAT agencies. It is clear also that it has not been reviewed by the ISA before release to the stakeholders. In our opinion, a more useful process would be that the final draft of an important document such as this one would be presented to stakeholders for review so that they could see that their "stake" is represented properly and completely, not to help write the document or peer review the conservation science and data. Many of our comments would have been caught by agency or science advisors and certainly would have been corrected or restated in a much more comprehensive and professional manner.
Garry George	2	INTRO		3	2	2	"Only solar thermal and solar photovoltaic (PV) projects within the DRECP boundary qualify for ARRA funding under SB 34 (CEC 2010)." This is unclear as SB34 does not provide ARRA funding.
Garry George	3	INTRO	I.A.3	5	2		"In addition to the recommendations from the ISA, additional advice from scientific experts will continue to be sought as needed at several points during the planning process". We suggest that this is one of those points, and should have been done prior to release of this draft.
Garry George	4	INTRO	I.B	6	5		<i>"Identify and incorporate climate change adaptation research,</i>

						<p><i>management objectives, and/or policies into the final plan document.”</i></p> <p>This has not been developed. Audubon provided samples of extensive climate change adaptation modeling science on species of birds in California, but this important science has not been mentioned, discussed, or included in the draft document. Climate change as an ecological process or as an impact on biological resources has not been fully discussed in the document. Even though it will be covered in the DEIR/DEIS it deserves more attention in this document in discussion of conservation reserves and conservation actions.</p>
	5	INTRO	I.C.4	10	2	<p>“In late 2010, the Covered Species Working Group developed a species “filtering” tool,”</p> <p>The Covered Species committee commented on the tool. The tool was developed by U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service</p>
	6	INTRO	I.C.4	11	8	<p>“Wildlife species of special concern to CDFG (CDFG 2011b). “</p> <p>We recommend adding “USFW Service Birds of Conservation Concern”</p>
	7	INTRO	I.C.5	13	9	<p>“RPS biomass projects “</p> <p>This has been eliminated by the Covered Activities Committee</p>

Commenting on: (Clean version, track changes version) ___ May 4 DRAFT _____