

The authors use Benedict and McMahon's (2006) definition of green infrastructure: “an interconnected network of protected land and water that supports native species, maintains natural ecological processes, sustains air and water resources and contributes to the health and quality of life for America's communities and people.” Applying this definition in a global context (Benedict and McMahon work for Conservation Fund, and very US-oriented NGO), does this definition work? How would you define “protected”? How broad or narrow should the definition of “protected” be?

Both case studies from Manchester make no distinction between private and public land. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this approach?

The authors list principles of effective green infrastructure planning, which include complementarity, connectivity, and opportunity costs (i.e. the cost of taking an action that is not good for every stakeholder involved). These are also fundamental principles of conservation planning outside of cities. Is green infrastructure planning within a city fundamentally different than protected area network planning outside of a city?

Protected area network planners are increasingly relying on a broad set of quantitative modeling methods and algorithms that design optimal protected area “infrastructure” that balances the needs of various stakeholder groups while minimizing cost. Would that kind of approach be suitable for urban planning? Why and why not?

How scale dependent is green infrastructure planning? Does scale dependence matter?

Pretend that you are a project manager on the SEA and both Manchester initiatives. For each project, what would be your measure of success?

In Manchester, they are using climate simulations to potentially inform policy and land-use planning. What are some of the challenges of applying scientific evidence to policy and planning issues in such highly populated areas?

\$280,000,000 dollars have been spent on green infrastructure in Seattle as a result of the success of SEA. Would you feel confident enough in the results of your own research to guide how that much money is spent?

When discussing the synergy between the two approaches in Manchester, the authors write: “such synergies need to be emphasized in order to provide sufficient evidence of the green infrastructure benefits...” Does your definition of “evidence” match the author's in this instance?

The UK has a very different policy mechanism in place to protect species and habitats. How does it compare the the US's Endangered Species Act? Which one do you think is more effective?

In section 5.4, the authors suggest that including ecological guidance early in the development process can benefit the developer, citing good publicity. Can you think of other (more compelling) benefits to the developer of incorporating ecological guidance?

You've landed a sweet job at the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (<http://www.rspb.org.uk>). A donor has given you 10,000 pounds for a bird conservation project. There are currently two projects you can support with this money: a) a nest box program for the bird species listed in 5.4.2 (none of which are of global concern) or b) a parcel of land that is far from an urban area (and will be closed off from the public), but is a known stopover site for the globally endangered Aquatic Warbler. Which project do you support, and why?