

**DRAFT REGULATED RIPARIAN HABITAT OFFSITE MITIGATION
GUIDELINES FOR UNINCORPORATED PIMA COUNTY**

Deleted:
PIMA COUNTY REGIONAL FLOOD
CONTROL DISTRICT'S

Deleted:

Deleted: ¶



Deleted: ¶
¶
¶
¶
¶

Prepared by

Pima County Regional Flood Control District
97 East Congress, Second Floor
Tucson, Arizona 85701
(520) 243-1800

Deleted: ¶

and

SWCA Environmental Consultants

Tucson Office
343 West Franklin Street
Tucson, Arizona 85701
(520) 325-9194
www.swca.com

July 2011

Deleted: April

DRAFT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	
2.0	MITIGATION IN-LIEU FEE	
2.1	IN-LIEU FEE OPTION	
3.0	IN-LIEU FEE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	
3.1	ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSING OF IN-LIEU FEES	
3.1.1	FEE COLLECTION	
3.1.2	ANNUAL REPORTING	
3.2	DISTRICT EXPENDITURE OF IN-LIEU FEE FUNDS TO COMPENSATE FOR HABITAT LOSS	
3.2.1	OPTIONS FOR EXPENDITURE OF IN-LIEU FEE FUNDS: ACQUISITIONS, LAND STEWARDSHIP, AND RESTORATION	
3.2.1.1	ACQUISITIONS	Deleted: LOW-TECH
3.2.1.1.1	LAND	Deleted: a
3.2.1.1.2	WATER RIGHTS	Deleted: a
3.2.1.1.3	CONSERVATION EASEMENTS	Deleted: a
3.2.1.2	LAND STEWARDSHIP	Deleted: a
3.2.1.3	RESTORATION	Deleted: b
4.0	ALTERNATIVE OFFSITE MITIGATION OPTIONS	Deleted: c
4.1	MITIGATION OF AN OFFSITE PARCEL OF LAND	Deleted: LOW-TECH
4.1.1	BASIC REQUIREMENTS	
4.1.2	RIPARIAN HABITAT PRESERVATION PLAN (RHPP)	
4.2	LAND TRANSFER	Deleted: EXCHANGE
4.3	PROTECTION OF MITIGATION LAND	
4.4	OTHER OFFSITE MITIGATION OPTIONS	Deleted: COMPENSATORY
5.0	LAND ACQUISITION CRITERIA	
APPENDIX A	DEVELOPMENT OF THE IN-LIEU FEE OPTION	Deleted: ¶
APPENDIX B	SWCA REPORT – OPTIONS FOR ASSESSING IN-LIEU FEES	6.0 CONCLUSION ¶
APPENDIX C	NATURAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT REPORT (NRAR) REQUIREMENTS	
APPENDIX D	<u>CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPMENT OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS OR EASEMENTS</u>	Deleted: CONSERVATION
APPENDIX E	IN-LIEU FEE CALCULATION SPREADSHEET AND <u>TUTORIAL</u>	Deleted: TEMPLATE
APPENDIX F	IN-LIEU FEE SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST	Deleted: EXAMPLES
APPENDIX G	LAND ACQUISITION CHECKLIST	
APPENDIX H	<u>GLOSSARY</u>	
		Deleted: ¶

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 16.30 of the Floodplain and Erosion Hazard Management Ordinance No. 2010-FC5 (Ordinance) stipulates that an applicant (private property owner, government agency, land developer, or builder) can mitigate for unavoidable impacts to regulated riparian habitat (RRH) through onsite mitigation. If onsite mitigation is investigated and deemed not feasible for the applicant, then offsite mitigation may be proposed, per Section 16.30.050.D of the Ordinance:

“Mitigation banking or other alternative mitigation measures as approved by the Board. At the request of the property owner, and with Board approval, the mitigation plan requirement under this chapter may be waived by contributing funds to an account established and administered by the District for the purpose of offsetting damage to riparian habitat.”

As outlined in the Ordinance, an offsite mitigation proposal must be reviewed and approved by Pima County Regional Flood Control District (District) and the Flood Control District Board of Directors (Board). Currently, there are three offsite mitigation options available, including:

- (1) Restoration of disturbed or degraded RRH on another parcel of land that provides comparable or superior biological function similar to the RRH proposed for disturbance, with appropriate long-term protection measures,
- (2) Land transfer proposals, and
- (3) Payment of an in-lieu fee.

Offsite mitigation opportunities become an option only after the applicant has shown that avoidance is not possible, impacts to RRH have been minimized, and the ability to mitigate entirely onsite has proven unfeasible. Compensation for RRH loss (in-lieu fee) is not meant to replace avoidance and minimization.

This document, hereafter referred to as the Offsite Mitigation Guidelines (Guidelines), describes how the in-lieu fee (ILF) program will function and be administered and provides guidance for alternative offsite mitigation options.

2.0 MITIGATION IN-LIEU FEE

2.1 In-Lieu Fee Option

One option to compensate for disturbance of RRH is a fee in-lieu of onsite riparian habitat mitigation. The ILF program has been updated and simplified for ease of use by applicants, and incorporates changes to the riparian protection regulations adopted under Ordinance 2005-FC2 and 2010-FC5. During the process of updating the Guidelines several options for assessing how to calculate the ILF were examined (Appendices A and B). The ILF option selected for use in the Guidelines is based on the amount and type of habitat disturbed, standardized costs for onsite mitigation (derived from representative real project costs) and an adjustment for inflation. Inflation rates will be reviewed and adjusted an average of every two to three years.

The fee structure is based on the cost to mitigate onsite, with standard costs determined by the District. A cost is assigned to each onsite mitigation component and is incorporated into a spreadsheet (Appendix E), whereby the user can input parameters, such as acreage of

- Deleted: will require
- Deleted: review and approval
- Deleted: compensatory
- Deleted: "in-kind"
- Deleted: and
- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
- Deleted: exchange
- Deleted: l
- Deleted: monetary
- Deleted: It should be noted and stressed that o
- Deleted: e following
- Deleted:
- Deleted: l
- Deleted: L
- Deleted: F
- Deleted: compensatory
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt, Hanging: 33 pt, Don't keep with next
- Deleted: for providing compensatory mitigation
- Deleted: in-lieu fee (
- Deleted:)
- Deleted: previous method of fee calculation placed the burden of estimating costs for onsite mitigation on the applicant or property owner. This resulted in cost estimates that varied with each project, depending on the person assessing the fee and source of the cost information. To ensure consistency and ease of use, the new
- Deleted: The revised method has standardized costs for
- Deleted: requirement
- Deleted: d
- Deleted: these costs
- Deleted: n easy to use
- Deleted: certain

disturbance, resulting in an ILF cost output. The following mitigation components are incorporated into the spreadsheet:

- Plant material (container trees and shrubs),
- Labor for plant material installation,
- Hydroseed (seed, mulch, water, cost for machinery, and labor to apply seed) (cost/acre),
- Irrigation system (materials and labor for installation) (cost/acre). Irrigation costs are calculated as a percentage of the plant material costs,
- Five years of maintenance (removal of noxious/invasive plant species, water, replacement plants, etc.). Maintenance costs are calculated as a percentage of the plant material costs, and
- Five years of monitoring. Monitoring costs were estimated based on actual projects.

Deleted: installing

Deleted: and monitoring

Deleted: weed

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: , and

Deleted: Other miscellaneous work, such as grading and/or construction of water harvesting basins. ¶

Deleted: for

A standard value is assigned to each mitigation component and is based on average cost estimates obtained from local vendors and consultants. An explanation for how costs were obtained is provided in Appendix E. The spreadsheet allows each component of the mitigation plan to be calculated separately so that total mitigation costs can be accurately assessed for each project. For example, a single-lot property owner will typically pay a smaller fee than the developer of a commercial or residential property since they have the ability to minimize installation, seeding, and irrigation costs.

Deleted: design

Deleted:

Deleted: the option to

Deleted: is still available to applicants

Deleted: plan

Although use of the standard ILF calculation spreadsheet is encouraged, applicants may hire a qualified professional to prepare an ILF estimate. The estimate shall account for mitigation components, as listed above, and follow requirements in the ILF checklist provided in Appendix F.

Deleted: commercial and residential developments (subdivision plat or development plan)

Deleted: will

Formatted: No underline

For projects undergoing the development review process, an additional surcharge may be applied to the ILF based upon riparian habitat classification and percentage of disturbance. The surcharge does not apply to single-lot development (residential permits). The purpose of the surcharge is to further encourage avoidance, promote habitat continuity, and minimize impacts to Important Riparian Areas (IRA) and other high quality habitat. The following requirement will apply:

Apply the following surcharge to the base ILF when the noted percentage of total mapped riparian habitat is disturbed:

For Class H, Xeroriparian Classes A and B, and IRA

- 20-39% = 5% surcharge added to the base ILF
- 40-59% = 10% surcharge added to the base ILF
- ≥60% = 20% surcharge added to the base ILF

Xeroriparian Classes C and D

No surcharge applies

Table 1 provides examples of how the surcharge would be applied toward the ILF depending upon the amount of total mapped RRH disturbed. Table 2 provides an average cost per acre of disturbance for projects undergoing the development review process, using the excel spreadsheet to calculate the ILF amount.

Deleted: an

Table 1. Cost of Surcharge per \$1,000 of base ILF

Deleted: ¶
¶

<u>Surcharge</u>	<u>Amount of Total RRH Disturbed</u>	<u>Amount of Surcharge (\$)</u>	<u>Total Cost: Base ILF plus Surcharge(\$)</u>
+ 5%	20-39%	\$50	\$1,050
+ 10%	40-59%	\$100	1,100
+ 20%	>60%	\$200	1,200

Table 2. Average Cost per acre of disturbance for projects undergoing the development review process

<u>Regulated Riparian Habitat Classification</u>	<u>Cost per Acre (\$)</u>	<u>Cost per Acre (\$) with 5% Surcharge</u>	<u>Cost per Acre (\$) with 10% Surcharge</u>	<u>Cost per Acre (\$) with 20% Surcharge</u>
<u>Xeroriparian Class A (XA)</u>	<u>\$20,414</u>	<u>\$21,435</u>	<u>\$23,578</u>	<u>\$28,294</u>
<u>Xeroriparian Class B (XB)</u>	<u>\$18,735</u>	<u>\$19,672</u>	<u>\$21,640</u>	<u>\$25,968</u>
<u>Xeroriparian Class C (XC)</u>	<u>\$17,140</u>	<u>na</u>	<u>na</u>	<u>na</u>
<u>Xeroriparian Class D (XD)</u>	<u>\$15,161</u>	<u>na</u>	<u>na</u>	<u>na</u>
<u>Important Riparian Areas with underlying Class H (IRA/H) or Class H (H)</u>	<u>\$39,990</u>	<u>\$41,990</u>	<u>\$46,188</u>	<u>\$55,426</u>
<u>Important Riparian Areas with underlying XA (IRA/XA)</u>	<u>\$30,655</u>	<u>\$32,188</u>	<u>\$35,407</u>	<u>\$42,488</u>
<u>Important Riparian Areas with underlying XB (IRA/XB)</u>	<u>\$28,104</u>	<u>\$29,509</u>	<u>\$32,460</u>	<u>\$38,952</u>
<u>Important Riparian Areas with underlying XC (IRA/XC)</u>	<u>\$25,702</u>	<u>\$26,987</u>	<u>\$29,685</u>	<u>\$35,623</u>
<u>Important Riparian Areas with underlying XD (IRA/XD)</u>	<u>\$22,792</u>	<u>\$23,931</u>	<u>\$26,324</u>	<u>\$31,589</u>

3.0 IN-LIEU FEE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

3.1 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSING OF IN-LIEU FEES

3.1.1 FEE COLLECTION

Single-lot Residential Development.

Deleted: amt. [1]
Formatted [2]
Deleted: t [3]
Formatted [4]
Formatted [5]
Formatted [6]
Deleted: with [7]
Formatted [8]
Formatted [9]
Formatted [10]
Formatted [11]
Formatted [12]
Formatted [13]
Formatted [14]
Formatted [15]
Formatted [16]
Formatted [17]
Formatted [18]
Formatted [19]
Formatted [20]
Formatted [21]
Formatted [22]
Formatted [23]
Formatted [24]
Formatted [25]
Formatted [26]
Formatted [27]
Formatted [28]
Formatted [29]
Formatted [30]
Formatted [31]
Formatted [32]
Formatted [33]
Formatted [34]
Formatted [35]
Formatted [36]
Formatted [37]
Formatted [38]
Formatted [39]
Formatted [40]
Formatted [41]
Formatted [42]
Formatted [43]
Formatted [44]

A single-lot residential development proposal disturbing more than 1/3 acre of RRH requires a Floodplain Use Permit (FPUP), which must be obtained prior to issuance of the building or grading permit. When onsite mitigation occurs, a Riparian Habitat Mitigation Plan (RHMP) is approved prior to issuance of the FPUP with mitigation occurring after construction is completed. When an ILF is proposed, fees are collected prior to issuance of the FPUP. This process ensures that a property owner compensates for disturbance of RRH prior to the impact occurring.

Deleted: s

Collection Procedure

Fees will be collected prior to issuance of the FPUP. For projects that require a specific hold, such as Prior to Slab inspection (P2S) or Prior to Electrical inspection (P2E), submittal of the ILF may be delayed until the time of inspection. The applicant shall provide a written request to delay payment of the ILF, which will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Delayed ILF payments, if approved, must be received prior to the P2S or P2E inspection.

Formatted: Underline

Deleted: Under special circumstances, the property owner may request that payment of the ILF be delayed until prior to final inspection. If this option is chosen, a hold will be placed on the final inspection until the fee is collected.

Commercial Development and Subdivisions

For projects following the development review process, ILF proposals are approved prior to Tentative Plat or Development Plan approval.

Deleted: Subdivision and

Collection Procedure

Deleted: , i.e. subdivision plats or development plans

ILF payment must be received prior to approval of the grading or paving plan. A note will be placed on the plat or plan that states that the ILF shall be paid prior to the authorization of any activity on the parcel.

Deleted: Final

Deleted: However, depending upon the project, many months or years may pass from the time of project approval to construction, delaying disturbance of RRH. In these situations, it may be appropriate to collect the fee prior to approval of the grading or paving plan.

Fines collected from RRH violations

On May 4, 2010, the Board adopted Ordinance No. 2010-FC5. The amended Ordinance allows the District to impose civil penalties for violations of the code, including violations related to the unpermitted disturbance of RRH. The District will pursue fines equal to the amount of the ILF value based on the amount of unpermitted disturbance. Fines obtained from violations resulting from RRH disturbance will be deposited into the ILF program bank account.

Deleted: _____Page Break_____

Deleted: new

Formatted: Font: Arial, 11 pt

Deleted: The District will deposit f

Administrative Processing

Payment of the ILF can be accepted via check or money order and shall be made payable to "Pima County Treasurer". When payment for the ILF is submitted, the applicant and/or property owner is issued a receipt, detailing the amount of the check/money order, check number, and project or FPUP number. This information is then input into the ILF tracking database and deposited into the ILF program bank account.

Deleted: a check

Deleted: ¶

3.1.2 ANNUAL REPORTING

An annual report, documenting the total amount of funds collected and disbursed throughout the year will be prepared at the end of each fiscal year. The report will document annual income deposited into the ILF program bank account, annual withdrawals for expenditures, a

Deleted: annual

summary of property acquisitions by parcel number and provide a brief section on funds spent for land stewardship activities and restoration.

Deleted: low-tech

3.2 DISTRICT EXPENDITURE OF IN-LIEU FEE PROGRAM FUNDS TO COMPENSATE FOR HABITAT LOSS

District priorities for expenditure of ILFs are:

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, Don't keep with next

Acquisition and Preservation

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

Preservation of high value habitat is best achieved through acquisition, which removes development pressure on riparian habitat. Acquisition in fee title of land containing riparian resources is an effective method for protecting and preserving intact habitat. Additional methods for the preservation of riparian resources is by protecting shallow ground water sources through acquisition or transfer of water rights, and protection of hydrologic functions and key features located in the watershed upstream of riparian areas.

Formatted: Font: Arial, 11 pt, Not Bold, Not All caps

Formatted: Font: Arial, 11 pt, Not Bold, Not All caps

Restoration and Enhancement

Restoration and enhancement of riparian vegetation can be a viable and desirable option for the use of ILF funds. The receiving area for restoration and/or enhancement of habitat must be able to support restoration efforts over the long term. Physical site characteristics, restoration objectives and design, and legal mechanisms that lead to long-term self-sustaining habitat must all be taken into account. Other restoration activities under this priority include land stewardship practices that allow degraded habitat to heal and naturally restoring processes that protect riparian habitat or water supply.

Deleted:

Deleted: s

Deleted: -----Page Break-----

3.2.1 OPTIONS FOR EXPENDITURE OF IN-LIEU FEE FUNDS: ACQUISITIONS, LAND STEWARDSHIP, AND RESTORATION

Deleted: LOW-TECH

Several options are available to the District for expenditure of ILF funds to compensate for impacts to RRR. Options include the following; acquisitions (land, water rights, conservation easements), land stewardship, and restoration.

Deleted: low-tech

Deleted: a

3.2.1.1 ACQUISITIONS

Several types of acquisitions may be made with funds received through the ILF program and include land, water rights and/or conservation easements. All acquisitions are subject to Board review and approval.

Deleted: Funds can be used for the acquisition of riparian resources.

Deleted: could

Deleted: may

Deleted: a

3.2.1.1.1 Land. Land would be selected based upon the resource value as determined by the Riparian Acquisition Map (Section 5.0). Funds would be used to purchase land in fee-simple. Water, mineral, and other rights may or may not be included in the purchase. The land will additionally receive long-term protection through use of a conservation easement or restrictive covenant.

Deleted: be offered

Deleted: the

Deleted: other

3.2.1.1.2 *Water Rights.* Water rights adjoining sensitive riparian areas may be purchased using ILF funds.

Deleted: a
Deleted: would
Deleted: a

3.2.1.1.3 *Conservation easement.* Conservation easements on lands containing high value riparian habitat may be purchased using ILF funds.

Deleted: would
Deleted: b

3.2.1.2 LAND STEWARDSHIP

In this option, funds would be distributed for stewardship of riparian habitat on existing Pima County-owned lands. Stewardship activities may include fencing to prevent unauthorized access by off-road vehicles and livestock, long-term monitoring, and invasive species control.

Deleted: would

3.2.1.3 RESTORATION

Restoration techniques may be implemented on existing Pima County-owned lands. Restoration techniques may include hydroseeding disturbed areas, incorporating water harvesting features, installing check dams, or other low-cost methods to enhance and restore existing riparian habitat.

Deleted: c
Deleted: LOW-TECH
Deleted: Low-tech, low-cost r
Deleted: will
Deleted: Low-tech r
Deleted: ation of
Deleted: -----Page Break-----

4.0 ALTERNATIVE OFFSITE MITIGATION OPTIONS

Several alternative offsite mitigation options are available to projects undergoing the development review process. Options include mitigation of an offsite parcel of land, a land transfer, or other offsite mitigation option. An alternative offsite mitigation proposal shall describe the relationship between the ecosystem functions being impacted on the project site and the functions which are compensated for by the proposed mitigation site.

Deleted: (subdivision plats and development plans)
Deleted: exchange
Deleted: compensatory
Deleted: will need to document
Deleted: ¶
Formatted: Space Before: 6 pt
Deleted: Only one alternative o
Deleted: is
Deleted: . This is
Deleted: .

Alternative offsite mitigation options available to single-lot property owners include (1) the option to mitigate on an offsite parcel of land in accordance with the onsite mitigation guidelines (Section 4.1.1), or (2) land transfer option (Section 4.2). Land transfer proposals will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and are subject to the discretion and approval of the District and Board.

4.1 MITIGATION OF AN OFFSITE PARCEL OF LAND

4.1.1 Basic Requirements

Mitigation in accordance with the onsite mitigation guidelines may be performed on another parcel of land with approval of the District. The proposed parcel must contain comparable or superior riparian habitat, or may only be used if the parcel is suitable for enhancement or restoration of degraded riparian habitat, as determined by the District. A deed restriction that protects the mitigated area(s) in perpetuity must be recorded. Additionally, the parcel must adhere to the following mitigation standards:

Deleted: The alternate parcel may be under the same ownership as the parcel impacted by development or may be under different ownership. In either case, a
Formatted: Superscript
Deleted: , adapted from standards drafted and approved by the Multi-Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) Implementing Agreement (IA) Committee

- If the proposed mitigation land will be split off from an existing parcel of land, the mitigation land shall be located and consolidated in the most biologically sensitive portion(s) of the property;

¹Adapted from standards drafted and approved by the Multi-Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) Implementing Agreement Committee

- Mitigation land shall be configured to minimize harmful edge effects;
- Mitigation land shall be contiguous with any conserved land on adjacent properties; Preferably, mitigation land should be located within the same watershed as that impacted by development;
- Mitigation land shall be free of all significant harmful land use practices that impair mitigation values (e.g., off-road vehicle use, livestock use/grazing, etc.), or if harmful land use practices have occurred in the past, the land may be restored and protected from future harmful land practices.

As an alternative to the onsite guideline requirement for providing mitigation on an offsite parcel of land, an applicant may propose mitigation through use of a Riparian Habitat Preservation Plan (RHPP).

4.1.2 Riparian Habitat Preservation Plan

Mitigation of an offsite parcel of land for qualifying larger projects (those that are required to go through the platting, specific plan, comprehensive plan, and/or rezoning processes) may follow requirements of a Riparian Habitat Preservation Plan (RHPP). A RHPP is designed to support the success of onsite preservation of riparian areas and the mitigation of disturbed habitat, as well as serve the special needs of a given project within the context of its natural resources, both upland and riparian.

For qualifying projects, applicants may propose a RHPP as an alternative to the basic requirement. The minimum requirement for a RHPP is to meet the conservation goals and objectives of the Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Land System (CLS). The RHPP must preserve, enhance, provide connectivity, overall function, and/or restore an impacted riparian system and/or its surrounding areas, and is subject to the discretion and approval of the District and the Board.

A RHPP may be acceptable when traditional mitigation does not address unique ecological or project conditions, such as:

- Highly fragmented and/or degraded riparian habitat;
- Sites with other unique ecological functions where a blended preservation plan would be more functional or appropriate; and
- Linear projects, such as roadways and sewers, or linear portions of projects where avoidance is not possible and linear mitigation options would provide limited value.

A RHPP may include, but is not limited to:

- Alternative options for restoring degraded riparian habitat;
- Preserving or enhancing wash corridors containing riparian habitat and transition zones that were not mapped under the Riparian Classification Maps, to increase connectivity;
- Conservation of adjacent uplands along riparian habitat to maintain diversity and watershed function,
- Combination of onsite and offsite conservation or mitigation; and
- Other conservation efforts that meet unique site ecological conditions including preservation of keystone species (e.g., ironwood and saguaro).

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt

Deleted: ould

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript

Deleted: ould

Deleted: hall

Deleted: ,

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ould

Deleted: option

Deleted: of

Deleted: (RHPP)

Deleted: for larger projects (those that are required to go through the platting, specific plan, comprehensive plan, and/or rezoning processes)

Deleted: these

Deleted: n additional option to the basic requirements for mitigation of IRA, Class H, and Xeroriparian Classes A-D is available. A

Deleted: iparian Habitat Mitigation Plan (RHMP)

Deleted: A RHPP is designed to support the success of onsite preservation of riparian areas and the mitigation of disturbed habitat, as well as serve the special needs of a given project within the context of its natural resources, both upland and riparian.

Deleted: proposed

Deleted: . Please be advised that proposal of a RHPP

Deleted: an available option

Deleted: . Applicable conditions may include

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

The RHPP must be equivalent to or exceed the ecological value of a traditional RHMP. Determination of equivalent ecological value will require an assessment of the offsite parcel(s) biological resources by a qualified professional and must reference and incorporate unique features identified by the Natural Resource Assessment Report (NRAR - Appendix C) into the RHPP. The NRAR must also address the overall connectivity and function of preserved riparian habitat on the offsite parcel(s) and how the proposed RHPP will enhance the overall function of riparian habitat.

Deleted: biological ...project site to evaluate the site's biological resources ...the ...determined ...) ... (Appendix C) ... [45]

Degraded habitats located on an offsite parcel can be restored in a number of ways, which may include direct restoration of degraded habitat or by restoring connectivity of habitat with techniques and land stewardship actions other than those outlined in the onsite mitigation guidelines. These techniques or actions may include:

- Cattle exclusion and/or regulation of grazing intensity or season,
- Noxious and/or invasive plant species control for the entire undeveloped RRH area and possibly upland areas. This option will depend upon the severity of the infestation, type of noxious and/or invasive species present, must be coincident with other restoration techniques, such as hydroseeding, and may not be used if a property owner has already been required to control invasive species,
- Short-term use of effluent for establishment of a mitigation area (i.e., spray fields to establish native seed mix),
- Abandonment of functioning wells in areas of shallow groundwater,
- Obtaining water rights for a particular property and transferring the rights to Pima County,
- Channel stabilization efforts,
- Water harvesting,
- Other restoration techniques that have also proven to have substantial riparian habitat benefits.

Deleted: c

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: exotic... (t...and ...)..., and... must not overlap with invasive species control required by other departments. Basically, ..., it will not be option for mitigation under Chapter 16.30) ... [46]

Deleted: s

Deleted: a...ing ... [47]

Deleted: o

Deleted: c

Deleted: w

Deleted: and o...been demo ... [48]

Deleted: show ... over the long term...use of ...irrigation...irrigation water...and/or for use in the establishment of...tion..., would not qualify as a suitable alternative option... Proposed RHPPs are subject to the discretion and approval of the District and the Board. ... [49]

A condition for use of a RHPP is that a proposal must demonstrate long term sustainability. For example, effluent may be used to establish plants and/or the seed mix; however, long-term use of effluent may not be used to artificially increase the density of existing riparian habitat or to sustain high water use plant species that would require irrigating with effluent for the duration of the plant's life.

Deleted: EXCHANGE

Deleted: For projects undergoing the development review process (subdivision plats and development plans), ...exchange... may be allowed...exchange...must...e...proxi mity to ... [50]

4.2 LAND TRANSFER

Applicants may propose transfer of land in-lieu of onsite mitigation. Land transfer proposals shall provide multiple benefits such as preservation of valuable habitat corridors, providing habitat connectivity and augmenting habitat preserved on public land, parks, preserves and habitat restoration projects.

To satisfy offsite mitigation requirements for disturbance to RRH, an applicant may choose to acquire land elsewhere in the County and transfer that land to the District for long-term protection of its riparian and biological resources. To assist the applicant in locating desirable parcels for land acquisition, the District has provided a land acquisition map indicating the general location of lands that may qualify for the land transfer option. This map is called the Riparian Acquisition Map (see Section 5.0). In addition to the map, a land acquisition checklist has been provided in Appendix G.

Deleted: Large-scale projects offer unique situations because they have the potential to affect relatively large areas of RRH. While protecting RRH onsite is preferred and could well prove to be an asset to the development, the community, and the County's goals for long-term riparian protection, a need for offsite mitigation may still occur. ... developer...apply the option that will allow them to ... This option will be considered on a case-by-case basis for larger developments only and is not available for smaller developments or single dwelling residential development on a single lot. All land acquisition proposals are subject to District and Board review and approval. ¶ would...exchange...compensatory mitigation ... [51]

For lands to qualify for RRH mitigation and transfer to the District, they must have biological and hydrological value that is of comparable or higher quality than the disturbed RRH. Values that must be considered include, but are not limited to, water availability, vegetation density, and biological productivity. An evaluation of these values by a qualified professional will be required as part of the applicant's land acquisition proposal. Selection of land appropriate for the land acquisition and transfer option shall be based on information provided by the applicant's NRAR (Appendix C).

Key points to consider, when selecting land for transfer include the following:

- Preference will be given to land within the same watershed as the disturbed RRH. If land cannot be identified within the same watershed, transfer of lands outside the watershed is an option;
- Land must have an equivalent or higher quality riparian habitat value (biological and physical) than the disturbed RRH;
- A biological evaluation of the land (NRAR), performed by a qualified professional is required;
- Include mechanisms to protect resources and conservation values in perpetuity; and
- All land acquisition proposals are subject to District and Board review and approval.

For applicants who are interested in the land transfer option, a pre-submittal meeting with the District will be required prior to submittal of the mitigation proposal and NRAR. Mitigation lands proposed for the land transfer option will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and require District pre-approval.

The District will consider long-term management and monitoring costs for the transferred land(s) and may at its discretion request a monetary donation or endowment from the beneficiary to cover management costs.

4.3 PROTECTION OF MITIGATION LAND

Long-term protection of mitigation land is critical to the success of the offsite mitigation program. Long-term protection can be achieved through transfer of mitigation land in fee title to the County or placement of a conservation easement or restrictive covenant on the mitigation lands (Appendix D).

Proposals involving the set aside of private land being utilized as mitigation under the Ordinance will require a restrictive covenant that is recorded with the property deed and runs with the land. These proposals will be evaluated individually based on the specific needs of each property and the covenants will include the following:

- The covenants will protect the mitigation area in perpetuity, restricting activities that negatively impact the natural resources or functions that support the mitigation area.
- Such a covenant would list specific stewardship activities and requirements for the property to protect the mitigation area in perpetuity.
- The land owner agrees that the County has rights of enforcement of the covenant conditions.

Deleted: contain

Deleted: to

Deleted: of

Deleted: that is disturbed

Deleted: need to

Deleted: . Therefore, an evaluation of the land proposed for transfer, performed by a qualified professional, shall be required as part of the developer's land acquisition proposal to the District

Deleted: . The purpose of long-term riparian protection is to promote stable flow conditions and natural functions along watercourses and floodplains County-wide by preserving and/or enhancing riparian vegetation and habitat. In ord... [52]

Deleted:

Deleted: the

Deleted: remember

Deleted: exchange

Deleted: <#>A biological eva... [53]

Deleted: that is being disturbed

Deleted: exchange

Deleted: will be

Deleted: s

Deleted: those that are being

Formatted [54]

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: exchange

Deleted: exchange

Deleted:

Deleted: .

Deleted: Exchanged propert... [55]

Formatted: Font: Arial

Formatted: Font: Arial

Deleted: costs of

Deleted: . The County

Formatted: Font: Arial

Deleted: ,

Deleted: ,

Formatted: Font: Arial

Deleted: other

Deleted: Example conservati... [56]

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: .

4.4 OTHER OFFSITE MITIGATION OPTIONS

A developer may purchase water rights that directly impact and/or support groundwater dependant riparian ecosystems. Acceptance of water rights for mitigation is subject to District and Board review and approval. This mitigation option requires District pre-approval and interested applicants are required to attend a **pre-submittal meeting with the District** to review proposed water rights acquisition(s).

Deleted: COMPENSATORY

Deleted: the

Formatted: Not All caps

5.0 LAND ACQUISITION CRITERIA

Lands that may qualify for acquisition under the offsite mitigation program shall be selected based on the following criteria, which help to define inter-connected corridors associated with watercourses throughout the County:

Landscape Level:

- Landscape position (Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Lands System (CLS) categories)
- Covered species habitat (Priority Conservation Areas)

Watershed/Project Site Level:

- Adjacency to existing Preserves;
- Adjacency to major watercourses;
- Connectivity between riparian areas;
- Riparian Classification Maps – Riparian vegetation plant community (Class H vs. Xeroriparian) and density (Total Vegetation Volume);
- Water Availability (Class H, shallow groundwater/intermittent and perennial streams/springs);
- Hydrology/Hydraulics – Ability to support riparian vegetation (presence of FEMA floodplains or locally mapped floodplains);
- Adjacency to reaches of watercourses defined by the 2002 SDCP Report “Riparian Priorities” (available for viewing and download at <http://www.pima.gov/CMO/SDCP/reports.html>);
- Adjacency to existing District or County owned property; however, this criterion is subject to verification of future uses of the land prior to being considered. Certain Pima County owned lands are set aside for future development;
- Within Habitat Protection Priority Areas or Private and state priority areas, pursuant to the Conservation Bond Program (2004 and 2010);
- Connectivity with parks, refuges, existing Pima County restoration projects, and undeveloped land;
- Adjacency to platted Natural Open Space (NOS);
- Special Elements (bosques, cottonwood/willow forests, springs, etc.);

Deleted: TVV

Deleted: ,

Deleted: -/

Deleted: -

Deleted: -

- Historical perennial flows;
- Constructed vs. natural riverine systems; and
- Adjacency to or use of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program and Sending Areas. Development rights are severed from these lands, which allows for higher density development in receiving areas (growth areas). TDR Sending Areas must have comparable RRH values.

The Riparian Acquisition Map (RAM) may be used to assist a property owner or developer in assessing property(s) for the criteria listed above. The RAM is a GIS based map that incorporates information derived from reports and data developed in support of the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan (SDCP). These reports spatially define biologically sensitive lands at a landscape level. Additional information regarding the RAM can be found in Appendix G.

Deleted: The criteria will also include the location of these lands in relation to existing County-owned property, state parks, and federal lands (refuges, national forest, and BLM lands, etc.) and works toward preserving inter-connected corridors associated with watercourses throughout the County.¶

Deleted: o

Deleted: , a Riparian Acquisition Map (RAM) was developed

DRAFT

APPENDIX A

DEVELOPMENT OF THE IN-LIEU FEE OPTION

Deleted: 6.0 CONCLUSIONS¶
The Guidelines provide a necessary tool that will allow for RRH to be mitigated in a timely manner with impacts, provides an alternative to onsite mitigation, and adequately compensates for lost riparian habitat function. This document addresses problems with methods used or contemplated in the past and meets the goals of the District with respect to an offsite mitigation program. Furthermore, this document has assessed and addressed the true costs of mitigation and long-term management of riparian habitat. The options proposed are easy to understand, use, implement, and manage and are based on sound financial and scientific principles, providing an avenue for the regulated community to mitigate for negative impacts to RRH through offsite compensatory mitigation.¶

-----Page Break-----

DRAFT

APPENDIX B

SWCA REPORT – OPTION FOR ASSESSING IN-LIEU FEES

DRAFT

APPENDIX C

NATURAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT REPORT (NRAR) REQUIREMENTS

DRAFT

APPENDIX D

CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPMENT OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS OR EASEMENTS

Deleted: CONSERVATION EASEMENT

Deleted: TEMPLATE

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Indent: Left: 18 pt

DRAFT

APPENDIX E
IN-LIEU FEE CALCULATION SPREADSHEET AND TUTORIAL

Deleted: EXAMPLES

DRAFT

**APPENDIX F
IN-LIEU FEE SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST**

DRAFT

**APPENDIX G
LAND ACQUISITION CHECKLIST**

DRAFT

APPENDIX H
GLOSSARY

DRAFT

Page 5: [1] Formatted	Unknown	
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [2] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [3] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [4] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [5] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [6] Formatted	Unknown	
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [7] Formatted	Unknown	
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [8] Formatted	Unknown	
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [9] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [10] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [11] Formatted	Unknown	
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [12] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [13] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [14] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [15] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [16] Formatted	Unknown	
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [17] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [18] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [19] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [20] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [21] Formatted	Unknown	
Font: 11 pt		
Page 5: [22] Formatted	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Font: 11 pt		

Page 5: [23] Formatted Font: 11 pt	DOT	05/23/2011 8:17:00 AM
Page 5: [24] Formatted Indent: Left: 33 pt	DOT	05/23/2011 8:10:00 AM
Page 5: [25] Formatted Font: 10 pt	DOT	06/13/2011 2:31:00 PM
Page 5: [26] Formatted Font: 10 pt	DOT	06/13/2011 2:31:00 PM
Page 5: [27] Formatted Font: 10 pt	DOT	06/13/2011 2:31:00 PM
Page 5: [28] Formatted Font: 10 pt	DOT	06/13/2011 2:31:00 PM
Page 5: [29] Formatted Font: 10 pt	DOT	06/13/2011 2:31:00 PM
Page 5: [30] Formatted Font: 10 pt	Unknown	
Page 5: [31] Formatted Font: 10 pt	Unknown	
Page 5: [32] Formatted Font: 10 pt	DOT	06/13/2011 2:31:00 PM
Page 5: [33] Formatted Font: 10 pt	DOT	06/13/2011 2:31:00 PM
Page 5: [34] Formatted Font: 10 pt	Unknown	
Page 5: [35] Formatted Font: 10 pt	Unknown	
Page 5: [36] Formatted Centered	DOT	06/23/2011 2:20:00 PM
Page 5: [37] Formatted Centered	DOT	06/23/2011 2:21:00 PM
Page 5: [38] Formatted Centered	DOT	06/23/2011 2:21:00 PM
Page 5: [39] Formatted Centered	DOT	06/23/2011 2:21:00 PM
Page 5: [40] Formatted Centered	DOT	06/23/2011 4:51:00 PM
Page 5: [41] Formatted Centered	DOT	06/23/2011 4:51:00 PM
Page 5: [42] Formatted Centered	DOT	06/23/2011 4:51:00 PM
Page 5: [43] Formatted Centered	DOT	06/23/2011 4:51:00 PM
Page 5: [44] Formatted Centered	DOT	06/23/2011 4:51:00 PM

Page 10: [45] Deleted biological	DOT	05/09/2011 5:28:00 PM
Page 10: [45] Deleted project site	DOT	05/09/2011 5:28:00 PM
Page 10: [45] Deleted to evaluate the site's biological resources	DOT	05/09/2011 5:28:00 PM
Page 10: [45] Deleted the	DOT	06/24/2011 12:31:00 PM
Page 10: [45] Deleted determined	DOT	06/24/2011 12:31:00 PM
Page 10: [45] Deleted)	DOT	05/09/2011 5:30:00 PM
Page 10: [45] Deleted	DOT	06/24/2011 12:32:00 PM
Page 10: [45] Deleted (Appendix C)	DOT	05/09/2011 5:29:00 PM
Page 10: [46] Deleted exotic	DOT	05/06/2011 3:35:00 PM
Page 10: [46] Deleted (t	DOT	05/06/2011 3:36:00 PM
Page 10: [46] Deleted and	DOT	05/09/2011 10:48:00 AM
Page 10: [46] Deleted)	DOT	05/06/2011 3:36:00 PM
Page 10: [46] Deleted , and	DOT	05/06/2011 3:38:00 PM
Page 10: [46] Deleted must not overlap with invasive species control required by other departments. Basically,	DOT	05/09/2011 10:47:00 AM
Page 10: [46] Deleted , it will not be option for mitigation under Chapter 16.30)	DOT	05/06/2011 3:37:00 PM
Page 10: [47] Deleted a	DOT	05/06/2011 3:35:00 PM
Page 10: [47] Deleted ing	DOT	07/26/2011 4:31:00 PM
Page 10: [48] Deleted and o	DOT	05/06/2011 3:33:00 PM
Page 10: [48] Deleted been demonstrated	DOT	05/09/2011 9:26:00 AM
Page 10: [49] Deleted show	DOT	05/06/2011 3:41:00 PM
Page 10: [49] Deleted over the long term	DOT	05/06/2011 3:41:00 PM
Page 10: [49] Deleted	DOT	05/06/2011 3:43:00 PM

use of

Page 10: [49] Deleted	DOT	07/26/2011 4:33:00 PM
irrigation		
Page 10: [49] Deleted	DOT	07/26/2011 4:33:00 PM
irrigation water		
Page 10: [49] Deleted	DOT	05/06/2011 3:45:00 PM
and/or for use in the establishment of		
Page 10: [49] Deleted	DOT	07/26/2011 4:34:00 PM
tion		
Page 10: [49] Deleted	DOT	05/06/2011 3:44:00 PM
, would not qualify as a suitable alternative option		
Page 10: [49] Deleted	DOT	05/06/2011 3:40:00 PM
Proposed RHPPs are subject to the discretion and approval of the District and the Board.		
Page 10: [50] Deleted	DOT	05/09/2011 9:19:00 AM
For projects undergoing the development review process (subdivision plats and development plans),		
Page 10: [50] Deleted	DOT	07/26/2011 8:38:00 AM
exchange		
Page 10: [50] Deleted	DOT	05/09/2011 9:19:00 AM
may be allowed		
Page 10: [50] Deleted	DOT	07/26/2011 8:38:00 AM
exchange		
Page 10: [50] Deleted	DOT	05/09/2011 1:38:00 PM
must		
Page 10: [50] Deleted	DOT	05/09/2011 9:26:00 AM
e		
Page 10: [50] Deleted	DOT	05/09/2011 9:27:00 AM
proximity to		
Page 10: [51] Deleted	DOT	05/09/2011 1:30:00 PM
Large-scale projects offer unique situations because they have the potential to affect relatively large areas of RRH. While protecting RRH onsite is preferred and could well prove to be an asset to the development, the community, and the County's goals for long-term riparian protection, a need for offsite mitigation may still occur.		
Page 10: [51] Deleted	DOT	05/09/2011 9:46:00 AM
developer		
Page 10: [51] Deleted	DOT	05/06/2011 3:50:00 PM
apply the option that will allow them to		

Page 10: [51] Deleted DOT 05/09/2011 11:43:00 AM

This option will be considered on a case-by-case basis for larger developments only and is not available for smaller developments or single dwelling residential development on a single lot. All land acquisition proposals are subject to District and Board review and approval.

Page 10: [51] Deleted DOT 05/09/2011 2:06:00 PM

would

Page 10: [51] Deleted DOT 07/26/2011 8:38:00 AM

exchange

Page 10: [51] Deleted DOT 05/09/2011 9:31:00 AM

compensatory mitigation

Page 11: [52] Deleted DOT 05/09/2011 9:44:00 AM

. The purpose of long-term riparian protection is to promote stable flow conditions and natural functions along watercourses and floodplains County-wide by preserving and/or enhancing riparian vegetation and habitat. In order to meet the purpose and intent of protecting riparian habitat, selection of I

Page 11: [53] Deleted DOT 05/09/2011 1:49:00 PM

A biological evaluation of the land, performed by a qualified biologist, shall be required as part of the land acquisition proposal;

Page 11: [54] Formatted DOT 05/09/2011 1:49:00 PM

Indent: Left: 42.5 pt, Tabs: 60.5 pt, List tab + Not at 34.5 pt

Page 11: [55] Deleted DOT 05/10/2011 8:03:00 AM

Exchanged property shall be evaluated for the properties' natural resource values, CLS status, contribution to County MSCP goals, and I

Page 11: [56] Deleted DOT 05/12/2011 1:43:00 PM

Example conservation easement language can be found in Appendix D