

From: Priscilla Storm [pstorm@diamondven.com]

Sent: Monday, November 12, 2007 5:46 PM

To: Carla Danforth; Julia Fonseca; Sherry Ruther; Lori Tuchman

Cc: Robert Tucker

Subject: MWG Mtng #3 - feedback

I will not be able to attend. Robert Tucker I believe will be attending. I have reviewed the document and without the benefit of DVI internal discussion or the discussion that will occur at the MWG meeting, I have the following quick observations and feedback. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

1. Is it possible for their to be a two-tier approach – individual lots different from a defined size of “larger projects”.
2. Is it possible that in certain instances disturbance for the purposes of restoration and enhancement would be preferred over avoidance? If so, how might this be addressed or acknowledged and/or incorporated?
3. Is it possible to get some historical data on in lieu mitigation fees paid? Averages by type of area of disturbance, size, etc. Feedback from staff on cases where this was viewed as a viable option?
4. Is it possible to collect seeds off-site, or purchase seeds from a viable seed source (Native Seed Search) and propagate on-site. This option is not identified and may have merit as an alternative.
5. By what method might the County entertain expanded species of trees and shrubs beyond those listed for hydro-mesoriparian and xeroriparian.
6. When there is reference to a “prolonged mitigation planting schedule may be allowed with approval.” What have been your thoughts on how long is “prolonged”? If 5 years is your standard with planting container material, what would be reasonable for collecting and propagating seeds.
7. The seed mix is pretty tightly prescribed, “approved seed mix shall include the following”. Is there any thought that different parts of the County might benefit from some flexibility in the overall seed mix and ratios of types of seeds within the mix?
8. I know that Silverbell Nursery, Desert Tree Nursery and Kelly Green Trees also sell the native species required for mitigation. You may want to add them.
9. Is the relationship between the SDCP CLS, Title 16 and NPPO clear as it relates to on-site mitigation disturbance with the goal of restoration and enhancement. Can NPPO area that also Regulated Riparian Habitat be disturbed for the sole purpose of implementing an approved riparian mitigation plan?
10. Have the Maintenance Requirements been reviewed by Landscape Architects and Landscape Contractors that might have this responsibility. For the sake of understanding by the Mitigation Working Group, would it be beneficial to get an estimate of the cost of meeting these Maintenance Requirements?
11. The stated purposes of the ordinance (pg 3) : #3 uses the term “important riparian areas”, as this is a CLS term, another may want to be substituted to convey the general concept

12. I am not sure I understand clearly the stated purpose of the ordinance (pg 3) in #4 "ecological sound transmissions...."
13. Identifying opportunities for restoration and enhancement of riparian areas is not listed as a concept in the purposes of the ordinance (pg 3). Is there any benefit to adding this?
14. Disturbance to riparian habitat is characterized in the negative, what about disturbance that increases vegetative volume (pg 5).
15. I really would like there to be open discussion about the trigger threshold for a mitigation plan of 14,000 sq. ft. Is it possible for there to be a higher threshold if the disturbance is for roadway, utility or drainage infrastructure related to public health, safety, and welfare. Is it possible to have a greater threshold for larger projects. Where did this threshold originate? What is the rationale behind this threshold? I know this issue has come up before and has been revisited and reaffirmed at the current level. Would be good to give some of us the background. (Fire safety zone impacts have to be mitigated? Really?)
16. In some cases, riparian areas are continuing to degrade and deteriorate without and development. (Ex: some in Lee Moore Watershed). Is avoid and minimize still the preference?
17. How frequently are reductions in setbacks and lot sizes being used as part of riparian mitigation? Where did the lot size reductions originate? What was the rationale? If this option is not being used frequently, perhaps the guidelines for this area could be revisited to incentive greater use of the option for the benefit of riparian areas.
18. On page 10, I really think a different standard for planned residential and commercial sites as compared to single lot commercial or residential would be beneficial.
19. For the Mitigation Irrigation Plan, if the seed collection and propagation option is used, how will compliance with this be met?
20. If mitigation is successful based upon monitoring points, annual reports and photographs, is it possible to be released prior to 5 years? How might this request be made and considered.
21. Restricting human access to natural undisturbed open space has been important to Pima County Staff in project reviews in the past, this results in fencing and walls that also impact wildlife mobility and access, how can these two conflicting values be reconciled?
22. Mitigation within the designated riparian area as compared to adjacent to should be discussed as viable. (pg 18). How will the determination of "located in the best area for the plants to live" be made. Is this too subjective?
23. What happens when the site cannot contain the total number of plants required to meet the mitigation standard. It seems like this is an issue, and should be addressed. Is it possible that the trees will have to be thinned after 5 years?
24. The shrub mitigation requirement is one shrub every 218 sq.ft. The guidelines state (pg 20) "Where the size of site allows, a minimum of 5 shrub species is recommended." What size of site is large enough to allow 5 species? It seems appropriate to consider a two tier system (Ex: sites under 20 acres and sites over 20 acres)
25. Since this is new recommended text, I hope the Xeroriparian D Basic Mitigation Requirements will be discussed. I assume there is a great likelihood that there may be 10 trees per acre, so the 30 tree minimum will probably be the standard. Do we have any

data on Xeroriparian D Mitigation plans that have been processed? Is it possible that a lower standard might be appropriate. (pg 24 and 25) Is there value in discussing the relationship between Xeroriparian D and the NPPO?

26.

Priscilla Storm
Vice President, Public Policy & Community Planning
Diamond Ventures, Inc.
2200 E. River Rd., Suite 115
Tucson, AZ 85718
520.577.0200