

Planning

Landscape Architecture

Information Technology

Real Estate Economics



THE PLANNING CENTER
a division of TPC Group, Inc.

MEMORANDUM

Date: 11/14/07 **Job No:** N/A
To: Lori Tuchman and Carla Danforth
From: Tim Johnson
Project: Riparian Mitigation Work Group

Lori and Carla,

I have the following comments related to the proposed revisions to the mitigation guidelines:

Page 5

- Alteration due to foot paths that meander to avoid existing vegetation should not be considered disturbance.
- Trigger for mitigation requirements should be relative to project size. 1/3 acre disturbance for a 6.5 acre project site is proportionately equal to 7.5 acre disturbance on a 150 acre project site. Additionally, there need to be clarification as to whether the 1/3 acre disturbance is cumulative or by phase, i.e. submittal for larger projects.

Page 11

- Provide reference for Defensible Fire Setbacks requirements
- Monitoring point locations – Who will be monitoring? Who will be reviewing the monitoring? How long will monitoring be required?

Page 12

- Will irrigation plans submitted to Development Services (DS) be reviewed by a licensed landscape architect? According to State Statutes by the AZ Bureau of Technical Registration only a licensed Landscape Architect can provide comments related to sealed plans.

Page 14

- Same comment related to 1/3 acre trigger from page 5.

Page 15

- Monitoring – Is 5 growing seasons the same as 2.5 years in southern AZ? (two growing seasons per year)

Page 16

Page 2

- *Include all layers of site-appropriate vegetation in an un-landscaped condition (as allowable per health and safety considerations). Remove un-landscaped and replace with naturalistic.*

Page 28

- Is there any evidence that a monitoring submittal would help in the goal of the establishing riparian habitat mitigation areas? The monitoring requirement seems to add an unnecessary layer of review.

Thank you,

Timothy Johnson, RLA, LEED
Director of Landscape Architecture

