

HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN
Technical Advisory Committee
July 12, 2005 1:00 – 4:00pm
Arizona Game and Fish Department Conference Room
555 North Greasewood Road
Tucson, Arizona 87545-3612

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees: Marit Alanen (USFWS), Cathy Blaush (AGFD), Guy McPherson, Mima Falk, Trevor Hare, Linwood Smith, Rich Glinski, Guy McPherson, Karen LaMartina, Lori Lustig, Michael Wyneken (City of Tucson – Planning), Leslie Liberti (SWCA), Ken Kertell (SWCA), Catherine Balzano and Michelle Menchez (Arizona State Land Department)

1) Update on Recent SAC Meetings/Upcoming Meetings

a. *Scheduled SAC Meetings:*

- July 13, 3-5 pm, @ Game and Fish. Tentative Topics: Implementation and funding options – brainstorming session.
- July 27, 3-5 pm, @ Game and Fish. Tentative Topics: Feasibility of implementation and funding options (follow-up to discussion on July 13); overview of TAC recommendations for Southlands.
- August 17, 3-5 pm, @ Game and Fish.
- August 31, 3-5 pm, @ Game and Fish.

b. *Scheduled TAC Meetings:*

- July 12, 1-4 pm, @ Game and Fish. Tentative Topics: Presentation on Arizona State Land Department and Southlands suitability analysis; covered activities and initial conservation measures for Southlands.
- July 26, 1-4 pm, @ Game and Fish. Tentative Topics: Presentation on state trust land reform initiative; continue development of conservation strategies for Southlands.
- August 9, 1-4 pm, @ Fish and Wildlife. Tentative Topics: Presentation on Tucson Water 50-year water plan; covered activities and initial conservation measures for Avra Valley.
- August 23, 1-4 pm, @ Game and Fish. Tentative Topics: Continue development of conservation strategies for Avra Valley.

2) New Business

(This item is out of order to accommodate scheduling constraints)

a. *Arizona State Land Department and Southlands Suitability Analysis*

Michael introduced Catherine Balzano. He noted that this presentation would be interesting, not only because of the overview on how state trust lands are planned and sold, but because the suitability analysis that the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) uses is very similar to the habitat modeling work done for the HCP. Catherine introduced Michelle Menchez, who is also in the Tucson ASLD office.

Catherine explained that, rather than presenting the draft Southlands conceptual plan, she would cover the Town of Marana's draft Phase I conceptual land use plan.

According to Catherine, ASLD was directed by the Growing Smarter Act to complete conceptual land use plans for state trust land. This is the same legislation that required municipalities to update their General/Comprehensive Plans. The ASLD is prioritizing the development of plans and focusing on land planning on "urban" state trust lands. Urban lands are those within 3 miles of heavily populated cities (>250,000 population) or within 1 mile of smaller cities. The focus has therefore been on state trust lands in Maricopa and Pima counties, and to some extent on second and third tier cities, including Sierra Vista, Flagstaff, and the tri-city area near Prescott. ASLD will soon start looking at land use planning in Yuma County.

According to the Growing Smarter Act, conceptual plans should look at the areas with highest growth and planning should coincide with the development or amendment of General/Comprehensive Plans. This is especially important since the conceptual land use planning process is not a public process; by coordinating these plans with General/Comprehensive Plans, it provides an opportunity for public review. Draft conceptual land use plans are reviewed by an Oversight Committee prior to approval, and the plans must be updated every 10 years.

In addition to conceptual land use plans, ASLD is required to develop 5-year disposition plans. The plan for southeast Arizona covers Pima County, southern Pinal County, Cochise County, and Santa Cruz County.

Trevor asked if any plans from southeastern Arizona have gone to the Oversight Committee yet. Catherine replied that only the Houghton Area Master Plan (HAMP) and the Southlands draft plan had gone to the committee. The Southlands plan, which was never approved, will be redone in the future in coordination with PAG, City of Tucson, Pima County, and Sahuarita.

Catherine noted that Marana has been experiencing tremendous development pressure, especially along the I-10 corridor. In fact, one of ASLD's first planning efforts in the Tucson area was with the Town of Marana, but it never manifested into a final plan.

There are three parts to the state trust land planning process in Marana. Phase 1, known as the Twin Peak plan, covers an area between Avra Valley Road, the Santa Cruz River, the CAP canal, and the sand and gravel conveyor belt. Phase II will look at the airport and environs and Phase III will cover state trust land east of I-10. ASLD feels that the Twin Peaks area will be the first of the trust land to experience development pressure in Marana.

ASLD has expanded upon the language in Growing Smarter with respect to developing a suitability analysis. A suitability analysis is used to plan for development (location and type/density) and transportation and infrastructure, while accounting for natural and man-made constraints. For about 5 years, ASLD has been using a GIS-based analysis for the conceptual land use planning process. Currently, there are 56 data layers that ASLD considers as part of a suitability analysis. These layers include information such as: local plans, zoning, slope, floodplain and floodway, vegetation, trails, threatened and endangered species, hazardous waste sites, powerlines, flood control structures,

existing water lines, soils, washes, existing and proposed streets, archeology, subsidence, and population projections.

In the case of the Twin Peaks plan, this list has been narrowed to 7 or 8 layers, which define the development constraints for the site. These factors are also weighted based on the sensitivity of the area. This subset of weighted factors is used to create a relative suitability map. Catherine showed the Twin Peaks plan suitability map.

Once the suitability analysis is completed, ASLD considers local land use plans, in this case the 2003 General Plan for Marana. The conceptual land use plan for this area considered the future land uses identified in the General Plan, as well as the proximity to the airport (e.g., influences such as noise). By integrating the suitability analysis and information from the General Plan, a proposed development concept is created.

The proposed development plan for Phase 1 includes medium and low density residential, with a commercial node and technical campus nodes along Avra Valley Road. The overall size of the planning area is about 2000 acres. The plan is also done at a very broad level; no parks, schools, or internal circulation is identified. The plan also does not consider the location of specific archeological sites.

Rich asked why the lighter green areas (which correspond to lower development suitability) have higher density development proposed than the darker green areas (which correspond to higher development suitability). Catherine responded that the suitability analysis does not reflect the presence of the airport. Also the relatively lower suitability on the northern end of the planning area is likely a function of swelling/shrinking soils near the river. While this factor does reduce the overall suitability rating, with current building practices, it is not much of an obstacle to development. According to Catherine, this area is a good area for development overall. There are few transportation challenges, the planning area is almost entirely outside of the floodplain, and there is very little topographic change.

Trevor asked if this planning area was on the ASLD disposition list. Catherine replied that it was not on the list yet. She thought that 300 to 400 acres would probably be released in several years, but there is currently no application for the land. Trevor asked why ASLD doesn't just sell the whole area at once. Michelle said that it is not in the best interest of the Trust to do so. Catherine added that ASLD only releases land when it is immediately ready for development. ASLD has no holding costs for the land, so there is no incentive to dispose of lands early.

Rich asked about trust land in Marana on the east side of I-10, the area where a preserve has been proposed in the draft Marana HCP. Catherine replied that this area will be addressed during Phase III. She noted that there are a lot of constraints in the area, including archeology, slope, threatened and endangered species, and huge drainage issues. ASLD will go through the suitability analysis and planning exercise for this trust land, but they probably won't sell any of it any time soon. The ASLD prefers to wait until infrastructure is in place in an area, prior to releasing trust lands because that infrastructure increases the value of the lands.

Mima asked what would happen if the ASLD's vision for an area differed from that of the local jurisdiction. Catherine said that the ASLD has to consult with local jurisdictions when planning trust lands. Guy wanted to know how firm is the "consult with" language.

Catherine responded that consulting with jurisdictions is important for having a plan that works locally. The ASLD must consider local General and Comprehensive Plans. The Phase I plan in Marana does differ somewhat from the Town's General Plan, but the future of the Town is tied to state trust land, so there needs to be a give and take relationship between Marana and ASLD.

Mima asked about transfers of development density and whether they were done on a case-by-case basis. Catherine replied that they are always case-by-case. She noted that Michael Wyneken could attest to ASLD's close working relationship with the City during the Houghton Area master planning process. One of the first tasks for the Tucson ASLD office was to adopt the City's HAMP as the state land use plan for the included trust lands.

Mima wanted to know if the conceptual plans provided certainty. Catherine said that they do not. The certainty comes only when the plans are integrated into local plans, and zoning has been changed to accommodate the plan.

Rich asked about state trust land reform. Catharine explained that the reform effort identified three types of areas: priority incentive areas would be automatically preserved, option areas could be purchased for conservation within a specified timeframe, and the remainder of the land would be open for development. The problem with the previous reform effort is that it was too comprehensive; they tried to accomplish too much in a single step. The new reform effort seems to be tackling the issue in pieces. Catherine thought that the new reform proposal would show up on the 2006 ballot. Under this new proposal, not only are conservation values assigned to the land, but it also changes the ASLD business model to allow the Department to act more like a private landowner. For example, ASLD could then participate in joint ventures.

Rich asked if this meant that ASLD would be hiring more investment bankers. Catherine responded that the result would likely be more joint ventures. Trevor noted that the reform would also give ASLD more money from the sales of trust land to be able to use for planning and site clean up. This would equate to more staff in general.

Michael asked if ASLD had considered the potential for a town-wide development transfer in Marana, to see if receiving properties can absorb the transfer. Catherine replied that ASLD was not there yet. She said that it should be possible to intensity development around Tangerine Road, with a lessening of development elsewhere.

Rich noted that planners know which 56 factors that ASLD considers in a suitability analysis. He wanted to know if they couldn't run a preliminary analysis for an area, even before ASLD is ready to begin a conceptual land use planning process. Catherine felt that the best approach is for planners and the ASLD to start at "block one" together.

Catherine pointed out that although the bulk of state trust land is in Yavapai, Cochise (nearly half of trust land), Pinal, and Pima Counties, ASLD has not really been worried about areas outside of Maricopa County. The trust lands in Maricopa were planned 20 years ago.

Rich asked if there was any interest in consolidating Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and ASLD land through land exchanges for management purposes. Catherine responded that the reform effort has proposed allowing exchanges for conservation

purposes. She thought that this was a good idea because it would allow ASLD to trade environmentally sensitive lands for areas that are suitable, and can be sold for, development. Trevor noted that a major problem is that BLM's disposition list is in horrible shape; it doesn't do a good enough job to identify what can be developed and what has conservation value. Catherine added that another issue is the completely different missions of the Forest Service, BLM, and ASLD. Leslie said that Diana Rhoades, from Sonoran Institute, would be giving a presentation at the next TAC meeting on state trust land reform.

Guy asked if conceptual plans could be changed between the time they are approved and when they are implemented. Catherine replied that there could be changes, especially during the site evaluation process. Guy wanted to know what the role of ASLD is once the land is sold. Catherine said that, once sold, the new owner of the land works with the local jurisdiction to negotiate what will be done with the land. The only influence that ASLD has at that point is through any development agreement, if there is one, between ASLD and the local jurisdiction regarding the property. Michelle emphasized how important is coordination between ASLD and local jurisdictions. Buyers would not be happy if ASLD sold trust land based on a conceptual plan, but the local jurisdiction will not grant zoning to accommodate proposed development densities.

3) Old Business

a. Meeting Minutes – Discussion and Approval of May 27, June 7, and June 22, 2005 Minutes

TAC members needed more time to review the minutes. Linwood had a few comments on the June 7 minutes. He will send those out by email prior to the next meeting. All three sets of minutes will be held over to the next meeting for approval.

b. Action Items from Previous Meeting

There are no action items from the previous meeting.

c. Topics Held Over from Previous Meeting – Questions from Joint Meeting

Leslie asked if anyone had questions or comments from the joint meeting. There were none.

4) New Business

b. Covered Activity Scenarios for Southlands

Michael handed out a sheet of calculations that the Planning Department developed as an initial assessment of how much development would occur in the Southlands during the proposed permit period. The sheet is titled *Southlands Preliminary Population, Density & Buildout Estimates*.

Mima asked if Michael thought the City and ASLD would develop a conceptual land use plan for the Southlands after the City had done their own plan. Michael replied that, for both the Houghton Area (HAMP) and the Southlands, the ASLD had developed a

conceptual land use plan before the City had done their own plan for the areas. Rich wanted to know what brought ASLD to the table to develop these plans. Michael explained that the HAMP was a unique situation where the ASLD had received a conceptual plan in 1999 from a consortium that included Diamond Ventures. Under the old system, developers would do the conceptual plans for state trust land. Soon after the plan was submitted, the Growing Smarter Act was passed and ASLD did their own conceptual land use plan for the HAMP area. In the case of the Southlands, money was allocated for land use planning in this area right after Growing Smarter was passed.

Marit asked about the amount of open space that was included in the HAMP. Michael replied that there was 30 percent open space, including washes, parks, and Fantasy Island.

Michael noted that the Southlands development scenarios did not include maps of where that development would occur. He explained that, since there was development along the edges of the Southlands at various points, it is impossible to predict at this point where development within the planning area would start. He said that, if the TAC needed to see where development might occur, the Planning Department could generate alternative map scenarios to show how development might progress within the Southlands.

Michael then went through the calculations on the handout and explained the assumptions behind them. The first set of calculations is to determine the approximate amount of developable land in the planning area. The gross buildable area was determined by taking the total planning area and subtracting existing development, riparian habitat and 100-year floodplains (estimated using the Harris riparian layer), existing road right-of-ways, and additional planned major right-of-ways (from the Southeast Arterial Study). The gross buildable area in the Southlands is approximately 25,000 acres.

Of that possible 25,000 acres of development, the Planning Department assumed that 70 percent would be residential and 30 percent would be non-residential (commercial, industrial, multi-use, etc.) development. Of the residential development, 70 percent would be single-family and 30 percent would be multi-family. Assuming an estimated single-family residential density of 4 residences per acre (RAC) and a multi-family density of 12 RAC, gives an estimate of nearly 115,000 residences within the Southlands at buildout. Assuming 2.75 persons per home in single-family residences at 2 persons per unit in multi-family residences, the Southlands would support about 267,000 residents at buildout.

These population estimates were then used to calculate the acreages that would need to be dedicated to parks and schools. The City Parks and Recreation Department requires, per 1,000 persons, 2 acres of regional parks, 3.5 acres of metro parks, 3 acres of community parks, 2.5 acres of neighborhood parks, and 1 acres of mini parks. Using predicted population for the Southlands, this equates to approximately 3,200 acres of parks, which is 12.5 percent of the gross buildable area. Vail School District estimates were used to determine the approximate number of acres that would be needed for new schools in the Southlands. Between 11 and 19 new high schools, 22 middle schools, 44 elementary schools, and 7 K-8 schools would be needed. Ranging in size from 5 to 50 acres, these schools would require an estimated 2,100 acres (8.5 percent of the gross buildable area). Some public facilities, such as parks, stormwater basins, and school

sports facilities, e.g., soccer fields, can be integrated into a single facility (referred to as collocation). Collocation is assumed to reduce the total needed parks and school acreage by 10 percent. The result is that the total estimated acreage for these facilities is reduced to 4,785 acres.

Although major road rights-of ways were subtracted from the gross buildable area, local and collector streets still need to be accounted for. Based on current knowledge, about 20 percent of a development goes into the creation of these roads and streets. Once all of these subtractions are made, approximately 16,700 acres remain for development in the Southlands, outside of parks, schools, and roads. Approximately 7,000 of these acres are estimated to be single-family residential, about 3,700 as multi-family residential, and almost 6,000 as non-residential development.

The projected Southlands development scenarios, at the bottom of the handout, uses this estimated development acreage and an estimated rate of residential permit requests to predict the length of time required to reach buildout of the planning area. Region-wide, an average of about 10,000 residential building permits are issued per year. Around 45 percent of these residential building permits have been issued for the Greater Southlands area. For the Southlands planning area, the City Planning Department feels that between 30 percent and 40 percent of the residential permits issued in the Greater Southlands will go towards development within the City (i.e., the Southlands planning area). This equates to between 1,350 and 1,800 residential permits per year. Accounting for schools, parks, and streets, this number of residential permits will consume between 300 and 400 acres per year, leading to an estimated buildout time of 64 to 85 years. The City Planning Department is projecting that development will begin within the Southlands planning area in 2020. This delayed start to development is a result of the anticipated disposal of state trust land in the HAMP and in Marana. The City is also considering a Section 10 permit length that runs until 2050. Given this estimated start time and projected rates of development, between 9,030 and 12,060 acres of the Southlands (35 to 47 percent) will be impacted by development during the proposed permit period.

Lori asked how many residential building permits are pulled in the City per year. She thought that there were only about 12,000 permits per year across all of eastern Pima County. Lori also felt that development in the Southlands planning area would begin before 2020 and she wasn't sure how the City got a projected buildout period of 85 years. Michael responded that the Southeast Arterial study has the Southlands buildout occurring about 2076 and a consultant on the HAMP has buildout of this area at 33 years. Lori wanted to know if the Planning Department had considered Diamond Venture's projections for the Swan Southlands. She thought that their numbers could provide a fairly good gauge for development in the Southlands planning area. She also noted that planned infrastructure, such as associated with the Swan Southlands, would be an important influence on when and where development in the Southlands would start. Trevor also suggested that the City consider the ASLD conceptual land use plan for the Southlands and Sahuarita's annexation and land use plans.

Lori suggested that Michael get in touch with John Strobeck to get feedback on the development calculations that the Planning Department development for the Southlands.

c. Conservation Strategies

Leslie asked how the TAC wanted to handle working through the conservation strategies for the Southlands. The TAC could work off of the draft goals and objectives first, or could sit down with maps of the Southlands and try to identify priority areas to protect. With respect to Pima pineapple cactus (PPC), however, it may be necessary to work backwards to figure out what the best approach would be for mitigation. She suggested looking at the County's Priority Conservation Area (PCA) for this species, identify which lands could be acquired, and come up with a strategy that is complimentary to what the County is proposing so that the results make sense at the landscape scale. Trevor noted that he was glad to hear that coordination with the County was an important consideration.

Leslie pointed out that the development estimates for the Southlands were just a rough cut and intended to put bounds on the anticipated level of take in the planning area. What is important from the perspective of the TAC's work is to ensure that the mitigation proposed is proportionate to the anticipated impacts.

Trevor suggested that 300 or so acres of development per year in the Southlands seemed a little low. He thought that developments are typically much larger in size than 300 acres. Leslie pointed out that development does not occur evenly from year to year. A 1200-acre development might be approved within the planning area one year, and no large developments approved in the next several years. Also, even though a development plan may cover 1,000 or more acres, it is not built all at once. Once a plan is approved, usually only a few subdivisions within the larger master-planned area are actually built at any one time. Guy noted that these estimates equate to roughly an acre of development per day. Trevor said that this fit roughly with what he thought the rate of development is in the county. Michael replied that he thought the rate was closer to 6 acres per day.

Leslie suggested that it may not be important to consider where development will occur, only the total acres of development that are anticipated. This is particularly relevant consider the City cannot control when and where state trust lands are disposed. Mima agreed that it would be better to deal with the issue of impact from covered activities in the abstract. She wanted to identify important areas for conservation of the covered species and then construct a conservation strategy around the protection of these areas.

Trevor noted that the TAC would need to see the PCA for the PPC and we should also look at the results of Marc's work when they are available. Leslie said that Marc had done the survey work, but he hadn't written up the results yet. Ken asked if the group was proposing to create a reserve for PPC. Mima replied that they were not set on any one approach.

5) Call to the public

There were no members of the general public at the meeting.

6) Next steps/Future meetings

At the next meeting (July 26), the TAC will review the maps requested at the June 7 TAC meeting and begin identifying conservation strategies. Leslie noted that the stressors/threats subcommittee meeting summaries and matrices and the draft goals

and objectives for each species is now on the City's HCP website. She asked everyone to review this information prior to the next meeting.