



MEMORANDUM

Date: June 22, 2016

To: The Honorable Chair and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "CH Huckelberry", is written over the printed name and title.

Re: **Responses to District 1 Regarding the Pima County Multi-species Conservation Plan**

This memorandum responds to questions regarding the Pima County Multi-species Conservation Plan (MSCP) that were posed to Ms. Julia Fonseca, Environmental Planning Manager, Office of Sustainability and Conservation (OSC), on June 8, 2016 (see attached email from Shirley Lamonna, Research Analyst with Supervisor Ally Miller's office). Ms. Lamonna's questions largely pertain to costs for Mitigation Land Management/Monitoring. Below are the questions, followed by responses prepared by County staff.

1. *"The estimates for Permit Phase 1 were based on 2009 costs plus 1 year of inflation. Has anyone reworked those numbers for the 3 phases based on 2016 costs?"*

The short answer is "no"; the estimates in Table 8.1 of the MSCP have not been reworked. These are only cost estimates, not financial obligations. The issuance of the Section 10 Permit is not predicated on a required amount of funding, so there was no need to rework the estimates.

First, as pointed out in the text of the document, the vast majority of costs listed in this table are based on programs and directives that are ongoing and already approved and funded by the Board for other reasons. For example, the cost listed here for the Planning and Zoning function was based on the 2009 approved budget, which was driven by continuing Development Services Department services to the private sector. Although the number of private development projects and the provision of these services by the County decreased with the recession and reduction of staff, the costs did not go away. Similarly, the cost to administer the Regional Flood Control Riparian Ordinance exists each year, whether or not there is a Section 10 permit.

As for Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation (NRPR), the cost estimates cover current and anticipated needs; since management of our natural area parks and ranch lands are not predicated on new MSCP requirements. Per the voter approved bonds for open space conservation, new lands were acquired during the past seven years; however, there was no need to rework the numbers, since NRPR did not receive any additional funds for management. In reality, the current Fiscal Year (FY) 2016/17 allocation for NRPR natural open space management is \$1,225,343, which is less than the 2009 figures due to realignment of NRPR job functions and staff. A previously submitted, but not approved, Natural Resource supplemental budget request for FY 2016/17 of \$668,478 would bring

this total to \$1,893,821, which is remarkably close to the 2009 NRPR estimate in Table 8.1 of \$1,829,000 for Year 1.

The OSC ecological monitoring is arguably the only new function that would not exist but for the MSCP Section 10 Permit. In this example, the FY 2016/17 approved budget for the existing OSC Conservation Science unit is \$453,224. This reflects an existing and approved function involving review, assessment and mitigation of environmental impacts and biological issues, including the MSCP, that affect Pima County. The only new cost for OSC is the new function of ecological monitoring. The supplemental budget request of \$149,305 was submitted for FY 2016/17 in anticipation of the issuance of the MSCP Section 10 Permit. Had this budget request been approved, the Year 1 budget for OSC Conservation Science would be \$602,529, approximately four percent more than the 2009 estimate of \$579,000.

In effect, these ongoing, Board-approved functions and budgets that are in place and provide support for implementation of the MSCP are being leveraged to receive a new and important benefit – the streamlining of endangered species compliance – with locally-funded programs and functions. This is a win for the taxpayers of Pima County. The US Fish and Wildlife Service will not require the County to expend the funds listed in Table 8.1, but simply provide the functions. The actual costs have fluctuated each year as the Board approved new budgets for the existing and ongoing functions of various departments. Under the Section 10 permit, the Board of Supervisors retains its discretion over the budget and the functions provided to the public.

After the Section 10 Permit is finalized by the Board, Pima County will be reporting estimates of the actual costs as part of our annual reporting requirements to the US Fish and Wildlife Service. These annual reports will be public documents, available to all.

2. *“What is the estimated increase in FTEs [full-time equivalents] included in the NRPR Mitigation Land Management fees” (Note: we assume the question meant to state “costs” instead of “fees”).*

The original cost estimates were not represented as FTEs, only the overall natural resource budget for NRPR. At the time of the 2009 budget (represented in Table 8.1), it was estimated management of the open space lands that would be credited for mitigation would cost the County \$1,829,000 that year. In FY 2015/16, the budget allocation figure is \$1,225,343, approximately a 33 percent decrease in absolute dollars. Adjusting for inflation (1.625 percent average from 2009 to 2016), the decrease is 41 percent from 2009 levels. This example illustrates the two principles from the preceding question: 1) that the land management function exists independent of whether we receive mitigation credit under the Section 10 permit, and 2) that the costs incurred have fluctuated (down in this case) and will fluctuate from year-to-year depending on the Board’s annual budget decisions.

3. *“Appendix Q indicated that work has already begun on the PCEMP [Pima County Ecological Monitoring] database. Were those costs included in the aforementioned tables?”*

Yes, the cost for database development was included in the estimates. This work is being handled by existing staff. There are no additional costs or FTEs for this effort.

4. *MSCP Final Pg.19 – County is in receipt of all applicable fees. (See Section 4.5.2). I believe this should reference Section 4.5.1.8.*

Yes, this is correct. The reference should be to Section 4.5.1.8., not 4.5.2.

5. *Final EIS – Page 3-69 Table 3.6 – Should the total of County Acres, ASLD acres & BLM acres (277,936) equal the Total acres (309,986?)*

This table was prepared by the US Fish and Wildlife Service contractor to address County ranch management for Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) purposes. Table 3.6 includes both informational errors and a number of calculation errors. The inclusion of the 85,900 acres in the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) column and 2,800 Bureau of Land Management (BLM) acres for Marley Ranch is incorrect and suggests we manage the leases, even though the table itself notes we do not hold these leases. The total acres for Marley Ranch managed by Pima County is 6,337. The Bar V Ranch total is also incorrect. The total for this ranch should be 14,437 acres.

Using current data and correcting several calculation errors in Table 3.6 in the EIS, the correct totals of ranchlands currently managed by Pima County is shown in the table below.

Total County-Managed Acres	County Acres	ASLD Acres	BLM Acres
189,236	45,530	131,823	11,883

Should additional questions arise regarding the MSCP or other matters, I request that such questions or requests be first provided to my office, and I will direct these questions to the appropriate staff.

CHH/mjk

Attachment

- c: John Bernal, Deputy County Administrator for Public Works
Nanette Slusser, Assistant County Administrator for Public Works, Policy
Chris Cawein, Director, Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation
Suzanne Shields, Director, Regional Flood Control District
Linda Mayro, Director, Sustainability and Conservation
Julia Fonseca, Environmental Planning Manager, Sustainability and Conservation
Kerry Baldwin, Superintendent, Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation

From: Shirley Lamonna
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 12:41 PM
To: Julia Fonseca
Subject: MSCP

Good afternoon Julia,

We are still reviewing MSCP, as the budget temporarily demanded a shift in our priorities.

My questions thus far fall under the category of NRPR's Mitigation Land Management/Monitoring. I've read the high level descriptions in Chapter 6 and reviewed the estimated annual costs to carry out Section 10 permit activities by Phase on Tables 8.1, 8.2 & 8.3 but am hoping you can provide some clarification (or direction if this isn't your area of expertise.)

The estimates for Permit Phase 1 were based on 2009 costs plus 1 year of inflation. Has anyone reworked those numbers for the 3 phases based on 2016 costs?

What is the estimated increase in FTE's included in NRPR Mitigation Land Management fees?

Appendix Q indicates that work has already begun on the PCEMP database. Were those costs included on the aforementioned tables?

I also noticed a few potential discrepancies:

MSCP Final

Pg 19 – County is in receipt of all applicable fees. (see Section 4.5.2) I believe this should reference Section 4.5.1.8.

Final EIS – Page 3-69 Table 3.6 – Should the total of County Acres, ASLD acres & BLM acres (277,936) equal the Total acres (309,986?)

Thanks in advance for your assistance.

Shirl Lamonna
Research Analyst

Supervisor Ally Miller, District 1
Pima County Board of Supervisors
130 W Congress St 11th Floor
Tucson, AZ 85701

P: (520) 724-8599

F: (520) 724-8489

www.allymillerdistrict1.com

[Sign Up for the District 1 Newsletter!](#)

**All messages created in this system should be considered a public record subject to disclosure under the Arizona Public Records Law (A.R.S. 39-121) with no expectation of privacy related to the use of this technology.