

Comment Type	Agency/Organization/ Individual	Pima Prospers Comments Received between October 2014 through March 10, 2015 (with one exception*)	How the Comments have been Addressed
Required 60-day	Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR)	ADWR appreciates the opportunity to review Pima Prospers. We have reviewed the plan and have no comments to offer at this time.	No specific comments.
Required 60-day	Arizona State Land Department (ASLD)	In the last communication with ASLD, an email from Tim Bolton - Principal Planner, it said that we would be receiving a letter stating no formal objection but this has not been received yet.	No formal letter received to date.
Required 60-day	City of Tucson - Office of Integrated Planning and Tucson Water	<p>From Tucson Water - #1. Pima Prospers appears to be congruent with the water goals of Plan Tucson &amp; of Tucson Water. #2. An additional goal that both the City &amp; County might want to include is that of making beneficial use of the Conservation Effluent Pool (CEP). Perhaps an additional goal added to Section 4.2 supporting the use of the CEP for environmental/community benefits would be useful. From the Office of Integrated Planning: #1 - Regional Vision pg. 1.4 - does the second sentence mean Pima Prospers reflects Imagine Greater Tucson (IGT) visions, or that it reflects a vision that is more complete for County than that provided by IGT? A bit further clarification of vision could be useful given references to "the plan's vision" - such as that found on the second line on pg 3.1 [an observation - the answer to 1.4 What We Mean by Pima Prospers" appears to encompass elements of a vision. #2 - Goal 1 Implementation Measures pg. 3.5: Just a general suggestion that this subtitle might be revised to read "Goal [#as approp] and Related Policy Implementation Measures." Also it might be helpful to find a way to reference the explanation about implementation measures provided in the second paragraph under "2.3 Using the Document." That was quite useful in understanding what the measures did &amp; did not include. #3 - Policy 6, pg. 3.3 Defining various types of deveolpment specified in this policy would be helpful. Perhaps this could be done in the Glossary or in conjunction with land use maps. #4 - Development Types - throughout the document, a variety of types of development are referenced. For instance, about 10 types of corridors are mentioned (e.g. International Trade, Key Transportation, Revitalization Development Opportunity, Economic Development, etc.). This can get confusing - is it possible to reduce the types? Perhaps in addition or alternatively, the type names &amp; definitions could be included in Glossary. #5 - Policy 6, pg. 3.8: Consider revising the second line of text to read "...Park as the major economic driver" to "...Park as a major economic driver" to acknowledge importance of economic diversity. #6 - Policy 12, Pg. 3.4: Health Impact Assessment (HIA) may be a new concept for many readers. While it is defined in Glossary, it might also be useful to introduce the concept in introductory text of section on pg. 3.2. #7 - Goal 3, Implementation measure f., pg. 3.12: Perhaps working with local jurisdictions could be included in addition to working with the State Land Department. #8 - Policy 1 pg. 4.4: Unclear as to whether this policy also includes Davis Monthan Air Force Base (DMAFB) for growth of aerospace, defense &amp; logistics industries. #9 - Maps: Will the legibility of the maps be dependent on using the Internet for their use or is the intention to make them more legible in print copies in future drafts? #10 - Map Legends: Noted - in printing the maps at 11X17, it was difficult to read the legend. Perhaps reformatting the legend would help address. #11. The Office of Economic Initiative &amp; Office of Integrated Planning: Plan Tucson Future Growth Scenario Map: We would appreciate consideration being given to incorporating reference to the Plan Tucson "Future Growth Scenario Map" (Exh LT-7, pg. 3.144) in Pima Prospers. The map which reflects..." appears consistent with Pima Prospers goals &amp; policies &amp; with acknowledgement that most of the growth of the County will be within incorporated jurisdictions, most notably the City of Tucson and the Towns of Marana and Sahuarita" (PP Pg 2).</p>	<p>Tucson Water - #1. This is an overall comment. #2. Done (Goal 1, Policy 3, on pg. 4.8 in Section 4.2). Office of Integrated Planning #1. Revised and clarified in text. #2. Did not revise to keep simple. #3 &amp; #4. Consolidated types as much as possible and defined some in the glossary. #5. Revised. #6. Referred to in the introductory paragraph and defined. #7. Goal 3, Implementation Measure "f" on Pg. 3.14 - this is a state requirement with regard to the Arizona State Land Department; County planning works with other jurisdictions as standard practice. #8. Added reference to military airport facility. #9. Have simplified and clarified maps as much as possible for the 11 X 17 format; may still require use of the website maps to be able to zoom in on particular sites. #10. Maps were clarified. #11. We believe we are not in conflict with the City of Tucson Future Growth Scenario map. We have added a reference to each of the incorporated jurisdiction including the City to the section on Focused Development Investment Areas on pg. 3.11.</p>
Required 60-day	Pima Association of Governments (PAG)	<p>The goals, policies, &amp; implementation measures described in Pima Prospers appear to be consistent with the factors that PAG must address for metropolitan transportation planning. Pima Prospers includes the goal of promoting economic development with strategic transportation investments. It also includes the goal of providing a comprehensive &amp; multi-modal transportation system. Comments for consideration: #1. Chapter 4 - should you wish to reference the most recently adopted long range transportation plan, the PAG 2040 RTP Update, please let us know if we can be of assistance. #2. Chapter 6 Pg. 6.9 Although the Sun Corridor MPO was not involved in the development of the Freight Transportation Framework Study, please note that it has joined the Joint Planning Advisory Council. #3. Appendix E, Glossary - PAG's organization structure no longer includes the Environmental &amp; Energy Planning divisions. Instead, it currently includes the Transportation Planning, Sustainable Environment Planning &amp; Technical Services divisions. #4. Where PAG is mentioned specifically (e.g. Ch.6 Goal 8, Policy 5) or referred to generally as a regional partner, we look forward to supporting Pima County's efforts to reach these goals. The document will serve as an important planning tool...</p>	<p>#1. Chose not to reference plan due to the number of other plans that would then also need to be referenced. #2. Noted. #3. Correction made. #4. This is a comment.</p>

Comment Type	Agency/Organization/ Individual	Pima Prospers Comments Received between October 2014 through March 10, 2015 (with one exception*)	How the Comments have been Addressed
Required 60-day	Tohono O'odham Nation, San Xavier District - Mark Pugh	San Xavier District only reviewed Introduction, Use of Land, Physical Infrastructure, Economic Development - Planners surprised that the Tohono O'odham Nation & San Xavier District not in any significant way mentioned or included in any of the 3 sections reviewed. As the Tohono O'odham Nation is part of the population, geography, and resources of Pima County, would appear to be a considerable oversight. Specific comments: 1. Cultural Resources Element - no mention of the Nation's Cultural Resources Affairs Department for Archaeological and Historical reviews by the Tribal Historical Preservation Office & his staff. 2. Environmental/Biological Review - & the Nation's Environmental Protection Office. 3. Within Water Resources Element no mention of SAWRA agreement with the Nation & San Xavier District, which includes CAP water allocations that could be available to County entities as water resources. Also San Xavier District is one area within the County not been mapped by FEMA. 4. Within the Tourism Element there is no mention of the National Historic Landmark, San Xavier del Bac Mission. As the premier historic mission - should be highlighted. 5. Lack of written documentation of support for the people of the Tohono O'odham Nation or their needs or ambitions. Was there any coordination with the Nation in document planning or Pima County resources? San Xavier District remains involved in many issues & projects integral to County plans including the Sonoran Corridor, transportation projects, health issues, flooding issues, jobs, and economic development - would be interested in seeing verbiage which acknowledges the issues & concerns of the Nation.	Overall: The planning director contacted Mr. Pugh immediately after receiving his comments and went over the previous efforts to engage the Nation in the process (e.g. two formal letters from the Board of Supervisors chairpersons). Also while the County recognizes the importance of the Nation in the region (which is specifically acknowledged in Pima Prospers), the County does not 'plan' for the Nation which is sovereign. While the Nation is recognized in the Background and Current Conditions appendix, Pima Prospers would not affect the Nation's practice whether environmental or cultural. Specifically - #2 Goal 3 on pg. 3.37 addresses environmental protection. #3 The plan does not get into that level of detail. #4 Cultural resources is generally addressed on pg. 3.50 and pg. 3.21.
Required 60-day	Davis Monthan Air Force Base	No comments received to date.	NA
Required 60-day	City of So. Tucson Planning & Zoning Department	No comments received to date.	NA
Required 60-day	Cochise County Community Development	No comments received to date.	NA
Required 60-day	Graham County Planning & Zoning Development	No comments received to date.	NA
Required 60-day	Maricopa County Planning & Devt Department	No comments received to date.	NA
Required 60-day	Pascua Yaqui Tribe Development Services	No comments received to date.	NA
Required 60-day	Pinal County Community Development	No comments received to date.	NA
Required 60-day	Santa Cruz County Community Development Department	No comments received to date.	NA
Required 60-day	Town of Marana Devt Svcs - Plng Dept	No comments received to date.	NA
Required 60-day	Town of Oro Valley Planning Division	No comments received to date.	NA
Required 60-day	Town of Sahuarita Planning & Zoning Division	No comments received to date.	NA
Required 60-day	Yuma County Devt. Services Department	No comments received to date.	NA

Comment Type	Agency/Organization/ Individual	Pima Prospers Comments Received between October 2014 through March 10, 2015 (with one exception*)	How the Comments have been Addressed
Agency	Sahuarita School District (Superintendent M. Valenzuela)	Importance of the K-12 school community and strategic partnerships, field experiences, and intentional planning efforts be part of the plan. This may be a valuable piece in regional alignment & growth of congruent educational programs, economic development, workforce development & overall quality of life.	K-12 is an integral part of the IGT Regional Vision. With one exception of one County-run school, the County is not a direct provider so policy language is drafted to support the roles of other entities such as school districts. Early education, etc. is addressed by Section 6.4, Goal 1, Policy 1 "g" on pg. 6.23 and Policy 2 on pg. 6.23. JTED is addressed in Goal 1, Policy 5 on pg. 5.22 in Section 5.4 Workforce Training/Education Element. Also access to schools is addressed in the plan.
Agency	National Park Service - Saguaro National Park	Providing improved connections to Saguaro National Park from surrounding communities is a park goal. Many of the transportation goals described in the plan ... should help us move in direction of achieving this goal. Enhancing and protecting viewsheds into and from the park are also important values that we are pleased to see addressed in this plan. Specific comments: #1. Pg. 50 Goal 1: Conserve and protect natural resources. Request the addition of specifically identifying the need to control buffelgrass across all land designations in the county. #2. Pg. 3.2 Conservation Guidelines, Policy 2: Request adding a requirement that in all cases where a permit is required for ground disturbing activities, that buffelgrass and other invasive non-native plant species are eradicated and controlled. #3 Pg. 3.24 Conservation guidelines Policy 8 bullet D: Request that connections and linkages from county lands to non-county conservation or otherwise protected lands such as Saguaro National Park are also considered and prioritized. #4 Pg. 3.3 Goal 2 Implementation measures: Request the addition of another implementation measure to develop, adopt, and enforce regulations to control the spread of buffelgrass. #5 pg. 4.3 Goal 1 Implementation Measures, bullet c: Correct spelling - change National Park Services to National Park Service. #6 Pg. 4.25 Trails Element: Consider adding a policy that requests the addition of bike lanes to all paved county roads either during new construction or when existing roads are resurfaced. #7 Pg. 4.25 Policy 6: Protection of trail corridors should also be considered for linking private lands to each other such as one neighborhood to an adjacent one, or that connect private lands to existing or approved trail corridors. #8. Pg. 9.4 Picture Rocks Rural Activity Center, Policies E: We appreciate the inclusion of this policy that requires notification to the park of any rezoning applications for this planning area.	#1 & #4 Buffelgrass eradication is addressed by Goal 2 Implementation Measures h-j on pg. 3.36. The County code has been reviewed and revised in the past with regard to Buffelgrass (primarily Title 7 Environmental Quality). #2 & #3. Per Pima Prospers practice - no substantive revisions were made to the CLS text. #5. Corrected. #6. "Complete Streets" is promoted by the plan which should address this issue. #7. Revised wording of Goal 1, Policy 6 on pg. 4.32. #8. This special area policy has been retained but <b>Note: Staff will revisit this item (Special Area Policy S-6) - at least some portions - as part of its recommendation at the public hearings.</b>
Agency	Metro Water District - Joe Olsen	In particular, Metro Water District supports collaboration with water providers under Goals 2,3, & 4 of Water Resources Element - it provides mutual benefits. Collaboration & cooperation are most significant ways to better integrate land use & water planning as noted in attached AWRA journal article. Metro also supportive of Goal 1 (Achieve water sustainability...) but believes it would be strengthened if it included a PC policy on reclaimed water entitlement for water providers contributing flows to non-metro water reclamation facilities, which has the benefit of achieving sustainable water management in areas outside of the Tucson metro area. For example, Metro has a reclaimed water entitlement proportional to the reclaimed water generated by District's Metro-Main & Metro-Hub service area customers & treated at the Tucson metro water reclamation plants per the 1978 IGA & 2000 Supplemental Agreements betwn PC & COT. However, effluent entitlements are lacking between water providers & PC at non-metro water reclamation facilities uner PC's control. Water providers other than the COT will likely be the water provider in unincorporated PC because of restrictions in the COT policy. Thus these water providers need access to renewable water supplies as addressed in Goal 2 Policy 1. Reclaimed is a vital renewable supply. The District has demonstrated leadership in sustainable water mgmt... having a renewable & sustainable water supply will be important... The District strongly encourages PC to include a policy on reclaimed water entitlements for water providers contributing effluent to non metro water reclamation facilities. #1 Adding <u>County</u> water rights. #2a. Add policy about water providers having designation of assured water supply a proportional share to reclaimed water they contribute to county non-metropolitan water reclamation facilities.??? #2b. Add Implementation Measure to "Execute reclaimed water entitlements with water providers." #3. Replace policy to "Consider production and underground storage of high quality reclaimed water as viable future water supply strategies" to "Consider <u>use</u> and underground...". #4. Add Implementation Measure to "Execute reclaimed water entitlements with water providers having Designation of Assured Water Supply status that contribute flows to County non-metropolitan water reclamation facilities". #5. Add policy to wastewater section "Develop reclaimed water entitlements with water providers that contribute flows to County non-metropolitan water reclamation facilities" and Implementation Measure "Develop reclaimed water entitlements with water providers."	In response to Metro Water District's request that Pima Prospers include a policy granting reclaimed water entitlements for water providers contributing effluent to non-meter water reclamation facilities, such a policy would be contrary to the direction received from County Administration in July 2013. #1. Done. Revisions made in introductory paragraph for Section 4.2. #2. Goal 1, Policy 4 on Pg. 4.8 addresses the subject of County water resources particularly reclaimed resources and above mentioned direction from County Administration regarding reclaimed resources. #3. Done (Goal 2, Policy 2 on pg. 4.10). #4. Goal 2, Policy 3 Implementation Measure "c" and reference above direction regarding reclaimed water resources. #5. Same as above regarding direction from County Administration.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization/ Individual	Pima Prospers Comments Received between October 2014 through March 10, 2015 (with one exception*)	How the Comments have been Addressed
Agency	AZ Game & Fish Department - Kristen Terpening	Commends Pima County's recognition of importance of healthy environment & in particular continuance of wildlife habitat conservation. (#1) Habitat connectivity for wildlife movement should be considered in all County development planning. Urge Pima County to include all wildlife linkage designs from the 2006 AZ Wildlife Linkages Assessment & the 2012 PC Wildlife Connectivity Assessment in the Comprehensive Plan & consider them in all future planning & permitting efforts. Recommend that all future planning & implementation reference & incorporate, where appropriate, Department's guidelines to help minimize impacts to fish & wildlife populations & habitats that often coincide with expanding urban development. Because new info or technology is often available prior to public release, contact Department's Project Evaluation Program ( <a href="http://www.azgfd.gov/hgis/guidelines.aspx">http://www.azgfd.gov/hgis/guidelines.aspx</a> ). (#2) We would also appreciate coordination in design, development & modification of roadways potentially impacting wildlife & /or their resources. Are particularly interested in roads within, near or adjacent to desert washes, riparian habitats & areas of native habitat. Design roadways to minimize wildlife mortality & population/habitat fragmentation. Identify appropriate road location, buffer areas, fencing, culverts & other wildlife friendly crossing structures. Specific comments: Pg. 4.3 Goal 3: Improve traffic safety & reduce accidents on county roads, additional policy suggestion, "Design roadway improvements/expansions to incorporate wildlife-friendly designs whenever possible to limit vehicle/wildlife collision potential" & corresponding implementation measure: "Work with Arizona Game & Fish Department to identify & prioritize opportunities to minimize vehicle/wildlife collision hazards." (#3) Pg. 6.13 Goal 1 Policy 1 additional implementation measure "Support efforts to eradicate invasive, non-native species, such as Buffelgrass, that threaten the Sonoran Desert natural environment". Including such language demonstrates to residents PC's commitment to responsibly manage & develop while maintaining its unique identity & desert environment. (#4) Pg. 9.64 RP-107 Add Sahara mustard ( <i>Brassica tournefortii</i> ) to the list of species not to be used in RP-107 under any circumstances for landscaping or revegetation.	#1. Addressed in Section 3.4 Environmental Element, Goal 1, Policy 9 on pg. 3.28. #2. Addressed by Goal 3, Policy 6, Implementation Measures "e" and "f" on pg. 4.4. #3. Buffelgrass is addressed by Goal 2, Policy 6 on pg. 3.35 and by Implementation Measures "h-j" on pg. 3.36. Buffelgrass is also addressed under Tourism in Section 6.2, Goal 1, Policy 1d on pg. 6.18 and Policy 3 on pg. 6.19. #4. An RP or rezoning policy applies to a past plan amendment action on a particular site. Did propose adding Sahara mustard per Goal 1 Implementation Measure "k" on pg. 3.36.
Community Organization	Amber Mathewson	Remember the aging in our communities. The population of older adults in Tucson & Pima County is growing. This change in demographics has huge implications for planning and policy making going forward. As the council responsible for planning, Pima Council on Aging is the Area Agency for Aging in our area and needs government support for a robust planning capability. City, county and regional governments need to fund this capability.	"Aging in place" is addressed by Pima Prospers. Specifically the Pima Council on Aging is addressed by Goal 9, Policy 2 on pg. 5.10 which promotes working collaboratively with the organization on a detailed list of aspects of aging and particularly Implementation Measure "e" which covers the designated planner position.
Community Organization	Bill McCreery	Need an "Aging Planner" to support planning for needs of older adults & support PCOA.	"Aging in place" is addressed by Pima Prospers. Specifically the Pima Council on Aging is addressed by Goal 9, Policy 2 on pg. 5.10 and particularly Implementation Measure "e".
Community Organization	*Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection	Comments based on the <b>first draft</b> : #1 They support Sections (i) 4.1 Land Use Element - Policies 2, 4, 5; (ii) 4.3 Open Space Element - Goal 1, Policy 1 & 2; 5.2 Water Resources Element - Goal 2, Policy 1 and Goal 4 Policies 7,8,9,10 and Goal 5 Policy 3; 7.1 Economic Development - Goal 2 Policy 1. #2 In the Environment Element (4.4) the following sections have been deleted: defines of Conservation Lands System (CLS) categories & guidelines related to rezoning activities, application of conservation guidelines, & CLS Implementation Strategies. Why deleted? #3 In Transportation Element, there is only one mention of "connectivity" in Policy 8. We strongly suggest that additional policies be added that address the protection & reconnection of PC's threatened wildlife linkages through construction of wildlife crossings, upgrading box culverts at wash crossings, using & implementing guidelines from the Environmentally Sensitive Roadway Design manual, retrofitting bridges to create bat habitats and the purchase and preservation of open space. #4 Section 7.2 Tourism is an economic engine Policy 3, we suggest addition of a bullet point advocating for purchase & protection of open space. See comments for argument. #5 We support addition of official policy addressing CLS off-site mitigation guidelines (Environmental Element Policy 9). We recognize that county staff has been unofficially implementing this policy for years...Location should be within same general geographical region, property should provide same or better resource values.. (see details), demonstrate that resource & conservation value of off-site mitigation property will be protected in perpetuity. We support including above mitigation principles & new off-site mitigation guidelines section in Pima Prospers. We also strongly recommend that additional language be added to these principles. This language should state that 1) off-site mitigation property would be monitored to ensure that mitigation goals are being met & 2) off-site mitigation acreage should be consistent with CLS migration guidelines.	Staff and the Coalition met subsequent to this letter. These items are several generally added as noted below in subsequent drafts. Verbal suggestions also made were incorporated into later drafts. #1. (i) 4.1 Land Use Element Policy 2 is now Section 3.1, Goal 1, Policy 2 on pg. 3.2; Policy 4 is now Goal 1, Policy 13 on pg. 3.5; Policy 5 is now (revised) as Goal 1, Policy 6 on pg. 3.3. (ii) Section 4.3 Goal 1 Policy 1 is now (with some revisions) (a) Goal 1 Policy 1 on pg. 3.20; (b) Goal 1 Policy 4 on pg. 3.20; (c) - related to Goal 1 Policy 1 on pg. 3.20 (manage land portfolio); (d) Goal 1 Policy 5 Implementation Measure "a 3"); Policy 2 is now Goal 1 Policy 3 on pg. 3.20; (iii) Section 5.2 Goal 2 Policy 1 is now Goal 1, Implementation Measure "f" on pg. 4.9; Goal 4 Policy 7 is now Goal 5, Policy 6 on pg. 4.15; Policy 8 was removed because the section referred to groundwater and surface water runoff would be addressed as stormwater-related policies. Policy 9 is now Goal 2 Policy 1 pg. 4.38 and Goal 5 Policy 3 is now Goal 3 Policy 2 pg. 4.18. (iv) Section 7.1 Goal 2 Policy 1 is now Goal 2 Policy 1 on pg. 6.3. #2 The CLS text has been substantively retained, however, some text is no longer in the policy section because it isn't policy language. For example, the definitions of CLS categories are in the Glossary. #3. Connectivity and wildlife addressed by Goal 3, Policy 6 on pg. 4.4. #4. Addressed by Section 6.2, Goal 1, Policy 3 as well as Goal 4 on pg. 3.22. #5. The mitigation guidelines are addressed in Section 3.4, Goal 1, Policy 11 on pg. 3.28.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization/ Individual	Pima Prospers Comments Received between October 2014 through March 10, 2015 (with one exception*)	How the Comments have been Addressed
Community Organization	Community Foundation (L. Penney)	Hoping that the findings from Imagine Greater Tucson informed the planning process and are cited in the comprehensive plan.	Pima Prospers incorporates the IGT Vision in several places, particularly Chapter 1 on pgs. 1.4 and 1.9-1.10. Also a link to the vision document is provided.
Community Organization	Donald Davis, Astronomy, Planetary and Space Science Consortium (APSS)	Members of Astronomy, Planetary and Space Science Consortium commend you & staff for leading development of the Pima Prospers draft. Offers excellent overall framework for guiding future direction of the county. #1. Astronomy is specific aim of Policy 17 Goal 1 on Pg. 3.5 which encourage areas to be more stringent than code in all zones E1. Encouragement by itself not sufficient to ensure more stringent application. Code lighting limits should be reviewed to protect dark skies. Also special zone around Mt. Lemmon E3a should be included. #2. Implementation Plan Point i. - should also include notifying Mt. Lemmon operators about potential impacts of development or zoning requests. #3. In Tourism section Policy 3, Goal 1 protect Sonoran Desert & dark skies! P.6.14 When addressing comprehensive plan issues, this point should be an overriding approach relevant to all other aspects of the plan. #4. Ch. 9 SAPs & RPs - Special protective zones E1 & E3a in Outdoor Lighting Code should be added to chapter with detailed reqmts for rezoning in these areas. Light limits go both with area & zoning within the area. One point of fact - Goal 4 in Public Safety & Emergency Services attempts to define quality lighting - is there an adequate description on P.5.14? For example, who will develop CPTED design standards? Many of the other items should be part of the adopted standards e.g. item 6. There are 2 related points which do not include APSS activities as significant economic factors in the region: #1. Workforce development on p. 5.22 optics cluster /astronomy/APSS are not obviously mapped to or contained in high priority strategic sectors for developing local economy. #2. Economic Growth Policy 8 enhancing collaboration with UA p. 6.5 - again APSS not mentioned as one category of economic engine where University impacts the community. We recommend for significant emphasis: shared resource/dark night sky for regional distribution of major research astronomical facilities is impacted by sky glow from entire urban area. Although E1 & E3a zones require special protection, for energy savings, preservation of unique qualities of the Sonoran Desert ambience for residents & tourists, as well as protection of astronomical sites, reduction of unnecessary light at night throughout region should be strong goal of planning, regulation, & enforcement. We suggest alternative statement in glossary regarding: dark sky/skies to better capture full range of the topic: "Dark Sky/Skies: Preservation of the natural light/dark cycle through minimizing light pollution. Reducing unneeded light essential to maintain viability/ numerous major astronomical assets in region covered by Plan & comes with providing economic, ecological & human health benefits".	Chapter 3 Use of Land, Section 3.1-Land Use Element, Goal 1, Policy 19 supports developments that voluntarily establish "Dark Skies" mitigation beyond outdoor lighting code requirements; Goal 1 Implementation Measure "j". Added notification of Mt. Lemmon observatory operators; Chapter 5 Human Infrastructure, Section 5.2-Public Safety, Goal 4, (defining quality lighting, CPTED design standards) removed; 5.4 Workforce Training/Education Element does not specifically list local employers or high-priority strategic sectors (APSS not deliberately omitted) Chapter 6 Economic Development, Section 6.1-Business Retention, Expansion & Attraction, Goal 3-Protect Existing Employers, Policy 10 (UofA), Implementation Measure "n" seeks to support research and industry growth related to optics, astronomy, planetary and space sciences; Section 6.2-Tourism as Economic Engine, Goal 1-Revitalize tourism industry, Policy 3 Protect natural environment as tourism attraction includes Implementation Measure "d": Protect Dark Skies. Additionally, the building code's Outdoor Lighting Code & E1 / E3a areas are required. "Dark Sky/Skies" section added with suggested text to the glossary.
Community Organization	La Cholla/Magee Neighborhood Association (LCMNA) Donna Heidinger	Two separate sets of comments - (A) Does not want RP-14 (SAP 2-20) removed as the site could be rebuilt at some point and she wants the policies to carry forward. Doesn't want to lose what they worked for with the Westcor agreement. (B) Am less concerned about LCMNA's individual properties being in both areas because the ... #1. Please reinstate SAP 2-20. RP-14 was a negotiation which does not reflect all of SAP2-20 (no solid masonry wall, etc.); #2. May we add a SAP to manage development Magee/Romero on Sandlin's 20 acres and Holloway's 5 acres? #3. May we add a SAP to manage the development of the 58 acres catty-corner to Mesa Verde Elementary School? #4 Bowers property & NEC Magee Trail/La Cholla were rezoned but no development (likely due to economy). Do you happen to know anything about those? These were rezoned with conditions - where are the RPs? Also, there were many rezoning conditions on the former Ducati parcel (Edgar Heights) that Pulte has developed (& screwed up) where are these policies? #5. Any information on the Nanini parcel at the SWC Magee La Cholla? (wasn't this rezoned to CB-1 with conditions for a restaurant Toscano's & stuff?) #6. Any information on the Courtney property (RP-131 still good) at the NWC Magee/La Cholla? #7. RP-77 - this property is developed - it is a church and no rezoning was required, but we want RP-77 to remain in the event of a future rezoning. Thank you. #8. RPs #s 19 & 129 - these appear to be the same thing for the same parcel (#129 seems to have been written after the Adaptive Reuse Ordinance was enacted & #19 before?)	The Planning Director responded in writing with the following: #1. No change - the property is rezoned and fully developed. If redeveloped then would abide by rezoning conditions. Policies no longer carry weight if property is rezoned with the exception of specific plans. #2 & 3. Best solution is to negotiate condition of rezoning. Not possible to put an RP on them at this time - have not talked to owner or neighbors. Best resolved at the rezoning stage. #4. This is a platted, zoned subdivision - the rezoning conditions would govern. #5. Correct, this is CB-1 but have no information on its development. #6. We show RP-131 still included in the plan. #7. We concur and continue to show RP-77 on property. #8. Two different parcels in which the ordinances are adopted and the sites built.
Community Organization	Metropolitan Pima Alliance (MPA) - Amber Smith	We thank you for the opportunity to comment on Pima Prospers... #1. MPA is pleased with the articulation and comprehensive nature of this plan, as well as the forward thinking in promoting our community's shared values of job creation, economic development, protection of the natural environment and enhancing our quality of life. Overall, the draft of Pima Prospers reasonably reflects an attainable future vision for Pima County, and adequately addresses and guides the future vision of our vibrant communities. #2. As we have met with consultants, we have formulated a recommendation that we think can improve and strengthen Pima Prospers. MPA respectfully suggests that the Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Lands System portion be removed due to its complex language and technical nature. MPA feels that this portion would better serve and protect the natural environment as a stand-alone document ultimately providing greater flexibility and ameliorating the difficult amendment process. MPA will continue to review the document as it evolves to ensure it mirrors the goals of MPA in creating reasonable land use policies that promotes growth and development while protecting our natural environment and neighborhoods. We are confident that many of the goals and policies outlined in Pima Prospers are obtainable and we look forward to reviewing the next draft. Again, we thank you for the opportunity to provide commentary on this document and look forward to collaborating to advance the community's shared values and the success of this region.	#1. Thank you for the positive comments. #2. Per Pima Prospers practice - no substantive revisions were made to the CLS text.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization/ Individual	Pima Prospers Comments Received between October 2014 through March 10, 2015 (with one exception*)	How the Comments have been Addressed
Community Organization	Dot Esler	Member of ELDER alliance, care about community, demographic shift toward aging underway, PCOA needs government support to have a robust planning capacity. Local governments need to provide funds to pay for a professional planner focused on issue related to aging. Any plan for the future should address this need. The population of older adults will continue to grow & social change will occur, our government needs to proactively be prepared to deal with these changes.	"Aging in place" is addressed by Pima Prospers. Specifically the Pima Council on Aging is addressed by Goal 9, Policy 2 on pg. 5.10 and particularly Implementation Measure "e".
Community Organization	Kathy Wilson	Page 4.23 Physical Infrastructure Connectivity Goal 3 By 2020 25% of PC residents will be 60 or older (15% today). Fastest growing segment is the 85+ population - many implications for community - housing, transportation needs, human services, health care access, & many other issues. To ensure our community can respond to changing demographic needs, need to support a professional planning effort, taking into account our changing population. With right plan & infrastructure, older citizens can remain active & connected with affordable housing & access to transportation & to services. PCOA (Area Agency on Aging (AAoA)) part of a national network of agencies that help communities plan to deliver services and supports to older residents. Since many AAoA are part of county government in other communities, planning for older adults is a natural part of the process. Since PC has a non-profit Area Agency, we need to create a position within PCOA, supported by each jurisdiction w/n the county in order to make the most of our collective resources. PC is a great place to live. Let's work together to ensure that our older citizens can continue to live here, remain independent and live in their own homes for as long as possible. In addition, these older folks have considerable talents and wisdom to share. Let's value their contributions by putting some effort into keeping them connected.	"Aging in place" is addressed by Pima Prospers. Specifically the Pima Council on Aging is addressed by Goal 9, Policy 2 on pg. 5.10 and particularly Implementation Measure "e".
Community Organization	LaVonne Douville	Pima Council on Aging (PCOA) needs to be supported by PC & COT and United Way and Community Foundation to hire planning staff to work with various city, county and community agencies to develop a comprehensive plan and policy actions to address the growing needs... strongly believe that PC should be one of the contributing partners to fund PCOA....	Aging in place is addressed by Pima Prospers. Specifically the Pima Council on Aging is addressed by Goal 9, Policy 2 on pg. 5.10 and particularly Implementation Measure "e".
Community Organization	League of Women Voters - Green Valley	Bringing people closer together where services are available already is what should be happening now. I hope your explanation (gave Pima Prospers presentation to her group) will generate some email comments from the people attending.	Compact and mixed use development are promoted by the plan particularly in Chapter 3. Compact Development is addressed in Section 3.1, Goal 1, Policy 1 on pg. 3.3 and within the Focused Development Investment Areas section on pg. 3.11.
Community Organization	Lucy Read	Planning for senior services & programs - to assist planning for the influx of boomers & others in this area, consider funding such a position at PCOA.	Aging in place is addressed by Pima Prospers. Specifically the Pima Council on Aging is addressed by Goal 9, Policy 2 on pg. 5.10 and particularly Implementation Measure "e".
Community Organization	Maria Ramirez-Trillo	Support for Aging Services Professional Planner - As a member of ELDER Alliance, we seek support for a professional planner for aging services in PC. With ever growing population of older adults, there will be huge implications for planning & policy making in near future. Funding will be needed to fill professional planner position. As the local Area Agency on Aging has responsibility for this planning, Pima Council on Aging, will need government support for a robust planning capability.	Aging in place is addressed by Pima Prospers. Specifically the Pima Council on Aging is addressed by Goal 9, Policy 2 on pg. 5.10 and particularly Implementation Measure "e".
Community Organization	Mary Dillon	Member of Elder Alliance - need for professional "aging planner".	Aging in place is addressed by Pima Prospers. Specifically the Pima Council on Aging is addressed by Goal 9, Policy 2 on pg. 5.10 and particularly Implementation Measure "e".
Community Organization	Robert Medler Tucson Metro Chamber	Still have concerns that the plan does not incorporate enough of the following: Little or no emphasis on the business community's two most important priorities: improving permitting and other systems, and streets and roads. #1. For the first concern, can improving the permitting process be included under section 6.1, Goal #3. It would seem like a natural fit and an easy way to directly approach this concern. Transportation funding focus could fit under the same section, but Goal #8. One of the things we hear consistently from those in logistics is how the roads wear and tear on their vehicles. Increased funding to road maintenance supports our region's ability to be a key transportation and logistics center.	#1 is addressed by Section 6.3, Goal, Policy 1 "l" & "m" on pg. 6.21 and Section 6.7, Goal 1, Policy 4 on pg. 6.30. #2 is addressed by Section 4.1, Goal 2, Policies 1, 3, 4 on pg. 4.3, Section 4.7, Goal 1, Policy 1 on pg. 4.6, Section 6.1, Goal 2, Policy 2 on pg. 6.4, Section 6.1, Goal 6, Policy 6 on pg. 6.16, Section 7.2, Goal 2, Policy 2 on pg. 7.3, Goal 6, Implementation Measures "c", "d" on pg. 7.7.
Community Organization	Tracy Taft	I really want to know whether there is anything specifically about Ajo or rural areas in general.	Ajo is especially recognized as a unique community in the plan (e.g. Ch. 1 on pg. 1.10). A policy to consider doing a community plan for Ajo is proposed in Section 3.1, Goal 1, Policy 16 on pg. 3.5 and identify funds to do a community plan ("g" on pg. 3.6). Ajo addressed in Arts District Section 6.6, Intro paragraph on pg. 6.27 and Goal 3, Policy 1a on pg. 6.28 and in the associated Implementation Measures on pg. 6.29.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization/ Individual	Pima Prospers Comments Received between October 2014 through March 10, 2015 (with one exception*)	How the Comments have been Addressed
Individual	Adam Kmiec	The Plan is really impressive and contains all the basic elements that need to be included in the future Pima County planning. Most of the elements are described in general terms, of course, and the details will be included in the annual plans of particular county departments. I hope that the detailed transportation plans for the coming years will conform to the Ch. 4 Transportation, Goal 2 "Maintain the county roadway system in a state of good repair", and will include the neglected for years Edwin Road, east of Lago del Oro (Tortolita Planning Area).	Thank you for the positive comments. Transportation planning is addressed in Goal 2 on pg. 4.3. Individual roads are not addressed by the plan (except economic development corridors); there are transportation plans that address specific roads.
Individual	Adam Kmiec	When contemplating the issue of the Edwin Road maintenance (East of Lago del Oro) the consideration for various road users seems to be the main problem. It applies actually to any other road in Pima County. The car and truck drivers need a road for themselves, the ATV riders need a road for themselves, the bike riders beg for safer bike paths, and the horse riders have their needs too. And when driving on Edwin Road one vehicle has to stop to make safe passage for the oncoming car because the road is so narrow. And it is a funny situation, since we certainly do not dsuffer from lack of vacant land in the US. Why not make the roads wide (the norms for road wideness) to provide for everyone's safe usage? When looking on the map we can see that almost 70% of land is begging for being use. Let's use it!	Transportation planning is addressed in Goal 2 on pg. 4.3. Individual roads are not addressed by the plan (except economic development corridors); there are transportation plans that address specific roads. The general transportation policies within the plan promote "complete streets".
Individual	Anthony Bruno	Reviewed plan in its entirety - pleased with road map & how it integrated all areas of concern. With that said, was a little surprised that it did not take into account what opportunities already exist in PC when it came to goal 5 and additional ways to support what already exists. Am speaking of Goal 5, health & Well Being. Health in rural communities means health & health care availability not just the fact that we need hiking & biking trails. Many rural areas in PC are considered target areas for not only health related issues but poverty. These communities may already have health care clinics or health plans in place or planned for future. These opportunities provide not only for health but for econ. development in these areas and goal 5 should support the current health care & related organizations but allow for those planned for in the future. Goal 5 seems to be more focused on lifestyles rather than completely investing in local pubic service facilities.	Goal 1 of Section 5.1 "Promoting Healthy Lifestyles..." addresses the issues from 'land use planning' to 'access to resources' on pg. 5.2. Goal 3, Policy 1 on pgs. 5.4 & 5.5 has to do with better communication to further access to resources.
Individual	Bill Ford	Pima Prospers is every bit as impressive as Plan Tucson. I look forward to a joint plan in 2030. Ed Mazria says that year is marked as a watershed for sustainable success and that means economic health. Everything we do now needs to move us into that direction. I'm glad PC has this opportunity. Truly historical.	This is a general comment on the plan.
Individual	Caroline Salcido	Area SW of Tucson lacks public meeting rooms. Usable space could be added to SW branch library or senior center. County may also consider including non-elderly disabled populution in senior activities as both groups have similar needs.	Goal 1 on pg. 5.27 supports the library system as a vital community asset for the provision of a variety of services and the associated Implementation Measures provide more specific direction.
Individual	Dave Devine	Since 1980, people in Pima County (PC) living on wages below federal poverty level has risen from approx 14 to 20%. Given current & future economic development possibilities in county, that steady increase shows no signs of abating. To change this direction, commentators for decades have pointed to importance of improving education in PC as key component. Per the Arizona Daily Star 1989: "business leaders and [TUSD] district officials said that without a 'good educational system' businesses here would suffer because future employees and entrepreneurs would lack education needed to succeed." Despite that & numerous other warnings, public educ funding has been drastically cut in AZ & Tucson voters in many school districts have denied spending overrides. Thus, PC's economy has stagnated & new jobs created are mostly low paying in service sector. To address this issue, draft plan emphasizes transp & tourism related econ devt projects - same types of recommendt's that have been issued for many years. ..Trying same thing & expecting different results won't bring about different outcomes. As alternative, reducing the county's poverty rate as well as lifting wage rates should be specific goals in plan. In addition, focus of tourism should be dropped. According to US Bureau of Labor Statistics the average hourly earnings of employees in leisure & hospitality was \$14.06/hr & avg #/hrs worked weekly was 26.2. In comparison mit.edu shows that for Tucson, 1 adult with 1 child needs to earn \$19/hr for "living wage". Most new jobs in tourism will create more poverty, not reduce it. In addition, Policy 8 should be added to Sect 5.4 "Workforce Training/Education Element" that would read: The BOS should support the creation of a Regional Education Association to be funded by a voter approved sales tax increase. These funds will be distributed to all public schools, from K-8 to the University of AZ on an annual basis for approved projects. In conclusion, PC is not prospering now nor has it been since Great Recession without investing more in education the possibility of reversing trend unlikely. Board needs to take a leadership role in this area or by 2020 & beyond who knows what poverty rate in PC will be.	Chapter 5 Human Infrastructure, Section 5.4-Workforce Training/Education Element focuses on workforce training and investment needs on sectors that provide high-paying jobs. Chapter 6 Economic Development, Section 6.1-Business Retention, Expansion & Attraction, Goal 3-Protect Existing Employers identifies region's top 3 employers (Raytheon, UofA, DMAFB), none of which are tourism-related, and seeks to increase degree pathways for incumbent technology workers and high-tech employers; Section 6.4- Our People as an Economic Driver, Goal 1-Develop our workforce, Policy 1- Develop potential workforce includes f) acknowledging poverty in the region and eliminating barriers for a productive workforce, and g) investing in education to give our workforce a head-start.
Individual	David Williams	There are no policies related to the 1900 acre property Rancho Verdad(?) Is this because you are still working on policies for this property? I am not a fan of such property specific policies in a comp plan... I am not really sure but if there is a succinct explanation of 'why' rezoning policies are needed in the plan it would be helpful to have it on hand.	Commenter withdrew his individual request. Staff expects his land use change request will be coming in as a regular plan amendment request during the annual cycle.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization/ Individual	Pima Prospers Comments Received between October 2014 through March 10, 2015 (with one exception*)	How the Comments have been Addressed
Individual	Dennis Rezabek	A new study jointly released Thursday November 6th by NASA and the University of California at Irvine paints a shocking picture for the future of Western water. In the last seven years, Lake Mead's dwindling water level has accelerated. The lake is now just barely more than 1,080 feet above sea level, slightly below its previous record low set in November 2010. The before images were taken when the lake level was 1,111 feet above sea level. Lake Mead hasn't been officially full - 1,221 feet above sea level- since 1983. The challenge to policy makers and water managers in the Colorado River Basin is to reliably meet freshwater demand under these dynamic conditions. Our work suggests that a conjunctive surface water and groundwater management plan is essential for sustainable water management in the Basin. Despite commendable efforts to craft solutions to meet required surface water allocation [Bureau of Reclamation 2012], consideration of the ability of groundwater withdrawals to meet current and future demands remains dormant. We hope that the heightened awareness of the rates of the Basin groundwater depletion highlighted here will foster urgent discussion on conjunctive management solutions required to ensure a sustainable water future for the Colorado River Basin and for the western United States.	Water Resources begins to be specifically addressed under "Water" in Chapter 1 Introduction on pg. 1.5. Water is addressed in the Climate and Emerging Issues section on pg. 3.35 (e.g. Policies 2 and 4). Section 4.2 Water Resources Element on pg. 4.6 is entirely on water. Water is addressed in the energy section on pg. 4.18 and in the Public Buildings section (Goal 2, Policy 1 "e") on pg. 4.28.
Individual	Dot Esler	Picture Rocks Special Area Policy (SAP) - measures to protect rural character are important: A. Makes sense even though Picture Rocks Business Association no longer in existence, sidewalks are most important element. B. Again important but hitching area & equestrian access are not relevant. Parking recommendations are valid. C. Nothing wrong with SW or western motifs being promoted. D. I agree no high rises. Another important issue not addressed is how to keep the Dark Skies at night. This is a value many residents hold in Picture Rocks. The SAP should also highlight a connection to the Saguaro National Park.	This special area policy is retained. <b>Note: Staff will revisit this item (Special Area Policy S-6) as part of its recommendation at the public hearings.</b> Dark skies is addressed several places in the plan including Goal 1, Policy 19 on pg. 3.5 and Section 6.2, Goal 1, Policy 3 and associated implementation measures. Special area policies are set up when there is a plan amendment for a particular site or they are a carryover from a past community plan policy. The SAP does state that the Saguaro National Park will be noticed on any rezoning applications.
Individual	Jerry Bodmer	Section 1.6 states that population will increase to 9 million - water availability is inadequate to sustain that growth, either a lot of water needs to magically appear, water use per capita needs to drastically decrease, or population growth needs to be significantly curtailed. In reality all 3 probably necessary. I see nothing in plan which addresses the water/population issue, region still has 'head in the sand' regarding water shortages, lust for money still trumps the truth. I am not sure that "Measures" in the plan mean actions or metrics. If former, label these initiatives. If latter, they are poorly written, they need to be stated in terms that can actually be measured, also state what is to be delivered & who is responsible. Is Appendix B mentioned in Section 10.8.C designed to address this? I believe that what is measured gets done. Without discipline, plan won't come to fruition. Intense attention & allegiance to Section 10.0 is absolutely critical.	Water Resources begins to be specifically addressed under "Water" in Chapter 1 Introduction on pg. 1.5. Water is addressed in the Climate and Emerging Issues section on pg. 3.35 (e.g. Policies 2 and 4). Section 4.2 Water Resources Element on pg. 4.6 is entirely on water. Water is addressed in the energy section on pg. 4.18 and in the Public Buildings section (Goal 2, Policy 1 "e") on pg. 4.28.
Individual	Lois Berkowitz	Mandatory green building parameters. See pg 9.88 RP-122 - should change "Example measures may include" to "Measures shall include..." These conditions should be mandatory not optional. Note all other policies under RP-122 are mandatory. Policies 1-3 listed under RP-122 B should be added to and made mandatory for every new building project, commercial or residential in the Pima Prospers document. There is no conceivable justification for new construction to be made without regard to 1. Solar orientation of buildings; 2. Landscape design to enhance shading of buildings and reduce urban heat island effects; and 3. On-site rainwater harvesting with the goal of augmenting or meeting irrigation needs. These rudimentary conservation efforts must be part of development in Pima County to improve quality of life for all.	A Rezoning Policy (RP) is developed at the time of a specific amendment to the comprehensive plan for a specific site. It is a policy and only becomes mandatory if it is carried forward as a rezoning condition. Therefore, the rezoning stage would be the time to make the statement a requirement. The plan does address Green Building in general in Goal 14 on pg. 3.49 and within Focused Development Investment Areas (FDIA) on pg. 3.12.
Individual	Marilyn Chico	Western section of Tucson has had huge increase in housing developments (Star West/East) What is the county planning for meeting "public needs" as far as convenient shopping? There is a huge population of homeowners who must travel at least 5 or more miles to a decent grocery store. Also to meet social needs has the county investigated the building of a recreational center? There are a lot of youth who could use a safe place to meet, play, study, and interact. To date there is not such a facility but plenty of open land to build a center.	Land use policies (beginning on pg. 3.2) promote mixed use and a balance of land uses. The southwest area is one of the specifically identified Focused Development Investment Areas (FDIA) as shown on pg. 3.11.
Individual	Merrill Eisenberg	Comments on Section 5.8 Food Access Element: #1. End of 2nd paragraph on pg. 5.30 "Do you think you could also mention things like WIC - a county-run program that provides vouchers for healthy food for low income pregnant women and children, and also vouchers that can be used at farmers' markets?" #2. Goal 1, Policy 1 on pg. 5.31 "You mention University of AZ, but maybe you could call out Pima County Extension Services?". #3. Goal 1, Policy 1 on pg. 5.31 item "not sure a food hub needs to be in an under-served area. but certainly kitchen incubator facilities can be developed at the neighborhood level to help folks prepare and market healthy food - if you want to know more about kitchen incubators let me know and I'll put you in touch with ..." #4. Goal 1, Policy 1 on pg. 5.31 Item "g" This might be better expressed as "access to healthy food at the neighborhood level". #5. Goal 1, Policy 1 on pg. 5.31 item "j" So I was told by some "expert" that roof gardens are not appropriate for desert climates - hope you had a better source. #6. Goal 1, Policy 1 on pg. 5.31 "k" This sounds very vague and I'm not sure the science is all that strong on organic (although I would certainly agree that organic is better...). #7. Goal 2, Policy 1 on pg. 5.32 Item "a" So how is this different from what you said above in Policy 1 "...removing barriers to... items "e" and "f"?"	#1. Added text. #2. Addressed by Goal 1, Policy 1 on pg. 5.32. #3 & #4. Revised Goal 1, Policy 1 item "f" and "g" respectively as suggested. #5. This is a comment only. #6. Revision not made. #7. Revised wording.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization/ Individual	Pima Prospers Comments Received between October 2014 through March 10, 2015 (with one exception*)	How the Comments have been Addressed
Individual	Mike Marks	Change RP 21 because it refers to REAC in title and content.	All RP's & SAP's were reviewed for consistency with the proposed Map Legend.
Individual	Peg Sutherland-Jones	6.4 Goal 1 Policy 2 Core solution is for young people to know they can succeed in jobs. County should pioneer serious job training in high schools, using German model of intensive training in last 2 years of high school, concurrent with traditional education. We can talk about a "favorable climate" & "support" forever but we need real programs in focused job training. Require concerted & well publicized effort to bring in low income students, essential for County's success, don't wait until they get to Pima Community College.	In Section 5.4 on pg. 5.21, the policies address connecting youth with high demand industry occupations. Also - Early education, etc. is addressed by Section 6.4, Goal 1, Policy 1 "g" on pg. 6.23 and Policy 2 on pg. 6.23. JTED is addressed in Goal 1, Policy 5 on pg. 5.22 in Section 5.4 Workforce Training/Education Element.
Individual	Peter Archuletta	Arterial roads taking toll with the amount of traffic, amount of air pollution produced by stop & go traffic, needs to be a bypass connecting Aviation to I-10 reducing traffic downtown, extend I-19 along Oracle Rd corridor Hwy 79 in Pinal County as a toll highway constructed, operated, & maintained by private entity. Construct loop system from Ina & I-19 along Ina, Skyline, Sunrise east to I-19 also as a privately operated toll highway. Construct Tangerine as an expressway with limited access to Oracle Road. Recognizing some outcry on the four suggested projects, it is still the right direction to go for protecting our arterial roads from deteriorating so quickly & causing continued maintenance problems, minimizing personal vehicle damage caused by poor roads, and minimizing air pollution by reducing idling vehicles.	General transportation goals are provided Section 4.1 on pg. 4.2 but specific roadways aren't addressed by this plan. Other, transportation plans address specific roads. Maintenance is emphasized by the plan in Goal 2 and associated policies and implementation measures on pg. 4.3 and Goal 6, Policy 6 in the economic development chapter on pg. 6.16.
Individual	Robert Jacobson	Edited Section 4.6 - added goals/directives. Wants to include the County Administrator in discussions. Mainly he wants to better promote the importance of communication networks particularly to economic development, enhance human infrastructure connectivity. Edits to Section 4.6- Communications Element, submitted Dec. 10, 2014: Goal 1. Fast, efficient, affordable, reliable communication networks, learning & collaboration technologies and people-centric services - public, private & hybrid - are fundamental to County economic development & enhanced human infrastructure connectivity. These networks, technologies & services are essential to meet social & environmental challenges & seize forthcoming opportunities - the County's social, cultural, governance & economic activities will increasingly take place in the virtual realm. People's ability to use networks, technologies and services (as residents of communities, businesses, cultural and educational organizations, & economic and social actors) is equally important if they are to become the County's economic driver described in the Economic Development Element. Goal 2. Encourage and ensure universal access on countywide basis to fast, efficient, affordable and reliable wireless and broadband communication networks, learning and collaboration technologies, and people-centric services that support economic development. Policy 1: Support and participate in countywide development of facilities that provide fast, efficient, affordable and reliable access to regional and community programs and services via wireless and broadband communication networks and learning and collaborative technologies. Policy 2: Proactively explore and exploit opportunities to extend wireless and broadband communication networks, learning and collaborative technologies and people-centric services throughout the County's communities and rural areas. Policy 3. Promote and support the thoughtful use of new communication technologies such as wireless and broadband (including fiber) networks, learning and collaborative technologies, and people-centric services. Goal 3. Explore the use of emerging, advanced communication networks and collaboration technologies to enhance County human-infrastructure connectivity and increase capacity of County and its people to anticipate, plan for and collaboratively meet social and environmental challenges and seize forthcoming opportunities. Goal 2 Implementation Measures: a. Continuously evaluate the communication, learning and collaboration and people-centric service needs of County residents, communities, businesses, cultural and educational institutions, and overall prosperity and well being. Make this a regular part of the County comprehensive planning process. b. Procure, provide and encourage the development of latest emerging networks, technologies and services to meet the needs described in "a" (above).	Chapter 4 Physical Infrastructure Section 4.6 - Communications Element, Goal 1 Implementation Measures include text about new or updated communication facilities and County residents' ability to stay current with new networks, technologies and services; Goal 2, Policy 1, Policy 2 and Policy 3 text added; Goal 3 text expanded into Goal 3 and Policy 1, a) and b); Goal 2 Implementation Measures a. and b. text added.
Individual	Ron Spark	Read through Ch. 1 & found wording clear & scope exhortary. Sure there will be some wordsmithing but substance has both breadth & meat.	This is a comment on the overall plan.
Individual	Tina West	Subject of Ajo arroyos & the Regional Flood Control District (RFCD) - specifically Gibson arroyo. The arroyo is in eminent danger of being rip-rapped according to political designs which are overriding even District engineers best attempts to advise to the contrary. Cumulatively, the Ajo arroyos will follow political demands. Is there anything in the new plan that could guide flood control development in Ajo arroyos with some wisdom & sound planning development guidelines? Afraid that definitions such as "riparian" & other terms leave Ajo's arroyos without protection. Let me know if I can be heard by being more current draft plan citation specific.	Goal 2 on pg. 5.18 addresses climate and drainage. The open space Section 3.3 and Section 3.1 Goal 1, Policy 5 on pg. 3.3 addresses drainage. The plan proposes the option of a community plan for Ajo Section 3.1, Goal 1, Policy 16 on pg. 3.5 addressing specific issues such as Dark Skies, economic development, trails & arroyo/wash protection, and recreation and open space and identify funds to do a community plan ("g" on pg. 3.6). Drainage protection is addressed in Climate and Emerging Environmental Issues Goal 2, Policy 4, on pg. 3.35, also Section 4.2 Water Resources Element and Section 4.9 Flood Control and Drainage Element. Some comments relate to specific issues being addressed as well by Regional

Comment Type	Agency/Organization/ Individual	Pima Prospers Comments Received between October 2014 through March 10, 2015 (with one exception*)	How the Comments have been Addressed
Individual	Tina West	Please include development policies that speak to: 1. Public & private utility companies must provide shields on streetlights to direct light onto public street only & not onto neighboring private residential properties. 2. Individuals or organizations installing stand alone privately operated outside lights must provide shields to direct light onto their property alone & not onto adjacent or neighboring properties. 3. County properties must minimize to fullest extent electrical light brightness level of lighting installed at public facilities such as parks, recreation buildings, schools, ballfields etc. to reduce significant negative impact of lighting on dark skies for community & private neighborhoods. I submitted extensive research information on the value of dark skies to public health & economy.	Flood Control District staff (e.g. Gibson arroyo).
Individual	Tina West	Please put something in the plan that maintains the arroyos/washes in & around Ajo in their natural state for their greenbelt, climate cooling, economic-aesthetic and community open space values. Mostly it is since Ajo's arroyos are mostly supplied by rainwater - do they have any protection under or outside wording such as "riparian" or other plan terms?	
Individual	Tina West	What is the land use designation for the upper Rocalla Road - Alley Road area which starts about Rocalla and Rosedale Avenue & heads in the "Scenic Loop" area west of town?	This question was specifically answered by email.
Individual	Wendy Swager	Human Infrastructure Connectivity Excellent document! On Page 5.23 it states for Goal 1 b. "Support investment for training of direct care workers and the Caregiver Training Institute." I do not think it is appropriate for Pima County to identify a specific training program - Caregiver Training Institute. There are many other state approved training programs in Tucson such as Practical Training Solutions, ABIL and A.I.R.E.S. Direct Care worker training programs are approved and monitored by the State of Arizona AHCCCS program or their contracted MCOs. This goal should be re-written to state "Support investment for training of direct care workers through state approved training programs."	Goal 1 Implementation Measure "b" on pg. 5.23 was revised to add other similar training programs. The Caregiver Training Institute was specifically cited based on a previous, specific comment.