

LID Workshop – March 15, 2011

NEIGHBORHOOD COMMON AREAS

Facilitated by: Mark Murphy, Geosystems

Group Members: Christina McVie, Dave Stewart, Henry Jacobson, Kevin Kugler, Julia Fonseca, Leslie Ethen, Marisa Rice, Robert Flynt

Question

Response Summary

1. **Ask the group to provide an accounting of where we are:**
 a. **Inventory of existing processes, resources, regulations, facts, ideas, activities on-the-ground.**
 b. **Regulations that are forthcoming.**

- City is doing future planning for Southlands but also considering neighborhood amenities as a tradeoff for changes in the LU code that favor smaller lot sizes and more intensive LU. Intensification depends on making neighborhood common areas do more in the future in terms of stacking functions that are valued by citizens.
- Green Infrastructure can be hard to sell without direct benefits to neighbors.
- What happens at edge where jurisdictions meet? Rules change across the boundary; no coordination but coordination is needed e.g. over issues like Section 404.
- Avoid, minimize and mitigation of impacts to riparian habitat is required by riparian ordinance in Pima County.
- TOM, OV and COT have their own approaches to riparian. City is revising their riparian ordinances.
- City plans to use County wash mapping but it is incomplete in the City. Lack of data on city washes where riparian vegetation is not mapped could be filled by volunteers through NGOs.
- Oro Valley offers flexibility in lot sizes as a tradeoff for wash protection
- There is some data to support idea that common areas can improve the bottom line. But this is not widely appreciated.
- Environmental community can fill this gap  in knowledge.
- Need to begin that educational process early in the rezoning process, before platting begins.
- Value and savings generated by the short-term cost is still not appreciated at the political level. Yes, it will cost more in short-term, but frees up money later on.
- Many functions are expected of neighborhood common areas; this is a lot to force on a small area.
- Public parks are part of the equation too.

Question	Response Summary
<p>2. As the community moves forward, what are the group's:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Concerns?</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. Ideas for areas of flexibilities and opportunities? Where does community support exist?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to change political discourse. What is the benefit of infill to existing neighborhood? Neighborhood common areas are part of that solution set, to the resistance to LU intensification. • There is potential for increased Q₁₀₀s as a result of more intense events especially on small watersheds (due climate change). This kind of data is important. • Actually models are used for estimating risks, not actual data. The methods are conservative already and the direction of impacts to hydrology is uncertain. • The question is whether in the future even more common area will be desirable for public health and safety reasons, if not neighborhood amenities? • Newly annexed areas for the City are in the upper watershed. City's lower watershed is more constrained by old infrastructure. • Developers do not bear the long-term consequences of their design – citizens, elected officials and the tax base does.
Question	Response Summary
<p>3. What can we do to be agents of change?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenario planning can be powerful for decision-makers – bringing together the effects of any different decisions on a watershed, on a populace, more collaboration across climate change, watershed plans, land use. • Case studies are good tools. • Lee Moore watershed plan was a good case of how City and County can work together to enact LID practices. • City is looking to partner with County RFCD on watershed effects of climate change. • Problem is that data on direct magnitude of change is lacking. • Is Las Vegas (SNWA) a model for LID techniques? Or source of examples of community buy-in. • Risks vs costs is a real issue too. You can design for maximum risk (for neighborhood common areas) but this can have great costs to the community.

	Question	Response Summary
4.	<p>What actions would you like the entire workshop group to accomplish in the future?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility for development is needed. • Look for vulnerabilities – who, where is at risk if LID practices are not adopted? Then where is the adaptive capacity? • Educate neighborhoods! Most of City’s work is directed at builders/developers; not neighborhoods. • WMG is filling this gap. • GI is broader than WMG. • The WMG-type groups are not sufficient; we need research and scenario-planning too. • Both new set asides in developing areas and retrofitting of existing neighborhood sites is needed. • City interest in working with NGOs and County to get money for neighborhood demonstration project. EPA funding. • Potential economic values of parks and neighborhood common areas are the key. Demonstrate the price-point outcome for development; and/or for tax base. • Regional GI plan could be a means of coordination. • County is doing internal infrastructure planning right now in preparation for comprehensive LU plan. Perhaps tie this into City and County LU plans.