

MSCP Draft V comments  
Iris Rodden 2-25-2009

p 6 and onwards

Figure 2.1 etc. – nearly all of these figures become virtually unreadable in black/white as categories can no longer be distinguished because of too many color categories of similar intensity. This document is important enough that it will likely be photocopied or printed in b/w by many people. These figures would be greatly improved by adding hatching/stippling patterns over some of the solid color shades. Fig. 2.3 does this in part but still contains indistinguishable categories in b/w.

p 12

Figure 2.3

The legend defines # 3 but why not #'s 1, 2, 4-6? Are these also landscape connections?

p 36, Sec 3.2 – the last sentence needs editing.

p 55

Sec 4.1.1, ¶2

The most pressing invasive species issues in PC is buffelgrass *as of 2009* – this could change given the unpredictability of climate change and how fast things happen – what about other invasives? I've observed several new grasses in recent years that could suddenly explode, and there are several mustards that already pose serious threats in areas very close by, not to mention expanding insect pests, etc. Should the MSCP make it clear that the County is prepared to continue its commitment to fighting invasives if other species become threats?

¶2, line 4: "...important partner of the inter-agency..."

p 61

Sec 4.2:

¶1, line 3: "To date..." What date are you referring to in text? Footnote says Dec. 2008.

¶2: A7 is \*currently\* the exception, but could this change in the future? It may be shut down and reopened at a later date under different management, anything is possible right now.

p 71: citations:

PPC: FWS uses the Roller protocol:

[http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/arizona/Documents/SpeciesDocs/PimaPineappleCactus/ppc\\_survey\\_protocol.pdf](http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/arizona/Documents/SpeciesDocs/PimaPineappleCactus/ppc_survey_protocol.pdf)

Roller, P.S. 1996. Distribution, growth and reproduction of Pima pineapple cactus (*Coryphantha scheeri* Kuntz var. *robustispina* Schott). M.S. Thesis, University of Arizona.

SWIFL: protocol has been revised, use citation:

Sogge, M.K., R.M. Marshall, S.J. Sferra, and T.J. Tibbitts. 1997. A Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Natural History Summary and Survey Protocol. Technical Report NPS/NAUCPRS/NRTR- 97/12. USGS Colorado Plateau Research Station, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona.

p 73

Sec 5.2.3: the latest NLCD is 2001, this seems dated to me. How will analyzing a years old dataset contribute to timely detection and response to changes in land cover?

p 77

Sec 5.4.1.1. – The County has already done this in coordination with acknowledged range experts such as Dr. Phil Ogden and Dan Robinett. This section should be revised to omit “within the first year of permit issuance” and state “the County gathered a team of rangeland experts to develop the program and determined that the effort and parameters were sufficient to detect...”

p 91

¶3: Buffelgrass Coordination Center is no longer “proposed” it was formed in 2008

p 93, last ¶: is this threat *Solenopsis invicta*? Please specify.

p 99-100: How about climate change scenarios and desertification? Seems more likely than the “collapse of civilization” scenarios.

p 104, last ¶: Kerry has provided updated figures but I think you should revise to say “as of some date” and omit mention of pending sales – now we have the Sopori and the Marley is pending... you could chase your tail trying to avoid having obsolete info.

p 107: title: here too maybe use “as of date” instead of “since June 2004” to avoid obsolescence?

p 110:

sec 7.3.1: staff numbers are subject to change too, see above.