

**Civano Neighbors Special Meeting  
Summary  
Civano Neighborhood Center • February 11, 2003**

- A special meeting of Civano Neighbors members was called to present Pulte's latest proposal for the purchase and development of Neighborhoods 2 and 3
- Approximately 40 people attended the meeting, including all Civano Neighbors Leadership Team members, residents and business representatives, a Pulte representative (Paula Meade, Director of Forward Planning), and Valerie Rauluk, chair of the Metropolitan Energy Commission
- Copies of the Pulte Proposal and Civano IMPACT System MOU Summary were made available at the meeting (as well as on CivanoNeighbors.com prior to the meeting)

**IMPACT System MOU**

- Association Spokesperson Simmons Buntin reviewed the IMPACT System MOU
- A summary of the MOU is available on CivanoNeighbors.com and the Discussion Forum
- Full MOU is available at <http://www.civaneighbors.com/docs/guiding/IMPACT-MOU.doc>

**Pulte Process Review**

- Treasurer Patrick Whelan reviewed the process leading up to tonight's meeting, including:
  - Civano Neighbors Leadership Team meeting with Pulte representatives at Pulte's request on December 5 and reviewing Pulte's initial, conceptual plans for purchasing/developing Neighborhoods 2 and 3
  - Leadership Team sending comprehensive follow-up letter to Pulte that emphasized Civano's sustainability goals and areas of Leadership Team support and concern for Pulte's initial proposal, dated December 9, available on CivanoNeighbors.com
  - A Civano walkabout in early January with Pulte reps and Leadership Team members to discuss Civano's sense of place, pedestrian orientation, and unique and resource-efficient architecture, and how those are essential for Neighborhoods 2 and 3
  - Pulte's presentation of its proposed purchase/development at the January 16 Civano Neighbors general meeting
  - Pulte's architect walking around Civano shortly after the meeting to evaluate architectural options for Neighborhoods 2 and 3
  - A "roll-up-our-sleeves" discussion between members of the Leadership Team and Pulte on January 31 with the goal of developing a proposal by Pulte that addresses the community's areas of concerns
  - The many conversations throughout this process between Pulte (primarily Tucson President Bruce Stokes and Director of Forward Planning Paula Meade) and the Association Spokesperson, and the emphasis by Pulte to collaborate with Civano Neighbors
  - Tonight's meeting, a facilitated review/discussion/series of straw polls by Civano Neighbors members on Pulte's latest proposal
  - Items that cannot be changed are:
    - Drexel Road right-of-way width (200 feet)
    - Powerlines/poles on Drexel Road
    - Street layouts that multiply wash crossings (such as fanning out from commercial areas)

- Current zoning (I-1, OCR-2, R-1, R-2)—note that this could legally be changed, but Pulte has stated that it will not undertake a zoning change or planned area development (specific plan)
  - While this point was not discussed at the special meeting, it has been discussed between Pulte and the Leadership Team and warrants inclusion in this summary
  - Current SR-1 zoning on peninsula between Neighborhoods 1 and 3 would be changed if developed

**Pulte Proposal Process: Review/Discussion/Straw Polls**

- At-Large Member Mike Eng facilitated a review of Pulte’s 15-item (during the meeting changed to 17-item) proposal, using a series of straw polls and rankings to determine community support for each proposal item
- The items presented in the proposal are primarily those that were raised as issues or concerns at previous discussions and meetings—they are not a comprehensive list of everything Pulte would or would not do in the development of the neighborhoods
- Many of the items are still conceptual or under exploration, so concrete numbers, diagrams, and the like are not available

**Rankings Process**

- Proposal items were ranked by a hand-count (straw poll) on a scale from 0 to 5, each representing:
  0. I need more information.
  1. I am against the proposal and will work to undermine its implementation.
  2. I do not agree with the proposal, but will not work to undermine its implementation.
  3. I can live with the proposal.
  4. I would be willing to support the proposal enthusiastically with some minor modifications.
  5. I enthusiastically support the proposal.
- The results of the rankings are listed with each proposal item, below.

**Proposal Review/Discussion**

- Each proposal item was read, discussed (and questions, caveats, ideas, suggestions, and other remarks noted on flip charts), and then ranked.
- Discussion bullets represent individual comments and questions (i.e., they are not necessarily a consensus of those in attendance, though may have been brought up or supported by many).

**Development Process**

1. Pulte will continue to involve the community in the entire process, including:
  - Information about plans
  - Collaboration on certain details and issues
  - Additional Civano Neighbors working groups will be involved

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
1	0	0	0	1	3	32

**IMPACT System MOU**

2. Pulte will meet the requirements of the existing MOU, with exception of:
  - Reclaimed water to each lot

- 10% profits to City-established not-for-profit entity
- Discussion:
  - What will Pulte do regarding telecommunications requirement in MOU?
    - Point was made by Leadership Team that there are ~50 such MOU requirements, and there wasn't time at this meeting to address these individually
  - What is the 10% profit? What does it go to? There are still questions on this that need to be resolved.
  - What is the date of the MOU that Pulte abides by? One in existence at time of development or the one in effect today, February 11, 2003?

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>2</b>	0	0	0	12	22	3

3A. Pulte will meet or exceed existing energy standards.

- Item 3 was broken into two separate items (3A and 3B)

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>3A</b>	0	0	0	0	4	36

3B. Pulte is exploring various water heating and solar devices; and Pulte is exploring pre-wiring/plumbing all homes for active/passive solar.

- Discussion:
  - If solar hot water heating is an option, it must be marketed
  - Sandia National Laboratory/Metropolitan Energy Commission will provide technical support to Civano in this area
  - We need more information on "beneficial solar," as defined in the MOU

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>3B</b>	0	8	9	14	4	3

4. Pulte will report energy use per MOU requirements.

- Discussion:
  - Energy use should be reported by an independent source

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>4</b>	0	0	0	0	1	36

### Neighborhoods, Amenities, and Streets

5. Rather than 8 "villages," as originally proposed, Pulte is now discussing area as two distinct neighborhoods: Neighborhoods 2 and 3

- Discussion:
  - Different groupings of homes (and elevations) will remain as previously presented under the villages concept

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>5</b>	0	0	0	0	8	28

6. Each neighborhood will have a central/core gathering area, such as a commons, and may include such things as amphitheater, ramadas, etc.
- The number of smaller parks on original plan may be reduced to accommodate larger central parks
  - Discussion:
    - Will net percentage of open space remain the same?
    - Change “may include” to “will include” on what Pulte is providing in these parks
    - Parks are not the full index of what makes a “core”
      - Need to know/consider other amenities, such as schools, etc.
      - Define it as central civic space, not just park/open space
    - Keep parks along washes
    - Need both pocket and central parks
    - Have adequate zoning at neighborhood cores (and across neighborhoods) to allow for central civic space
    - Will core areas include enclosed structures?
    - Ranking changed based on this discussion to simply determine the balance of parks supported by the community (other items, such as central civic amenities, still need to be addressed):
      - Scale from 1 to 5, with 1 representing large central parks and 5 representing small pocket parks

Item	1	2	3	4	5
6	0	10	22	2	2

7. Neighborhood 2 will contain an indoor recreation center, with outdoor pool (likely along Drexel)
- Pulte will evaluate additional, smaller pools in Neighborhoods 2 and 3
  - Discussion:
    - Recreation center pool must be big (Olympic)
    - Is recreation center/pool only for Neighborhoods 2 and 3, or for Neighborhood 1 also
      - Relationship, Master Association, impacts on HOA dues, charging for use by Neighborhood 1 residents, etc., all require further investigation

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
7	1	1	1	11	23	3

- 8A. Connectivity between Neighborhood 1 and Neighborhood 2 is still being explored, and will be further enhanced than original proposal
- Street layout will be modified from original proposal (more curvilinear)
  - Discussion:
    - This item was divided into two items, per request from attendees
    - Stantec road plan was shown as a possibility for linking Neighborhoods 1 and 2 (the plan is proprietary, so currently not otherwise available for review)
      - Stantec road plan is good
    - Pulte is eliminating cul-de-sacs as much as possible regardless of road layout
    - Curves should be based on topography
    - There is concern about traffic flow on major streets
    - Streets must have adequate parking, especially on narrow streets
    - Ranking changed based on this discussion to simply determine the balance of street types supported by the community:

- Scale from 1 to 5, with 1 representing curvilinear to 5 representing straight grid

Item	1	2	3	4	5
<b>8A</b>	1	6	23	5	1

8B. Streets will be more narrow than standard, but not quite as narrow as current streets (about 2' wider).

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>8B</b>	0	0	0	8	24	5

9. Sidewalks will be separated from streets with landscaped strips.

- Discussion:
  - Street trees are preferred

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>9</b>	0	0	0	1	1	37

10. Pulte is seeking alternative materials for alleyways, and asks us to spearhead working with the city to find/allow a viable, more permeable alternative than pavement

- Discussion:
  - Is that the neighborhood association's responsibility/expertise?
  - Alleys must be acceptable as public streets
  - What alternative materials are available? What constitutes "alternative" materials?

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>10</b>	0	0	0	0	24	9

### Mixed Uses and Homes

11. Pulte will set aside 5% of lots for innovative homes to be constructed by other builders

- Lots must yield a modest profit, and most likely will be in Neighborhood 3
- Discussion:
  - There should be a higher percentage of lots set aside for this use
  - Lots should also be set aside in Neighborhood 2

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>11</b>	0	0	0	3	23	6

12. Pulte will set aside 1 to 1.5 acres of land likely adjacent to Drexel for commercial/institutional use

- Marketed by Pulte for 3 years; if not sold/developed, resorts back to residential
- Discussion:
  - The number of acres set aside for this use needs to be higher
  - What is the status of the city recreation center that was "slated" for Neighborhood 2 or 3?
    - There will be a 2005 City of Tucson bond initiative per Civano agreement that, if passed, will set aside \$4 million for purchasing land and constructing a recreation center

- Can Pulte set aside that land now? Would Pulte be willing to set aside that land, and if so how/where?

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>12</b>	19	1	0	1	7	7

13. Pulte will set aside 5 to 8 lots in Neighborhood 2 for mixed-use home/office units—“hoffices”—and will consider building a spec to assist in the marketing of this specialized use

- Additional hoffices are likely in Neighborhood 3 if successful in Neighborhood 2 and if current zoning allows for such uses
- Discussion:
  - Does that number of lots meet the current IMPACT System sustainability goals:
    - Creating one job onsite for every two residences
    - Reducing internal vehicle miles by 40 percent
  - Flexible zoning is needed to allow such uses throughout Neighborhoods 2 and 3
  - The number of lots dedicated for “hoffices” should be greater
  - Question: Can mixed-use be offered as an option?

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>13</b>	2	0	0	1	21	11

14. Pulte will build a mix of housing orientations:

- 67% alley and side-loaded
- 33% front-loaded (garage facing street and garage turned to side, both at front of house)
- Discussion:
  - The percentage of homes with garages in back or behind the house should be greater
  - We need to see the actual home designs

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>14</b>	1	0	0	0	18	14

15. Housing themes will be consistent with architectural design guidelines of Civano

- Exterior elevations will be Southwestern, and Pulte would like to consider other varieties as well
- Color schemes will draw from Civano’s current pallet
- Discussion:
  - Are the homes attached or detached?
    - There will be some attached (per Pulte’s previous presentation)
  - How are homes oriented, how do they flow?
  - We want the homes to be like Neighborhood 1 (eclectic, pedestrian-scaled, interesting, etc.)
  - There needs to be a significant diversity of homes
  - MOU approval of streetscape may take care of architectural diversity and orientation concerns
  - Pulte must design the streetscape, not just homes

Item	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>15</b>	6	0	0	0	16	8

## Others

- Following is a list of other concerns, questions, issues, suggestions, and the like noted following the review/discussion of the Pulte proposal:
  - Want a grocery store
  - Need more information/explanation on Pulte's plans for Item 12 (mixed use set-aside)
  - Will Civano still be the name of Pulte's development?
    - Yes
  - Would like to see mixed elevations (not all one type like typical subdivisions and typical Pulte subdivisions, but major variations)
  - The neighborhood center commercial is tied to three sustainability goals
  - We need a park acreage commitment
  - Pulte should also address street/streetscape lighting. Will it be adequate?
  - Sidewalks in Neighborhoods 2 and 3 should be wider than those in Neighborhood 1, to allow two people to walk abreast

## Concluding Thoughts from Pulte

- Pulte Director of Forward Planning Paula Meade, who answered questions throughout the discussions but did not present or facilitate, provided some concluding thoughts:
  - The project must be economically viable
    - Additionally, Pulte wants to be able to provide affordable housing
  - Most of these items are still open—to be determined, so refer back to Item 1 (Pulte will continue to work with the community in the development of Neighborhoods 2 and 3)
  - Pulte will be here for the long-term
  - Historically, Pulte homes have increased surrounding property values
  - Neighborhoods 2 and 3 will be complementary, but not exactly the same as Neighborhood 1
  - Pulte offers more long-range viability than Neighborhood 1 has

## Wrap-Up and Next Steps

- Civano Neighbors Association Spokesperson Simmons Buntin thanked everyone for coming on short notice, as well as Mike Eng for his outstanding job facilitating
- The Leadership Team acknowledged that no developer or builder since the inception of Civano has worked so diligently with the community as has Pulte, and that Pulte's collaborative approach is much appreciated
- Next steps:
  - The Leadership Team will report back to the community by disseminating these notes as well as including a summary in the next issue of *The Town Crier*, our newsletter (next issue out in March)
  - The Leadership Team will assimilate all the information and then get back together with Pulte quickly to help meet Pulte's short time frame for making a decision to move forward on Civano Neighborhoods 2 and 3
  - A core group of Leadership Team members will continue its "working group" role and discussions with Pulte, and will continue to inform and involve Civano Neighbors members throughout the process

For additional information, please contact any Civano Neighbors Leadership Team member, or Association Spokesperson Simmons Buntin at 520.722.5977 or [buntin@terrain.org](mailto:buntin@terrain.org).