

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Phase II Request for Proposals (RFP)
Stakeholder Meeting January 30, 2015 / 11:30 am – 1:00 pm / City Hall
MEETING SUMMARY

Prepared by Rebecca Ruopp, Office of Integrated Planning, February 19, 2015

ATTENDEES

Forty (40) people signed in for this meeting (excluding staff noted below). A copy of names and affiliations is provided as *Attachment A*.

CITY STAFF PRESENT

Nicole-Ewing Gavin, Office of Integrated Planning
Lynne Birkinbine, Office of Integrated Planning
Rebecca Ruopp, Office of Integrated Planning
Maria Gayosso, Office of Integrated Planning (to provide Spanish translation if needed)
Becky Flores, Office of Integrated Planning
Juan Garcia, Office of Integrated Planning
Carlos de Leon, Department of Transportation
Dan Longanecker, Procurement Department

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Where We've Been & Where We're Going
3. RFP, Phase II Key Elements: Review & Discussion
4. Next Steps

Agenda Item #1: Welcome & Introductions

Rebecca Ruopp, acting as facilitator, welcomed everybody and briefly reviewed items on the agenda (see above).

Agenda Item #2, #3, & #4: Where We've Been & Where We're Going; RFP Phase II Key Elements: Review & Discussion; and Next Steps

Rebecca Ruopp narrated a PowerPoint that addressed Items #3 - #5. The PowerPoint is provided as *Attachment B*.

Following are notes from the meeting discussion, which were originally recorded on flipcharts. (Note: These have been edited slightly for readability.)

- Clarify if Federal Transit Administration (FTA) information provided in the Phase II RFP is verbatim or summarized.
- Provide clarification on what "Fair Share of Revenue" and "Fair Share of Costs" mean
- Staff estimated FTA investments in the project site as being \$6.7M. and noted these were actual, un-inflated dollars.
- Look more closely at what dollar amount FTA considers invested in RTC (e.g., what about the recent (\$2 million)

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Phase II Request for Proposals (RFP)
Stakeholder Meeting January 30, 2015 / 11:30 am – 1:00 pm / City Hall

Meeting Summary continued

- Future needs –preserve flexibility in design to allow adaptation over time – need to elaborate in RFP
- Bike share/car share – include in submittal requests
- Make sure proposers know they need to respond to the goals
- Public Engagement Plan: Should address how developer would communicate with public throughout
- Should address how development would enliven the area at night
- Kiosks
- Make sure goals and submittal requirements line up
- Look back at Phase 1 RFP documents and consider whether information was included that should be provided in the Phase II RFP (e.g., incentives)
- Make project financial return numbers available to the public as much as possible
- More language (emphasis) about high quality design (design that elevates). Can the University of Arizona College of Architecture, Planning, and Landscape Architecture be involved?
- Timeline after public review seems too compressed
- Important to make sure that there is design review and tracking through the development process to make sure final design is executed properly [maybe a more formal mechanism separate from evaluation committee]
- Couldn't the RFP language be more exciting?
- Consider performance requirements
- Development agreement should address future sale/ongoing ownership of property
- Consider an "Operations Board" that might consist of developer, city, and community representatives. Would provide line of communication. Would add transparency.

Public Presentation (discussion points related to the public presentation requirement included in the Draft RFP, Phase II)

- Consider having public presentations held on two dates
- Consider having Webinar presentations
- Boards, videos [decide details later]
- Aggregate comments from public presentations and request that proposers respond to all comments
- Evaluation committee members should attend public presentations