

Questions AFTER the Presentation

Alexander Company / OasisTucson Inc.
September 15, 2015

AC-1: I am strongly in support of the proposal of the Alexander Company/Oasis Tucson for the Ronstadt Transit Center. I firmly believe that the present shade structure and its tile work and mature oak trees should be preserved.

Thank you.

AC-2: A short comment on the Ronstadt Center redevelopment, I regularly pass by this space, so when I saw the write-up in the Star about the competing proposals, my aesthetic and practical sense leans strongly to the Alexander Team proposal. The Peach proposal seems a little overblown, under thought, and excessively expensive. So, anyway, I hope that the evaluation team seriously considers all aspects of each proposal and presenters and selects the one that most fits with the nature and character of the downtown area.

Thank you.

AC-3: One last comment, I love how the Alexander Group kept the arcade.

Thank you.

AC-4: After reviewing the two plans for the Ronstadt Transit Center parcel, I believe that the Alexander Team proposal is clearly better, as it preserves the beautiful, and beautifully tiled, artistic shade structure and the mature trees on site. I had a wonderful opportunity recently to go on an extensive tour of the UA campus with R. Brooks Jeffery, director of UA's Drachman Institute associated with the College of Architecture. he opened our eyes to the idea that great spaces is the new direction of great architecture, and suggested we all take a stroll through the shaded colonnade fronting the student housing along Highland, mentioning it as one of the best architectural treasures of the UA campus. I believe that the shaded colonnade at the Ronstadt Transit Center is extremely similar in feel, and purpose, and is much more beautiful. As such, every effort to save it should be made.

Thank you.

AC-5: As a citizen who lives close to downtown, if development is going to occur at the Ronstadt Bus Depot, I strongly support a solution that encompasses the whole present structure as far as the brick was from a historic connection and the last thing I think we want to see in the Old Pueblo is bland redevelopment Phoenix style. *Keep the history, keep the art: Alexander team option*.

Thank you.

AC-6: Please accept this email as my support, in writing, for The Alexander Company to complete the future work at our Ronstadt Center. I know Melody Peters and have worked on several projects with her and her artwork should stay as a part of the Downtown transit center's history.

Thank you.

AC-7: I am strongly in support of the proposal of the Alexander Company/Oasis Tucson for the Ronstadt Transit Center. I firmly believe that the present shade structure and its tile work and mature oak trees should be preserved.

Thank you.

AC-8: Please strongly consider saving the Ronstadt Transit center's beautiful historic brick work adorned with Melody Peter's tiles. The shaded walk ways are so lovely and ARE a work of public art. They belong to the citizens of Tucson. Although I realize spaces need change with changing public needs, other communities keep a sense of beauty and historic style. It seems like yesterday when Melody Peters designed and installed those tiles, yet it seems like the walkways, tile and mature trees have always been part of down town Tucson. I support the Alexander plan and hope you will too.

Thank you.

AC-9: In the Alexander proposal there is a turnstile / access gate to RTC from the 6th Ave. sidewalk. Why is this in this location? Is it to keep non-users out? If that is the case, people can access the interior of the RTC via the bus entrance / art park at 6th / Toole.

The location of the main entrance on the 6th Avenue side was proposed because that location is where the largest existing opening in the Historic Brick Arcade lies. We would like to keep the arcade intact. We have proposed access points on three sides of the Intermodal Center but we have also deferred the locations of the access points and the decision on controlling access into the Intermodal Center to the City and SunTran.

AC-10: Please choose the Alexander proposal. It keeps the Ronstadt hardware store echo, the oak trees, architecture that reflects the downtown surroundings. Has multi transit center, totally needed downtown. Tucson-based firm, has respect for Tucson's unique style and can work responsively as they are based here.

Thank you.

AC-11: After reviewing the proposals for the Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development project, I have a lot of concerns about the Alexander Group's proposal and believe their proposal must address the following questions before it can be considered a viable option. Questions directed to the Alexander Group:

- **You have placed a lot of emphasis on preserving the historical context of downtown by retaining the existing arcade. How exactly do you believe that keeping a structure whose historical significance is only that it is built from bricks that were originally part of the Pioneer Hotel maintains the historical feel in downtown Tucson? It seems to me that this emphasis is just political rhetoric aimed at appeasing as many viewpoints as possible, regardless of its feasibility. The brick arcade will do nothing to maintain the historical context when there is a large modern-looking building directly behind the arcade walls. Additionally, the effects from the amount heat radiating from these bricks**

will be more of a detriment to the residents and retail stores located in the building than the benefits of retaining the historical context if the structure remains.

We believe that the design of the arcade and of its tiles is a unique resource that is worth incorporating into the project. Most of our team has lived and worked in Tucson for a long time and believe that as Tucson has developed over the last 10-15 years a lot of the context as to the buildings and the materials used to construct Tucson historically has been lost. We believe we should strive to save materials and buildings when and where there are opportunities to incorporate and interpret historic elements into modern construction techniques and design of projects.

The most important space in the design of the project is the public realm - the first two stories or 20 feet of the building and the pedestrian experience within that realm. We believe that this arcade adds character to the space and provides both an attractive and shaded pedestrian thoroughfare; we also see opportunity to let this component flow into or reappear in other parts of this project in order to thematically unify the space.

- **How will personal safety issues be addressed? Preserving the arcade in front of your proposed building will create “dark” spaces in which individuals with undesirable intentions can hide; enclosing the transit center and placing the entrance in what is essentially an alley pushes bus rider out of site and may likely encourage criminal activity. Will the proposed police station have their sources to assign an officer to full-time duty of patrolling the transit station? Because it will need one.**

The lighting and design of the new retail frontage will improve the current conditions in and around the facade for pedestrians. The purpose of enclosing the Intermodal Center is to increase safety, add amenities and to improve conditions for riders. The Intermodal Center not only has a police substation but puts the Transit Services Center and its operators on site as well. The access control system is designed to limit non transit riders from entering the center. The interior is better lit than the current center, has security cameras, responders on site and has more eyes on the facility, all of which will enhance the safety for the public. In the end, the proposed access points and control system is a decision for the City and the Operator and can function fully with or without the proposed control system.

- **What is the purpose of incorporating a turnstile entrance concept into the design? It seems like at best this will create rider congestion at the entrances, and at worse it will be a hindrance to quickly evacuating the area in the event of any emergency.**

We will go into the reasoning behind the turnstile concept but note that we have deferred that decision as it is an operational decision that should be made with City and SunTran input.

One of the primary concerns we have heard from transit users and that we have witnessed on our site visits is safety concerns. There has been a preponderance of illicit activity in and around the transit center because it is an open area that promotes opportunities to loiter. The control system proposed is a safety feature that allows any bus patron into and out of the facility at their leisure, but aims to prevent non-bus patrons from entering the facility. It is the non-bus patrons at the current center who are predominantly involved in said illicit activity.

Having ticket kiosks at the entrance, where patrons can buy their tickets, will reduce loading times on the buses as patrons will all have paid tickets or transfer passes in hand as they enter. In an emergency the automated turnstiles open at all three exit points to assure everyone’s evacuation is organized and safe.



- **Have you considered that with turnstiles you are actually discouraging mixed-mode transportation by creating a barrier for bicyclists who want to utilize both their bikes and the public transit system?**

The proposed turnstiles at each entrance are ADA designed for both wheelchairs and bicycles to pass through. It is not the intent of the design to limit bicycle entrance or force people to carry bicycles “over their head.” The design of the entire facility is to encourage multi-modal transit; our plan promotes bicycle commuting by providing short and long term bicycle parking both inside and outside the new Intermodal Center.

- **Your proposal states that you will improve ADA access in the area, and on the platform in particular. How exactly is a turnstile concept going to improve ADA access? If there are special doors for wheelchairs, are you planning on preventing non-wheelchair bound individuals from using these doors? If not, why not just put doors in for everyone’s use?**

The sizing of the turnstiles, if installed, would be ADA compliant and anyone could use them.

- **If, as your proposal states, you believe that walking and bicycling are an important modes of transportation, shouldn’t you have already identified the barriers to walking and biking so that the resolutions to these barriers are incorporated into your proposed plan?**

Yes, and we have.

AC-12: Thank you for hosting the forum last evening. I am writing first to express my strong support for the joint project - may we have the will to move it forward in one form or another. It is tremendously good for downtown, and hence the larger Tucson community. I have a personal preference for the Alexander Company project, largely because of the quality of the team and their past performance both in downtown Tucson (Plaza Centro) and beyond. In addition, I believe their vision for the site fits our downtown architecturally and is more realistic and achievable. Greatly appreciate this opportunity to express support, both as a City of Tucson resident and employer.

Thank you.

AC-13: I prefer this because it keeps the transit options in one place. Having the transit station all together in an indoor space would be a great advantage during our hot weather. The design is thoughtful and fits into Tucson's character. More housing would be a great advantage since we have a great demand for downtown living for all ages. I support this Proposal.

Thank you.

AC-14: The small (relative to other buildings gone up lately) scale of the buildings and the incorporation/preservation of the original tile work are a definite plus. The lineup of talent, especially Demian Clinco, was good - no women on the planning group, though. The serious drawback to this project is the penning in of the transit users: go through a turnstile, no exit, no access to retail, out of

sight, out of mind. Transit is an afterthought, not the central concept, that being maximizing profits while excluding the supposedly lower-income transit users. No attempt to expand the pool of users. No public space, isolation of bus areas from the rest of the downtown. Feedback from bus drivers: difficult to navigate, restrictive entry/exit. Basically, a backward-looking concept, elitist and car-centric.

The site program was designed from the inside out with the focus on the operation of the Intermodal Center. Our plan's primary goal is to keep the transit center onsite and to provide increased amenities and improve safety conditions. The RFP asked for responses to develop a mixed use building with neighborhood level retail services on the street that must not reduce the functionality of the transit center. At the pedestrian level, we want to improve the transit center, add Greyhound to the site, add car-share, taxi and shuttle bus stops to the facility, improve the inter-modal connections, keep and incorporate the historic arcade and develop enough retail to pay for the new facility along with our payment for the land. That program, to provide all those options on the site yielded a program with 15 indoor bus bays, instead of the current 13, an easier access from drivers to enter and leave the facility, reduce turning conflicts and traffic on Congress, increased amenities and services for riders, increased safety for riders and drivers all while providing the City with its goals of a mixed use development with neighborhood service level retail. We believe that our program is well thought out and focuses on the users of the Intermodal Center and what will improve the area the most. We believe it would be disingenuous to propose to develop an infeasible project that looks exciting in pictures, but could never be built. Our focus was on what we thought was best for the users, the site and the City.

AC-15: The Site Plan was not as creative and inclusive as the Peach plan. The rendering of the Art Park looked eerily similar to the layout/look of the Cadence development. - I liked the facade/architecture of the buildings...they did fit in with the buildings on Congress and with the Historic Train Depot to the north. What I don't like is the long layout of the proposed building(s). Tucson has enough wide buildings. The consistent approx. 6 story height is tiresome...and pretty redundant for downtown Tucson. In line with the 1st bullet, the buildings look way too similar to the Cadance building...and if you've ever walked the Broadway side of the Cadence...there's not a lot of public interaction. Overall, I favor the Peach Properties proposal. My main suggestion would be to mix up and/or improve the architecture/facade of at least 2 of the proposed 4 buildings. Thank you. Artemio Hoyos

Our site plan is a result of the programmatic designs needs for the function of the site and the goals of the RFP. We will be working with the City and the Public to refine the site plan to maximize both the indoor and outdoor public space and the facade design for the building. Additionally as part of our clarification submittal we will be showing revised renderings that will show that there are actually multiple buildings.

AC-16: OPT/SATM suggest/request:

- Provide space in "art park" (triangle tip – SE corner Toole and 6th Ave.) for rotating historic transit vehicle display
- Provide space in transit center (or under preserved arcade along 6th Ave.) for permanent interpretative panels on Tucson's transit history including the reason for the Ronstadt name.
- Provide space in rotary for permanent display of replica horse/mule-drawn streetcar on the exact location of the start of construction of Tucson's first streetcar line by the Tucson Street Railway in November 1897.
- Provide space at NE corner of parcel on north side of Toole for extension of railroad locomotive display track to display other restored/preserved railroad cars.

- **Under slide titled “Meetings – Opportunities for Stakeholder Involvement”, OPT/SATM requests continuing input on the above suggestions/requests.**

We will be working with the stakeholders to define the design and amenities in both the indoor and outdoor spaces and program of those spaces. These are the types of concepts that we would like to discuss in those meetings and we appreciate you sending these in to us.

AC-17: Building Massing – project could be improved greatly with the plane of the building being broken vertically and horizontally. Heard from several people that the project looked too monolithic, even institutional. If the heights and setbacks we're not continuous, that could address the monolithic problem. Public space-I really like the design of the outdoor space at the North end of the project, but I would much rather see that same space be on the corner of Congress and sixth rather than Toole Avenue where it is not likely to get activated as much. That solves two problems at once, allows the public to flow into the space from Congress and break the plane of the building envelope on Congress and sixth so it was not so monolithic. Transit area design – from the comments I heard from the bus riders, they were concerned that the feeling is going to be too claustrophobic. They also wanted to see a connection back to Congress Street. I think they have a point here. There will be no direct sunlight reaching that space.

Transit security – police substation needs to be in full view of the transit area. Maybe could swap places with the restroom. Transit roundabout on Toole. I like this idea, but I don't know what transportation is going to say. I still believe the city needs to use this opportunity to reduce the number of buses coming into downtown. Tool Avenue lot – failing to design this portion of the project and include it in the project cost estimates is skewing the public discussion. I heard repeatedly that the Schwabie project is not realistic because it cost so much more. I guess you can't force the developer into 100% lot coverage, but maybe the analysis of the project should come down to a cost per square foot comparison. Overall opinion – this project is solid, safe, and has all the political correct considerations. I feel some changes to the way the project is laid out, especially if it could be made to look like a series of buildings rather than one large structure could help its street appeal immensely.

We agree with your comments and believe that finding a way to break up the long consistent façade design will improve the overall aesthetics of the building. The interior of the Intermodal Center has over 20 foot ceilings and open air from two sides. We believe we can promote rider comfort best by striking a balance between openness of design and protection from the elements. The roundabout has been previously recommended to the City by its consultants in a 2013 bus access and pedestrian safety study so we are hopeful that this will help convince the City of its merits.

We had not included a full design for the second parcel as we believe development of an additional parcel should be contingent on successful development of the Intermodal Center. We believe that adding other parcels we are interested in developing around the Intermodal Center skews the discussion. The primary proposal, which we believe must stand alone, is the development of the transit center parcel. If this proposal cannot be financed and constructed or if its financing depends on other triggers, outside revenue or development on other sites, we believe the likelihood of it ever happening are low. Based on your comments and others, we are making sure the substation has both a view into the center and the street and we are adding a connection to Congress Street.

AC-18: 1. What is Alexander’s contingency plan if, for any reason, the City is unable to respond fully to Alexander’s proposed cost sharing for the project or if others of the various public financing elements of the project prove to be unavailable?

The benefit of this type of process is that we have described to the City exactly our partnership goals and needs. If the City is unable or unwilling they can choose the other proposal or presumably choose neither proposal. Additionally, please note we are not asking for any general funds from the City and are paying back public funds through land acquisition, sales taxes and parking fees.

2. Please provide more detail about the type of site conveyance(s) Alexander expects to propose for the Ronstadt site(s). Given that Alexander is proposing a phased development plan, does Alexander anticipate requesting a phased conveyance of the property?

We would propose the project be broken into condominium blocks. Alexander/OT would own the retail and residential blocks while the City/Rio Nuevo would own the Intermodal Center and parking. This is similar to Plaza Centro or the AC Hotel. The north parcel conveyance is fee simple and timed based on performance metrics on the first parcel. If we are unable to meet those metrics on the first parcel, the City keeps the North parcel.

3. Is the inclusion of Greyhound bus operations (and presumed lease revenues) a necessary element for successful project financing and positive operations cash flow?

We actually have not contemplated what Greyhound would pay for a lease in the space. Our goal of proposing it there was solely to connect all modes of transportation on the site. Presumed lease revenue was projected at the 2017 market rate for that space and a lower rate would not affect project financing. If it turns out that Greyhound does not lease the space, then that space would be leased to another user in order to bring in necessary income; the negative aspect of this alternative would be a lost opportunity for connectivity between Greyhound and the Intermodal Center.

4. Please prepare and present graphic materials that explain

Our pro forma in Business Plan and Financial Capacity for the RFP response is probably the best illustration and explanation but we have had no discussion with Greyhound to provide any detail.

5. What contingency plans has Alexander considered if there should be a slowdown or downturn in Tucson’s downtown real estate market?

The residential portion of the project is phased so if the market turned negative the project could react by postponing future phases.

6. How will project design and day-to-day operations staff maintain “gated public access” at the north end of the new transit center (where it opens to Toole Avenue)?

The entrance off of the rotary is solely for bus traffic. Pedestrian traffic should be using the 6th Avenue, Arizona Avenue and Congress Street entrances. We are proposing to relocate the Transit Services Center onto the site for customer service with the kiosk and gates (if installed) being automatic.

7. If the City and SunTran were to express a preference for an alternative layout and location for the on-site bus facilities, would Alexander be prepared to evaluate the feasibility of incorporating that design into its proposed project design?

Yes. We do believe however that it is imperative for the master planning of downtown and the Entertainment District that we do not increase bus traffic on Congress Street.

8. Alexander's pre-qualification materials and its website make reference to its in-house architectural capabilities. What role will its staff architects play in the project?

Aleks Istanbul Architects is handling the conceptual and schematic design portions of the project. The Alexander Company will manage the creation of construction documents. Both firms will be working with the City and the public to define and deliver a project that fulfills the requirements of the RFP.

9. Please describe the universal access elements of the proposed project, including signage.

There are three access points for pedestrians; buses will access the site via the roundabout; and public safety vehicles may also access off of Arizona Avenue (so that they have two points of access). Wayfinding signage will be of a consistent design both inside and outside the facility with electronic live arrival/departure boards (think airport) located both internally and externally to the facility. We would like these boards to include alternate transit modes (Amtrak, streetcar, Greyhound) as well as the current bus schedule. All these operational decisions will be made in conjunction with the City and SunTran.

10. The City is committed to the development of the Ronstadt site as a landmark property. Among its goals in this regard is that once developed, the property be an active, welcoming place in downtown. The City, downtown business people, and Tucson residents concur that site programming can be an important element of Ronstadt's activation. How does your team propose to respond to this need?

This building will be of great significance to downtown development by virtue of its size and diversity of its uses, including its role as the central transportation hub for the region. Our design approach was to focus on defining the design program – keeping the brick arcade and basing our materials palette on nearby historic buildings – in order to start the discussion with the community on a vision for this site. Our expectation has been that we will work collaboratively with the community during the detailed design process but we were prompted to propose a concept in this RFP process.

AC-20: Liked the traffic circle entrance/exit and closing off to Congress. I've driven circles on the east coast--they work well enough. The cost projections seem low. I would like to see a realistic breakdown including how much in government incentives they are requesting. Where is the financing coming from? What is the time line from planning to completion? How will they keep the transit operations from bogging down? I liked the concept of using the brick arches but few people have the context about their history. If it limits the project find a way to reuse them. The architecture while complimentary to the existing downtown area buildings, doesn't break any new ground. It should be broken up so it doesn't present one large wall that isn't permeable visually and is inviting to pedestrians. Bicycle access to downtown will become more onerous from the north when downlinks are built across 7th Ave. 6th and 4th Ave. are not bicycle user friendly. The Peach proposal the bridge the railroad is intriguing. I like bringing more retail, restaurants, office space and market rate housing to downtown. Traffic--both projects bring more cars to downtown. It's not easy to navigate the

downtown in a car when it's busy. I think the COT could help the downtown environment at night by having parking and shuttle service from Broadway Volvo.

The cost estimate for the retail and housing was based on a bid from Tofel Construction and is in line with other recent ground up construction in downtown. It is critical to understand the success of the project is based on the revenues supporting the costs of the project. The Alexander Company-OasisTucson team spent over eight weeks defining and redefining the pro forma to ensure this project is buildable and financeable.

The cost projection for the garage was based on experience of other garages in Downtown Tucson (Centro and AC Hotel). The cost projection for the Intermodal Center was based on similar facilities built in the United States over the past 5 years. The final cost will be based on the final design and amenities in the space as determined by the City.

Everything we have requested is in our proposal, but generally we have asked that the Intermodal Center and Parking Garage be publicly financed and publicly owned with the payments for that financing coming from the project in three forms; lease/land payments, sales tax and user fees (e.g. leasing parking spots). Although the financing is public; it is conduit financing of which the expectation is that no current funds from the city are required for repayment.

The exact timetable of the project is dependent on the length of negotiations and other factors out of our control. In the RFP we have estimated approximately a year for design with an additional 18 months for construction for a total of 30 months for the project. With a contingency of 20% would make this a roughly three year project, start to finish.

To encourage Congress Street to grow into a more pedestrian friendly entertainment district we are removing buses and reducing car traffic on that overloaded street. To this end we will both route buses and provide garage access on Toole Avenue.

AC-21: Much more restrained aesthetically. I think it could be more expressive to communicate its multiple uses. Not sold on the historical references. Not sure if references are really even necessary. Historical sensitivity isn't about making something look old. It's about carefully expanding on established ideas and patterns that have proven successful over time. Transit portion seems too segregated. Placing it under the structure may be a good way to mitigate solar exposure, but it starts to suggest a less than pleasing parking garage experience. Add to this the size and scale required with the consolidation of the transit and greyhound buses. Would have liked to have seen more creative use/types of outdoor space and pedestrian experiences. Art park is nice, but seems disconnected from overall scheme.

With regard to design, we feel contextual sensitivity is extremely important to the fabric of downtown Tucson. The Intermodal Center will have a 20' ceiling and be open on two sides with an expansive entrance off of 6th Avenue. We are looking to add a large light/air well that would provide additional natural light and fresh air which would be supplemented mechanically. Toole Ave is treated as an afterthought to most of downtown and we wanted it to be its own district with the rotary, Art Park and entrance to the Warehouse Arts District.

AC-22: Alexander plan don't like that it is an out of town company once more taking jobs from local people. They est. 800-1200 buses per day at Ronstadt if understood them correctly. They have cleverly brought on board people from the community that may have been part of the planning processes in their design. Will have to use energy to help deal with the pollution from the buses as it

will be "underground" with all those buses running (seems like it would be more of a health hazard for people with lung problems and perhaps help cause lung problems).

As stated at the presentation, the vast majority of the jobs will be based in Tucson using Tucson subcontractors and workers. OasisTucson and Tofel Construction are both major players and Tucson based. We believe any outside of Tucson expertise used brings value and experience that may be missing in Tucson.

The Intermodal Center stays on site at street grade, not underground. The facility has open air coming into it from the Arizona Avenue, Toole Avenue and the entrance on 6th Avenue. Additionally we are adding a large light/air well within the garage that will provide natural light and fresh air. Any final design will handle the fresh air requirements of the Intermodal Center, naturally and mechanically.

How will cars get in/out of garage without interfering with buses?

Cars and Buses have separate entrances and exits off of Toole though both are from the rotary. During peak time there will be a bus every 30-45 seconds so the operation of the rotary is critical to keep traffic flow moving.

Think the traffic circle is a poor idea with the amount of buses that will have to use it and that there may not be enough space or will take too much space to accomplish it. What happens to the current building structures around the area of that circle?

None of the buildings around the traffic circle will be affected. The circle will allow more buses to move in and out of the Intermodal Center quicker than the current traffic signal and was highly recommended in an independent traffic study of downtown commissioned by the City of Tucson. It also eliminates one and maybe two traffic signals depending on final design.

3 bikes/ bus could happen without this plan Ronstadt as they envision it not economically viable as a stand- alone project so they will be depending on public funding (again). City will have to bear the cost of infrastructure when we don't even have the monies for many other projects and obligations in the city. The infrastructure of DT is old and would have to be made up to "code". Very expensive for the city. For the amount of sales tax this might bring in it would take many years to recover the expense of the public monies put into it. Again what happens to the buses transit during construction period.

Per the presented pro forma the current returns on cash for the public sector currently exceeds the return of the private sector. In order for this project to occur it needs to be a collaborative approach and it is imperative to create a win-win. Our economics are viable and this project can be completed. As stated we do not use nor ask for any General Funds from the City of Tucson.

We proposed two options in the interim as the center is being constructed. Use the North lot as a temporary facility or handle transfers at the street level directly at stops.

What is est. of construction period?

Approximately 18 months for the initial phase depending on final design of the Intermodal Center.

Prevents people from being in the bus center if not taking bus. Again limits easy access to people who take buses from DT businesses. Is the current opening onto 6th to be moved to another location on 6th.

There is no reason for anyone to be loitering within the Intermodal center unless they are commuting but we have left the decision whether to control access up to the City. We have repeatedly heard that safety is of upmost concern and elimination of the illicit activity a must. The current opening in the arches on 6th Avenue is the main entrance for the new Intermodal Center. Additional entrances will potentially be on Congress Street and Arizona Avenue depending on SunTran approval.

How will that affect the Ronstadt wall?

The entrance was chosen to avoid any impacts on the historic arcade and tile work. In fact by bringing Melody Peters onto our development team we have made the design decision to include and extend her art into the Intermodal Center.

Will the wall remain as part of the project and in what form? (See Peach comments about wall.)

Yes. We are proposing to keep the arcade as is.

It should not be torn down period. Trash receptacles will be far away from the businesses and will have to be walked to through the bus center areas. Dangerous for the workers. Trash trucks will have to have access to pick up trash. How will that be scheduled so it does not interfere with the buses?

There is a service corridor behind the retail for loading, trash and recycling so that there is no need to go through the transit center. There is a compactor and trash pickup planned in Arizona Avenue which does not interfere with the bus operations.

Did not answer how bike/ped will access from N off 6th.

There are entrances on all sides that pedestrians and bikes can enter or exit the facility.

food trucks in alley - seems there will not be room for them with so much having to be taken by buildings.

There is no plan for food trucks in the alley. However we are looking at having popup locations and space for food vendors along the pedestrian areas of the site and also within the Art Park.

Will the entrance only be from the East side? Again this would limit easy access to bus riders.

There is access on 6thAve, Congress Street and Arizona Alley. SunTran and the city will dictate entrances as it is an operational decision of the Intermodal Center.

Unknown if rooms will be rental or owner occupied since they will be expensive. 300 parking spaces. Again how will cars access them with the buses there?

The residential will be a combination of affordable and market depending upon the economics of the project and the market itself. There are separate points of access for the bus and cars into the garage through the rotary. Buses and cars entering the garage will use the rotary rather than clogging

Congress Street. The rotary eliminates one, maybe two, streetlights and will move traffic more efficiently.

How would grey water and water harvesting be used on this site?

This would be determined during detailed design, but we are looking at cisterns to capture drainage from the rooftop and condensate from the HVAC systems which would be used as a supplement water for irrigating the onsite landscape.

50% open to air at the ends of building, vents through buildings. We see how that works at the Library with the need for energy use to move the air. Sound from buses trapped underground. What happens in an earthquake with all that structure set on top of empty space?

The building is designed for maximum energy efficiency and to withstand events of natural disaster. The library garage only has one small entrance rather two fully open sides with a large light/air well. Air movement and fresh air will be mandated and fulfilled by the design.

Longer walk to access Sun Link as well as other areas west of the site. How will closing Pennington effect access to Marshall Building, Maynard's, and Congress Hotel?

It will not prevent access to any of those buildings although it may change the route in a minor way. The entrance to the Intermodal Center is a straight shot down Pennington and the Arizona Avenue exit looks directly at the Historic Depot.

AC-23: Not my preferred solution. I am impressed with the amount of similar projects they have completed. But the fact still remains; Unique Tucson is not that city. And I reviewed their listing of professionals previously on their website, and now, there still exists insufficient architectural designers in their group then and now esp. with local flavor & talent. And my complaint for some time, is the insistence by our clients that architects only qualify for a project ONLY IF they have completed hundreds of the same type of project. No freshness is allowed to happen. Architects are taught to DESIGN, addressing new design each time with freshness applicable to the current project, and not copying the last one. Their project has the design intent of a mixture of their last few projects, not applicable to this one esp with an ENCLOSED TRANSIT STATION--not in Tucson. My comments above numbered 2,4,6 & 8 are applicable to this presenter.

- a. **The problem with retaining the Arcade totally, there is insufficient room for extensive trees in front of the Arcade. The Arcade does block the visibility of any other tenants along the streetscape.**

We believe the arcade is a unique streetscape opportunity that should be explored and incorporated. There is plenty of room for plantings and an active streetscape. We believe the visibility for the spaces based on the design plan will be fine. Additionally with an RFP amendment the City has requested that the current arcade and tilework be retained. The combination of the arcade and streetscape trees creates a functional solution for a Tucson streetscape.

- b. **It was halfway thru the presentation that I finally understood the transit area is an enclosed building--I am not fan of this concept.**

The Intermodal Center is open on two sides, has a 20' high ceiling, a large light/air well, and air handling units to ventilate air. We believe the concept provides the best experience for riders and drivers while allowing for development of a mixed use project to pay for these upgrades.

- c. Graphics lacking--at least provide power point slides of the individual renderings, if not 3-D.**

Our resubmission will have enhanced renderings.

- d. The lacking of "architectural sense" (I am not bias) was missing from the presentation. I no idea of the architectural character of the presentation with little architectural verbal or enlarged renderings.**

We agree the renderings were lacking in showing our contextual fit and comparison to the historic Pioneer Hotel. Revised renderings will be submitted with our final submittal.

- e. Though I like the idea of just traffic on Toole as noted before, the circle and angled bus parking appears to slow down the boarding and bus traffic--which just make travel time even worse than it is now with these large buses in Downtown.**

The traffic circle will eliminate at least one traffic signal and help traffic flow in Downtown Tucson. Having the entrance off of Toole takes 120 buses (at peak) off of Congress Street. The exact configuration of bus stalls would be a City of Tucson and SunTran decision.

- f. I have been in New York's Penn station--the amount of tall, spacious environment is not available here--too cramped of a site to pull the NY concept off unfortunately.**

We are not looking to duplicate Penn Station, but by definition our Intermodal Center will have as many uses as Penn Station. It serves as Downtown Tucson's transportation hub similar to Penn Station.

Both-1

As a second generation Tucsonan—my grandparents on both sides came her in the late 20'and early 30's—and a homeowner in Armory Park. I expect the city to pick the proposal that retains the ambiance of the Ronstadt Center. I remember going into that Hardware store and speaking with Linda's Dad and uncle-- and I know that the Ronstadt family would be disappointed if the artwork and trees which are part of the original design were destroyed. I think the downtown revival is wonderful but please let's be sane about it. The home I was raised in in the Tanque Verde area has disappeared in a flurry of development and modernism. Take Care! Curb your enthusiasm Please. I have been so sad to see my City destroyed.

We agree that the arcade and tile work should be retained and are committed to making downtown better by designing a project that contextually and historically fits into the fabric of Tucson.

Both-2

I want to tell you how exciting it is to see the proposals for the Ronstadt Transit Center. I like the Peach Properties "park-like" feeling to bring a town-center feeling to that area. I like how the Alexander proposal used the existing brick arches and artwork but the building feels stale and boring. I hope we can continue the exciting downtown development with the Peachtree proposal.

Please review our new renderings which we feel will show much better the look and feel of the Alexander/OasisTucson proposal. We are excited to show what Ronstadt can be.

Both-3

I was just informed of these two design proposals and the opportunity to provide feedback. I find the Alexander Company Proposal to be ordinary and derivative. It is a watered down version of a conservative version of 70s postmodern design. It would add no distinction to the site. It isn't a building that will fit into the environment; it will be a building with no distinction. I truly hope your committee wants a building that will announce itself as distinctly Tucson.

I think the Peach Property design does exactly that. It subtly references the mid-modern style that is so important to Tucson's history. It skips over the early postmodern pastiche of historic styles that has no true referent in Tucson's architectural history, and provides a sophisticated and unifying image of Tucson. The design articulates the layers of local history; it doesn't blend them together in a seamless whole, that isn't Tucson. Yet the core of the building is unified, and the building is proudly contemporary. Isn't that what we want for Tucson? Why not a building that metaphorically engages those aspirations.

Architectural styles keep evolving, but well-designed distinctive buildings remain just that. Average, quasi-postmodern copies are scattered throughout cities all over the country. Tucson doesn't need to add another forgettable building to that list.

Demion Clinco feels that contextual and historic fit, especially at this location, is imperative. You are correct architectural styles come and go. Our vision is to create a structure that feels timeless and not driven by the flavor of the day architectural style.

General Comments:

aa. Adult housing is a must. We have only student housing of which it's my understanding, none of is large enough to become condos for adults to purchase or reside. Cadence, Jim Campbell's project, though the site layout is great, (surprised to see palm trees), but it is not that pleasing aesthetically as the entrance to Downtown, but won awards for its financing options--which somehow needs to be in place or City of Tucson incentives/cash to get these built as well as the rest of the complex.

The U of A recently did a market study on adult housing in downtown and found a market was lacking. A portion of the residential will be market rate so any adult will be able to live within the project. Regarding incentives, the major incentive for Cadence, AC Hotel and Ronstadt is the building of the parking garage. In all three projects these funds are repaid through garage revenues and increased sales tax revenues.

bb. Retail businesses:

These must be provided with incentives to take the chance of being Downtown esp for local retailers to relocate or have a second store downtown. I guess the students don't shop downtown--so again, adult housing is important.

Getting retail that is not restaurant or bar based is an important next step for Downtown Tucson and we hope to be a part of that movement. Downtown's redevelopment will only be sustainable if it has a mix of housing and retail options along with quality transportation choices.

With the Green Garage added as close parking, perhaps free parking if you're shopping at the new "Ronstadt Retail Center", part of the Ronstadt Transit Center.

It is certainly a concept worth discussing. Thanks

cc. Nothing happens without "cash". Our city needs to put add to the pie to make this a success with funding, incentives, reduced permit fees, etc. ((Broadway needs the same input of cash from our city to ensure the specific results everyone is expecting.) The expectations here are enormous!

We are pragmatic on what the City can and cannot do for this project. We are proposing that no general funds from the City to be used on the project because we believe those funds are needed elsewhere. Any investment the public makes should have a corresponding social or economic return. We agree that this needs to be a collaborative project and is important for downtown.

Both-4

A few comments on the Ronstadt Transit Center development proposals presented by Peach Properties and the Alexander Company week before last.

Any redeveloped transit center needs to have a social services element incorporated into it. Currently social services are spread out all over the city, which makes them impractical to access. Having at least a representative of each local social service agency at the transit center would do a world of good. It would also make the transit center serve as a destination in and of itself. This would draw people into your retail and dining establishments you plan on incorporating. It's an obvious win-win. After the meeting I spoke with one of the Peach presenters, because Peach did mention that they were going to include a social services element. I specifically asked him to include homeless services, since homeless folks rely on the bus for their transportation. He said they certainly would include homeless services, so Peach has the right idea.

Also, the transit center needs to have some sort of Safe Park/respice campground included in it. In other words, a place where those homeless people who rely on the bus could sleep. This could be part of the transit center proper, or adjacent to it. Right now those homeless people are spread all over downtown, which leads to inevitable conflicts and friction with the downtown businesses. Having them all in one place would eliminate that. Frankly I'm surprised the city hasn't already done this, as many cities across the country have done. Designed properly the park would serve the public during the day, and allow camping overnight.

I think this might also draw in some tourism. Community campgrounds are common in Europe. If I know I can take the Greyhound to Tucson, camp in a well-maintained city park, and use the local bus service to see the sights I'm going to do that.

We do not envision the Art Park to be a location for sleeping at night but that determination will be made by the City based on their rules and regulations. We would need to investigate the social services aspect but it is one of the services we will be discussing with the City.

Both-5

Please pass on the following for comment by the proposing companies for the RTC project.

As the founding member of the Downtown Innovation District and a strong supporter of the startup ecosystem development in Tucson, it has become clear through my economic development work that creating space for startup incubation and entrepreneur in residence programs is critical to a successful urban core.

What elements of your proposal will support the space and resources for co-working space, incubators or entrepreneur in residence programs similar to those currently offered by Startup Tucson?

The primary focus of our plan is providing an improved transit center with increased multi-modal options, housing for a variety of income levels and neighborhood service level retail to serve transit riders and people living and working downtown. We have programmed live/work space on the North site in which we envision entrepreneurs of different types taking residency and producing goods and services. As we move forward in designing the project we are planning on engaging the stakeholders of the transit center and the City in a discussion on what other elements or services would enhance the project. We would expect that discussion to include some of the elements you mentioned.

How do you imagine those integrations working with your current plan?

We have programmed a flex space on both sites in anticipation of the stakeholder discussion on what the community would like to see added to the project.

What types of live/work arrangements will be included in your plan and are these feasible for startup founders, tech companies, and small creative class workers?

The programmed live/work space on the north site is proposed to be rental units for creative class entrepreneurs focused on the arts.

Both-6

I am a SunTran bus rider who rides the #3 bus from Pima West to or through the Ronstadt Center at least once per week. I would like to offer a comment, in particular, on the Peach Properties proposal that would have buses only stop and pick up passengers at Ronstadt instead of idling there until the scheduled departure time: The presence of waiting buses at Ronstadt Center makes it easier for older, physically disabled, or encumbered (i.e., with packages, strollers, etc.) passengers to board. Such passengers get more time to enter the bus, pay fares, and situate themselves as the buses wait for their departure times. If buses do not have "layovers" at Ronstadt, it will no longer be a transit center but just an extra-long and busy bus stop. The Alexander proposal, while it does allow for layovers, has the disadvantage of making Ronstadt Center into a low-ceilinged potentially hot and noisy space for bus riders, and I don't think it's any better.

We have designed the new Intermodal Center to handle the current operations of SunTran and to be flexible based on future decisions. The ceilings within the center are 20' and will be designed with open air flowing through it, a large light/air well and exhaust air handlers to make it both a pleasant and safe experience.

I would also like to say that I think Ronstadt Transit Center does the job it's supposed to do and is a beautiful outdoor public space. If the washrooms were up to par and the Information Booth was staffed, there would be no need to "upgrade" it.

Understood.

Both-7

Of the two proposal teams I believe The Alexander Company had the stronger presentation. I've arrived at this conclusion for the following reasons:

- 1. I found the individual team members of the Alexander Co. to be better qualified in terms of each member's backgrounds and the manner and content of each presentation.**
- 2. I felt that the Alexander group's track record was superior to Peach properties in terms of sensitivity to stakeholders and preservation of historic structures.**

3. I was impressed with the Alexander Companies attention to details covering all the environmental, logistical, and aesthetic considerations of the project. Alexander Company's design keeps some of the existing Ronstadt Structure and in particular its artistic features such as the priceless tile work. Peach Properties proposes to destroy everything relating to the Ronstadt, replacing it with something having no relation to the historic structures on Congress. They claim that they will 'reuse' the artwork, but breaking up a work of art totally destroys its unity and integrity. They seem to want to offer 'everything but the kitchen sink' to the stakeholders.

4. Alexander Companies professionalism was apparent in terms of its transparent presentation of its budget. Peach Properties was elusive regarding its finances. Indeed, they avoided the issue in their presentation. Their budget was 3x what Alexander's budget was! I think that alone speaks volumes.

5. Alexander Company answered each of the audience's questions thoroughly and convincingly. Peach Properties' answers, on the other hand, seemed at times elusive, even patronizing. Therefore, I strongly urge the committee to approve The Alexander Company's proposal for the new Ronstadt Transit Project!

Thank you.

Both-8

1. Include rental housing for elderly and low-income households (less than 80 percent AMI)

In the August 2014 Report "Affordable and Mixed-Income Housing in Transit Oriented Development for Eastern Pima County", prepared by the Drachman Institute for the Arizona Department of Housing, the Ronstadt Transit Center was one of two highest ranked sites for near-term priority development for TOD affordable and mixed-income housing. This means that this site would be most effective in addressing the demand for affordable TOD housing options in Eastern Pima County, as demonstrated in that report.

The market study conducted as part of the report indicates that in Eastern Pima County, the housing market will see demand from 95,600 households for TOD housing between 2015 and 2045. Of these households:

- More than two-thirds will be by renter households with nearly one-quarter of that demand composed of elderly households.**
- More than two-thirds are projected to be below-moderate income households earning less than 80 percent AMI.**

We agree with this comment and we are proposing to include affordable housing in our proposal.

2. Emphasize functional design strategies such as passive solar design, different treatment of different elevations, variation in building heights and elevations; and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, from the placement of vegetation through building form and opportunities for "eyes on the street." "The proper design and effective use of the built environment can lead to a reduction in the fear of crime and incidence of crime, and to an improvement in quality of life." (www.cptedtraining.net) The Peach proposal appears much more open, which would promote a greater sense of safety. Locating the two (North and South) plazas within the commercial context makes them more usable (and safe) as compared to the "Art Park" of the Alexander proposal located away from the commercial pedestrian traffic.

Our goal is to draw the activity on Congress Street down 6th Avenue and onto Toole. Congress and 6th is the heart of downtown and we look to activate 6th in a similar way.

3. Focus on enhanced, accessible pedestrian links to the Modern Streetcar and Amtrak at the historic depot, and possible Greyhound station. The Peach proposal includes good pedestrian access at two

points from the east and connecting directly to the two public plazas and Sixth Avenue on the west. This encourages pedestrian activity in the area and “eyes on the street.” The Peach proposal including a Greyhound station adjacent to the Downtown Links with connection to RTC and the Amtrak/historic depot would be a big plus.

We have included Greyhound within the Intermodal Center block rather than across the railroad tracks. We feel that embraces the purpose of the Intermodal Center more appropriately. Pedestrian access is from 6th Ave, Congress Street, Pennington Street and Arizona Ave.

4. Consider access and adaptability for future transit options such as Bus Rapid Transit (including larger buses and level entry), Inter-City Rail (at the historic depot/Union Pacific), and extensions of the Modern Streetcar.

We have taken those options into consideration and the Intermodal Center is created in a flexible way to handle future changes.

Both-9

If the two could alter their plans or mix & match that would be great!

They're both good but I'm leaning towards The Peach proposal as it includes a very needed 144-room hotel and a pocket / dog park.

We did not include a hotel because of the AC Hotel and the new Marriot at Main Gate. We are open to a small dog park on the site and programming the open space in accordance with the needs of the transit users and residents.

The Alexander proposal would add restaurants, retail space, and 3,200 square feet of commercial space which is great but the artists' live/work lofts is a wonderful idea. And, it's more affordable, by \$1 mil

Thank you.

Both-10

I'm an architect and citizen of Tucson, graduate of u of a '78 and interested observer and participant in the future of our city.

The 2 proposals show 2 extreme images of our future. There is an overly pessimistic view shown by the Charlie sheen wanna be group, whose main claim to fame seems to be their ability to clean up contaminated sites in the Midwest. They have given up hope on becoming a city whose image can rival Austin or San Diego. They've lowered their standards to Tucson circa 2005 and earlier. Going back to when the pure, simple adobe structures found here first became glitized up by Midwesterners. and that's with the direction of a historical preservation expert. c'mon man.

We greatly appreciate Tucson for what it is and what it can be. We also understand our economic limitations and if an architectural design does not take into account the financial considerations the project will never be built. We also believe our design concept is timeless and will always fit into the fabric of Downtown Tucson and is sensitive to our surroundings.

The 2nd presentation was vivid and lively, filled with hope for the future of Tucson. It was maybe even too inclusive, trying to work with any and all comers regarding what could be the central hub of our pueblos evolutionary growth. At 174 million it is high risk but the reward could be extraordinary.

this is compared to a 49 million dollar proposal that the developers are already trying to cut the budget on.

Our budget is reasonable based on our experience with similar projects and only includes the current transit center site. The other proposal includes the current site, the North Site, the Corbett site and a bridge connecting them in their budget.

Busway wise both schemes have flaws. The covered plan avoids congress at all costs. They're sold on the perfection of the traffic circle, though I've never been on one that was helpful or clear. The peach proposal has an open air straight away concept that provides flexibility for future evolution in bus design. It does use Congress, which is its negative.

The traffic circle was based on a City commissioned traffic study that recommended it has the best approach to handle the buses and congestion. You are correct in that it was very important for us to reduce traffic conflicts on Congress Street.

The historical arcade will be used in both schemes. In the budget scheme it is to save money and the façade. In the peach plan it will be removed and then used as an artistic compliment to the new design.

We feel strongly that keeping the arcade as is to provide historical context and as a design amenity is important. We have brought Melody Peters on to our team so we can continue that theme into the Intermodal Center and throughout the project.

The upper building in both schemes is far from finalized. The budget scheme is proposing a self-storage type box that covers the whole site. Not showing us anything interesting so we won't be upset when they strip it down for budget reasons. The peach project faintly gestures towards a contemporary scheme with cantilevered and staggered balconies to set the buildings back as they rise and to show Austin and San Diego that we too have decided to join this century. So you can probably guess that my vote, if I had one, would go to the peach! I hope the city agrees.

We have proposed a design theme and concept that we believe makes sense for the City of Tucson and that we are confident we could build tomorrow if the City asked us to. We look forward to working with the City and the public to further define a design that is both feasible and will make a statement that we are all proud of.

Both-11

My comments to the presentations are as follows:

1. I think from a transportation perspective I like the Alexander Company's proposal. It is paramount to divert the buses off of Congress. 1200 trips a day is almost one per minute and at the peak it could be 2 per minute. To turn in off of Congress, the buses would need to take up two lanes for the turning radius.

We strongly agree for the merchants, traffic and pedestrians that reducing buses on Congress Street is of great benefit.

2. I think we need to be realistic on what we can deliver, and what the demographics and economics will allow. From that perspective I have seen too many other grand projects promoted and never delivered in a timely fashion. I have walked by the Thrifty Block for 11 years. I think the Proposers need to be qualified and demonstrate they can Financially Deliver.

As previously stated, the most important aspect of this project is being able to deliver a project that is worthy of the opportunity and on a committed schedule.

3. Has the U of A committed to space and made a financial commitment? I think all the proposed committed players need to be qualified as to their level of commitment.

The U of A has sent a letter stating they have no funds and are not committed to any proposal.

4. I think Architecture and design is important. I like the Peach Proposal Architecture and design. However, I'm concerned with how economically feasible it is.

We like the Peach design as well, but don't feel it contextually fits at 6th Avenue and Congress Street. Our new renderings will show our final design tweaks.

5. I'm concerned about the Alexander Company's architecture. While pragmatic and simple, it could be more sophisticated.

Refined architectural renderings will be presented upon the September 30th resubmittal.

At the end of the day, as a downtown stakeholder and property owner for over 20 years, I think we may have a short window in this current development cycle. This is an important project, and if it's to get built it needs to be built now, otherwise it may be another decade or more before we have another opportunity. Whichever project is selected needs to be qualified, assurances need to be made on timing and benchmarks need to be provided on when the development commences and is completed by.

We agree.

Both-12

1. Neither proposal seems to take account of UAV (unmanned aerial vehicle) technology as a mode of transportation. Google cars, Amazon deliveries, and similar transportation developments will be more of reality by the time the proposed Ronstadt center is operational. How would either team take account of this?

We have taken those elements into account, but we are early in the programmatic phase and have not had a chance to have discussions with those companies as to what they project their future needs to be. We have proposed the 6th Avenue frontage to operate as a much-needed place where taxi's, car share, shuttle buses, etc., can queue for pickup's and drop offs.

2. Both proposals probably depend on marketing information about commuters and users of the proposed Ronstadt center, but there is no explicit discussion of options. Why is there no requirement for an information/privacy policy? Why not be proactive in enabling community members to voluntarily share information in polls in which the data—with permission—are linked to buying and travel patterns? Sharing the benefits would reduce costs, provide incentives for use of the facility, and put Tucson on the map as an exceptional community place.

We are proposing to leave the Intermodal Center in the City's control and have no plans to market, share or collect information about commuters or their travel patterns.

Both-13

My initial strong preference for the 100% hometown Peach Properties was overcome by the Alexander Company. The difference in the proposals was vivid for me. The Alexander may be a smaller scale vision, but it fits the context much better. The architectural flavor is consistent with the other buildings in size and shape. I very much like that they would keep the "arcade." I liked the traffic flow better. By turn styling the public transport system, they are "gentrifying" it to encourage more ridership. Their liaison with local folks was impressive to me.

Thank you.

My concern about the Peach Properties plan it seems to promise all things to all people and lacked focus. The flavor of the architecture proposal was anywhere USA. The willingness to jettison the "arcade" because it is not historic seems cavalier. The plan seemed sketchy and big and rangy, but not thought out. Plus the projected costs were substantially more. This town needs projects that are COMPLETED not more visions of what could be. Tucson's obligation to the homeless needs to be addressed apart from the Ronstadt center.

We agree it is important that this project is completed.

Both-14

Project purposes and goals -

GOAL A

The project should incorporate (1) a transit center with similar or improved services....

From what I can recall, NEITHER Alexander nor Peach mentioned, in any detail, HOW their particular proposal was going to achieve the goal in A (1). The MAIN focus, not to be forgotten in all the gee whiz and wow about a wellness center and a hotel at the corner of 6th and Congress, is TRANSIT!

We feel our transit design not only improves transit services and options but also will create a better experience for the transit riders and the bus drivers.

Goal A - paragraph 2

The project should incorporate community open space....

The ALEXANDER proposal, as I recall, stated that to gain access to the RTC a person would have to go through a turnstile, presumably using a SunGo Card. No card, no access - sort of like making RTC into a "private club." If you don't have a membership card you can't use the Y or you can't go to Tucson Country Club!

The proposal for the turnstiles was in response to hearing numerous concerns about safety and illicit activity taking place in and around the current center. The project can function with or without the turnstiles and we will defer that decision to the City of Tucson.

Goal A - paragraph 3

The design of the project...offers architecture responsive to the urban historic fabric....

The PEACH proposal for the RTC exterior, as mentioned previously, looks like something better suited for L.A. than Tucson; therefore, it would seem that Peach's exterior design does not fulfill the CHARACTER portion of Goal A.

We are very sensitive to the contextual fit within the community and our new renderings will show that in more detail.

Both-15

The idea of putting the downtown transit center under a ceiling is frankly horrifying. The toxic fumes will ensure that no one will use SunTran unless they absolutely have to. One likely outcome of this project will be a substantial decrease in SunTran ridership to downtown, as people use any other means to avoid the noise and exhaust fumes in the transit center. other than parking, retail and high end condos, this project fails to provide any improvement to the city. Frankly we should be improving mass transit and reducing automobile traffic downtown and high-end housing and increasing parking lots do the opposite.

Many transit facilities nationwide are set up in a similar fashion. In our case the new Intermodal Center it is completely open on two sides with 20 foot ceilings and a large light/air well. Air handlers will ensure fresh air throughout.

The city of Tucson needs to consider the needs of the poor rather than continuing the attack on the homeless and working class who use the downtown transit center. Any transit center development should be done with an eye towards the people who currently use the area, and not for the rich elite who might move in once the neighborhood is "cleaned up". I am a Tucsonan. I grew up poor, and used the Ronstadt daily for many years, and I am ashamed of how the city is treating the homeless and poor. I am currently in school in San Francisco, and every winter and summer break I come home to Tucson to see more rich white self-important generic urban development and less of the culture and identity of Tucson. I want my home to be unique, with a culture and identity that is not like Phoenix or LA, not homogenized and vanilla, and this proposal is more of the same. If I wanted to live in a new city with a mass produced contemporary consumerist culture, I would live somewhere else. I will oppose any plan that fails to encourage the use of public transit, and convince people to get out of their cars, and that respect the diversity and culture of the Old Pueblo. This plan is awful and if you decide to go forward with it, the community will work to stop you.

Like you, our artist team member grew up poor and as a practicing artist has lived at, or below, poverty level for most of her adult life. Melody Peters rode into town on a Greyhound bus in 1979 and after completing her MFA at the University of Arizona taught part-time at both PCC East and PCC West, making long SunTran journeys to do so. It was while teaching at PCC that she applied for the woefully underfunded commission to produce hand-made tile for the new construction of the Ronstadt Transit Center. Riding the bus to classes gave Melody an appreciation for her fellow bus riders, both for the poor who had no other transportation options, and for the middle class commuters who rode the bus out of concern for the environment. She felt strongly that bus riders deserve the best and was determined to give them artwork that was ambitious in scope but also graceful and quietly cheerful. (She did literally give the work to the bus riders and the City, as the \$8 psf remuneration for hand-made tile did not even cover her manufacture costs and as a result had to work five additional part-time jobs during this time to subsidize the art commission.) Although she now walks to her part-time teaching job, Melody still adamantly believes that bus riders deserve the best and she pledges to do all she can in her role as the artist team member to deliver once again!

Both-16

How can you even THINK about destroying the public art that our tax dollars paid for at the Ronstadt Transit Center? It would seem to be a no-brainer to select the option that incorporates (at least) the tiles in the new design. It would also seem to be a no-brainer to do everything possible to save the trees growing there.

Please select The Alexander Company/Oasis Tucson Proposal, which might leave a little of Tucson as we know it. The Peach proposal is just AWFUL -- modern in a way that does NOT fit with or enhance the downtown area.

We want a city we can be proud of. We want it to be attractive and to reflect the Tucson of yesteryear updated -- not some über-modern, outlandish structures. Tall buildings are not better buildings, especially not the ones in the design concepts of Peach. This would pretty much dismantle everything that's there -- trees, tiles, etc. -- and leave us with a gigantic piece of weird.

I want my tax dollars spent wisely. A hotel? One that was just a few blocks away failed. And it was much closer to the Convention Center, which is more of a draw than "downtown". If someone wants to be downtown, he/she can stay at the Hotel Congress, a local business.

On another note: Thriving downtowns around the country generally have a thriving art center downtown, as well. Tucson artists can't afford to be downtown. This is shameful. While both proposals mention "artist space", you and I both know that artists in Tucson will NOT be able to afford any space in these developments.

Please, PLEASE: If we have to have "urban renewal", select the Alexander Company / Oasis Tucson option. And make sure they keep the public art and the trees.

Thank you.

Both-17

I know I'm late, but.... PLEASE - getting rid of shade trees in the desert is crazy. Please don't allow it!

Thank you.

Both-18

I don't like the Peach exterior. It looks "too L.A." I think I've seen places that look similar on Wilshire Blvd. This is TUCSON, not LOS ANGELES! I do like the Alexander exterior. It definitely looks more Tucson. As I recall, neither team addressed the issue of security. At a previous (City Hall) presentation, Michael Keith said that during a given period of time the TPD arrest rate in most of downtown was ** 6 ****; however during that same period of time the arrest rate at RTC was **** SIXTY ****!?!?? People are not going to be attracted to live/work/shop in an area that has a high crime rate! Both Alexander and Peach have indicated that they will add apartments to their developments. What are they planning on doing to include "affordable housing" to their proposals? The term "affordable housing" as used here follows the HUD guidelines that rent shall be no more than 30% of renter's income. I don't like the Alexander idea of entering the RTC via a turnstile. I think this violates the open space goal of the RFP. I question the viability of the Peach hotel idea. People who come to the downtown area on business, not pleasure, can stay at the Hotel Congress, the hotel at St. Mary's and Granada or the new AC Marriott basically across the street from the RTC. I don't like the "underground cavern" aspect of the Alexander proposal for the bus bays. I don't like the "up to 12 stories" aspect of the Peach proposal. The Alexander proposal states they will include a Greyhound bus depot at the RTC site. It is my understanding that Greyhound DOES NOT WANT a depot where their buses have to negotiate downtown Tucson traffic. Both companies should change their plans so that their respective buildings should start ABOVE the current RTC and keep the current open air/space of RTC.**

We believe the activation of the site with many more eyes will greatly enhance the site and reduce any criminal activity. We are proposing affordable, workforce and market rate housing with the final mix and determination defined by the market and economics of the project. The turnstile, if desired by the City, can create efficiency for SunTran and increase safety within the Intermodal Center. The bus riders we have talked to desire a reduction of the loitering and illicit activity at the center. The Intermodal Center is open on two sides with 20' ceilings and a large light/air well. Greyhound is in our proposal, but it will be up to them and the City if they are included. They would add value to the Intermodal Center.

Both-19

I am very concerned that the arcade artwork and the trees might be demolished in this development. Therefore, I strongly urge you NOT to favor the Peach Property design which will demolish all of this and go with the Alexander Team which preserves this arcade and the trees. I live in the Armory Park Historic District and am active on both the Board of Directors and the Historic Zone Advisory Board, and do have a very great interest in the downtown.

We are retaining the arcade and associated art work as previously mentioned.

Both-20

I am writing to express my opinion about the Ronstadt Center presentation on July 22. as a Tucson native, and someone who patronizes downtown daily for business and entertainment, I wholeheartedly endorse the design presented by Peach Properties.

I feel it is important to patronize the local designers, not simply for the sake of "keeping it local," but because they have an intimate knowledge of the area and its people. Their presentation showed a respect for the local climate, and the desires of the local population: it provided substantial and flexible opportunity to develop a rich and eclectic mix of business and lifestyle/entertainment; it reflected the atmosphere and environment of our downtown culture; it provided a critical analysis of a progressive face for Tucson that is both sorely needed and desired by Tucsonans.

To the contrary, the presentation by the Alexander Company suggested an outdated design that seemed to lack vision or seriousness. There appeared to be little effort to change the fabric of the block. the design of the architecture was uninspiring and inappropriate, and doesn't appear to be a design that will provide opportunity for flexible and diverse uses. In fact, I hypothesize that surrounding the existing bus facility as if they are trying to cover up a blemish would turn the terminal into a dark and dangerous environment, and would increase crime in the area.

Our focus was to keep the existing transit uses on site and propose a design for a quality mixed use project surrounding it that would fit into the context and character of the surrounding area. We believe the design of the new center will greatly improve the current safety conditions and increase ridership of the system.

Both-21

Neither presentation clarifies public monies for site/construction or operating/maintaining the facility. Can you offer clarification?

We have proposed that the city design, own and operate the center, which will be built as part of the larger project. The Intermodal Center will be publicly financed through a conduit issuance with the payments for the facility coming from the project in the form of payments for the land, leases and sales tax. No existing general fund or transit funds would be used to pay for the project, just new site generated revenues from the project.

Additional Comment 2: Is the inclusion of Greyhound a necessary condition in order to make project financing work? What is the status of your discussions with Greyhound?

The inclusion of Greyhound, and potentially other bus systems, is the result of the desire to create a central intermodal transit facility for the region. We believe that the opportunity to connect multiple modes of transit will increase ridership across all the systems. We have not discussed this concept directly with Greyhound; rather we are proposing this option as they and the City of Tucson seek a permanent location for Greyhound. We look forward to having the opportunity to sit down with the

City and other private bus operators to figure out how we can accommodate their needs as part of this project. And no, we are not dependent on the inclusion of Greyhound.

Additional Comment 3: As a relatively new member of the University and nearby Downtown communities (nearly 2 years), I would like to express my support for the protection of the brick shade structure at Ronstadt as you move towards a decision on the architect and project plan. Though I'm definitely favorable to a remodel of the property, the shade structure seems to me to be in perfect harmony with the architecture of our city. I'm hopeful that you'll consider saving the brick structure, tile and oak trees from demolition. My understanding is that the Alexander project best accomplishes this - but I'd be open to a re-work of the Peach project in order for these local treasures to be saved.

We concur that the existing brick arcade and tile work are in harmony with the site and should be saved and incorporated into the project. Although this provides unique challenges, it also provides unique opportunities that we believe will enhance the public realm surrounding the project. To this end we have brought Melody Peters on to the team to expand her art into the Intermodal Center.

Additional Comment 4. Having reviewed both proposals, I strongly encourage you to choose the Alexander design, which respects the historic context of the site, the artwork so beloved by the community, and the Tucson aesthetic. The Peach design could be in any city...it does not relate to Tucson, and appears impersonal and sterile to me.

Thank you.

Additional Comment 5. Alexander Group's proposal excels in almost every respect. Alexander clearly have a lot of experience with projects of this nature, including restoring and/or adaptively reusing historic properties and remediating brownfield sites. Peach appeared to be out of their depth: all glitz and no substance.

Thank you.

Additional Comment 6

GOAL A: USES & CHARACTER

"RESPONSIVENESS TO URBAN FABRIC"

–it preserves and incorporates the existing public art, the arcades and beautiful handmade tilework created for the Ronstadt Center, itself echoing the tilework on County Hall and other landmark Downtown buildings. Although not yet 50 years old, as stated in the meeting, it was the first public art used in a TDOT project, so has a historic status in that sense. Beyond that, Bus Riders in the meeting I attended spoke warmly about how great they felt that the COT had created a beautiful place for them to use. I was horrified to hear Peach had not considered preserving it. So much for their lip service to public art! In today's dollars, I'm told, an equivalent installation would cost half a million dollars.

–more broadly, the Alexander proposal respects the historic built environment with an overall design, massing and scale sympathetic to the existing historic streetscape. The Peach proposal, while vague, looks like a Dagwood sandwich, and heaven forfend they actually use the glaring acid yellow that appears on the drawings. Unless the final design is drastically rethought, it will be an instant eyesore looming over downtown. My notes say the "towers" would be "5 to 12 stories" high. Did I mishear, or was it indeed this vague? Fans of jutting exterior balconies should consider the problems with students throwing missiles from the high-rises near campus. Along with the nondescript Cadence

building, this raises the general need for design standards for Downtown construction: new buildings need not look like “fake” old buildings but should not dwarf and disrespect the historic streetscape.
“SUSTAINABLE/ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE DESIGN”

Alexander Group propose a LEED Silver certification, which they said was “realistic.” Peach paid lip service to sustainability throwing out ideas such as farmers’ markets and rooftop agriculture--but can someone explain how two rooftop swimming pools reflect sustainable design in a desert?

Thank you.

GOAL B: TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE MULTIMODAL

–The Alexander proposal returns the Greyhounds to the site, where they belong. They need to be apprised that buses to Mexico need to be fitted in as well. The Peach proposal puts the Greyhounds on the other side of the tracks--literally--and proposes a bridge people can trudge over in 105 degree heat to get to them. That bridge looks like a folly that will be cut first thing when the budget pinches.
“ENHANCE FACILITIES FOR CURRENT BUS RIDERS & INCREASE APPEAL”

--The only drawback to Alexander’s proposal, and something they could hopefully be asked to reconsider, is the blocking off of the transit center itself from the retail and the street. I understand turnstiles promote quick boarding, and consequently greater bus frequency. But transit-oriented retail should serve transit users first, surely! Bus or transit riders should not have to pass through a turnstile, possibly paying a double fare, to get a drink, a sandwich or a newspaper. These should be available where transit riders, including those using the center only to transfer, can access them. Sorry, but vending machines just don’t cut it. Those all-important discretionary riders we need to balance the books must be enticed to use the facility, not punished like those with no choice.
–bus riders also spoke warmly about the openness and airiness of the current RTC. This was the only aspect of the Peach proposal that was more appealing than the Alexander proposal. A Wisconsin firm may not realize that nothing falls from the sky in Tucson that will stop the buses from running, nor will it need to be shoveled. If Alexander’s bus terminal could be opened up a bit, perhaps over the bus bays themselves (while allowing riders an air-conditioned waiting area) it would meet that goal. It would also make for better ventilation of exhaust fumes.

There are a few options we are proposing to ameliorate the separation concerns between the retail and the transit center. The first is not having the turnstiles at all. We proposed that as a mechanism for safety and efficiency for loading but the decision is in the hands of the City. The project works with or without the turnstile. The second concept we are proposing is the inclusion of an automat either directly into the transit center or into the main entrance of the transit center off 6th street. The current concept for the retail along 6th Avenue is a combination public market/food hall with a commercial kitchen space for public use. We will be proposing the inclusion of an automat, which is a large vending machine wall where food made from the restaurants in the food hall, from the public market or the public commercial kitchen (if possible) can be temperature controlled and sold quickly to passengers or pedestrians, providing a multitude of quick, fresh options for those on the go. The power of this concept is the ability to connect local vendors or individuals just starting out directly with the riders, pedestrians and residents of the project.



We did not put this in our proposal or presentation because we felt it was premature and we do not believe our proposal should be chosen simply because we have some interesting tenant ideas for the space that may or may not work. We want the focus to be on the transit center and the project as a whole first.

To the second point, we believe that we did a poor job of showing the concept of the Intermodal Center in a visual form to help people grasp the concept. We are including new visuals to hopefully help understand the concept and what it could be. We want the facility to have as much open air and light as possible, both through the new light/air well and through the open sides, and to have an air handling system to assure that transit riders are comfortable waiting for their bus. Opening up the facility more is certainly possible and one of the focuses will have with the City and the transit riders as we move forward.

GOAL C: FINANCIAL & ECONOMIC VITALITY

—probably most important from most people’s perspective, the Alexander Group offered a detailed budget of \$49 million, and had even worked out what funding sources were likely, including \$12 million of public funds, and \$37 million of private investment. A member of the team told me afterwards that in their experience such a project could not raise more than \$50 million. They also estimated an \$850,000 annual return to defray the investment. Peach volunteered no budget at all, and when pressed, Phil Swaim, who appeared to be their spokesman rather than Ron Schwabe of Peach, offered an “estimate on a concept” of \$174 million. How can the budget figures be so disproportionate?

Although we cannot speak to the other team’s budget or experience building vertical mixed use projects, we can tell you that we have worked on a lot of similar projects and spent a lot of time on our budget and cost estimating, including, a contractor’s estimate bid for the apartment cost. Our proposal, including our breakdown on the public participation and return on the public’s investment, is of course based on a concept but one where we feel comfortable we would be able to execute.

GOAL D: “COMMUNICATION & PARTICIPATION”

Peach’s touts their “local” credentials, but the track record of their team members reflects disregard for public input and the historic built environment in the current Broadway process. HDR was recently sent back to the drawing board by an exasperated Citizens Task Force; Kaneen furnished a “facilitator” unable to build consensus, remain neutral, or even end meetings on time; and Jim Schon based traffic modeling on 2040 projections we all know are wrong. Apparently someone local thinks

it's acceptable for current bus riders to trudge to Alameda to purchase tickets--and let's not even discuss ticketing for the Streetcar.

If Peach's glitzy but vapid presentation represents the quality of proposals that normally get funded in Tucson, it's no wonder we have such a patchy record of seeing projects completed. If I were the COT I would not trust them to pull this off. Alexander appears by far the more competent, professional and experienced. Their design is superior and exponentially cheaper.

Thank you for your comments.