

MASTER FORM – WITH COMMENTS & SUGGESTIONS RECEIVED ON 2-10/11-2014
Joint Development of Ronstadt Transit Center Project Area
DRAFT RFP/Phase I Scope Document: Stakeholder Comments & Suggestions
MY COMMENTS & SUGGESTIONS ON DRAFT SCOPE

[Following two paragraphs in black were instructions for completing form.]

PROVIDING & RETURNING COMMENTS & SUGGESTIONS: You may use this form to write your comments and suggestions on the Draft Scope, or you may write directly on a copy of the Draft Scope. Please leave completed forms or marked-up copies of the Draft Scope on sign-in table today, or scan and email to Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov, or fax them to R. Ruopp at (520)-791-2529. Alternatively, you can include your comments and suggestions directly in an email to Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov. You may also call Rebecca Ruopp at (520) 837-6973 to convey your comments or suggestions.

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS BY TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2014, NOON. Staff will review all comments and suggestions returned, as well as those provided at the Feb. 10 stakeholder meeting, for consideration in updating the Draft Scope in preparation for the Mayor and Council public hearing on its February 19, 2014, meeting. *THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING.*

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MASTER FORM PRESENTS A COMPILATION OF WRITTEN COMMENTS, INCLUDING 13 COMPLETED FORMS, 7 EMAILS WITH COMMENTS, AND 3 MARKED-UP COPIES OF THE DRAFT SCOPE (TOTALING COMMENTS FROM 23 PARTICIPANTS). STAFF REVIEWED THESE COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS IN CONJUNCTION WITH REVISING THE DRAFT SCOPE FOR TRANSMITTAL TO MAYOR AND COUNCIL FOR THE FEBRUARY 19, 2014, PUBLIC HEARING ON THIS JOINT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.

RFP Phase I Draft Scope SECTION	COMMENTS RECEIVED
PROJECT OVERVIEW (pg. 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st bullet, 2nd line – delete “components of” • First bullet, second line – make it “transit/mixed-use center” rather than “mixed use/transit center” • 1st bullet, 2nd line - The terms that the City will stipulate for “own, lease, manage” need to be part of the development agreement or a separate MOU. • Statement “own/lease, and/or manage” currently provides the only description of the legal arrangements. Is ownership by a developer even a possibility given the FTA involvement? • 1st bullet, 1st line – Revise the 1st and 2nd sentences to read, “The City of Tucson seeks to create a list of qualified development teams that are capable of successfully completing a transit-oriented development. The successful team will plan...” • Add 2nd bullet, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main goals of the project are to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhance transit services; 2. Increase transit ridership by providing an additional downtown destination; 3. Generate public revenues and maximize public return on investment gained from/through the development for the benefit of transit services; 4. Achieve transit, land use, and economic development objectives while maximizing revenues generated

	<p>to COT by providing a financial return equal to the highest and best use of the current Ronstadt Transit Center Property. <i>[Note: “Objectives” was used rather than “goals” for consistency with another change commenter made when asking that the “Purpose and Goals” section be retitled “Purpose and Objectives”]</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd bullet point: “...will need to be developed __ FTA.” FTA rules apply to 2 parcels, but not to the Toole parcel. • 3rd bullet, 1st/2nd lines – Replace “transit center” with “RTC” • 3rd bullet - substitute current text with “The selected developer and its successors in ownership will be responsible for managing the RTC - its facilities and amenities – in perpetuity. Comment followed suggested revisions that said “Elsewhere we can specify what “managing” means...cleaning, surveillance, security, etc. We should draw the language from a solid property management contract from CBRE or equal.” • 3rd bullet, 2nd line – change “continues to serve a” to “improves & strengthens RTC’s” • Seek development team that can: finance and/or fund, design, construct, etc. etc. (Make sure the finalists have the economic means to <u>finish</u> the project.) • Stress environmental concerns – global warming is a serious threat – There is no commerce or human traffic on a dead planet. We cannot “leave it to others” to solve ecological threats. • Must further specify what the specific mechanisms of “control” over the uses, both current and developed, new uses. What the “veto” power or other cancellation mechanisms are written into agreements. • The goal of increasing ridership and the objective of enhancing facilities for riders and making transit more attractive should include “communication”; i.e., should refer to the importance of information about the system availability of customer service, and signage/wayfinding with respect to downtown. This should also or alternatively be included under Transit and Transportation Infrastructure in the Objectives section. <i>[Note: “objectives” section is a reference to another commenter’s edits, which suggested that “goals” be termed “objectives.” This commenter endorses that approach.]</i> • General Comment: Reviewing this document from the perspective of a respondent, the Draft RFP is <u>grossly</u> lacking any substantive information upon which to base a response. • The City has the opportunity to make a huge impact on Downtown revitalization. If this project can be allowed to succeed the long term benefit is immense. Most important this project needs to make economic sense. The #1 driving force behind this opportunity is economic development. NOT TRANSIT!! Nothing happens unless this project makes money for the developer – market housing, offices, retail uses will pay handsome taxes for decades and help pay for additional City services.
<p>PROJECT PURPOSE (pg. 1) Please provide any comments on the purpose statement, and then in the following rows on the individual goals. If you think a goal should be eliminated or replaced with another</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise “Project Purpose & Goals” head to read “Project Objectives” • Transit first _____. In purpose statement switch “mixed-use development” & “multi-modal transit center” • We need to emphasize “economically viable” for both the original developer and future business owners who would occupy the buildings. • RTC works well now. How will a construction project impact the bus riders?

goal, please indicate that.	
<p><i>Use & Character</i> Goal #1 (pg. 1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal #1, 1st line – Switch “land uses” and “transit” to read “transit” and “land uses” • Keep “mix of land uses” first • Goal #1, 1st line – reorder and edit “land uses, transit, and public open space” to read “transit, public open space, and other land uses” • Specify transit first. Mention varied income levels. • Comment re inclusion of examples in Goal #1 – “I disagree with the comment yesterday that the RFP shouldn’t provide examples.” • Comment on “daycare” example included in Goal #1, third line – “ I would delete given the proximity to the bus station. Also, for many property owners, daycare is a hot button.” • Goal #1, 4th line – after “pharmacy” add “cleaners, etc.), commercial office and/or...” • “Goal #1, 4th line – “Calling for ‘business incubator’ space seems a little weird. That sounds like something that costs money rather than making it. Maybe just office/commercial/employment?” • Goal #1, 5th lines – “The bowling alley mention seems odd too. I can’t imagine that’s the kind of high value space that is going to pay for itself down there.” • Make “employment” and/or office a separate use. • Goal #1, 5th line – add “health club” after “(such as a...)” – Comment followed that said, “There is a major national company looking around downtown for a spot for a large club.” • Goal #1, 5th line - Comment on the inclusion of “movie theatre” example – Tricky, given the parking needed. A multi-screen theatre in this location would require a huge transit and walk share for customers. • Goal #1, 5th line - Comment on the inclusion of “bowling alley” example – Anywhere else in the US, this would make possible proposers laugh. • Goal #1, 5th line - Use language that addresses the multiple levels of pricing for recreation/entertainment venues. • Economic make-up of features will result from a free-market evolution. The retail/business uses cannot be pre-destined. • Remove specificity from uses • Goal #1, add a last sentence that reads, “However, priority should be on services that serve transit users and improve their experience.” • Goals 1 – 3 are good. Except they open the door for micro management and put too many conditions and restrictions on the final development. In the end the developer needs to pay for everyone’s wish list. We cannot bind the hands of developers or nothing will happen.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stress current bus service must retain current level of service.
<p><i>Use & Character</i> Goal #2 (pg. 1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal #2, Word “Yes!” written next to goal. • Goal #2, 3rd/4th line text – i.e., “and that has a clearly responsible entity in charge of its programming and maintenance” COMMENT: “The City should indicate that it is in the process of forming an Operations Board to deal with management issues regarding the RTC and that the selected Developer will be one of the members of the Board. • As I said yesterday, I’d recommend “a clearly responsible community entity in charge...” • With regards to open space, I think serious consideration should be given to park setting. Look what other major metros have done (i.e., Millennium Park, Chicago) open space for future generations. Build the right project with the right vision and you will get the return on your investment. • Give a % or some quantifiable goal. • I am not sure what “open space that is urban in character” indicates, but since it’s in the middle of downtown it seems more important to use wording that points to a green or natural component. RTC was originally designed to be something of an oasis in the downtown (and that is part of what has been eroded in recent years.) • Public space where people can gather, without having to pay, is vitally important for a strong democracy – our public resources are being transferred into private hands at an alarming rate. • Used by people of all ranges of mobility. Design must incorporate security and safety features. • Guarantee good maintenance of the transit center.
<p><i>Use & Character</i> Goal #3 (pg. 1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire someone local and this will take care of itself. • Add “bikeways” • Make highly visible. Prioritize function as transit center.
<p><i>Transportation & Infrastructure</i> Goal #4 (pg. 1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reorder goals under “Transportation and Infrastructure” to be first and goals under “Uses & Character” to be second • Change “Transportation and Infrastructure” subhead to “Transit & Transportation” • Goal #4, 2nd line – Add “grow to” after “can” • “adaptable is a good word” • Strengthen idea of future expansion adaptability. • I’m not sure every single mode needs to be mentioned separately as in [this goal], but connectivity to the intercity bus should be enhanced and not compromised in the short or long term. • Goal #4, 3rd line – Delete “connection to the modern streetcar,” and move idea to next sentence by editing the sentence to read, “It should provide connections to the Modern Streetcar and Amtrak inter-city rail, and it should [delete “and can”]...”

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal #4, 3rd line – Add “multi-income” before “housing” • Goal #4, 3rd line - Hopefully “public buses” includes intercity buses. If not, it needs to. • Do not use terms like “kiss and ride” without defining. • Provide the 5-Year Transit Plan for Ronstadt – identify what is non-negotiable in that Plan. • The RTC should be appropriate for Downtown. It should not be the central hub for all Tucson Public Transportation. Most people don’t come downtown. They live throughout Tucson. Downtown is a tiny place. The RTC should be a multi modal hub that serves anyone and everyone coming Downtown. We need to understand Sun Tran’s long term plan. How many more buses will Sun Tran utilize in 5-10-15 years.
<p><i>Transportation & Infrastructure</i> Goal #5 (pg. 2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. Good • Goal #5, 1st line – Add “pedestrian and bicycle” after “provide.” • Add bikeways pedestrian to the goal • Add “bikeways” in connectivity. • Under [this goal] regarding connectivity I would include the term “adjacent residential and commercial areas” to emphasize the need to facilitate entry and exit to the center of downtown from the neighborhoods to the north and the Fourth Ave. underpass. • Become conversant with future for _____ and other _____ operations and planning.
<p><i>Transportation & Infrastructure</i> Goal #6 (pg. 2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reorder Goal #6 to follow Goal #4 • Goal #6, 4th/5th/6th lines – Replace “better designed” with “clean, secure restrooms; replace “air conditioning” with “outdoor pedestrian environment amenities such as;” add “and misters” after “shade”; add “etc.” after “fountains and delete “play area.” Comment about “play area” said, “Open space is a good idea, but a play area is not.” • Goal #6, 4th line - Use “user comfort” instead of “air conditioning.” The term “air conditioning” is overly limiting. <i>[Note: This comment was circled followed by the word “OK” with arrow point to comment.]</i> • Developer must have specific strategy of Sun Tran plan of operation near term & long term • Need to add more information about Sun Tran. • Basically, RTC should be designed as though the designers’ kids and grandmas will use it because they have no other options – What “face” do we want to show our visitors and tourists? • What the Bus Riders Union wants won’t come out of the redevelopment project. Some of the infrastructure can be realized but much of what the BRU wants needs to be handled by Sun Tran and City Transportation. If there is a market for retail, food, etc. someone will provide it. Can a vendor be successful at RTC. • Clean, well-functioning, attractive restrooms and a working clock would greatly improve...
<p><i>Transportation & Infrastructure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sure

Goal #7 (pg. 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment regarding Goal #7, “Already covered in #s 4 and 5 above. Edit or delete.
<i>Financial & Economic Vitality</i> Goal #8 (pg. 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is “sufficient” infusion? What are the City’s expectations? \$1 million? \$5 million? A yearly ground least payment of \$500,000? • Sufficient? What does that mean? • ____ should be defined: sufficient infusion • Risk is not defined – liability • Joint development of site will generate sales and property tax, as well as real & property & ____ property • More important than anything! It needs to make economic sense. Economic development is first! Not transit. If transit comes first, then the DOT needs to help fund it. _____ • Need criteria to assess economic model of both development and maintenance. • My fear is over-reliance on our current financial system is leading us in the wrong direction – economies are crashing all around the world. Recalibrate to value Humans & Volunteerism instead of worship of dollars. Public Works & CCC did so much to rescue us from our first Great Depression. • Specify how income is allocated, with assurance that certain percentage is dedicated to “bus system,” as opposed to general fund or general transit (to be drained off by streetcar)
<i>Communication & Participation</i> Goal #9 (pg. 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave goal as written • Do not specify specific stakeholders, no need to single out individuals (i.e., BRU) • Must ensure a balanced representation of stakeholders in each phase of the project’s proposed development. • As long as these groups don’t disrupt and derail the project. • Ensure an ongoing diverse oversight group that must include representatives of bus riders. • Local involvement of developer and design team would almost guarantee that all parties would be given respect throughout the process.
NOTE: Additional space for goal comments & suggestions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deal is far beyond transit. This project can be transformational for all of Tucson. A vibrant commercial center with lots of community activity will continue to fuel Downtown Revitalization. This site could become the de facto center of Downtown. Condos and apartments would keep people Downtown and generate commerce sufficient to support a grocery store, drug store, and other retailers. There is demand to live downtown. We need private market rate housing. Transit is critical, too. Long-term, public transportation will best serve Downtown but Downtown should not be the center of all public transportation. The RTC should be appropriately sized to serve Downtown for the next 20 years. • Write RFP to favor locally-based firms.
PLANNING GUIDANCE (pg. 2)	[NO WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED]
TUCSON CONTEXT (pg. 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ronstadt Center currently has a beautiful architecture with intricate clay tile murals along the Congress St.

	<p>and 6th Avenue sidewalk portals.</p>
<p>SITE CONTEXT (pg. 3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd paragraph, 2nd line – Add “financial, governmental,” after “being the” • Last para. (page 3 of 10) last line: please change UniSource Energy to <u>UNS Energy Corporation & more than 500 employees.</u> (Larry Lucero, TEP) • 3rd para., 1st line on pg. 4, arrow pointing to “Mister Carwash Headquarters” followed by a question, “Isn’t this on at Sixth/4th near the old Baptist Church? Not on street car line. • 3rd para., 4th line, should it say “More than 100,000 people live OR work within...”? rather than “and” • Investment <u>downtown</u> as of 2-10-14: <u>Private:</u> \$309,086,411; <u>Public</u> - \$602,652,841 = TOTAL \$911,739,252 This is just for downtown. Total streetcar = over \$1 billion.
<p>SITE SPECIFICS (pg. 4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st line – Replace “on” with “at.” • 1st para. – Comment: “I suggest restructuring this paragraph so that each of the sites is briefly described in its own bullet. Please add all the streets and other landmarks (such as the railroad ROW) that border the sites • First para., 3rd line – Add “is an FTA-funded property” after “(RTC)” • Para 1, line 4: Is “entertainment district” an official designation? Seems to me with this project we may be trying to diversity that image. Will the phrasing be misleading? • 10th/11th line – Add “,as follows” after “4.7 acres”; delete “with the” before RTC 2.3; delete “the” before “Triangle Lot”; add “Toole Lot” before “northern parcel,” and then delete “northern parcel.” • Comment at end of 1st para. – “An attachment that lists the allowable uses, setbacks, other dimensions, etc. would be helpful.” • 2nd para., Downtown Links should be defined. • “Existing Transit Center” bullet – “Delete the extra bullet in the middle of the paragraph.” • “Existing Transit Center” bullet – delete random bullet • “Existing Transit Center” bullet – Replace 4th, 5th, and 6th sentences with “The center includes an information booth, covered waiting area, restrooms, and other amenities. Ronstadt is open 365 days a year, with hours of operation on weekdays from 4:45 a.m. to 12:00 a.m., and weekends and holidays, 5:45 a.m. to 9:30 p.m.” [NOTE: K. Riley provided these revisions to para. About RTC amenities and bus hours.] • “Existing Transit Center” bullet, 5th line – The information booths have been closed for years due to budget constraints • Under “Existing Transit Center,” are “hours of operation” correct and what does “operation” mean – buses picking up passengers? Information booth open? Restrooms open? • Under conditions, “Existing Transit Center,” there are some inaccurate or outdated statements: there’s not an information booth currently; it’s a security station used by staff; ride guides are not generally available, nor is trip planning guidance. The operation hours of the center are more extensive than those listed. • 1st bullet, 3rd line, “purchase a bus pass” is circled with following question, “Can still do this at RTC? Thought this

function was moved to Stone/Alameda?

- “Existing Transit Center” bullet, 10th line – Delete “a variety of”; change “was” to “were”
- “Existing Transit Center” bullet – Add following final sentence, “These improvements have significantly improved the safety of the site. (See attached.)
- 1st bullet, 6th line, quotations put around word improvements” and comment that says “These changes did not improve the rider experience – turned an open gathering area into a cattle corral – not welcoming. Did not increase comfort
- You might want to add Corky’s study showing that crime at the site is down 50%, i.e., the improvements worked.
- Under “utilities” should mention recent replacements on Congress and Broadway with modern streetcar construction.
- “Utilities” bullet – “To the greatest extent possible, there should be no uncertainty about the availability of utilities to serve the three parcels. A City engineer needs to do a quick study and report the results in an attachment to the RFP. In addition to the utilities you have mentioned, it needs also to reference SW Gas, telecom, and drainage. It must describe not just the availability and condition of utilities, but also their capacity.”
- “Archaeological” bullet, 3rd line – “I suggest deleting “significant” and adding a “such as” to this sentence.
- “Historic Resources” bullet, 6th line - Delete “within and”
- “Circulation and Transit,” bullet, 3rd para., 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th lines – Replace “ten arterial” with “principal”; add “and Congress Street after “Boulevard”; add “Avenue” after “Church”; add “Avenue” after “Stone”; add “Avenue” after “6th”; delete “Main”; add “Avenue” after “Granada”; delete “and” and “avenues” and add “Avenue” after “Toole”; delete “Congress”; add “6th Street”; add “Street” after “Alameda”; add “Pennington Street; revised “streets” to say “Street” after “Cushing”
- “Circulation and Transit,” bullet, 3rd line – Replace “including” with “ranging from”
- “Circulation and Transit,” bullet, 4th line – Make “service” plural; replace “to” with “and”
- “Circulation and Transit,” bullet, 3rd para, 7th line - Comment about use of “Barraza” – “No one uses this part of the name except Google”
- “Circulation and Transit,” bullet, 3rd para, end – Consider adding a sentence about the planned extension to Aviation Parkway to I-10
- “Circulation and Transit,” bullet, 4th para. – Delete “the only”
- “Circulation and Transit,” 4th line – Note indicates that “para-transit” is one word.
- Under “Circulation & Transit,” when mentioning Broadway/Congress access from I-10, should also mention the same pair connect. Under UPRR to east side.
- We need to have the Long Term Plan from Sun Tran, RTC and other transportation experts. Unless we know

	<p>what “Transportation” people’s long term plan is we can’t make decisions on the RTC redevelopment.</p>
<p>CITY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (pg. 7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You should not be going to Mayor & Council this month. You are not ready. Is there an estimated timeline? Days for approval?
<p>POTENTIAL CITY INCENTIVES (pg. 7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Government Property Lease Excise Tax (GPLET)</i> <i>Primary Jobs Incentive</i> <i>Site Specific Sales Tax Incentive</i> <i>Tucson Community Development Loan Fund</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is supposed to be an economic benefit to Tucson. The risk here is that you are giving away the farm. We need to weigh any incentives offered versus the desire to realize revenue to the city. It almost appears that O.L.P. is pushing the process faster than it is capable of moving. <i>Tucson Community Development Loan Fund</i>, 4th bullet, 4th line, words “urgent community needs” underlined accompanied by question “How are these defined? Addressing urgent social needs, not turning profits for developers, right?” <i>Tucson Industrial Development Authority</i>, 1st bullet, pg. 8, 3rd and 4th/5th lines - phrases “serve a public purpose” and “new and expanding businesses,” are underlined with comment “Not sure how serving a public purpose (“public”) squares with “new & expanding business” climate. <i>[Consider adding]</i> Rio Nuevo – Joint Ventures – Given that Notice to proceed has been given. Should add Pima County IDA as they have been more aggressive in their lending requirements than their City counterpart
<p>OTHER POTENTIAL INCENTIVES (pg. 8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>New Market Tax Credit</i> <i>Low Income Housing Tax Credit</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st bullet, arrow pointing to “New Market Tax Credit” with question, Who is offering? City? State? Feds? 1st bullet, 4th/5th lines, words “The RTC project area qualifies as “severely distressed” underline with question How is RTC project area defined for this purpose? No one lives on RTC, triangle, and Toole lots, so income/employment seems applicable. If project area is larger than these 3 parcels for this purpose, what are the boundaries?
<p>SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS (pg. 9)</p> <p>Qualifications and Experience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of firm(s) and team members Demonstration of experience with projects of similar scale and complexity that include such elements as: transit-oriented, mixed-use development; development in urban setting; interactive public involvement; high quality architecture and design and compatibility with historic elements and surrounding area Evidence of successful execution of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under “Qualifications and Experience,” not just TOD, but transit planning & operation. Qualification of Team: Transit planning & operational expertise – first item before transit-oriented “Qualifications and Experience” – Add new dashed point, “Transit planning using best practices.” Expertise in transit and transportation operations and planning. Emphasize direct transit experience on design team “Qualifications and Experience,” after 2nd dashed point – Add new dashed point, “Mixed-income housing” “Qualifications and Experience,” 3rd dashed point – Add “community planning and” after “Interactive” Following “Qualifications and Experience” last bullet, add another bullet that says “General approach to financing the project” Experience minimizing construction disruption How will project impact the current Sun Tran operations?

<p>related projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of financial capacity to deliver project <p>General Project Approach (pg. 9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of team’s overall concept for development of site and anticipated approach to execution of joint development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “General Project Approach,” 1st bullet, 2nd line – Replace “to execution of” with “or undertaking” Successful execution include added economic value Evidence of financial capacity to complete this project “General Project Approach,”– Add additional bullet, “What is the conceptual development schedule?” “General Project Approach,” 1st line – Add “community processes to inform design elements” after “for” General Project Approach bullet , 1st line – add “, for public engagement” after “site” and “for” before “the at the end of the line In the same vein [reference to earlier comment], I especially support Liz’s strengthening of the two items concerning community involvement and process. This is not your average parcel of city property. Community ownership of a special sort was established with its conversion to a transit center more than two decades ago. Frame the qualifications carefully to give preference to local architects, without violating legal challenges (e.g., “local first” challenges)
<p>EVALUATION CRITERIA (pg. 9)</p> <p>Proposer’s Qualifications (pg. 9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has development team been detailed and described? - What is experience of team in financing, developing, managing, and operating comparable projects? - Does team have a demonstrated track record of successfully financing, developing, and completing comparable projects? <p>Proposer’s General Project Approach (pg. 9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has proposer described how overall project concept would be consistent with project mission and goals? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Proposer Qualifications” – Revise first dashed point to say, “Does the development team and the specific individuals assigned to the project have the technical and management expertise and experience to successfully undertake the project?” “Proposer Qualifications” – Add new dashed point, “Have the proposed development team members worked together on prior projects similar to the RTC project?” “Proposer Qualifications” – Delete second dashed point. “Proposer Qualifications” – Revise the third dashed point – Add “development” before “team”; add “constructing” after “developing;” replace “completing” with “managing” Does the team have experience with FTA guidelines and following NEPA requirements? Financial capacity is important, however defined “financial resources available” to start project Does the team have the financial capacity to execute the project? What is the financial plan? _____ Timeline & development schedule Evaluation of prior track record with demonstrated outcome of prior projects “Proposer Qualifications” – Add new dashed point, “What other projects is the development team planning or undertaking that might conflict with or compete with the conduct of the RTC development?” “Proposer’s General Project Approach” – Revised first dashed point to say, “Is the proposed overall project concept consistent with the City of Tucson’s goals for the development” “Proposer’s General Project Approach” – Add new dashed point, “What are the public transportation benefits of the development concept?”

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Proposer’s General Project Approach” – Add new dashed point, “What are the economic development benefits of the development concept?” • There should be preference points available for a local developer – economic benefits would stay in Tucson. • There should be preference points available for a local design A/E team – again economic benefits from the <u>process</u> would stay in Tucson. • Redundant [arrows pointing to “Proposer’s Qualifications” and “Proposer’s General Project Approach”]
<p>ATTACHMENTS & LINKS (pg. 10) Please indicate any additional references / background material that you think would be useful to a potential proposer and, therefore, you would like considered for inclusion in the list.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under relevant Plans & Initiatives – Very important to list Downtown Tucson Intermodal Center Plan • As Liz indicated, complete notes from the current phase of community input must be included. I have stated elsewhere my objections to the Poster Frost report as a representation of any systematic process or consensus. As currently posted on the city’s website, that report contains an erroneous version of the Bus Riders Union position statement. I have submitted a correction but it was not edited in the PDF available online. I request that it be corrected before the report is attached to an RFP document. • Sun Tran COA • Notes from current round of stakeholder meetings, and list of participants • www.350.org • www.ClimateMarch.org • President Obama and Pope Francis’ speeches on income inequality • Founding father’ writings on democracy.

OTHER COMMENTS ON SCOPE AND/OR PROCESS

- The one critical element and area of expertise I would like to see included in the RFP is more detailed information about type of housing. I would hope that we can include workforce housing for most of the low wage workers who work downtown. This is critical and the housing can be safe, affordable, and beautiful.
- 1. The focus of the RFP should be the highest and best use of the property for the benefit of Tucson. This property is a “Community asset and should be evaluated as such.”
- 2. A great transportation infrastructure is critical to the future success of Downtown Tucson and the community as a whole. Portland Oregon and Vancouver Canada are examples of cities that would not have been successful without a transportation system that supported the success of economic development.
- 3. The long-term goals of the Community should be a consideration and focus of the study. These issues were presented at the previous meetings, but do not appear to be part of the RFP. I recommend that it be modified to include the above concepts.