

**Questions/Comments from Members of the Public
Received via email between July 23 and August 3, 2015.**

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

PP-1

No, No, and No to the Peach Properties proposal.

To demolish this attractive and inviting brick structure with 2500 feet of extraordinary custom designed handmade tile work is ludicrous, and a total waste. And to demolish the live oak trees that have been growing along the street for almost 25 years! Please...we live in the desert. We should be planting many, many more trees along our walkways—especially downtown—not uprooting what exists.

Let's go with the Alexander Team proposal which preserves and incorporates the distinctive shade structure into the facade, and recognizes the existing historic architectural context. In addition to their plan's sensitivity to the flavor of the Old Pueblo, the Alexander Team's proposal is budgeted at less than 1/3 of the Peach team.

I see no redeeming factors that would prompt a decision to go with Peach.

It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our many public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-used it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We are actively working with Melody Peters, the original artist, to best integrate her work. We will harvest the condensate water from the air conditioners which is clean, distilled water good for water features such as misters and fountains. Regarding the trees, an inspection of all the site trees was completed by the teams landscape architect prior to submittal of the Phase 2 proposal. All of the trees on site showed signs of stress, including poor growth form, leaf drop, and dead/dying parts. The Southern Live Oak trees planted between 6th Avenue/Congress Street and the brick structure, showed the most signs of stress. Several oaks were newly planted perhaps as replacement plants, of these replacements two were dead. Of the remaining oak trees there were several that were dying from the top down and none showed healthy growth patterns for 20+ year old trees. Several factors can be contributing to the poor condition of the street trees including: the trees are planted in 3'x3' planting wells constricting root growth and water absorption area; compacted, nutrient depleted soils within the 3'x3' planting areas; Southern Live Oaks are not Sonoran Desert native or desert adaptable drought tolerant trees; afternoon radiant heat from the red brick sidewalk and structure on 6th Ave; vehicular exhaust fumes from all sides. More suitable trees for this site would be Sonoran Desert native trees such as Palo Verde tree species, mesquite species, or acacia species. The City of Tucson is moving toward the use of native vegetation in new City owned construction including parks, plazas, and right-of-ways. In the past 20 years there have also been improvements in urban tree planting, and soil technologies that if employed would ensure more healthy trees at the site.

PP-2

Thank you for the opportunity to share my opinions regarding the Ronstadt Center Development. One of the proposed design schemes demonstrates an understanding of our desert environment and our downtown Tucson context. This proposed scheme was submitted by Peach development. This scheme exhibits knowledge of our desert environment and our downtown context by use of a hierarchy of outdoor spaces, integration of building scale and awareness of the downtown setting beyond the boundaries of the proposed site. The outdoor urban spaces in the Peach scheme are set

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

in a clear hierarchy. This hierarchy enables clear way finding. Wayfinding is an essential part of any successful urban design solution. Not only is a clear path of travel necessary for new users, but it is essential for the elderly and disabled that rely on public transportation. In addition, a mindset of security and defensive space is also formed by clearly defined elements of space and path, allowing for a better sense of security and belonging. The hierarchy of outdoor spaces is designed and arranged to create a familiar form, the desert slot canyon. The desert slot canyon is a contextual form that allows for views out of the site, allows natural ventilation in, while still providing much needed shade. In my imagination, I compare fellow Tucsonans waiting for a bus. In the Peach scheme, they wait in the shade along a wall of a canyon, open to ventilation, with views through and between the buildings. The other scheme I imagine the experience of being in an exterior space, the wind and sky blocked off by a building overhead. While I have shade, the heat radiates off the spaces surrounding me, heat trapped by the building above me, I am enclosed by a cloud of bus exhaust. Perhaps this is a dramatic comparison, but I feel it is accurate.

The desert slot canyon scheme by Peach also offers sun-shading elements that are integrated into the architecture and are not hung on the building like ornaments. In the competing scheme sun shading devices are offered but their use is inconsistent; and along the Western exposure the sun-shading devices seem to come and go. Because of the inconsistent use these devices fall into the category of useless decoration rather than contextual element or sustainable design.

Sustainable design relates to the spirit of the project, its heart, and soul, not tacked on elements, like buttons or pins. Also, tacked on elements easily fall to the wayside during future value engineering in latter phases. Un-shaded windows on the south and west elevations have nothing to say about our desert environment.

The Peach scheme responds positively to the sun by having north, south and east and west exposures respond in different and varying ways. In addition, simple building orientation has proven to be a very effective means of sustainable design in our desert environment.

Response to context is highlighted in the Peach scheme by the buildings sense of scale. The Peach scheme has a massing that relates to the buildings along Congress. The competing scheme shows a large block of mass. This large form is out of scale with the surrounding positive context. A large, uniform block with punched openings has little to say about Tucson looking forward.

Also, the Peach scheme illustrates a modern approach to design, looking forward, rather than mocking the past. The scale of the buildings relates to the surrounding context, and the pedestrian level bays offer a realistic sense of scale.

The Peach scheme also presents links to downtown beyond the edge of the site in a clear and realistic way. The competing scheme, for example offers up a picture of the Fox Theater, while offering no linkage or approach rather than a simple internet search for images.

Thank you for this thoughtful response. We could not agree more.

PP-3

It is hard to believe that the Peach Properties Proposal is being considered seriously when the Alexander proposal is so obviously superior in every way. And a great deal cheaper. Peach pays no attention to the exceptional quality of the original structure while Alexander preserves not only the much of the beautiful tiling but also the mature trees which it would take many years to replace.

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

For any tourist with a particular interest in architecture, which is my own relation to Tucson, the interest of the town would be seriously diminished were you to allow Peach Properties a free hand to destroy one of your most iconic architectural landmarks.

It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our many public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-used it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt and we are actively working with Melody Peters to best integrate her work. Please see PP-1 for more details on our tree inspection and findings, but in short: the existing Live Oaks along 6th Avenue are non-native, non-desert-adaptive trees. It is evident by their appearance and lack of growth in the 20+ years when planted, that these trees are not thriving in this particular location. From a sustainability approach, it is beneficial to have a diverse plant palette of Sonoran or desert-adapted trees instead of a single species for our downtown area.

PP-4

I believe to attract and keep younger generations in Tucson, we need more cutting edge developments like the proposal by Peach Properties. It's beautiful and functional and it doesn't matter that it does not conform to the surrounding properties. Who's to say we like what it's surrounded by!?

I can tell you as a professional full-time Realtor that specializes in Modern and Historic and very hot properties, THIS project by Peach is what people are begging for! I believe if you build that, THEY will come.

In Mayor Rothschild's latest State of the City address he talked about the importance of keeping and attracting young talent. We agree and we believe a development like this in downtown is key.

PP-5

I wanted to submit some comments and feedback for the RTC proposals. I like elements of both proposals, but overall I like the vision Peach has of creating a bridge to the north. Also, their design elements are something more modern, and would be a great addition to the landscape of downtown, creating needed diversity and interesting architectural elements.

This is Tucson's last chance to take advantage of the easement over the rail road tracks and create a pedestrian bridge linking downtown to North of the tracks. It would be a shame to let this opportunity pass. Thank you for your input.

PP-6

I'd like to voice my support for the Peach proposal for the Ronstadt Center. I'm a 18-year resident of Tucson, educator at various schools at both secondary and collegiate level, and feel that this is the superior proposal.

As a frequent traveler, I appreciate this proposal's more robust and varied approach to the terminal. Access to buses, taxis and more would be great. I especially appreciate the concept of being able to take a shuttle directly to Sky Harbor (where there are often better airfare rates), without the need to drive to Phoenix and leave a car/pay for parking. Additionally, the inclusion of a car-sharing service is

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

very forward-thinking and would align us with the advancements in place in other parts of the country but currently absent from our community.

As a cyclist (which we in Tucson can boast to have a large community of), I appreciate this proposal's inclusion of us, giving more consideration to parking, rentals (for visitors, etc.) and more. As a creative professional (artist, business owner and 10+ year arts educator), I also would like to comment on the superior aesthetics of this proposal. The appearance of the town I live in and love means a lot to me, as it does to many in our community. This proposal creates much more visual interest than the massive block look that is proposed by The Alexander Company.

As an invested citizen of the Tucson community, I thank you for taking the time to listen to my comments and feedback. It is exciting to see our hometown grow and develop. Here's hoping your committee will take it in the best possible direction, which I believe Peach's proposal does.

We appreciate these points made.

PP-7

Peach Properties is the superior design, hands down.

Thank you.

PP-8

I know it's a day late, but I support the Peach Properties proposal for the Ronstadt Transit Center. I wasn't able to attend public meetings, so my feedback is based on the materials available online.

Peach's visual design and proposed usage is much richer and more creative than the Alexander proposal. I disagree with moving the transit center underground. The Alexander proposal seems to drop a generic boxy development behind the existing transit center colonnades. The elevations verge on institutional in appearance. The public engagement seems lacking -- in Alexander's design I see an art park at the south end and two outdoor seating areas at the north end, while Peach's proposal clearly and thoughtfully integrates many transit modes and a variety of spaces for a variety of public uses, daytime and nighttime.

Overall, the Peach proposal is more thorough, creative, and better articulated. It's a development that I could be proud to show off to visitors.

I'm not informed about the business end of the proposals, so I cannot comment.

(I was here for the tear down of the block for the transit center, and I miss the Manhattan Bar and the waila dancing there.)

Thank you. We miss the Manhattan Bar as well.

PP-9

I reviewed the proposed plans for the Ronstadt Center renovation and I much prefer the Peach proposal. An open (but shaded) design makes much more sense in Tucson because of beautiful weather most of the year. An open approach capitalizes on what people love about Tucson and may also reduce opportunities for crime or other illicit behavior. The open plan feel much more cosmopolitan, 21st century, and much more welcoming.

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

The transit mall approach is clearly the way of the future. It looks and will undoubtedly feel more lively, more progressive, and more vital. I also love the multilevel outdoor space which gives a friendly feel, and is much more pleasing to the eye.

Would love to see Tucson do some renovation that really improves the look and feel of the city and pushes us into the future, while respecting Tucson traditions, instead of leaving us stuck in the past.

Thank you. We do want to respect and celebrate Tucson's rich past, while looking forward.

PP-10

I would like to let you know I think Tucson needs could really use the Peach team's vision of the Ronstadt Center. I grew up in Tucson and left to live in France and New York but while visiting stopped by the proposal meeting and was blown away by Peach and the team and their vision. We have an amazing city but the public transit needs to catch up with the rest of the world. I believe that starts with taking the stigma away from "having" to ride to bus to "getting" to ride the bus. I think a multipurpose center would really get people taking the bus and also coming downtown. I just didn't feel the same way about the other team's proposal.

Transit was our driving force. We want to create a transit center that increases ridership.

PP-11

I am writing to express my support the for the Ronstadt Center redevelopment plan proposed by Ron Schwabe and the Peach Properties team. The comprehensive proposal they have submitted represents a realistic and long-term investment into our downtown's rapidly changing infrastructure.

From my perspective as a native Tucsonan, the competing Alexander/Campbell plan sounds far too reminiscent of the short-sighted, low-investment, and low-density housing goals our city has mistakenly made throughout my life. Looking at the plans from my perspective as a young person I applaud the mixed-use nature of the Peach plan, its embrace of affordable housing, and its relationship with the University of Arizona. This makes me confident that the project would maintain its usefulness to our community for generations, not just decades. As a professional working downtown, it seems that we need to create a centerpiece that is modern, visually appealing, and useful to all kinds of people. The Peach plan for redevelopment seems like that vibrant and useful city center that Tucson needs.

Thank you for taking your time to consider my input, I hope that you put your support behind the Peach project's redevelopment plan. The plan represents a local perspective, the long-term economic needs of Downtown Tucson, and the transportation and housing needs of our whole community.

We agree. This is an investment not just in this 4.7 acres, but in Tucson's future.

PP-12

Better late than...

Neither amazes but this one tries harder. [Note: A rendering from the Peach Properties proposal was inserted after this sentence.]

Our whole team put a lot of work into the concept and planning. Thank you.

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

PP-13

I saw you were taking comments on the new development at the Ronstadt Center. I just wanted to weigh in as a guy who is downtown constantly and has been involved in much of its more creative aspects recently. I really like the added color, sense of openness and decorative flair that the Peach proposal contains. There are so many other cool buildings already (like La Placita), and I would love to see more like that instead of the claustrophobia inducing, big box architecture that now greets people as they enter downtown on Broadway.

Thank you. Layering and cascading levels was a big part of our design.

PP-14

As a resident of Tucson since 1981 and a Custom Home Builder in Tucson since 1991, I wanted to express my opinion about the Comment on Peach/EB5 Global/FORS/Ryan Proposal.

I feel that the "Peach Proposal" not only accomplishes the purpose of the continued revitalization of downtown, but it does it in a way that creates excitement while still relating to its surroundings. I feel that the Oasis design and program doesn't produce a destination feel like the Peach design does. I believe the Peach design will be much more likely to attract additional activity downtown both from a traffic perspective and ultimately the impetus for more development.

We are very excited about this project. Thank you for recognizing that.

PP-15

From the illustration provided by PEACH [https://www.tucsonaz.gov/files/integrated-planning/Presentation_no_animations.pdf-23/70] it appears that there are only nine (9) bays for buses to use; however, the Sun Tran Ride Guide shows that there are 19 routes coming into the RTC plus six (6) express routes. Where are the other routes going to be embarking /disembarking?

Where are buses / passengers going to go to use buses during construction?

The transit will be temporarily located at the Toole Site during Phase 1 of construction. The initial concept shows that the linear transit mall could accommodate 3-4 buses per bus bay, with a total of 4 bays (2 bays in each direction). This would accommodate a total of 12-16 buses. The linear transit mall assumes that the bus network would change from a pulse based transit system to a more frequent transit network where bus volumes are more equally distributed throughout the hour. In other words, it would accommodate more buses per hour, but there would not be as many buses there at one time as there are today using the pulse based system.

PP-16

We have an issue with the placement of the Greyhound Station in the Peach proposal.

Specifically, placing the Greyhound station at 5th Ave. and 7th St.

Back when Greyhound was next to the Rialto there were constant problems with the itinerant traffic coming from the station. Theft, shoplifting, aggressive panhandling, etc. were common fair for both us and the merchants downtown. Offenders were rarely caught as they just got back on the bus and were gone before police could respond. When the station was moved away from downtown, there

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

was a marked decrease in those activities. We don't want to increase the problems we've fought so long and hard against to come back.

To the broader plans in the area specifically, the 5th Ave. spur onto and off of Barrazza is currently designed as limited access, which means the bus traffic will most likely be coming and going through the surface streets in the business/entertainment district, increasing congestion, noise and pollution. It also creates logistical issues for FAMA during street fair, which we continually fight to maintain.

Because of the modern streetcar configuration/construction and the lost usable real estate for street fair, we now use 7th St. to 5th Ave. and have plans to take it all the way to 6th Ave over the next two years. This is our only path if we want to regain lost real estate due the streetcar. FAMA installed support infrastructure along this corridor during streetcar construction in anticipation of future growth. That means we will have to contend with bus traffic and the associated safety and logistical issues, which would be detrimental to the fair.

It is my understanding the numbers of Greyhound buses coming through Tucson is minimal, one every two hours or so, and can easily be handled at the RTC, as opposed to a new station separated from the RTC. If Greyhound service were to be handled at the RTC, which is very possible, it would make the RTC a true intermodal center.

It is also my understanding Peach doesn't have a real pro forma, the finance tools they do refer to have no money, i.e., they contemplate \$40 million from the FTA, but that is not a true or available source of revenue for a project like this.

Personally (not a FAMA position, but one Ronstadt's), after seeing both proposals Wednesday night, I don't think either is all that good. Peach is a pie-in-the-sky plan including the kitchen sink, but is incredibly short on substance in terms of the reality of being able to deliver what they're representing. The other plan is solid, but has no real vision or imagination ~ rather milk toast. A hybrid is what's needed in my opinion.

Greyhound is actively pursuing new sites, so they aren't an integral part of our proposal. FTA funding is something we would like to pursue, however our proforma and project do not depend on it.

PP-17

I like the Peach Properties plan for Ronstadt Center.

We do too!

PP-18

Please support the Peach proposal! It is clearly the better solution for our city. It is a stronger proposal, is realistic and brings a true mixed use for the downtown. Thank you.

Mixed-used and multi-modal are our driving forces. Thank you.

PP-19

I found the Peach Properties presentation to be very well done. They have incorporated community need and feedback with a creative, multi-faceted project that will add a new dimension to downtown Tucson.

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

I applaud Peach for their ability to reach this new level in development ideas. Peach Properties has a proven track record in our city. Why not allow them to continue to explore themselves creatively in our community - a community they have always listened to.

We do listen to our neighbors and will continue to do so in this project. Thank you.

PP-20

In favor of the Peach Watermark Plan. By far.

This design group has a history of recycling and reuse of materials, and I would totally trust them to dismantle the tiled colonnade along Congress and Sixth Avenue and integrate it into the new design. I like the possibility of using space like a city center with the two fountain plazas, and the areas that could be used for markets including produce, or arts and collectibles.

This design brightens up the Sixth Avenue side which seems like that energy would anchor future development northward from there.

We agree that our plan will brighten both Arizona Avenue/ the bus station and 6th Avenue.

PP-21

I strongly favor the proposal submitted by Peach Properties.

However, a few aspects of that plan seem problematic to me:

- 1) I am disappointed that there are so few historical references, although I like the buildings. The brick and tile of the existing trellis perhaps could be incorporated into the design's public patio and park areas (instead of that silly bike rack that says "downtown").**
- 2) Why have a pedestrian walkway over Toole Avenue? I understand the walkway reaching from the Greyhound station across the railroad tracks, but taking foot traffic off of street level once we're on the downtown grid seems it would damage the "street life" we're trying so hard to create.**
- 3) Placing a public market adjacent to a bus mall—won't people avoid the market in order to avoid huffing diesel fumes and being so close to the noise of buses? It seems like a nice way to use the space in theory, but I suspect no one will actually want to hang out there.**

It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our many public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-used it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt and we are working with Melody Peters, the original artist, to ensure it is. We have received some feedback about the pedestrian bridge going over Toole and we are open to changing the length of the bridge. We understand that the success of this development lies in collaboration. Therefore, we will continue to collect helpful feedback like yours to improve our design and plan. The market will be located on the perimeter of the bus station in order to avoid fumes.

PP-22

As a business owner and property owner on 4th Avenue for the last 20+ years, I would like to provide

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

you with a few negative arguments regarding the Peach Properties Ronstadt Proposal. Since 1995 I have kept a business open on 4th Avenue through the closure/construction of the 4th Avenue Underpass, the High School Wash drainage project, the Modern Streetcar project and soon to be Aviation Highway project. Each construction event caused a negative impact on my business and the negative impact always lingers long after the project is complete. Construction runs off customers. Construction negatively impacts daily sales. Construction leaves a lasting impression on everyone that the location is "under construction".

1. The Peach Properties proposal suggests placing the Greyhound terminal on the north side of the tracks. Bad idea. Plain and simple. Adding Greyhound bus traffic to an area that is not designed to handle oversize buses is not a good idea. Why would the City want to move Greyhound away from the highway frontage road? It has instant access on and off I-10. The roads in that area are meant to handle the size of the buses. The Modern Street car is steps away. Keeping the terminal out of a congested area is the smart thing to do. Let those riders utilize the new Streetcar as it was meant for.

2. If the Greyhound terminal is to be located north of the railroad tracks and north of the new Aviation Highway, how are riders supposed to get to downtown or the main City bus terminal? Shuttle? Bus? Walk with luggage? Why? If the plan of the City is to move Greyhound downtown, PUT IT DOWNTOWN. Additionally, the underpasses are not always available access for pedestrians or auto traffic. (i.e...Flooding during monsoons and weekend closures of the 4th Avenue underpass due to poor traffic and road planning).

3. If nothing else, look at the design Peach Properties has suggested. The design is just wrong. It doesn't fit the architecture of the area or anywhere in Tucson. It looks like it belongs in Downtown Tokyo. It just doesn't match. And it never will.

Greyhound is actively pursuing new sites, so it is not an integral part of our concept. At this point everything is very conceptual. We will incorporate the brick and tile in the design of the project. We are planning options to keep some in place, relocate to the public market, and integrate in the public plazas. Buildings should respond to context and culture, but also inspire and expand the community. If designs just copied old styles, we would not have the modern architecture that our community has been passionate about preserving along Broadway and throughout Tucson.

PP-23

I wanted to offer a quick word of support for the Peach Properties Proposal for the Ronstadt Center. I don't have any connection with either team, but as a citizen who works downtown, I'd love to see a great project happen here.

The site is one of the crucial parcels to maintain the resurgence of downtown Tucson as a more vibrant truly urban area. I believe the project will benefit from a more ambitious proposal, and possibly create the focal point Tucson has always lacked. Think of transportation hubs like Grand Central Station in New York or Union Station in Washington. This project will not benefit from a "safe" approach.

The Peach / Swaim / Fors / HDR proposal takes on all the challenges and produces something wonderful out of them. Having worked in transit design for 10 years on the east coast, the transit mall concept really solved the traffic challenges well. The architecture is vibrant, creates the opportunity for great streets and allows for defined, shaded outdoor plazas.

Questions/Comments from Members of the Public
Received via email between July 23 and August 3, 2015.

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

Both proposals have merit, but this is really the time for Tucson to make a great plan for a great public space.

We agree. This is no time or place for mediocrity.

PP-24

We're incredibly excited at the prospect of a revamped transit center downtown. The Peach Properties proposal is visually more appealing in addition to providing a public market. We are also in full support of a local company helping to build a downtown attraction.

Looking forward to these improvements!

We are glad you are excited as well.

PP-25

I'm in favor of the Peach Watermark plan

We appreciate your support.

PP-26

I wanted to vote for the Peach Watermark team for the Ronstadt Transit remodel.

Thank you!

PP-27

The Peach proposal is realistic and is backed by a team of people who know what they are doing. Peach all the way.

Thank you!

PP-28

As a lifelong Tucsonan, I am proud and excited to see the improvements in recent years. In reviewing these proposals, the Peach properties proposal far outweighs the competition. I highly recommend to the review committee to consider the Peach team.

Thank you for taking the time to look over both proposals.

PP-29

Putting the Greyhound station on 6th and 7th *makes no sense for the travelers* who will need direct access to our mass transit and Streetcar. It will not be convenient and a burden for travelers to drag luggage .3 miles to the Transit Center or Streetcar to travel in town? What about disabled riders? They should not need to take a cab to a Tucson bus or streetcar .

The buildings don't fit the character of Tucson and are uninviting. I support more housing downtown and don't see a need for another hotel. I do not support this plan.

Greyhound is actively pursuing new sites, so the aren't an integral part of our proposal. Buildings should respond to context and culture, but also inspire and expand the community. If designs just copied old styles, we would not have the Modern architecture that our community has been passionate about

Questions/Comments from Members of the Public
Received via email between July 23 and August 3, 2015.

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

preserving along Broadway and throughout Tucson. 5N5th Hotel, L.L.C. is the hotel developer and the developer of the new AC Marriott hotel in downtown Tucson. In conjunction with the management company Cima Enterprises, L.L.C., they have reviewed the feasibility of another hotel as part of the Ronstadt Center proposed development and concluded that there is evidence of sufficient demand to support the project. A study they performed for the AC Hotel showed the need for additional rooms in the market. As of March 2015, demand had increased 3.4 percent without additional supply. Revpar has also increased. 5N5th also has a letter of support from Marriott.

PP-30

Excellent design in terms of open social space, of incorporating the transit users into the project, green features. Forward-looking in creating a true multi-modal transit center, with local, interstate and international vision. Creates a space that is inviting to all downtown, that blends many populations and uses. Wide-ranging services as part of the center, that would benefit everyone, including working families, students, job seekers. Museum and cultural venues extremely inviting; UA presence a plus.

Impressive lineup of staff, enthusiastic, strong presence of women's projects.

Drawbacks: elimination of beautiful, award-winning tile work of original RTC. Monster buildings in Jetsons cartoon style, totally out of proportion. Interesting architecture, not just 'stalinist' boxes but way over powering. Bus drivers unhappy about restricted space for buses and maneuvering.

In all, I'd vote for the Peach project, with the suggestion of incorporating the existing tiled brick arcades - would make lovely shaded areas in front of retail - and reducing the height of the futuristic buildings.

At this point everything is very conceptual. We will incorporate the brick and tile in the design of the project, but are concerned about the reality of building adjacent to the arcade. We are already working with Melody Peters, the artist, to best incorporate her art. Buildings should respond to context and culture, but also inspire and expand the community. The tallest building in our design is 12 stories and the rest are 8, 7, and 6 stories. This is on par with neighboring buildings for example the new AC Hotel will be 8 stories, the Unisource building is 9 floors, and the tallest building downtown, 1 S Church, is 23 floors. Most of the lingering and congestion on the site today is a function of the current bus schedule, which includes a pulse based system where buses generally arrive/depart at the same time. This leaves time blocks in between where passengers are waiting (often 15-30 minutes). The linear transit mall uses a more free flow operation where there would be frequent bus service distributed more equitable throughout the hour. This will give the bus drivers more room.

PP-32

OPT/SATM suggest/request:

- **This proposal shows little respect for history other than Ronstadt name. It removes the existing arcade along 6th Ave. and Congress constructed from bricks taken from the Owl Drug Store and other buildings removed in the late 1980's to make way for RTC.**
- **Provide historic interpretative panels along the bridge regarding Tucson's transit history including the reason for the Ronstadt name.**
- **Provide space in either the north or south plaza for rotating historic transit vehicle display.**
- **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.**

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-installed in the market it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We are actively working with Melody Peters, the original arcade artist, to best incorporate. We would like to include some historical references and art pieces on the pedestrian bridge. Since the pedestrian bridge crosses and overlooks the railroad that would be the perfect place for this display.

PP-33

Pedestrian bike bridge – felt this was extremely original and make some much-needed bike and pedestrian connection to the triangle. Since it is impossible to make a left turn into downtown going west on Downtown Links, this connection could provide a very successful access for both bikes and pedestrians. More importantly, it's a jumpstart Stiteler's and Cummings plans for the triangle, essentially giving us two major projects for the price of one in a reasonable development horizon. The major concern from everybody I talked to was how to fund these improvements. I'm not sure about adding the two Mexican carriers greyhound and car rental to the north side of the railroad tracks. This potentially reduces the land available for residential development and open space.

Building design – heard from several people that the buildings were too progressive for Tucson. Or that they were out of context with the downtown surrounding buildings. I'm not sure I agree with that assessment. I think it's time for us to move forward stylistically, cannot remain a prisoner of building styles that are over 100 years old. I believe if we don't start designing and planning for the millennial's and the Gen z's we are going to lose out in the next 20 years. I really don't know how Tucson is going to progress if we cannot attract start up entrepreneurs.

Outdoor market – I like this idea conceptually, but wonder how successful it will be in that location.

Bus transit area – I really think this is for the superior design over the two projects. Developer spent considerable time with the bus riders in designing the space. Still have concerns about security however, And did not see an area designated to a police substation.

Open space – thought this was a much better place open space in the Campbell/Alexander project, and liked the fact that it was being activated by retail restaurants and overlooked by housing. Would like to see more shade however.

Overall opinion – I think that the building designs could be reworked a little. I don't think they have to be as stylistically glittery to be successful and modern. I really like the rooftop uses and think that's going to add a lot of demand appeal for downtown. The major concern I heard repeatedly was how is this going to be financed. But I know the work that the selection committee and procurement is going to do to answer that question, and I'm sure it's the first question Mayor and Councils going to ask. I would like to see detailed Pro-Formas for both projects be made public.

In conclusion, both projects are solid, well-thought-out proposals that have answered the requirements of the RFPs. Both teams have the experience and track records to successfully complete their projects. This is a huge moment for downtown as you've heard me say 1 million times, but I don't think we could go wrong with either proposal as long as some refinements made.

**Questions/Comments from Members of the Public
Received via email between July 23 and August 3, 2015.**

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

In regards to safety, all areas will be well lit, and a blue light system will be put in place. Blue Light is a crime prevention emergency alarm system that will contact local law enforcement each time the button is pressed. This system is currently in use on the University of Arizona campus. We are also talking to downtown Tucson organizations that contract security services. The building designs are conceptual at this point, but we do believe a modern design will serve Tucson best. At this point everything is very conceptual. To be conservative we allowed a ceiling of up to \$174 million. That being said this is an urban development, which should cost significantly more than a suburban development. For example the new AC Hotel being built just a block South is costing \$33 million for less than a half of an acre. The Ronstadt site is 4.7 acres. Any developer would be doing a disservice to Tucson if they were to spend less than \$100 million on a site of this size and of this importance. Since the presentation we have continued to value engineer the project and with a change in building materials, design changes, and alternative funding sources we have decreased that ceiling substantially. We are excited to work with the community and share this information, however considering this selection process, there is confidential information that we can't divulge at this point. Below we have included a consolidated look at our funding. Thank you for your thoughtful response.

Uses of Capital	
Private/ Conventional Funding (residential, commercial, office, hotel and transit center)	\$ 99,317,773
Mixed/ FTA Funding (parking, plazas, pedestrian bridge, and general infrastructure)	\$ 16,400,850
Total	\$ 115,718,623

PP-34

1. What is Peach's contingency plan if, for any reason, the various public financing elements of the project prove to be unavailable?

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

3. Is Peach's inclusion of University of Arizona leased space (and presumed lease revenues) in its proposal and presentation a necessary element for successful project financing and positive cash flow from operations?

4. In its public presentation, Peach seemed to indicate that it and EB5 Global may have secured a corporate "flag" for the proposed hotel. Please update the City on your discussions and provide any documentation as to the status of such discussions that might be available.

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

6. 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?

1. In the case that our various types of public financing fall through we have the means to finance conventionally. 2. Yes we have a phased schedule. Financing, design, and permitting will take us through 2016 with construction starting in quarter two of 2017. Construction will be done in 3 phases and we plan to be completed by the end of quarter three of 2018 and fully leased by 2019. 3. The U of A is not essential to our project. 4. 5N5th Hotel, L.L.C. is our current hotel developer and the developer

**Questions/Comments from Members of the Public
Received via email between July 23 and August 3, 2015.**

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

of the new AC Marriott hotel in downtown Tucson. They have a letter of support from Marriott. 5. Our plan includes a Transit Hub Welcome Center with the idea that you can go from Ronstadt to anywhere in the world. Signage will be clear, bilingual, and help link the different modes of transportation. Real time transit boards will include location and times for Sun Tran, the Link, shuttles, Tucson International Airport, etc. We will also include world-wide clocks and weather. This will be a hub for every type of traveler and commuter. 6. In designing the new RTC we wanted to make a place people truly want to be. Along the bus station we will have a daily market where transit riders and passerby can grab something quick to eat. We will also include a Transit Hub Welcome Center where you can see real time schedules. The station will be inviting, airy, and bustling with plenty of seating, shade, and access to Plazas. Our Plazas will be a gathering place with events such as movies at the park and concerts.

PP-35

Putting the Greyhound station on 6th and 7th *makes no sense for the travelers* who will need direct access to our mass transit and Streetcar. It will not be convenient and a burden for travelers to drag luggage .3 miles to the Transit Center or Streetcar to travel in town? What about disabled riders? They should not need to take a cab to a Tucson bus or streetcar.

The building doesn't fit the character of Tucson and are uninviting. I support more housing downtown and don't see a need for another hotel. I do not support this plan.

Greyhound is actively pursuing new sites, so the aren't an integral part of our proposal. Buildings should respond to context and culture, but also inspire and expand the community. If designs just copied old styles, we would not have the Modern architecture that our community has been passionate about preserving along Broadway and throughout Tucson. 5N5th Hotel, L.L.C. is the hotel developer and the developer of the new AC Marriott hotel in downtown Tucson. In conjunction with the management company Cima Enterprises, L.L.C., they have reviewed the feasibility of another hotel as part of the Ronstadt Center proposed development and concluded that there is evidence of sufficient demand to support the project. A study they performed for the AC Hotel showed the need for additional rooms in the market. As of March 2015, demand had increased 3.4 percent without additional supply. Revpar has also increased. 5N5th also has a letter of support from Marriott.

PP-36

Liked the architectural concept --but it's concept that costs a lot. Will another hotel work year around downtown?

The egress/ ingress from Congress and Bus Mall seems to not solve traffic issues. Creates more.

The bridge is an interesting idea but seems likely to be cut when project costs become real.

Where is the financing coming from?

What is the time line from planning to completion? How will Peach keep the transit operations from bogging down?

What COT incentives will Peach request?

What bonds will both companies need to post to start work? What consequences will there be if they fall drastically off schedule?

I liked the improved services for bus riders in both proposals.

**Questions/Comments from Members of the Public
Received via email between July 23 and August 3, 2015.**

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

1. 5N5th Hotel, L.L.C. is the hotel developer and the developer of the new AC Marriott hotel in downtown Tucson. In conjunction with the management company Cima Enterprises, L.L.C., they have reviewed the feasibility of another hotel as part of the Ronstadt Center proposed development and concluded that there is evidence of sufficient demand to support the project. A study they performed for the AC Hotel showed the need for additional rooms in the market. As of March 2015, demand had increased 3.4 percent without additional supply. Revpar has also increased. 5N5th also has a letter of support from Marriott. 2. Buses will use both Congress and Toole to enter/exit the linear transit mall. The entry/exit on Congress will be developed using urban design principles that balance the operational needs of Sun Trans buses with the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles. Issues such as turning radii, sight lines, driveway widths, curb and gutter, pavement materials, signage, and building frontage will all be considered. It should be noted that Congress has always been used as an access point for buses for the existing Ronstadt Transit Center. Currently, daily traffic volume on Congress is approximately 15,000 vehicles. Studies conducted for the Downtown Links project showed that nearly 50% of daily traffic on Congress was through traffic, not destined for downtown. Conservatively, it is expected that 25% of current traffic on Congress, or some 3,800 vehicles per day will use the Downtown Links by-pass when it is open in two to three years. As such, traffic volumes on Congress will decrease. 3-4. At this point everything is very conceptual. To be conservative we allowed a ceiling of up to \$174 million. This is an urban development, which should cost significantly more than a suburban development. For example the new AC Hotel being built just a block South is costing \$33 million for less than a half of an acre. The Ronstadt site is 4.7 acres. Any developer would be doing a disservice to Tucson if they were to spend less than \$100 million on a site of this size and of this importance. Since the presentation we have continued to value engineer the project and with a change in building materials, design changes, and alternative funding sources we have decreased that ceiling. We are excited to work with the community and share this information, however considering this selection process, there is confidential information that we can't divulge at this point. 5. Financing, design, and permitting will take us through 2016 with construction starting in quarter two of 2017. Construction will be done in 3 phases and we plan to be completed by the end of quarter three of 2018 and fully leased by 2019. During construction on the North site, the transit center will be relocated to the Toole site. 6. We will request New Market Tax Credits, Rio Nuevo funding on the parking structure, and cooperation from the City of Tucson when working with the FTA as this is a joint development with the FTA.

PP-37

Consideration of pedestrian linkage to development along N 6th Ave across train tracks to future greyhound station is thoughtful.

North and south plazas are nice. I see "streetscape" term as the better descriptor over "plaza". Streets have mixed use frontages (restaurant seating, private courtyards, etc...) and an implied directional movement of people along them. Trees are essential. We have plazas in Tucson, and most are static, hot, and empty.

Massing of the buildings is very modern and nice looking. Not sure how it effectively addresses solar concerns with glass and orientation. Sun screen elements are nice. Urban agriculture, outdoor green spaces are all great.

Outdoor market idea along the bus lines is nice. Good way to help mix up the uses at the street level. Again, I see trees as critical here.

Nod to alternative modes of travel very thoughtful (bike and car sharing, shuttles & taxi).

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

Not sure how historical context is addressed. I see connectivity and scale as the bigger concern.

Thank you for your thoughtful response. It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-installed in the market it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We are actively working with Melody Peters, the original arcade artist, to optimize the implementation.

PP-38

Was surprised that Peach a "local" company, would have such disregard for the history of the place and their proposed building is downright ugly, like stacked concrete thrown on top of each other haphazardly. Doesn't at all fit with the current buildings around the site. It is almost like they wanted to do a poor job of fitting with the criteria set by the city. Some off the wall, rebel approach. Another developer pushing the envelope to see how much they can get away with. Windows did not appear to be designed to reflect or prevent sun from striking windows and warming the building through them.

Thrift/Talk of the Town site has not even been developed yet. Seems that is more important. And what will they do with all the buses during construction? Is this a way to relocate that like they did Greyhound in the name of DT development?

Also the Peach people's ideas for the buses was asinine giving no room for the buses to operate as well as having ingress and egress on to Congress street thus causing even more problems on Congress. Perhaps apolitical backed move to "do something" about the "problems" of Congress.

The Peach people's design would also remove all of the long celebrated and lovingly constructed wall of the Ronstadt Center. That wall was a compromise to people that didn't want the old buildings torn down in the first place. This would be a slap to those people's efforts to retain a sense of history.

And then there is the art work commissioned for, approved through the compromise process and lovingly constructed and celebrated. The Peach design totally ignores all that with a design that is not even compatible with the surrounding area.

While we are on the Peach plan here are some notes/question taken the night of the presentation about that plan.

Wants to put in another hotel. There is already a hotel going in just south of this area. How many hotels can DT actually support. Two (one an historical) have already gone down the pike, what makes these more likely to succeed? There are many places throughout the city for people to stay in the one month of GEM show that need the business of the GEM show also.

Extending a bridge over the railroad tracks. This is a pie in the sky as have seen already how hard it is to get permission from the railroad to do that. Question, would a new structure north of the tracks interfere or cause traffic problems with the road being extended from Broadway and would the site be big enough for Greyhound to use effectively?

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

Est. 125 buses per hours and they want to have all them enter an arrow passage between their buildings and those to the east. With the current bus transit design the buses can operate safely. Theirs appears to see the buses as an afterthought maybe even necessary nuisances so in the future the city will be strongly motived to move the transit center. There simply does not appear to be enough space dedicated to the original use of the site for a bus terminal.

Restricting access to the bus center through gates on the one side so people cannot easily access DT from the bus center. Their answers to that were not well thought out

Water features, NO, we need to be more conservative with our water not throwing it away. Look what happened to the water features in other city projects (Convention Center, the park between Congress and Broadway).

At this time everything is very conceptual. Our two story base responds to the human scale downtown, and we utilize shade and courtyards for our desert climate. Buildings should respond to context and culture, but also inspire and expand the community. If designs just copied old styles, we would not have the Modern architecture that our community has been passionate about preserving along Broadway and throughout Tucson. We will also be incorporating if not keeping the historic brick arcade in place. We have discussed different window options for the East and West and our architects will respond to that in more detailed renderings. During construction of the bus site we will temporarily relocate the bus station to the Toole site. Most of the lingering/ crowding on the site today is a function of the current bus schedule, which includes a pulse based system where buses generally arrive/depart at the same time. This leaves time blocks in between where passengers are waiting (often 15-30 minutes). The linear transit mall uses a more free flow operation where there would be frequent bus service distributed more equitable throughout the hour. Our new hotel developer 5N5th Hotel LLC has done extensive market research. In the past, a few hotel developments have been unsuccessful due in large part to the economic conditions at that time, and by offering inferior brands or non-branded options. With a limited number of available hotel sites downtown, in the center of expanding restaurants, entertainment venues, and businesses, the proposed Ronstadt Center Hotel along with the AC Tucson Hotel would be the key properties to meet the increasing room demand. Our proposed pedestrian bridge would go over traffic. Again, everything is conceptual and we want to take public opinions into account in our public spaces, so the water feature isn't set in stone. However, We will harvest the condensate water from the air conditioners which is clean, distilled water good for water features such as misters and fountains. Our plan doesn't include a grocery store. Parking will be located at the Toole site. We have a plan and budget for a temporary transit center to be at the Toole site. This redevelopment site is 4.7 acres, so there is enough square footage for all our intended uses, especially when you consider the levels of buildings. Regarding cost, to be conservative we allowed a ceiling of up to \$174 million. This is an urban development, which should cost significantly more than a suburban development. For example the new AC Hotel being built just a block South is costing \$33 million for less than a half of an acre. The Ronstadt site is 4.7 acres. Any developer would be doing a disservice to Tucson if they were to spend less than \$100 million on a site of this size and of this importance. Since the presentation we have continued to value engineer the project and with a change in building materials, design changes, and alternative funding sources we have decreased that ceiling. We are excited to work with the community and share this information, however considering this selection process, there is confidential information that we can't divulge at this point.

PP-39

Very impressive, this is my preferred solution, my favorite project:

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

I am always impressed with 3-D and layman graphics as presented recently. Great ideas appear even better with these graphics which anyone can understand. (Our city was so cheap on Broadway project--few really understood the project--now too narrow for any accents, landscaping or amenities--their own renderings indicate a bleak streetscape and roadway.)

Of course, my comments:

1. if not retain a portion of the famous brick Arcade in front of the entries to your outdoor entry/gathering areas or at the corner in front of the hotel, then implement pieces in various locations with signage of what it represents. The entire Arcade is not that useful, blocking the new business frontage from view.
2. Sidewalks require shading along with the trees at the perimeter where the Arcade was originally and ease of access thru and around as possible in this scheme.
3. More specifics are coming, but I did not notice shade structures with cooling, decorative ceiling/wall fans for the bus boarding areas. Is the perimeter street sidewalk shaded, esp if the Arcade disappears? I believe that shading is important even if just portions of the brick walkway are retained.
4. I still don't care for all the noise and exhaust for these buses. Perhaps, their major travel can be limited to just a couple of streets downtown? Essentially, in and out of the bus transit center. I wish the buses only traveled on Toole, Congress to 6th south about to Toole, and along the perimeter of Downtown.
5. Stepped buildings: You noted such, I did not see accurate graphics reflecting such; perhaps specific graphics for better understanding of this great technique. The stepped buildings appear to be really needed in the linear bus area.
6. To clarify my comments about bus routes--these large, noisy buses need to be limited to certain streets. It is no fun sitting outside Little or big Poca Cosa, and Janos and having these buses cruise by. My preferred plan, esp if majority of riders are just transferring and not entering downtown, is move the transfer station to the city owned property at Speedway/Stone, with a small station at Ronstadt, less buses in downtown.) If in fact, the amount of buses will increase and other transit options, that station noted above may be needed in the future.
7. So a perimeter of Downtown is preferred for transfer, larger buses. Now we need those smaller buses thru downtown--maybe--or encourage Streetcar usage with a smaller fare for just the downtown area.
8. The pedestrian level surface materials, colors, textures are of course excellent idea and in the RN design elements. I am still frustrated Poca Cosa has no detailing at the main floor of the Green Garage--if your plan includes this garage, that pedestrian walkway needs design help for all tenants much less for PC, perhaps a continuation of your streetscape Design on 6th.

1. It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our many public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-used it will

Questions/Comments from Members of the Public
Received via email between July 23 and August 3, 2015.

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We look forward to working with Melody Peters, the arcade artist, to best integrate the arcade brick and tile. 2. Our streetscape includes trees and shade structures. 3. The bus station has shading from the streetscape, buildings, and the market stalls. 4. Our plan doesn't increase bus traffic on Congress and Suntran has many options for bus routes throughout downtown. 5. Our building design does include cascades and steps. 6. Bus routing and bus station location is ultimately up to Suntran.

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.

Rehabilitation and re-use are the cornerstone of what Peach Properties has done and will continue to do in downtown Tucson. Some past rehab projects include the Cartel Coffee & Thunder Canyon Brewery block, the Depot Plaza (also known as One North Fifth apartments) on Congress, and Scott & Broadway where Providence Inc. is headquartered. Peach also had a large part in restoring the Historic Warehouse Arts District with multiple developments at 6th & 6th such as Exo Coffee and Santa Teresa Tile. These buildings are now listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Peach properties has salvaged many buildings that were set to be demolished. For example 119 E Toole, along the rail road tracks, which now houses tenants like Borderlands. These are just a few examples of Peach Properties' rehabilitating historic buildings to bring new life to Downtown Tucson. It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our many public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-used it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We look forward to working with Melody Peters, the arcade artist, to best integrate the arcade brick and tile.

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.

Thank you for your support!

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

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.

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.

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.

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.

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!

Our residential will not be solely for students. Our projected rents for retail and commercial are actually less than current comparable rents that are being paid downtown today. We will also have the public market stalls, which will allow a different bracket of retail that was previously unable to locate downtown due to rental barriers.

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

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

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.

Thank you for your input and ideas. We agree that the development should have a social services element hence our wellness center.

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?

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

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?

We agree that a space such as this is needed, which is why we have already talked with Startup Tucson about including incubation spaces in some of our office space. With 45,000 square feet of office space we definitely have room for incubation spaces. The top 2 floors of the Toole site are dedicated to live/work lofts with commercial at the street.

Both-6

I am a Sun Tran 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

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

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.

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.

Examples of similar linear transit malls can be found in Seattle (3rd Avenue and Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel), Portland (5th and 6th Avenue), and Minneapolis (Nicolette Mall). The common principle of a transit mall is that multiple bus routes are assigned to a single bus boarding area (or bay), as opposed to individual bus routes being assigned to an individual bus bay (like the Ronstadt Transit Center today). The advantage is that it provides more operational flexibility in terms of frequency and bus fleet. Our proposal does not depend on increased frequency, but rather it allows for increased flexibility. We believe our bus station will be an improved place for busriders to stop, grab something from the market, relax at the plaza, and spend time.

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!**

It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-installed in the market it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We are actively working with Melody Peters, the original artist, to determine the best integration. At this point everything is very conceptual. To be conservative we allowed a ceiling of up to \$174 million. This is an urban development, which should cost significantly more than a suburban development. For example the new AC Hotel being built just a block South is costing \$33 million for less than a half of an acre. The Ronstadt site is 4.7 acres. Any developer would be doing a disservice to Tucson if they were to spend less than \$100 million on a site of this size and of this importance. Since the presentation we have continued to value engineer the project and with a change in building materials, design changes, and alternative funding sources we have decreased that ceiling. We are excited to work with the community and share this information, however considering this selection process, there is confidential information that we can't divulge at this point.

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.**

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.

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.

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

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.

1. Our residential is open to all. We are including 20% affordable housing. 2. We will build for LEED Silver Certification and plan on doing more environmental efforts like rainwater and condensation harvesting and green roofs. We believe the activation and integration of our site plan will promote safety. We will integrate a Blue Light safety system (buttons conveniently located, so someone in distress can press, and instantly notify the police) that is currently used on the University of Arizona campus, as well as making sure the whole center is well lit. 3. We designed our plan with pedestrians at the highest priority, so thank you for recognizing that. 4. Our linear transit mall is designed to be flexible and easily adaptable.

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.

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

Our plan also includes retail space for restaurants and shops - over 50,000 square feet of it!

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.

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.

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 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.

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

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.

Thank you for your comments. We share your hope and pride in the future of Tucson!

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

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.

1. Buses will use both Congress and Toole to enter/exit the linear transit mall. The entry/exit on Congress will be developed using urban design principles that balance the operational needs of Sun Trans buses with the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles. Issues such as turning radii, sight lines, driveway widths, curb and gutter, pavement materials, signage, and building frontage will all be considered. It should be noted that Congress has always been used as an access point for buses for the existing Ronstadt Transit Center. Currently, daily traffic volume on Congress is approximately 15,000 vehicles. Studies conducted for the Downtown Links project showed that nearly 50% of daily traffic on Congress was through traffic, not destined for downtown. Conservatively, it is expected that 25% of current traffic on Congress, or some 3,800 vehicles per day will use the Downtown Links by-pass when it is open in two to three years. As such, traffic volumes on Congress will decrease. 2. At this point everything is very conceptual. To be conservative we allowed a ceiling of up to \$174 million. This is an

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

urban development, which should cost significantly more than a suburban development. For example the new AC Hotel being built just a block South is costing \$33 million for less than a half of an acre. The Ronstadt site is 4.7 acres. Any developer would be doing a disservice to Tucson if they were to spend less than \$100 million on a site of this size and of this importance. Since the presentation we have continued to value engineer the project and with a change in building materials, design changes, and alternative funding sources we have decreased that ceiling. We are excited to work with the community and share this information, however considering this selection process, there is confidential information that we can't divulge at this point. 3. The U of A has not made a financial commitment. 4. Our buildings can be financed conventionally. Thank you for your thoughtful questions and response.

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?

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 didn't consider UAVs, but as that becomes prevalent our design can definitely adapt. In another comment we got a suggestion for an app for the Travel Center and we think that is a great idea! The Peach Team is fully committed to discussion and collaboration with neighbors, stakeholder groups, and other interested members of the public during the design of Ronstadt. During the initial planning stage members of our team attended meetings of the Bus Rider Union and various neighborhood meetings. We look forward to continuing this collaboration and holding more public meetings throughout the development process. We understand that the success of this projects lies in collaboration. The Peach Team has a comprehensive plan for on-going engagement with the community, and our team is made up of Tucsonans, many of whom are downtown residents.

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.

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.

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

Tucson's obligation to the homeless needs to be addressed apart from the Ronstadt center.

It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our many public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-used it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We are already working with Melody Peters, the arcade artist, to best integrate the arcade brick and tile. At this time everything is very conceptual, however buildings should respond to context and culture, but also inspire and expand the community. If designs just copied old styles, we would not have the Modern architecture that our community has been passionate about preserving along Broadway and throughout Tucson. Regarding financials, everything is conceptual at this point. To be conservative we allowed a ceiling of up to \$174 million. This is an urban development, which should cost significantly more than a suburban development. For example the new AC Hotel being built just a block South is costing \$33 million for less than a half of an acre. The Ronstadt site is 4.7 acres. Any developer would be doing a disservice to Tucson if they were to spend less than \$100 million on a site of this size and of this importance. Since the presentation we have continued to value engineer the project and with a change in building materials, design changes, and alternative funding sources we have decreased that ceiling. We are excited to work with the community and share this information, however considering this selection process, there is confidential information that we can't divulge at this point.

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!

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!

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.

It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our many public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it

**Questions/Comments from Members of the Public
Received via email between July 23 and August 3, 2015.**

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-used it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We are already working with Melody Peters, the arcade artist, to best integrate the arcade brick and tile. At this time everything is very conceptual, however buildings should respond to context and culture, but also inspire and expand the community. If designs just copied old styles, we would not have the Modern architecture that our community has been passionate about preserving along Broadway and throughout Tucson. We are just as excited about the bus station as all components of our plan. We discussed the new and improved linear transit mall that will run along Arizona Avenue. Along the bus station we will have a daily market where transit riders and passerby can grab something quick to eat. We will also include a Transit Hub Welcome Center where you can see real time schedules. The station will be inviting, airy, and bustling with plenty of seating, shade, and access to Plazas. We believe this is a substantial improvement to the current transit center.

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.

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 Rondstat 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.

We want to maintain Tucson's quiriness as well, with components like the public market, re-incorporating the brick and tile arcade, and with artist live/ works lofts. We discussed the new and improved linear transit mall that will run along Arizona Avenue. Along the bus station we will have a daily market where transit riders and passerby can grab something quick to eat. We will also include a Transit Hub Welcome Center where you can see real time schedules. The station will be inviting, airy, and bustling with plenty of seating, shade, and access to Plazas. These are characteristics we collected when we attended the bus rider union meetings. We believe this is a substantial improvement to the current transit center and will serve busriders as they should be served by their transit hub. Improving

**Questions/Comments from Members of the Public
Received via email between July 23 and August 3, 2015.**

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

facilities to increase ridership is the cornerstone of transit oriented development and was front of mind during our design.

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.

It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our many public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-used it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We are already working with Melody Peters, the arcade artist, to best integrate the arcade brick and tile. At this time everything is very conceptual, however buildings should respond to context and culture, but also inspire and expand the community. If designs just copied old styles, we would not have the Modern architecture that our community has been passionate about preserving along Broadway and throughout Tucson. Our new hotel developer 5N5th Hotel LLC has done extensive market research. In the past, a few hotel developments have been unsuccessful due in large part to the economic conditions at that time, and by offering inferior brands or non-branded options. With a limited number of available hotel sites downtown, in the center of expanding restaurants, entertainment venues, and businesses, the proposed Ronstadt Center Hotel along with the AC Tucson Hotel would be the key properties to meet the increasing room demand. Our plan includes artist live/ work lofts at the Toole site. Our projected rents for retail and commercial are actually less than current comparable rents that are being paid downtown today. We will also have the public

**Questions/Comments from Members of the Public
Received via email between July 23 and August 3, 2015.**

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

market stalls, which will allow a different bracket of retail that was previously unable to locate downtown due to rental barriers.

Both-17

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

An inspection of all the site trees was completed by the teams landscape architect prior to submittal of the Phase 2 proposal. All of the trees on site showed signs of stress, including poor growth form, leaf drop, and dead/dying parts. The Southern Live Oak trees planted between 6th Avenue/Congress Street and the brick structure, showed the most signs of stress. Several oaks were newly planted perhaps as replacement plants, of these replacements two were dead. (see attached images) Of the remaining oak trees there were several that were dying from the top down and none showed healthy growth patterns for 20+ year old trees (see Images). Several factors can be contributing to the poor condition of the street trees including: the trees are planted in 3'x3' planting wells constricting root growth and water absorption area; compacted, nutrient depleted soils within the 3'x3' planting areas; Southern Live Oaks are not Sonoran Desert native or desert adaptable drought tolerant trees; afternoon radiant heat from the red brick sidewalk and structure on 6th Ave.(Image 6); vehicular exhaust fumes from all sides. More suitable trees for this site would be Sonoran Desert native trees such as palo verde tree species, mesquite species, or acacia species. The City of Tucson is moving toward the use of native vegetation in new City owned construction including parks, plazas, and right-of-ways. In the past 20 years there have also been improvements in urban tree planting, and soil technologies that if employed would ensure more healthy trees at the site.

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.

**Questions/Comments from Members of the Public
Received via email between July 23 and August 3, 2015.**

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

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.

At this time everything is very conceptual, however buildings should respond to context and culture, but also inspire and expand the community. If designs just copied old styles, we would not have the Modern architecture that our community has been passionate about preserving along Broadway and throughout Tucson. Light and activity will be key to the safety of the Ronstadt. All areas will be well lit. We also believe the many functions will bring more people to the area. A blue light system is also apart of the plan. This is a crime prevention emergency alarm system where stations are located throughout the area, which anyone can press when in distress. 20% of housing will be HUD classified affordable, which will lease below the market rate according to the HUD affordable housing rent limits at the time of leasing. The current rents range from \$489 for a studio and \$680 on the lower bracket to \$822 on the higher bracket for a 2 bedroom. 5N5th Hotel, L.L.C. is the hotel developer and the developer of the new AC Marriott hotel in downtown Tucson and the our developer for the new hotel at the Ronstadt. In conjunction with the management company Cima Enterprises, L.L.C., they have reviewed the feasibility of another hotel as part of the Ronstadt Center proposed development and concluded that there is evidence of sufficient demand to support the project. A study they performed for the AC Hotel showed the need for additional rooms in the market. As of March 2015, demand had increased 3.4 percent without additional supply. Revpar has also increased. 5N5th also has a letter of support from Marriott. The tallest building in our design is 12 stories and the rest are 7 stories. This is on par with neighboring buildings for example the new AC Hotel will be 8 stories, the Unisource building is 9 floors, and the tallest building downtown ,1 S Church, is 23 floors.

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.

It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our many public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-used it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We are actively working with Melody Peters, the arcade artist, to best integrate the arcade brick and tile. All of the trees on site showed signs of stress, including poor growth form, leaf drop, and dead/dying parts. The Southern Live Oak trees planted between 6th Avenue/Congress Street and the brick structure, showed the most signs of stress. Several oaks were newly planted perhaps as replacement plants, of these replacements two were dead. (see attached

**Questions/Comments from Members of the Public
Received via email between July 23 and August 3, 2015.**

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

images) Of the remaining oak trees there were several that were dying from the top down and none showed healthy growth patterns for 20+ year old trees (see Images). Several factors can be contributing to the poor condition of the street trees including: the trees are planted in 3'x3' planting wells constricting root growth and water absorption area; compacted, nutrient depleted soils within the 3'x3' planting areas; Southern Live Oaks are not Sonoran Desert native or desert adaptable drought tolerant trees; afternoon radiant heat from the red brick sidewalk and structure on 6th Ave.(Image 6); vehicular exhaust fumes from all sides. More suitable trees for this site would be Sonoran Desert native trees such as Palo Verde tree species, mesquite species, or acacia species. The City of Tucson is moving toward the use of native vegetation in new City owned construction including parks, plazas, and right-of-ways. In the past 20 years there have also been improvements in urban tree planting, and soil technologies that if employed would ensure more healthy trees at the site.

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.

Appreciate that thank you!

Both-21

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

Our project can be financed conventionally, but we would like to apply for FTA funding considering this is a joint development and includes many public components. We are excited to work with the community and share this information, however considering this selection process, there is confidential information that we can't divulge at this point.

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

THE FOLLOWING RESPONSES ARE TO COMMENTS THAT WERE PROVIDED DURING COMMENT PERIOD, BUT INADVERTENTLY MISSED IN THE INITIAL DOCUMENTATION OF COMMENTS.

Additional Comment 1 (Peach)

Is the inclusion of the University of Arizona a necessary condition in order to make project financing work? What is the status of your discussions with UA?

The University of Arizona is not essential to our project. We would like to see the University, however official plans have not been set.

Additional Comment 2 (Both)

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

Greyhound is actively pursuing new sites, so they are not an integral part of our proposal.

Additional Comment 3 (Both)

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.

It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-installed in the market it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We are actively working with Melody Peters, the original arcade artist, to optimize the implementation.

Additional Comment 4 (Both)

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.

It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another options is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-installed in

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

the market it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We are actively working with Melody Peters, the original arcade artist, to optimize the implementation. Regarding the architecture, at this point everything is very conceptual. Buildings should respond to context and culture, but also inspire and expand the community. If designs just copied old styles, we would not have the modern architecture that our community has been passionate about preserving along Broadway and throughout Tucson.

Additional Comment 5 (Both)

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.

If you look at past Peach projects downtown, they are filled with substance. We have a history of building rehabilitation and saving them from demolition in a uniquely Tucson way. *(See below for the rest of our responses to your comments.)*

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.

It has been our intention from day one to implement the beautiful arcade brick and tile work into one of our public spaces. We would like to leave it in place, however we have concerns about leaving it in place during construction. Another option is to incorporate it into the public market along the transit station. After all, the original intention of the Ronstadt Arcade was to facilitate market stalls. We believe by re-using the tiles and bricks in the market they will be re-activated, allowing more enjoyment of this unique part of Tucson's history and culture. Whether the arcade is kept in place or re-installed in the market it will be a highlight of the new Ronstadt. We are actively working with Melody Peters, the original arcade artist, to optimize the implementation. At this point, building design and heights are conceptual, but we plan on them being eight, twelve, six, and seven stories respectively from North to South.

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

“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?

Although we did not highlight our environmentally friendly plans in our presentation, they are an important part of our original proposal. These plans include: Leed Silver Certification, rainwater harvesting for landscaped streetscape, plaza and transit center, as well as solar water heating, and composting for use in gardens.

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.

The Greyhound is actively pursuing other sites, so their locations isn't integral to either proposal. We have received some feedback about the pedestrian bridge going over Toole and we are open to changing the length of the bridge. We understand that the success of this development lies in collaboration.

“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.

We have allowed for lots of open space in our design that allows for the issue of exhaust fumes to be mitigated. Many members of our team attended bus rider union meetings in order to ensure the best possible outcome for the bus riders, which is where our open, active, and airy design originated.

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,

RESPONSES FROM PEACH PROPERTIES

and when pressed, Phil Swaim, who appeared to be their spokesman rather than Ron Schwalbe of Peach, offered an “estimate on a concept” of \$174 million. How can the budget figures be so disproportionate?

Our project can be financed conventionally, but we would like to apply for FTA funding considering this is a joint development. At this point everything is very conceptual. To be conservative we allowed a ceiling of up to \$174 million. This is an urban development, which should cost significantly more than a suburban development. For example the new AC Hotel being built just a block South is costing \$33 million for less than a half of an acre. The Ronstadt site is 4.7 acres. Any developer would be doing a disservice to Tucson if they were to spend less than \$100 million on a site of this size and of this importance. Since the presentation we have continued to value engineer the project and with a change in building materials, design changes, and alternative funding sources we have decreased that ceiling. We are excited to work with the community and share this information, however considering this selection process, there is confidential information that we can't divulge at this point.

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.

Nowhere in our plan do we intend for bus riders to walk to Alameda to purchase tickets. We have proven our experience through our many successful projects in downtown. The Peach Team is fully committed to discussion and collaboration with neighbors, stakeholder groups, and other interested members of the public during the design of Ronstadt. During the initial planning stage members of our team attended meetings of the Bus Rider Union and various neighborhood meetings. We look forward to continuing this collaboration and holding more public meetings throughout the development process. We understand that the success of this projects lies in collaboration. The Peach Team has a comprehensive plan for on-going engagement with the community, and our team is made up of Tucsonans, many of whom are downtown residents. For example, Ron Schwabe of Peach Properties lives a mere five blocks from Ronstadt