

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses

---

**RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS**  
**Received Between Jan. 30, 2015, and Feb. 9, 2015**

*Responses prepared by Office of Integrated Planning, City of Tucson, Feb. 25, 2015*

---

**Organization & Coding of Comments**

The table below indicates who provided written comments and when. The written comments received were compiled into one document, which is posted on the OIP website at <http://www.tucsonaz.gov/integrated-planning/office-integrated-planning>.

**Types of Comments**

Please note that there are generally four types of comments as noted below. Some commenters provided a mix of comment types.

- a. Specific suggestions for revisions to Phase II RFP
- b. Thoughts on the RFP process
- c. Ideas about type of development that should happen at the project site
- d. Position statements regarding the project

**Responses to Comments**

Responses have been focused on the comments that make suggestions regarding the content of the Phase II RFP and/or the process. Comments that share opinions and ideas about the proposed project are acknowledged through their inclusion in the compilation of the comments posted on the OIP website. Those on the RTC contact list were informed via email about the online availability of the comments.

<b>Comment Set #</b>	<b>Commenter &amp; Affiliation</b>	<b>Date Rec'd.</b>
<b>#1</b>	Allen Benz, <i>Tucson Bus Riders Union</i>	1/31/15
<b>#2</b>	Laura Tabili, <i>Co-Chair, Downtown Neighborhood Residents Council</i>	2/2/15
<b>#3</b>	Marilyn Robinson	2/3/15
<b>#4</b>	Brian Flagg, <i>Tucson Bus Riders Union</i>	2/5/15
<b>#5</b>	Jim Hannan, <i>Bus Friends Forever</i>	2/6/15
<b>#6</b>	Tony Ford, <i>Chair, Downtown Innovation District</i> Justin Williams, <i>CEO, Startup Tucson</i>	2/6/15
<b>#7</b>	Don Ijams	2/6/15
<b>#8</b>	Les Pierce	2/6/15
<b>#9</b>	Robert Kaye	2/8/15
<b>#10</b>	Margot Garcia, <i>Tucson Transit Task Force</i>	2/8/15
<b>#11</b>	Barbara Brookhart	2/9/15
<b>#12</b>	Suzanne Schafer	2/9/15

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses

**COMMENT SET #1**

**Comment Summary:** This set of comments relates to the goals, with emphasis on revising “should” to “shall” throughout the goals.

**Response:** Because the goals were developed and agreed to through the public process and because they were included in the Phase I RFP, they are not proposed for revisions. However, as suggested by a participant at the Jan. 30, 2015, Stakeholder Meeting, the submittal requirements have been reviewed and revised as appropriate to make sure that they satisfactorily reflect the intent of the goals. Also note that under Section VI: Phase II Submittal Requirements Item 5(a) requires the Offeror to “Describe how the proposed project achieves the City’s Project Purpose and Goals presented in Section III of this RFP.”

**COMMENT SET #2A; #2B; and #2C**

**Comment Summary:** This comment set is comprised of three position papers from the Downtown Neighborhoods & Residents Council (DNaRC). While the position papers are not dated, the content of the first two makes it clear that they were written prior to the release of the Phase I RFP. The papers raise issues about the need to redevelop the sites and emphasize the importance of the transit center and the need to focus resources and attention on the transit site and operations

Within the Comment Set are some statements that seemed germane to the current Draft Phase II RFP. These and responses to them are provided below.

**COMMENT SET #2A**

**Comment 2A.1:** Any proposed retail/commercial uses to be added to the site must serve the needs of transit riders and provide short- *and* long-term revenue for the transit system. (Federal Transit System Administration, Guidance on Joint Development Circular [proposed], 2013, p. II-3).

**Response 2A.1:** The need for the project to serve transit riders is addressed in Goals A and B in the Draft Phase II RFP. These goals were developed through a public process with stakeholders. Goal C states that the project should provide investment that will economically benefit public transit among other things. Additionally, and as is implied by this comment, the project will need to meet FTA requirements laid out in Circular 7050.1, Federal Transit Administration Guidance on Joint Development, issued in August 2014.

**Comment 2A.2:** Additional steps need to be taken prior to issuing an RFQ with priority given to a larger more inclusive public process.

**Response 2A.2:** There has been a number of steps in the public process, beginning with meetings with individual stakeholder groups, which in 2014 evolved into a broader, more inclusive public process, comprised of multiple, interactive meetings attended by stakeholders representing a broad range of interests from transit users, to Downtown neighborhoods, to local businesses, to developers, and others.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses

**Comment 2A.3:** Any decision about future uses of the RTC needs to be preceded by an open, inclusive process that includes the expertise of bus riders, neighborhood residents, and downtown neighborhood associations as well as downtown business owners, civic leaders, urban planners, and transportation engineers. The process needs to be more than a public hearing; it needs to be an inclusive design process in which these key stakeholders participate in shaping the future of a viable regional transit hub.

**Response 2A.3:** See response to proceeding comment (2A.2), which describes a process that has been much more than a public hearing. Also it should be noted that the Phase II RFP, now being prepared, requires all Offerors to make a presentation of their proposed projects to the public and solicit their feedback (Item 9). Additionally, the RFP requires the Offeror to develop a plan for public engagement throughout the development process (Item 7).

**Comment 2A.4:** We believe that the primary and paramount goal needs to be clear: New projects need to focus on transit-oriented outcomes (public interest). The priority objectives, which follow from that goal are to: (1) engage in an inclusive process that includes bus riders, neighborhoods, downtown merchants, and other key stake holders; (2) improve basic amenities (water fountains, bathrooms, bus info/maps/schedules, shelter from rain) for riders and for non-riding users of the public space; (3) improve bus service, including customer service; and (4) preserve or increase public open space.

**Response 2A.4:** The FTA Joint Development requirements, with which this joint development project must comply, emphasizes transit enhancement. Investments should allow improvement of transit-related amenities on an ongoing basis. The inclusion of open space is explicitly called for in Goal A and the Submittal Requirements require under “Program Description,” details about the community open space.

#### COMMENT SET #2B

**Comment Summary:** The points in this position paper are similar to those presented in the previous position paper.

#### COMMENT SET #2C

**Comment Summary:** This position paper references a summary written by Jim Hannan of Bus Friends Forever, and “highlights key points and suggested steps” on which DNaRC is in agreement. It should be noted that Jim Hannan provided comments on the Draft Phase II, which are coded as Comment Set #5.

**Comment 2C.1:** What is the target amount of transit revenue to be raised from the future development? It would seem that any proposal would need to meet these criteria before any other.

**Response 2C.1:** 1. At a minimum the project must achieve a fair share of revenue. The total FTA investment may vary based on how much of the RTC is contributed to the joint development. If the entire RTC is contributed to the joint development, the City estimates the original federal investment in RTC is \$7 million.

**Comment 2C.2:** Development on the site may take as long as five years to complete. In the interim, there are easy, low-cost steps that can be taken now to improve the center for both transit users and the other downtown denizens. ... there are...basic amenities that would improve the functioning of the RTC: upgrade of the restrooms; re-opening and staffing of the information booth for all transit riders (including streetcar) and downtown visitors, and a secure place to lock bikes.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses

**Response 2C.2:** The City's Department of Transportation and Sun Tran will evaluate and program improvements to RTC based on available local and federal funding and the scope and timing of any potential joint development project. When working with a selected development team on phasing, if required, the City would keep the issue of amenities in mind as important for the nearer term.

**Comment 2C.3:** Ronstadt provides the only semi-public space on the east side of downtown. There are currently signs and ordinances that tell people Ronstadt is only for bus riders. This should change immediately, to re-instate the RTC as a fully public space. It should be re-animated as a public square.

**Response 2C.3:** Two points. First, the RTC Joint Development RFP calls for community open space in Goal A, and requires a description of that open space in Section VI, Submittal Requirements, Item 3 (g). This would help in addressing the deficit of open space implied in the above comment. Second: The thoughtful ideas related to the exterior and interior of the RTC site will be available for review by Offerors.

**Comment 2C.4:** We reiterate our view that any decision about future development of the RTC needs to be preceded by an open, inclusive process that includes the expertise of bus riders, neighborhood residents, and downtown neighborhood associations as well as downtown business owners, civic leaders, urban planners, and transportation engineers. The process needs to be more than a public hearing: it needs to be an inclusive design process in which these key stakeholders participate in shaping the future of a viable regional transit hub.

**Response 2C.3:** See response to Comment 2A.2.

**COMMENT SET #3**

**Comment 3a:** My first suggestion for the next phase of this RFP process is to ensure flexibility for future transit systems in the design this project. The connection to the existing streetcar and potential inter-city rail at the historic depot should be facilitated of course, but also consider possible future introduction of a Bus Rapid Transit system or streetcar lines that might run both east on Broadway and south on Sixth Avenue, where current RTA/PAG plans show future high capacity transit extensions.

**Response 3a:** Revisions have been made to the Phase II RFP, Section VI. Phase II Submittal Requirements, Item 4, to add a separate sub-item that reads "Describe how the project could be adapted over time to serve additional modes of transportation."

**Comment 3b:** I also hope that the proposers in this RFP process will be required to respond to public input, explaining how they have incorporated changes or why they have not, and will be given time to make any revisions.

**Response 3b:** As provided in the revised schedule at the beginning of the RTC RFP and referenced in Section VI. Phase II Submittal Requirements, Item 9, each Offeror will be provided with assembled comments from the public presentation of its proposed project and will have 30 days in which to incorporate changes. Item 9 been further revised to request from the Offeror written explanations as to how a comment was addressed in modifications to the project or if not addressed why.

**COMMENT SET #4**

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses

**Comment 4a:** The comments gathered before 2-6-2015 need to not just be assembled and sent to an executive session of the City Council, like it says will happen in your project timeline.

The public needs to be able to see and evaluate and have input on the assembled comments before moving the process forward. One more stakeholders meeting would be appropriate.

**Response 4b:** The comments received were assembled and emailed to everyone on the RTC contact list on Friday, February 20, 2015. Staff then learned over the weekend that because of the size of the attachments, some of the emails did not go through. A follow-up email was sent on February 23, 2015, acknowledging this problem and providing the link to the Office of Integrated Planning website where the attachments are posted. Additionally, another meeting is being held on February 25, 2015, to review the comments received and discuss how they were addressed in the revisions to the RTC Phase II RFP or if they were not addressed why.

<b>COMMENT SET #5</b>
-----------------------

**Comment Summary:** This set of comments was divided into two parts, one labeled “General Comments,” and the other labeled “Specific Comments.” The latter are the comments most directly related to the Phase II RFP.

**Comment 5a:** Any proposal should bring in a significant revenue stream to the city, that would be legally committed first to maintain Ronstadt, and then to improve the bus system in general. With an overall budget of \$60 million per year for Sun Tran, 1% of that would be \$600,000 per year. Any proposal that doesn’t provide the city at least \$600,000 new, net revenue is probably too marginal to pursue. This means net revenue to the city, after all development costs, including incentives, have been covered.

**Response 5a:** At a minimum the project must achieve a fair share of revenue. The total FTA investment may vary based on how much of the RTC is contributed to the joint development. If the entire RTC is contributed to the joint development, the City estimates the original federal investment in RTC is \$7 million. It is up to Mayor and Council to determine what would be sufficient revenue to proceed with a joint development project.

**Comment 5b:** The RTC footprint should not be compromised by commercial development along Congress or 6<sup>th</sup> Street. This would have a negative impact on the current bus system needs. Closing the Congress Street ingress would result in significant travel time delays for bus riders, involving two street lights and more interior congestion. Closing the 6<sup>th</sup> Street egress is also unwise, limiting the system’s flow lines. Also, by building along Congress, the RTC will lose its physical and visual connection to the modern streetcar stop across Congress.

**Response 5b:** While maintaining the existing RTC footprint is not a criterion for this project – i.e., it’s an option to move the transit function elsewhere WITHIN the designated project site, the RFP addresses some of the commenter’s issues in several ways. First, under Section III, Project Purpose & Goals, Goal A, it says “The project should incorporate (1) a transit center with similar or improved services....” Second, FTA Eligibility Criterion Two: Public Transportation Benefit, requires “The joint development project to “(a) enhance the effectiveness of a public transportation project to which it is related physically or functionally, or it can (b) establish new or enhanced coordination between public transportation and other modes of transportation. If Offeror chose (a), it appears they would need to discuss any negative impacts to the existing system, if (b) it appears they would need to address

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses

connectivity as part of coordination. Third, under Section VI, Submittal Requirements, Item 4(b), the Offeror must “Describe how the project will enhance the transit use, including, but not limited to i. Operational needs of the bus system and its passengers, ii. Pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between transit, other modes of transportation, including but limited to the modern streetcar and Amtrak inter-city rail; and other land uses....” Fourth, under Phase II Evaluation Criteria, the A.2. criterion regarding “Integration of Transit Use” reads “Has the Offeror clearly described how the required transit facilities, uses, and purpose will be integrated with the proposed project. Does the proposal clearly describe enhancements to the transit use, including, but not limited to, operational, connectivity, and physical enhancement?”

**Comment 5c:** Any development should place a high value on the time of bus riders. This should be a key evaluation piece in both the long term effects of a proposal, and the shorter term effects of construction on the site.

**Response 5c:** See previous response, which calls out the Submittal requirement for the Offeror to “Describe how the project will enhance the transit use, including, but not limited to i. Operational needs of the bus system and its passengers.”

**Comment 5d:** We propose the following scoring system to evaluate the two proposals:  
10% - Project feasibility. How likely is the proposal to actually happen?  
40% - Project revenue. How much additional revenue does this proposal net the city?  
25% - Project value added. How does this proposal significantly enhance this part of downtown? Does it make available resources that are not currently available?  
25% - Project design. How does the project reflect on, and expand upon the beauty of the current RTC? How does the design enhance the streetscape in the two other parcels?

**Response 5d:** The Phase II Evaluation Criteria, which have been revised to a limited degree, were developed to parallel the Submittal Requirements. Included in those revisions is the addition of the word “feasibility” to A. Specific Criteria, Item 8., which now reads, “Does the proposal provide sufficient evidence that the project is feasible and that the Offeror is committed to a long-term partnership with the City?” Also it appears that application of the RFP criteria would result in answering many of the questions suggested by the commenter.

**Comment 5e:** We believe that the City of Tucson and the FTA are undervaluing the current sunken capital costs. We believe that the current work on the Madden Triangle and Toole lot should be included, perhaps raising the total from \$6.7 million to closer to \$7.2 million.

**Response 5e:** City staff has recalculated this number at \$7 million, which they have submitted to FTA for its confirmation or revision.

**Comment 5f:** We recommend that the city’s Transit Task Force be incorporated into the RFP process. The proposal that is selected by the evaluation committee should go first to the Transit Task Force for review before going to Mayor and Council.

**Response 5f:** Because the Evaluation Committee recommendation is confidential until it goes to Mayor and Council, it would not be possible to have the Transit Task Force review the recommendation prior to it going to Mayor and Council. However, it should be noted that several members of the Transit Task Force are on the Evaluation Committee. Additionally, the Transit Task Force and/or its members can, as they have done to date, attend Stakeholders Meetings, share their comments, and will be able to attend the required public presentations of the project and provide comments.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses

**Comment 5g:** Bus Friends Forever is concerned about actual implementation of an accepted proposal. The City of Tucson has a poor record in achieving results in downtown development projects. Because of the unusual nature of this project, it is extremely important that safeguards are in place to ensure that the development that is proposed, is actually built, and that the project revenue is paid to the city. The city should set up an oversight committee, including stakeholder members, to ensure that full compliance is achieved.

**Response 5g:** This idea, or variations on this idea, has come up at the Stakeholder Meetings and in some of the written comments. Staff is in the process of exploring the idea. See also Oversight Committee reference in Section VI, Submittal Requirements, Item 7(b).

**Comment 5h:** The suggest project timeline is optimistic and perhaps unrealistic. In particular, the evaluation committee may need more time for deliberation, especially considering that the city plans to engage third party professionals to evaluate the project financials and design features.

**Response 5h:** The project timeline has been revised to reflect a few more steps and some more time. However, it should be noted that there is a window of opportunity during the public presentations of the projects, which is after the proposals have been submitted but before the Evaluation Committee begins its deliberations, for third party reviewers to review the proposals.

**COMMENT SET #6**

**Comments Summary:** The commenter has provided some comments and data related to “it...being important to move from a car focused downtown to a diverse transit downtown where bike, ride share, bus, walking and cars can each find appropriate and easy access.” Commenter goes on to reference what the Gen Y worker is seeking.

The commenter states that “Specific RFP suggestions are in bold.” The following Comments and Responses are in reference to those suggestions in bold.”

**Comment 6a:** Some significant portion of the development parcel must be reserved for green/open space. This space must be programmable for art, culture and event programming, welcoming to pedestrian traffic and a highlight area in clear view of the public with proper lighting and landscaping to ensure safe, equitable use.

**Response 6a:** Under Section VI, Phase II Submittal Requirements, the item that requires the Offeror to describe the community open space features (now Item 3[g]) has been expanded to include more specificity better reflecting the goal statement regarding community open space, which is under Section III, Project Purpose & Goals, Goal A, second paragraph. Item 3(g) now reads, “Describe community open space features – including its integration with its surrounding; its accessibility to the public; its locational visibility, lighting, and other safety related features; its natural features; and its programming.”

**Comment 6b:** A successful proposal must include housing at both market rate and low income housing interspersed with specific housing units designed for artists, independent creative’s or entrepreneurs.

**Response 6b:** Residential is a suggested example of types of land uses that are encouraged. See Section III, “Project Purpose & Goals,” Goal A, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses

**Comment 6c:** A best use proposal would include some form of live work component integrated into office space, coworking space or other shared use work space.

**Response 6c:** This idea has not been directly articulated in the RFP, but the comments will be available to Offerors to review.

**Comment 6d:** Any successful proposal must include the integration of community policing via a police substation on the development site. This space should be created so as to offer highest visibility, transparency and positive community interaction while providing improved safety, crime prevention and response times to transit riders, and the population that will live, work, and experience the sites amenities.

**Response 6d:** City took note of this idea, and it is one that could be pursued during the development negotiations with the selected Offeror.

**Comment 6e:** A successful proposal must include design and architectural features that meet current industry standards for best in class design for both the local environmental requirements (shade, thermal planning, conservation, and efficiency) and architectural, artistic and design aesthetic as approved by the independent design review board.

**Response 6e:** Under Section VI, "Submittal Requirements," Item 3(b), there is reference to demonstrating a high quality project design with an architectural and artistic aesthetic and sensitivity to the surrounding development and historic resources, the desert environment, and the northern viewshed. Additionally, in the same section, Item 3(f) requires that an Offeror "describe the incorporation of sustainable practices, such as LEED certification."

**Comment 6f:** A successful proposal should include specifically designed infrastructure that can adapt to current projected trends in technology and transportation development with supporting research as to the adoption and integration of those technologies on the development site.

**Response 6f:** Such a requirement is not currently included in the Phase II RFP.

**COMMENT SET #7**

**Comment Summary:** Commenter explained his approach to reviewing the RFP with a focus on public involvement.

**Comment 7a:**

**7. Public Engagement Plan**

Stakeholders have been involved in the development of the Phase I and Phase II RFPs. A successful project will find ways to include the public throughout the development process.

At a minimum, Offerors will:

- (a) Develop a plan for involving the public throughout the design phase.
- (b) Attend meetings with City staff, Planning Commission, and City Council as needed.

My reaction to reading this wording, with the inclusive environment in mind, is that there is not enough guidance provided to offerors as to the background new levels of participation now required.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses

In one place you say “throughout the development process” and in another place you say “throughout the design phase.” Which is it? I am reminded of Jan Cervelli’s warning that effective monitoring is needed to assure that what makes it onto the ground is correct vis-à-vis the plans.

Perhaps you have some additional wording you could add to a. above that will flesh it out a bit?

**Response 7a: In Section VI, Submittal Requirement, Item 7, Public Engagement Plan, has been revised and expanded to be more specific about expectations regarding public participation.**

**COMMENT SET #8**

**Comment 8a: Q1:** Are we going to bring up relocation of Greyhound? Would it be fair to add it to Phase 2 requirements when it was not mentioned in Phase 1? If not, could we offer this for the winner to consider building into its proposal?

**Response 8a: Relocation of Greyhound has not been discussed as part of this project to date.**

**Comment 8b:** Under the summary of FTA’s “Fair Share of Costs” criterion, it is stated that all tenants must pay rent reasonable to cover their fair share of operating costs (i.e., no gifts of free rent). Does this extend to community services (as covered in “Fair Share of Revenue”)? E.g., if the final project has a retail component for which high rents are charged to subsidize a community center (which pays token rent), would that fly if the total of rents collected exceeds the totality of operating costs. (Sorry if this is spelled out in the actual document.)

**Response 8b: The developer could lower the rent for community space and increase the rent for other uses to offset the reduced community space rent. In the end, the developer must pay their total fair share of costs to the city.**

**Comment 8c:** Under Section VI “Phase 2 Submittal Requirements”, item 3 “Project Description”, can there be added a requirement for “in-situ” renderings that show the final structures as they will be amidst their surroundings (i.e., and not sitting alone on a vast empty plain as renderings are usually done)? Sure, I’d like to have drawings of the buildings alone so I can focus on the lines and design, but I’d also like to see how they’ll look with the MLK apartments next door, across from Hydra and the pizza place, and so on.

**Response 8c: Under Section VI, “Phase II Submittal Requirements an Item 3(c) has been added that reads, “Provide a rendering that shows how the project relates to and integrates with the surrounding urban fabric.”**

**Comment 8d:** Section VI, item 7: Do we want minimum requirements for the public engagement plan? How binding will the descriptions be in terms of quality and quantity of interactions? If they promise Cadillac engagement but only deliver Yugos, what happens?

**Response 8d: In Section VI, Submittal Requirement, Item 7, Public Engagement Plan, has been revised and expanded to be more specific about expectations regarding public participation.**

**Comment 8e: Section VI, item 8:** I assume the contestants will be thoroughly background-checked to catch any history or other data that will likely not be revealed through the carefully chosen submitted references? We’re not going to just take them at their word, are we?

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses

**Response 8e:** In addition to checking references, the City intends to have third party reviews of financials and would follow up with any red flags identified. Additionally, Procurement will do spot checking of teams identified registrations, licenses, etc.

**Comment 8f:** Section VI, item 9: Do we want to recommend that the contestants attend the public proposals unveiling forum?

**Response 8f:** Each team that responds to the Phase II RFP will be required to present its project in a public forum, see Section VI, Submittal Requirements, Item 9, which has been revised to require that team's respond to all comments provided – explaining how they were used in making modifications to the proposed project or if they were not used why not.

**Comment 8g:** Evaluation Criteria, item A.1: Do we want to clarify that even the prettiest of balconies and rooftop gardens will not count towards “open space” requirements for the purpose of this project? (Somewhere in the bowels of the UDS, rooftops can count as open space if there is a shade structure or something like that.)

**Response 8g:** A community public space is required as part of the RFP. See Section VI, “Phase II Submittal Requirements, Item 3(g), which requests a description of the community open space,” and has been revised to include more specificity in keeping with Section III, “Purpose & Goals, Goal A, second paragraph.

**COMMENT SET #9**

**Comment Summary:** This set of comments included a copy of the Draft RFP with suggested changes. This marked-up document is included with the full set of comments on the OIP website. Many of the suggested edits have been incorporated in the 2-25-15 Revised Phase II Draft RFP. The nature of many of those changes was characterized in the cover email and the contents of that email are included in Comments 9a - 9d below.

**Comment 9a:** Calendar, p. 2. I spent some time thinking through the logistics and timing for the City and the proposers. Rather than writing a comment, I chose to propose some specific dates. Also, I added several steps in the evaluation process that I felt were missing.

**Response 9a:** The project timeline presented in Section I, “Request for Proposal (RFP) Process & Status, has been revised to include many of the revisions suggested.

**Comment 9b:** Communication and Participation, p. 5. In several places in the document, I re-worked comments on public engagement to include local businesspeople and to suggest that the process needs to extend well past the point of final approvals on the project. While it is my suggestion, it's the City's call.

**Response 9b:** Revisions suggested by the commenter to Section III, “Purpose & Goals,” have not been made. No revisions suggested by this commenter or other commenters have been made to Section III, “Purpose & Goals.” Because the purpose and goals were developed and by staff and stakeholders working together and because they were published in the Phase I RFP, they have been left intact for this RFP. However, as suggested by a participant at the January 30, 2015, Stakeholder Meeting, revisions have been made to the Submittal Requirements to reflect more of the intent of the goals.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses

**Comment 9c:** I. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, p. 13. ...I have significant concerns about a few of the procurement technicalities embedded in the document. In some cases, it was easy enough to suggest an edit or an addition. But in my opinion, this section needs to be *fixed*: There needs to be a provision for the submission of confidential information. See also the edits I made to section K, WHERE TO SUBMIT PROPOSALS in which I've added text on how to submit confidential information. Note also, that the latter section K doesn't actually say where to submit proposals. Please add that information there.

**Response 9c:** **Currently, Procurement and the City Attorney feel the existing RFP language is sufficient because it allows Offerors to request that their information remain confidential.**

**Comment 9d:** 1. Contact Information, p. 16. As written, the Phase II submittal requirements would disqualify the Alexander Group's proposal or force them to retire from the process or force them to spend the time/effort/money to create an Arizona corporation without any assurance that they would win the competition. The edits I have made here are crucial to avoiding these outcomes.

**Response 9d:** **This language has been revised so that this would not be required prior to a Offeror 's proposal being selected and development negotiations begun.**

**COMMENT SET #10**

**Comment 10a:** The draft proposal as presented seems quite complete. My one comment would be that the Mayor and Council appointed Tucson Transit Task Force should be included in the evaluation of the proposal as well as specifically mentioned in Goal D on page 5. "The project team should be committed to regular, collaborate meetings and communication with the City, *including the Tucson Transit Task Force* and other agencies and community engagement with stakeholders."

**Response 10a:** **See Response to Comment 5f. Also Section VI, "Phase II Submittal Requirements, Section 7(c) Has been revised to read "Attend meetings with City staff, Planning Commission, City Council, and other City entities as needed." The latter could include the Transit Task Force, the Historical Commission, and other such entities.**

**COMMENT SET #11**

**Comment 11a:** I understand that the RFP must follow the city procurement guidelines, but couldn't the supporting documents on the website be presented in a more exciting manner. I suggest the following documents might be good additions to the document page:

- ULI panel recommendations
- Information about the Innovation District
- Arizona Public Media METRO WEEK in depth overview as to what is happening in downtown that aired on February 6, 2015, with interviews with Jan Cervelli, Dan Gibson, director of corporate communications for Visit Tucson, and Buzz Isaacson, first vice president of CBRE
- Videos of the lively Entertainment District, Fox and Rialto theaters events, art and cultural events, restaurants and drinking establishments, interviews with downtown business owners, etc.

In fact, Integrated Planning or EDC should have an exciting and ongoing downtown development information page where any developer can find information about what is going on in downtown, as well as the studies, zoning, and tax incentives information that are already posted.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses

**Response 11a:** The comment is duly noted; the City has recently updated its website and will continue to work to make it a more compelling and inspiring place to visit and obtain information.

**Comment 11b:** Tucson can't lose this golden opportunity for developing these three parcels with exciting day and night uses, while building a state-of-the art multimodal downtown transportation center that can be adaptable for future modes of public transportation. Once bus riders arrive at the Transit Center, they become pedestrians or bikers. Any new development must be a safe and attractive gateway for pedestrian and bikers to get to their destination in the downtown civic and business areas, transfer to the Sun Link Modern Streetcar or the Historic Train Depot, and create a well-lit and safe passageway to the Entertainment District and to attend cultural events at night.

The original stakeholders meetings mentioned that the community wanted day and night used, but the Phase II RFP doesn't seem to mention this. Perhaps this could be put under Uses & Character: Nationwide, compact, walkable cities, rich with culture and entertainment options are the new places to be. Therefore strategies to make Downtown an urban neighborhood with 18-hour vibrancy (which, BTW, is the current real estate trend) is integral to it becoming a more active, busy, and fun environment and attractive to people and businesses. I would like to stress this, as one of the respondents wants to put an Assisted Living complex on the transit center site.

**Response 11b:** Section VI, "Phase II Submittal Requirements, Item 3(e) has been revised to read "Provide a narrative description of the utilization of the site and how it will be activated in both the daytime and nighttime.

**COMMENT SET #12**

**Comment 12a:** How determined are the mayor and council to go forward with a development? How much trust will they have in the judgment of the selection committee? In theory, we could get a proposal that receives a good deal of negative public comment, and that is even rejected by the selection committee, and the mayor and council could decide (or be convinced) to go forward with it. This is an obvious structural point, but what's disturbing is that, in that event, the public would not know the selection committee had been overruled until the offer was on the table. Alternatively, approval by the selection committee in the absence of a good public consensus would lead to the same result: a done deal that's not supported by those potentially most affected.

**Response 12a:** OF course, there is no way to absolutely prevent the scenarios suggested, but it is hoped that the collaboration and good faith that has been displayed to date will continue and that decisions will be made thoughtfully and prudently.

**Comment 12b:** The timelines are also of concern, especially the 90 days, as I understand it, from submittal to award. Since the proposers could withdraw after that amount of time, the City will need to complete all its evaluations, plus the public display/forum, plus the selection committee deliberation, in that window. And if major concerns are raised in the public discussion of the proposal(s), the proposers are not at liberty to make adjustments prior to formal evaluation/selection/award. Is that a correct interpretation?

**Response 12b:** The timeline has been revised, and the period between submittal to award -- i.e. announcement of an Offeror selected to continue into Development Agreement Negotiation (if an Offeror is selected), has been extended.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Phase II Request for Proposal (RFP) Process  
Comments & Responses