

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>AC-1</b> I am strongly in support of the proposal of the Alexander Company/Oasis Tucson for the Ronstadt Transit Center. I firmly believe that the present shade structure and its tile work and mature oak trees should be preserved.</p> <p>Too much of our previous (beautiful) downtown area has already been demolished and lost forever.</p>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>AC-2</b> A short comment on the Ronstadt Center redevelopment, I regularly pass by this space, so when I saw the write-up in the Star about the competing proposals, my aesthetic and practical sense leans strongly to the Alexander Team proposal. The Peach proposal seems a little overblown, under thought, and excessively expensive.</p> <p>So, anyway, I hope that the evaluation team seriously considers all aspects of each proposal and presenters and selects the one that most fits with the nature and character of the downtown area.</p>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>AC-3</b> One last comment, I love how the Alexander Group kept the arcade.</p>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>AC-4</b> After reviewing the two plans for the Ronstadt Transit Center parcel, I believe that the Alexander Team proposal is clearly better, as it preserves the beautiful, and beautifully tiled, artistic shade structure and the mature trees on site.</p> <p>I had a wonderful opportunity recently to go on an extensive tour of the UA campus with R. Brooks Jeffery, director of UA's Drachman Institute associated with the College of Architecture. he opened our eyes to the idea that great spaces is the new direction of great architecture, and suggested we all take a stroll through the shaded colonnade fronting the student housing along Highland, mentioning it as one of the best architectural treasures of the UA campus. I believe that the shaded colonnade at the Ronstadt Transit Center is extremely similar in feel, and purpose, and is much more beautiful. As such, every effort to save it should</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
be made.	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>AC-5</b> As a citizen who lives close to downtown, if development is going to occur at the Ronstadt Bus Depot, I strongly support a solution that encompasses the whole present structure as far as the brick was from a historic connection and the last thing I think we want to see in the Old Pueblo is bland redevelopment Phoenix style. *Keep the history, keep the art: Alexander team option*.</p>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>AC-6</b> Please accept this email as my support, in writing, for The Alexander Company to complete the future work at our Ronstadt Center.</p> <p>I know Melody Peters and have worked on several projects with her and her artwork should stay as a part of the Downtown transit center's history.</p>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>AC-7</b> I am strongly in support of the proposal of the Alexander Company/Oasis Tucson for the Ronstadt Transit Center. I firmly believe that the present shade structure and its tile work and mature oak trees should be preserved.</p> <p>Too much of the our previous (beautiful) downtown area has already been demolished and lost forever.</p> <p>Please - let's preserve what beauty remains in our town.</p>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>AC-8</b> Please strongly consider saving the Ronstadt Transit center's beautiful historic brick work adorned with Melody Peter's tiles. The shaded walk ways are so lovely and ARE a work of public art. They belong to the citizens of Tucson. Although I realize spaces need change with changing public needs, other communities keep a sense of beauty and historic style. It seems like yesterday when</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
Melody Peters designed and installed those tiles, yet it seems like the walkways, tile and mature trees have always been part of down town Tucson. I support the Alexander plan and hope you will too.	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<b>AC-9</b> In the Alexander proposal there is a turnstile / access gate to RTC from the 6th Ave. sidewalk. Why is this in this location? Is it to keep non-users out? If that is the case, people can access the interior of the RTC via the bus entrance / art park at 6th / Toole.	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	TRANSIT RIDER SERVICES
<b>AC-10</b> Please choose the Alexander proposal. It keeps the Ronstadt hardware store echo, the oak trees, architecture that reflects the downtown surroundings. Has multi transit center, totally needed downtown. Tucson-based firm, has respect for Tucson's unique style and can work responsively as they are based here.	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	TRANSIT RIDER SERVICES
<b>AC-11</b> After reviewing the proposals for the Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development project, I have a lot of concerns about the Alexander Group's proposal and believe their proposal must address the following questions before it can be considered a viable option.  Questions directed to the Alexander Group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You have placed a lot of emphasis on preserving the historical context of downtown by retaining the existing arcade. How exactly do you believe that keeping a structure whose historical significance is only that it is built from bricks that were originally part of the Pioneer Hotel maintains the historical feel in downtown Tucson? It seems to me that this emphasis is just political rhetoric aimed at appeasing as many viewpoints as possible, regardless of its feasibility. The brick arcade will do nothing to maintain the historical context when there is a large modern-looking building directly behind the arcade walls. Additionally, the effects from the amount heat radiating from these bricks will be more of a detriment to the residents and retail stores located in the building than the benefits of retaining the historical context if the structure remains.</li> <li>• How will personal safety issues be addressed? Preserving the arcade in front of your proposed building will create "dark"</li> </ul>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>spaces in which individuals with undesirable intentions can hide; enclosing the transit center and placing the entrance in what is essentially an alley pushes bus rider out of site and may likely encourage criminal activity. Will the proposed police station have their sources to assign an officer to full-time duty of patrolling the transit station? Because it will need one.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the purpose of incorporating a turnstile entrance concept into the design? It seems like at best this will create rider congestion at the entrances, and at worse it will be a hindrance to quickly evacuating the area in the event of any emergency.</li> <li>• Have you considered that with turnstiles you are actually discouraging mixed-mode transportation by creating a barrier for bicyclists who want to utilize both their bikes and the public transit system?</li> <li>• Your proposal states that you will improve ADA access in the area, and on the platform in particular. How exactly is a turnstile concept going to improve ADA access? If there are special doors for wheelchairs, are you planning on preventing non-wheelchair bound individuals from using these doors? If not, why not just put doors in for everyone's use?</li> <li>• If, as your proposal states, you believe that walking and bicycling are an important modes of transportation, shouldn't you have already identified the barriers to walking and biking so that the resolutions to these barriers are incorporated into your proposed plan?</li> </ul>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	SITE LAYOUT / FUNCTIONALITY / CIRCULATION
<p><b>AC-12</b></p> <p>Thank you for hosting the forum last evening. I am writing first to express my strong support for the joint project - may we have the will to move it forward in one form or another. It is tremendously good for downtown, and hence the larger Tucson community.</p> <p>I have a personal preference for the Alexander Company project, largely because of the quality of the team and their past performance both in downtown Tucson (Plaza Centro) and</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>beyond. In addition, I believe their vision for the site fits our downtown architecturally and is more realistic and achievable.</p> <p>Greatly appreciate this opportunity to express support, both as a City of Tucson resident and employer.</p>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	SITE LAYOUT / FUNCTIONALITY / CIRCULATION
<p><b>AC-13</b></p> <p>I prefer this because it keeps the transit options in one place. Having the transit station all together in an indoor space would be a great advantage during our hot weather.</p> <p>The design is thoughtful and fits into Tucson's character. More housing would be a great advantage since we have a great demand for downtown living for all ages. I support this Proposal.</p>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>AC-14</b></p> <p>The small (relative to other buildings gone up lately) scale of the buildings and the incorporation/preservation of the original tile work are a definite plus. The lineup of talent, especially Demian Clinco, was good - no women on the planning group, though. The serious drawback to this project is the penning in of the transit users: go through a turnstile, no exit, no access to retail, out of sight, out of mind. Transit is an afterthought, not the central concept, that being maximizing profits while excluding the supposedly lower-income transit users. No attempt to expand the pool of users. No public space, isolation of bus areas from the rest of the downtown. Feedback from bus drivers: difficult to navigate, restrictive entry/exit.</p> <p>Basically, a backward-looking concept, elitist and car-centric.</p>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>AC-15</b></p> <p>- The Site Plan was not as creative and inclusive as the Peach plan. The rendering of the Art Park looked eerily similar to the layout/look of the Cadence development.</p> <p>- I liked the facade/architecture of the buildings...they did fit in with the buildings on Congress and with the Historic Train Depot to the north. What I don't like is the long layout of the proposed building(s). Tucson has enough wide buildings. The consistent approx. 6 story height is tiresome...and pretty redundant for downtown Tucson. In line with the 1st bullet, the buildings look way to similar to the Cadance building...and if you've ever walked the Broadway side of the Cadance...there's not a lot of public interaction.</p> <p>Overall, I favor the Peach Properties proposal. My main suggestion would be to mix up and/or improve the architecture/facade of at least 2 of the proposed 4 buildings.</p> <p>Thank you. Artemio Hoyos</p>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>AC-16</b></p> <p>OPT/SATM suggest/request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide space in “art park” (triangle tip – SE corner Toole and 6th Ave.) for rotating historic transit vehicle display</li> <li>• Provide space in transit center (or under preserved arcade along 6th Ave.) for permanent interpretative panels on Tucson’s transit history including the reason for the Ronstadt name.</li> <li>• Provide space in rotary for permanent display of replica horse/mule-drawn streetcar on the exact location of the start of construction of Tucson’s first streetcar line by the Tucson Street Railway in November 1897.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Under slide titled “Meetings – Opportunities for Stakeholder Involvement”, OPT/SATM requests continuing input on the above suggestions/requests.</li> </ul>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>AC-17</b></p> <p>Building Massing – project could be improved greatly with the plane of the building being broken vertically and horizontally. Heard from several people that the project looked too monolithic, even institutional. If the heights and setbacks we're not continuous, that could address the monolithic problem.</p> <p>Public space-I really like the design of the outdoor space at the North end of the project, but I would much rather see that same space be on the corner of Congress and sixth rather than Toole Avenue where it is not likely to get activated as much. That solves two problems at once, allows the public to flow into the space from Congress and break the plane of the building envelope on Congress and sixth so it was not so monolithic.</p> <p>Transit area design – from the comments I heard from the bus riders, they were concerned that the feeling is going to be too claustrophobic. They also wanted to see a connection back to Congress Street. I think they have a point here. There will be no direct sunlight reaching that space.</p> <p>Transit security – police substation needs to be in full view of the transit area. Maybe could swap places with the restroom.</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>Transit roundabout on Toole. I like this idea, but I don't know what transportation is going to say. I still believe the city needs to use this opportunity to reduce the number of buses coming into downtown.</p> <p>Tool Avenue lot – failing to design this portion of the project and include it in the project cost estimates is skewing the public discussion. I heard repeatedly that the Schwabie project is not realistic because it cost so much more. I guess you can't force the developer into 100% lot coverage, but maybe the analysis of the project should come down to a cost per square foot comparison.</p> <p>Overall opinion – this project is solid, safe, and has all the political correct considerations. I feel some changes to the way the project is laid out, especially if it could be made to look like a series of buildings rather than one large structure could help its street appeal immensely.</p>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>AC-18</b></p> <p>1. What is Alexander’s contingency plan if, for any reason, the City is unable to respond fully to Alexander’s proposed cost sharing for the project or if others of the various public financing elements of the project prove to be unavailable?</p> <p>2. Please provide more detail about the type of site conveyance(s) Alexander expects to propose for the Ronstadt site(s). Given that Alexander is proposing a phased development plan, does Alexander anticipate requesting a phased conveyance of the property?</p> <p>3. Is the inclusion of Greyhound bus operations (and presumed lease revenues) a necessary element for successful project financing and positive operations cash flow?</p> <p>4. Please prepare and present graphic materials that explain Alexander’s proposed development phasing plan for the project.</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>5. What contingency plans has Alexander considered if there should be a slowdown or downturn in Tucson’s downtown real estate market?</p> <p>6. How will project design and day-to-day operations staff maintain “gated public access” at the north end of the new transit center (where it opens to Toole Avenue)?</p> <p>7. If the City and Sun Tran were to express a preference for an alternative layout and location for the on-site bus facilities, would Alexander be prepared to evaluate the feasibility of incorporating that design into its proposed project design?</p> <p>8. Alexander’s pre-qualification materials and its website make reference to its in-house architectural capabilities. What role will its staff architects play in the project?</p> <p>9. Please describe the universal access elements of the proposed project, including signage.</p> <p>10. The City is committed to the development of the Ronstadt site as a landmark property. Among its goals in this regard is that once developed, the property be an active, welcoming place in downtown. The City, downtown business people, and Tucson residents concur that site programming can be an important element of Ronstadt’s activation. How does your team propose to respond to this need?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ALEXANDER CO.</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS</p>

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>AC-19</b></p> <p>Liked the traffic circle entrance/exit and closing off to Congress. I've driven circles on the east coast--they work well enough.</p> <p>The cost projections seem low. I would like to see a realistic breakdown including how much in government incentives they are requesting. Where is the financing coming from?</p> <p>What is the time line from planning to completion?</p> <p>How will they keep the transit operations from bogging down?</p> <p>I liked the concept of using the brick arches but few people have the context about their history. If it limits the project find a way to reuse them.</p> <p>The architecture while complimentary to the existing downtown area buildings, doesn't break any new ground. It should be broken up so it doesn't present one large wall that isn't permeable visually and is inviting to pedestrians.</p> <p>Bicycle access to downtown will become more onerous from the north when downlinks are built across 7th Ave. 6th and 4th Ave. are not bicycle user friendly.</p> <p>The Peach proposal the bridge the railroad is intriguing. I like bringing more retail, restaurants, office space and market rate housing to downtown. Traffic--both projects bring more cars to downtown. It's not easy to navigate the downtown in a car when it's busy. I think the COT could help the downtown environment at night by having parking and shuttle service from Broadway Volvo.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ALEXANDER CO.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS</p>

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>AC-20</b></p> <p>Much more restrained aesthetically. I think it could be more expressive to communicate its multiple uses. Not sold on the historical references. Not sure if references are really even necessary. Historical sensitivity isn't about making something look old. It's about carefully expanding on established ideas and patterns that have proven successful over time.</p> <p>Transit portion seems too segregated. Placing it under the structure may be a good way to mitigate solar exposure, but it starts to suggest a less than pleasing parking garage experience. Add to this the size and scale required with the consolidation of the transit and greyhound buses.</p> <p>Would have liked to have seen more creative use/types of outdoor space and pedestrian experiences.</p> <p>Art park is nice, but seems disconnected from overall scheme.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ALEXANDER CO.</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS</p>
<p><b>AC-21</b></p> <p>Alexander plan don't like that it is an out of town company once more taking jobs from local people.</p> <p>They est. 800-1200 buses per day at Ronstadt if understood them correctly.</p> <p>They have cleverly brought on board people from the community that may have been part of the planning processes in their design.</p> <p>Will have to use energy to help deal with the pollution from the buses as it will be "underground" with all those buses running (seems like it would be more of a health hazard for people with lung problems and perhaps help cause lung problems).</p> <p>How will cars get in/out of garage without interfering with buses?</p> <p>Think the traffic circle is a poor idea with the amount of buses that will have to use it and that there may not be enough space or</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>will take too much space to accomplish it.</p> <p>What happens to the current building structures around the area of that circle?</p> <p>3 bikes/ bus could happen without this plan</p> <p>Ronstadt as they envision it not economically viable as a stand-alone project so they will be depending on public funding (again). City will have to bear the cost of infrastructure when we don't even have the monies for many other projects and obligations in the city. The infrastructure of DT is old and would have to be made up to "code". Very expensive for the city.</p> <p>For the amount of sales tax this might bring in it would take many years to recover the expense of the public monies put into it.</p> <p>Again what happens to the buses transit during construction period. What is est. of construction period?</p> <p>Prevents people from being in the bus center if not taking bus. Again limits easy access to people who take buses from DT businesses.</p> <p>Is the current opening onto 6th to be moved to another location on 6th. How will that affect the Ronstadt wall? Will the wall remain as part of the project and in what form? (See Peach comments about wall.) It should not be torn down period.</p>		
<p>Trash receptacles will be far away from the businesses and will have to be walked to through the bus center areas. Dangerous for the workers. Trash trucks will have to have access to pick up trash. How will that be scheduled so it does not interfere with the buses?</p> <p>Did not answer how bike/ped will access from N off 6th.</p> <p>food trucks in alley - seems there will not be room for them with so much having to be taken by buildings.</p> <p>Will the entrance only be from the East side? Again this would limit easy access to bus riders.</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>Unknown if rooms will be rental or owner occupied since they will be expensive.</p> <p>300 parking spaces. Again how will cars access them with the buses there?</p> <p>How would grey water and water harvesting be used on this site?</p> <p>50% open to air at the ends of building, vents through buildings. We see how that works at the Library with the need for energy use to move the air. Sound from buses trapped underground. What happens in an earthquake with all that structure set on top of empty space?</p> <p>Longer walk to access Sun Link as well as other areas West of the site.</p> <p>How will closing Pennington effect access to Marshall building, Maynard's, and Congress Hotel?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ALEXANDER CO.</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS</p>
<p><b>AC-22</b> Not my preferred solution.</p> <p>I am impressed with the amount of similar projects they have completed. But the fact still remains, Unique Tucson is not that city. And I reviewed their listing of professionals previously on their website, and now, there still exists insufficient architectural designers in their group then and now esp. with local flavor &amp; talent.</p> <p>And my complaint for some time, is the insistence by our clients that architects only qualify for a project ONLY IF they have</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>completed hundreds of the same type of project. No freshness is allowed to happen. Architects are taught to DESIGN, addressing new design each time with freshness applicable to the current project, and not copying the last one.</p> <p>Their project has the design intent of a mixture of their last few projects, not applicable to this one esp with an ENCLOSED TRANSIT STATION--not in Tucson.</p> <p>My comments above numbered 2,4,6 &amp; 8 are applicable to this presenter.</p> <p>a. The problem with retaining the Arcade totally, there is insufficient room for extensive trees in front of the Arcade. The Arcade does block the visibility of any other tenants along the streetscape.</p> <p>b. It was halfway thru the presentation that I finally understood the transit area is an enclosed building--I am not fan of this concept.</p> <p>c. Graphics lacking--at least provide power point slides of the individual renderings, if not 3-D.</p> <p>d. The lacking of "architectural sense" (I am not bias) was missing from the presentation. I no idea of the architectural character of the presentation with little architectural verbal or enlarged renderings.</p> <p>e. Though I like the idea of just traffic on Toole as noted before, the circle and angled bus parking appears to slow down the boarding and bus traffic--which just make travel time even worse than it is now with these large buses in Downtown.</p> <p>f. I have been in New York's Penn station--the amount of tall, spacious environment is not available here--too cramped of a site to pull the NY concept off unfortunately.</p>	<b>ALEXANDER CO.</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>PP-1</b> No, No, and No to the Peach Properties proposal.</p> <p>To demolish this attractive and inviting brick structure with 2500 feet of extraordinary custom designed handmade tilework 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.</p> <p>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</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>PP-2</b> Thank you for the opportunity to share my opinions regarding the Ronstadt Center Development.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The outdoor urban spaces in the Peach scheme are set in a clear hierarchy. This hierarchy enables clear wayfinding. 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.</p> <p>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</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>PP-3</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>PP-4</b></p> <p>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!?</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>PP-5</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>PP-6</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 very forward-thinking and would align us with the advancements in place in other parts of the country but currently absent from our community.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<b>PP-7</b> Peach Properties is the superior design, hands down.	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	PROJECT COSTS / FUNDING
<p><b>PP-8</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I'm not informed about the business end of the proposals, so I cannot comment.</p> <p>(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.)</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>PP-9</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>PP-10</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>PP-11</b></p> <p>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.</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>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.</p> <p>Thanks 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.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>PP-12</b> Better late than... Neither amazes but this one tries harder. [Note: A rendering from the Peach Properties proposal was inserted after this sentence.]</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>PP-13</b> 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.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>PP-14</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>PP-15</b> From the illustration provided by PEACH [<a href="https://www.tucsonaz.gov/files/integrated-planning/Presentation_no_animations.pdf-23/70">https://www.tucsonaz.gov/files/integrated-planning/Presentation_no_animations.pdf-23/70</a>] 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?</p> <p>Where are buses / passengers going to go to use buses during construction?</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	SITE LAYOUT / FUNCTIONALITY / CIRCULATION
<p><b>PP-16</b> We have an issue with the placement of the Greyhound Station in the Peach proposal.</p> <p>Specifically, placing the Greyhound station at 5th Ave. and 7th St.</p> <p>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 was a marked decrease in those activities. We</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>don't want to increase the problems we've fought so long and hard against to come back.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
is what's needed in my opinion.	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	SITE LAYOUT / FUNCTIONALITY / CIRCULATION
<b>PP-17</b> I like the Peach Properties plan for Ronstadt Center.	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<b>PP-18</b> 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.	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<b>PP-19</b> 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.  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.	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<b>PP-20</b> 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.		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>This design brightens up the Sixth Avenue side which seems like that energy would anchor future development northward from there.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>PP-21</b> I strongly favor the proposal submitted by Peach Properties.</p> <p>However, a few aspects of that plan seem problematic to me:</p> <p>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").</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>PP-22</b> As a business owner and property owner on 4th Avenue for the last 20+ years, I would like to provide 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</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>location is "under construction".</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS</p>
<p><b>PP-23</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>transportation hubs like Grand Central Station in New York or Union Station in Washington. This project will not benefit from a "safe" approach.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Both proposals have merit, but this is really the time for Tucson to make a great plan for a great public space.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>PP-24</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Looking forward to these improvements!</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>PP-25</b></p> <p>I'm in favor of the Peach Watermark plan</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>PP-26</b></p> <p>I wanted to vote for the Peach Watermark team for the Ronstadt Transit remodel.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>PP-27</b></p> <p>The Peach proposal is realistic and is backed by a team of people who know what they are doing. Peach all the way.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>PP-28</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>PP-29</b></p> <p>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 .</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b></p>	<p>GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS</p>
<p><b>PP-30</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b></p>	<p>GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS</p>

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>PP-31</b></p> <p>The Site Plan was top-notch. Very well thought out. I loved the 2 public plazas, pocket park, dog park, public market, and the streetscape. It involved high quality transit and pedestrian accessibility, aesthetically pleasing, and incorporated property on the other side of the tracks, which I thought was cool and clever. That concept connects the 2 areas similar to the way the 4th Ave. Underpass does.</p> <p>- The renderings and design of the buildings were neat and fresh. Tucson really needs some height in its buildings and getting to or surpassing 10 floors would be a HUGE deal to many of us. 10 floors has not been built in Tucson since 1986. That's a loooong time and having a development in downtown to finally reach that is important. So I love the idea of a 12 story building...wish it could be more...but I'll take it. I like the idea of having 4 separate buildings...all mix-use, yet allows separation of certain functions. The building proposed for the corner of Congress/6th is at an appropriate height considering the other buildings near it. The one thing that I didn't like about the design/renderings of the buildings was the redundant look (facade) of all 4. It would be a bit much for any city...so for the folks here in Tucson, it would cause many some heartache. Perhaps the 2 buildings on the most north and south be a different design and the 2 in the middle have the current rendering...just a thought. Secondly, the yellow. That's a lot of yellow in the renderings.</p>	<p><b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b></p>	<p>GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS</p>
<p><b>PP-32</b></p> <p>OPT/SATM suggest/request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Provide historic interpretative panels along the bridge regarding Tucson's transit history including the reason for the Ronstadt name.</li> <li>• Provide space in either the north or south plaza for rotating historic transit vehicle display.</li> </ul>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>PP-33</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Outdoor market – I like this idea conceptually, but wonder how successful it will be in that location.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Open space – thought this was a much better place open space in the Campbell/Alexander project, and liked the fact that it was</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>being activated by retail restaurants and overlooked by housing. Would like to see more shade however.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS</p>
<p><b>PP-34</b></p> <p>1. What is Peach's contingency plan if, for any reason, the various public financing elements of the project prove to be unavailable?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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?</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>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.</p> <p>5. Please describe the universal access elements of the proposed project, including signage.</p> <p>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?</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>PP-35</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>PP-36</b> Liked the architectural concept --but it's concept that costs a lot. Will another hotel work year around downtown?</p> <p>The egress/ ingress from Congress and Bus Mall seems to not solve traffic issues. Creates more.</p> <p>The bridge is an interesting idea but seems likely to be cut when project costs become real.</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>Where is the financing coming from?</p> <p>What is the time line from planning to completion? How will Peach keep the transit operations from bogging down?</p> <p>What COT incentives will Peach request?</p> <p>What bonds will both companies need to post to start work? What consequences will there be if they fall drastically off schedule?</p> <p>I liked the improved services for bus riders in both proposals.</p>	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>PP-37</b></p> <p>Consideration of pedestrian linkage to development along N 6th Ave across train tracks to future greyhound station is thoughtful.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Nod to alternative modes of travel very thoughtful (bike and car sharing, shuttles &amp; taxi).</p> <p>Not sure how historical context is addressed. I see connectivity and scale as the bigger concern.</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>PP-38</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>While we are on the Peach plan here are some notes/question taken the night of the presentation about that plan.</p> <p>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</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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 motivated 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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>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). Swimming pool -- another not future thinking in terms of how to use our precious water.</p> <p>Walgreen's. ha, ha, Walgreen's abandoned DT long ago. And now Walgreen's only want to have buildings that have drive-in access to their businesses. This is sky pie.</p> <p>256 apartment units. Will people be willing to walk north across the railroad tracks to their cars?</p> <p>One does not even know yet if Gibson's grocery store is going to be able to make a go of it and already competition is suggested. There were grocery stores DT and they failed, how can adding on even more grocery stores help the Gibson's stay in business. This not diversity thinking.</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>There are only two good feature of this plan. The thought of open space but they also plan to remove the current trees to remake the area. And with all they plan for the area how can they even have much open space? And the buses being open to the air for nature to help with the pollution and noise but being in the canyon it would be in would be a problem.</p> <p>This space is too small for all they have proposed. They need to go start another DT center somewhere else.</p> <p>They depend too much on outside monies to make their very expensive project happen. And they don't seem to have handled on the true cost of things.</p> <p>Again what happens to the buses and the transit center during this construction time of est. 2 years with maybe over runs of time?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS</p>
<p><b>PP-39</b></p> <p>Very impressive, this is my preferred solution, my favorite project:</p> <p>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.)</p> <p>Of course, my comments:</p> <p>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,</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>blocking the new business frontage from view.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>8. The pedestrian level surface materials, colors, textures are of course excellent idea and in the RN design elements. I am still</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
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.	<b>PEACH PROPERTIES</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>Both-1</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Take Care! Curb your enthusiasm Please. I have been so sad to see my City destroyed.</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>Both-2</b></p> <p>I want to tell you how exciting it is to see the proposals for the Ronstadt Transit Center.</p> <p>I like the Peach Properties "park-like" feeling to bring a town-center feeling to that area.</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>Both-3</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>General Comments:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>bb. Retail businesses:</p> <p>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.</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):	OFFEROR	CATEGORY
<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
<p><b>Both-4</b></p> <p>A few comments on the Ronstadt Transit Center development proposals presented by Peach Properties and the Alexander Company week before last.</p> <p>Any redeveloped transit center needs to have a social services element incorporated into it. Currently social services are spread out all over the city, which makes them impractical to access. Having at least a representative of each local social service agency at the transit center would do a world of good. It would also make the transit center serve as a destination in and of itself. This would draw people into your retail and dining establishments you plan on incorporating. It's an obvious win-win.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
use the local bus service to see the sights I'm going to do that.	<b>BOTH</b>	<b>USES &amp; PARKING</b>
<p><b>Both-5</b> Please pass on the following for comment by the proposing companies for the RTC project.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>How do you imagine those integrations working with your current plan?</p> <p>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?</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	<b>USES &amp; PARKING</b>
<p><b>Both-6</b> 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 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</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	TRANSIT RIDER SERVICES
<p><b>Both-7</b></p> <p>Of the two proposal teams I believe The Alexander Company had the stronger presentation. I've arrived at this conclusion for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4. Alexander Companies professionalism was apparent in terms of its transparent presentation of its budget. Peach Properties was</li> </ol>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>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.</p> <p>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!</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>Both-8</b></p> <p>1. Include rental housing for elderly and low-income households (less than 80 percent AMI)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than two-thirds will be by renter households with nearly one-quarter of that demand composed of elderly households.</li> <li>• More than two-thirds are projected to be below-moderate income households earning less than 80 percent AMI.</li> </ul> <p>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</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	TRANSIT RIDER SERVICES

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>Both-9</b> If the two could alter their plans or mix &amp; match that would be great!</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>Both-10</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>So you can probably guess that my vote, if I had one, would go to the peach! I hope the city agrees.</p>	<p><b>BOTH</b></p>	<p>GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS</p>
<p><b>Both-11</b> My comments to the presentations are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>5. I'm concerned about the Alexander Company's architecture. While pragmatic and simple, it could be more sophisticated.</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>Both-12</b></p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>Both-13</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>This town needs projects that are COMPLETED not more visions of what could be.</p> <p>Tucson’s obligation to the homeless needs to be addressed apart from the Ronstadt center.</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>Both-14</b></p> <p>Project purposes and goals - GOAL A The project should incorporate (1) a transit center with similar or improved services,....</p> <p>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!</p> <p>Goal A - paragraph 2 The project should incorporate community open space....</p> <p>The ALEXANDER proposal, as I recall, stated that to gain access to</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>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!</p> <p>Goal A - paragraph 3 The design of the project...offers architecture responsive to the urban historic fabric....</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>Both-15</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>Both-16</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>On another note: Thriving downtowns around the country generally have a thriving art center downtown, as well. Tucson</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>Both-17</b> I know I'm late, but.... PLEASE - getting rid of shade trees in the desert is crazy. Please don't allow it!</p>	<b>BOTH</b>	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>Both-18</b> 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!</p> <p>I do like the Alexander exterior. It definitely looks more Tucson.</p> <p>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!</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>		

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p>Marriott basically across the street from the RTC.</p> <p>I don't like the "underground cavern" aspect of the Alexander proposal for the bus bays.</p> <p>I don't like the "up to 12 stories" aspect of the Peach proposal.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	BOTH	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>Both-19</b></p> <p>I am very concerned that the arcade artwork and the trees might be demolished in this development.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	BOTH	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>Both-20</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	BOTH	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>Both-21</b></p> <p>Neither presentation clarifies public monies for site/construction or operating/maintaining the facility. Can you offer clarification?</p>	BOTH	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project  
Staff Compiled, Categorized Emailed Question/Comments

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (transcribed from Emails received between July 23 and August 3, 2015):</b>	<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
<p><b>City-1</b> I know it's too late and probably others have commented on guarantees. How will the COT ensure that whatever project is selected will be built out close to the design presented? No major changes, no elimination of major elements, no last minute we didn't anticipate this so we have to cut back. No Bourn excuses. Will the COT retain the right to pull the plug on the project if the developer can't perform as presented? Will the COT set a timeline for the project to start and finish and for penalties if the developers do not perform to their schedule and promises? The Hub at Main Gate is an example of a project that had major changes that were caught by the WUNA rep after the fact and the remedy does not work. Hope you had a relaxing weekend.</p>	CITY OF TUCSON	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>City-2</b> I have a question about the process from here out. It was my understanding that the meeting on weds night was to see the two final proposals. It sounds like now those proposals could be radically changed. Is that correct. Also, are comments public record? Is there an opportunity to express thoughts or concerns directly to the committee charged with making the recommendation on who to choose!</p>	CITY OF TUCSON	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS
<p><b>City-3</b> If my understanding is correct it's possible that the final project might not look anything like what was shown at the meeting last week. Am I correct?</p>	CITY OF TUCSON	GENERAL / MULTIPLE TOPICS