

**Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Phase II Request for Proposals (RFP)
Stakeholder Meeting February 25, 2015 / 11:30 am – 1:00 pm / City Hall**

MEETING SUMMARY

Prepared by Rebecca Ruopp, Office of Integrated Planning, February 27, 2015

ATTENDEES

Twenty-nine (29) people signed in for this meeting (excluding staff noted below). A copy of names and affiliations is provided as *Attachment A*.

CITY STAFF PRESENT

Nicole-Ewing Gavin, Office of Integrated Planning
Rebecca Ruopp, Office of Integrated Planning
Maria Gayosso, Office of Integrated Planning (to provide Spanish translation if needed)
Becky Flores, Office of Integrated Planning
Carlos de Leon, Department of Transportation

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Brief Overview for New Participants
3. Comments Received on Draft Phase II Request for Proposals (RFP)
4. Proposed Revisions to RFP & Discussion
5. Next Steps

Agenda Item #1: Welcome & Introductions

Rebecca Ruopp, acting as facilitator, welcomed everyone, and then each participant introduced her or himself.

Agenda Item #2, #3, & #4: Brief Overview, Comments Received, and Proposed Revisions

Rebecca Ruopp narrated a PowerPoint that addressed Items #2 and #3. For Item #4, Proposed Revisions to RFP, Rebecca showed the PowerPoint slides, but generally focused on a page-by-page review of the actual RFP document, which was provided as a handout. [NOTE: Both the PowerPoint and the Revised Phase II RFP are available on the Office of Integrated Planning website at <http://www.tucsonaz.gov/integrated-planning/ronstadt-transit-center-joint-development>.]

Discussion: Following are notes from the meeting discussion, which were originally recorded on flipcharts by Nicole Ewing-Gavin. (Note: These have been edited slightly for readability.)

Clarify if Federal Transit Administration (FTA) information provided in the Phase II RFP is verbatim or summarized.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Phase II Request for Proposals (RFP)
Stakeholder Meeting February 25, 2015 / 11:30 am – 1:00 pm / City Hall
Meeting Summary *continued*

- Staff has sent FTA its calculation of \$7 million as FTA funds invested in RTC, and is awaiting a response from FTA.
- When will appraisal of RTC be done? Participant suggested that proposers may need to know this for the design phase.
- In reference to Section V Instructions to Offerors, E 8., participant noted that an Offeror is not likely to know subcontractors needed.
- In reference to Section V Instructions to Offerors, I. Confidential Information, participant stated that Offerors are private companies, which should be considered in the handling of the “financial capability” and “the deal” information. Noted that in other cities proposals are sent in two envelopes [one with financial information that is entrusted to City for limited internal review – e.g., City treasurer evaluates financial capability on City’s behalf]. *[Note: Staff asked whether the participant might provide some examples of how “confidentiality” was treated in RFPs prepared by other jurisdictions.]*
- Suggestion that “universal design” be included in Section VI Phase II Submittal Requirements, 3 (j).
- Suggestion that in addition to the word “safety,” the word “security” be included in Section VI Phase II Submittal Requirements, 3 (g).
- In reference to above, there was a question as to what was meant by “security.” Several participants contributed their sense of the meaning -- “keeping everyone feeling safe,” focusing on “safe by design” (e.g., eyes on the street; active programming vs. police presence).
- Suggestion that in Section VI Phase II Submittal Requirements, under 3. Project Description, ongoing facility/open space management should be separated out as an important issue.
- Question about if and how collateral damage from development (e.g., damage to surrounding infrastructure) would be addressed. [Staff responded that such issues should be addressed through the Development Agreement negotiations.]
- Under Section VI. Phase II Submittal Requirements, 3.(k), suggested that list of modes be re-ordered to put “pedestrian and bicycle access” first to emphasize the importance of access for these modes being maintained along with the maintenance of vehicular access.
- Question re Section VI Submittal Requirements, 3. (k): “Who will enforce Construction Mitigation Plan?”
- Question as to the meaning of “taxis” in Section VI Submittal Requirements, 4. (b) iii. Wondered, for instance, if it could include private shuttles.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Phase II Request for Proposals (RFP)
Stakeholder Meeting February 25, 2015 / 11:30 am – 1:00 pm / City Hall
Meeting Summary *continued*

- Question as to whether consideration had been given to including Greyhound in the RFP. Some discussion among participants about intermodal connectivity needing to be considered in conjunction with this project. *[Staff noted that where Greyhound ultimately located would be a decision made by Greyhound not the City.]*
- Comment about how viewsheds would become more limited as the site was built up and suggestion made that perhaps consideration could be given to elevated open space for views (e.g., rooftops).
- In response to the previous comment, a participant shared the opinion that the community open space called for in the RFP seemed as if was the place to concentrate in terms of publicly accessible open space since areas such rooftops were more likely to be private.
- Comment about the importance of considering transit expansion capacity in conjunction with the project.
- Opinion expressed that revisions to the Section VI Phase II Submittal Requirements, 7. Public Participation, seemed extensive given that there had been a lengthy public participation effort to date. Wasn't sure what was being asked for. Was some discussion among participants, including suggestion that major design changes should be subject to public review, and that there should be regular avenues of communication through the development process.
- Question as to whether 10 years was long enough in the requirement for a "10-year operation pro forma" referenced in Section VI Phase II Submittal Requirements, Section VI Phase II Submittal Requirements, 8. c (v).
- Several participants stated that the process was too rushed; should be slowed down. One participant noted that part of the public participation effort has been educating stakeholders.
- In response to a question about ongoing maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure, staff explained that such responsibilities would be addressed in the Development Agreement.

Agenda Item #5: Next Steps: Next steps were reviewed as part of the discussion regarding the Revised Phase II RFP. In summary, comments on the revised RFP can be provided through 9 a.m., Monday, March 2. These will be taken into account as staff makes final revisions to the Phase II RFP. Mayor and Council will consider the Phase II RFP in Executive Session on Tuesday, March 3, and if they direct staff to proceed with the RFP, it is currently scheduled to be published on Monday, March 9, 2015. Subsequent steps are included in the estimated schedule presented on page 2 of the Revised Phase II RFP.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Phase II Request for Proposals (RFP)
Stakeholder Meeting February 25, 2015 / 11:30 am – 1:00 pm / City Hall
Meeting Summary *continued*

ATTACHMENT A

Note: Following are names and affiliations of meeting participants who signed in. This does not include City staff, who are noted on first page of Meeting Summary.

Name	Affiliation
Donald Ijams	Tucsonans Residents for Responsive Government
Hillary Turby	The Planning Center
Richard Mayers	
Chris Gans	West University Neighborhood Association
Allen Benz	Tucson Bus Riders Union
Barbara Brookhart	
Brian Flagg	Tucson Bus Riders Union
Barbie Urias	Tucson Bus Riders Union
Cesar Aguirre	Tucson Bus Riders Union
Cezar Glez	Tucson Bus Riders Union
Diana Amado	Ward 6 Council Office
Gene Caywood	Transit Task Force
Gene Einfrank	Downtown Neighborhoods and Residents Council
Gilbert Contreras	Tucson Bus Riders Union
Jan Cervelli	University of Arizona & Downtown Partnership
Jim Thomas	Tucson Bus Riders Union
Jim Campbell	Oasis Tucson
Jim Hannan	Friends of Sun Tran
Jimmy Ojeda	Tucson Bus Riders Union
Maria Cadaxa	Tucson Bus Riders Union
Les Pierce	Arroyo Chico Neighborhood Association
Leticia Valenzuela	Tucson Metropolitan Chamber
Michael Keith	Downtown Partnership (Downtown Business Owner)
Robert Kaye	Sentinel Peak Ventures, LLC (Real Estate Development)
Ron Spark	
Suzanne Schafer	Bus Riders Union
Tony Ford	Downtown Innovation District
Matt Kopec	Ward 3 Council Office
William Greenway	Downtown Tucson Partnership