CITY OF TUCSON

Office of Integrated Planning

Re: **Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project**
Written Comments Received on Draft Request for Proposals (RFP), Phase II

Compiled by: **Rebecca Ruopp, Principal Planner**

Date Posted: **February 20, 2015**

At the Stakeholder Meeting of January 30, 2015, a draft of the RFP for Phase II of the RTC Joint Development Project was distributed and discussed. Comments recorded at that meeting are posted as a separate document. This pdf document includes written comments on the Draft RFP for Phase II that were received during the January 30, 2015, to February 9, 2015, comment period.

A list of commenters and the dates comments were received is provided below.

Commenter & Affiliation *(if provided)*	**Date Received** *(Note: All comments were received via email.)*
Allen Benz, *Tucson Bus Riders Union*	1/31/15
Laura Tabili, *Co-Chair, Downtown Neighborhoods & Residents Council*	2/2/15
Marilyn Robinson	2/3/15
Brian Flagg, *Tucson Bus Riders Union*	2/5/15
Jim Hannan, *Bus Friends Forever*	2/6/15
Tony Ford, *Chair, Downtown Innovation District* & Justin Williams, *CEO, Startup Tucson*	2/6/15
Don Ijams	2/6/15
Les Pierce	2/6/15
Robert Kaye	2/8/15
Margot Garcia, *Tucson Transit Task Force*	2/8/15
Barbara Brookhart	2/9/15
Suzanne Schafer	2/9/15

149 N. Stone Avenue, 2nd floor, Tucson, AZ 85701 • Mailing: PO Box 27210, Tucson, AZ 85726-7210
Phone: (520) 791-4675 • Email: integrated-planning@tucsonaz.gov • Website: tucsonaz.gov/integrated-planning

attachment follows

Rebecca Ruopp - Ronstadt Draft Summary document handed out 1-30-2015

From: Allen Benz <acaseofthebenz@gmail.com>
To: <Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>
Date: 1/31/2015 5:59 PM
Subject: Ronstadt Draft Summary document handed out 1-30-2015
Attachments: RONSTADT TRANSIT CENTER - JOINT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.doc

Attached please find document with questions, comments, etc.

Allen Benz
(Tucson Bus Riders Union)

Benz Attachment 1
Attachment = 2 pgs.

RONSTADT TRANSIT CENTER
JOINT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS - PHASE II

Preliminary Draft Text - January 30, 2015

Comments, questions, etc.

III. Project Purpose & Goals

Goal A: Uses & Character

Para 1 (3) ...public open space - define term as used in this document.

Para 2 define:

Urban in character
Well integrated with surrounding uses
Natural features
Clearly responsible entity in charge

Para 3 The entire paragraph sounds like its main focus is art and culture. This is supposedly a document dealing with the Ronstadt TRANSIT Center, NOT a proposed Ronstadt Art & Culture Center. A suggested revision would be:

The design of the project SHALL create a signature destination that integrates the ***needs*** of *transit users*, local downtown businesses, adjacent properties and downtown neighborhoods. [define term - "downtown neighborhoods" Is "The Cadence" a neighborhood? Is "The Herbert" a neighborhood? Armory Park? Iron Horse?] The project SHOULD show some sensitivity to the arts and recognize the community's cultural diversity, include sustainable/ environmentally sensitive design, activate the streetscape, [define the phrase] and offer architecture responsive to the urban historic fabric and views. Architectural renderings presented by the Offeror SHOULD be reviewed by a group from the University of Arizona School of Architecture consisting of faculty, undergraduate and graduate students. This could be a class / semester project for them.

Goal B: Transportation and Infrastructure

Para 1 Revise - The project should be....
- The project SHALL be....

Para 2 Revise - The project should incorporate....
- The project SHALL incorporate....

Para 3 Revise - The project should enhance the physical infrastructure
- The project SHALL enhance the physical infrastructure

Para 4 Revise - The project should provide pedestrian....

Benz Attachment 2

- The project SHALL provide pedestrian....

Goal C: Financial and Economic Vitality

Revise - The project should be delivered....

- The project SHALL be delivered....

Goal D: Communication and participation

Revise - The project team should be committed....

- The project team SHALL be committed....

V Instructions to Offerors

Definitions of Key Words Used In The Solicitation

Shall, Will, Must - Indicates a mandatory requirement. Failure to meet... may...result in the rejection of a proposal as non-responsive.

Tabili 1 of 1
attachments follow

From: "Tabili, Laura - (tabili)" <tabili@email.arizona.edu>
To: "OIP@tucsonaz.gov" <OIP@tucsonaz.gov>
CC: "burdenelizabeth@gmail.com" <burdenelizabeth@gmail.com>, "rebecca.ruopp@...
Date: 2/2/2015 9:24 PM
Subject: Ronstadt Center: Downtown Neighborhoods & Residents Council statements
Attachments: Ronstadt Position Statement_version 2_final.pdf; RTC Downtown Neighborhoods andResidents Council position statement.pdf; DNaRC Position Paper 3 on Ronstadt Transit Center.pdf

Dear OIP and Rebecca,

Please find three position papers on Ronstadt Center development produced by the Downtown Neighborhoods & Residents Council of the Downtown Partnership.

Laura Tabili
Co-Chair, Downtown Neighborhoods & Residents Council

Tabili Attachment A1

Attachment A = 4 pgs.

Downtown Neighborhoods and Residents Council (DNaRC) Position Statement on Ronstadt Transit Center Site "Redevelopment"

The present is the fulcrum of the promises of the past and the possibilities of the future.

Introduction

The Ronstadt Transit Center (RTC) is a unique and valuable resource for downtown, downtown neighborhoods and other stakeholders, and the metro Tucson residents. Since 1997, the RTC has functioned as a transit hub, bringing individuals downtown for work and play, and reducing pollution and traffic congestion.

Downtown neighborhoods individually, and DNaRC as a representative committee, have an interest in a successful transit system. **DNaRC believes the assumption held by some interests that the RTC is underutilized and should (or needs to) be redeveloped is incorrect.** DNARC asserts that the highest and best use of the land is as a city-wide transportation hub, a PUBLIC space. This is not based on a hunch; it's based on both local community input as well as national best practice. (See, for example, "Public Transit is Worth Way More Than You Might Think, Atlantic Cities, August 14, 2013.)

Any plan for the RTC needs to present a long-term vision for an integrated multi-modal transportation center/system. **Any proposed retail/commercial uses to be added to the site must serve the needs of transit riders *and* provide short- and long-term revenue for the transit system** (Federal Transit System Administration, *Guidance on Joint Development Circular* [proposed], 2013, p. II-3).

Although the City of Tucson has undertaken a community planning process of sorts, it is premature for the Mayor and Council to issue a request for qualifications. In the near term, it is difficult to predict the future of downtown and its transit needs; Downtown Links, Sunlink/Modern Streetcar, and other transportation projects will change the traffic and transit patterns. Moving forward quickly with changes to the RTC may lead to unforeseen consequences; mistakes are likely to be cast in concrete, which will be difficult—if not impossible--to change.

Additional steps need to be taken prior to issuing an RFQ, with priority given to a larger, more inclusive public process. Accurate and complete data are necessary to support any decision, and need to be gathered *before* any RFQ is issued. A survey of current and potential transit users is key, along with the collection of new data on current bus usage (and limitations). An RFQ should not be developed until after Sun Tran's Operational Study is complete, the streetcar is operational, and additional community participatory planning is conducted to develop specific project/site goals.

Tabili Attachment A2

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

Response to Community Planning Report (Poster Frost Mirto, May 2013)

DNaRC commends the city for conducting a review of previous plans and for soliciting preliminary community input on the future of the Ronstadt Transit Center.

We believe that the report mischaracterizes the current climate as "emerging consensus" for redevelopment. Language is key: redevelopment is defined as "any new *construction* on a site that has pre-existing uses." We do not believe there is consensus regarding redevelopment; in fact, our view is that **RTC is not in need of redevelopment--it is in need of upgrade and expansion to improve its functioning as a regional transit center for the best use for riders of current and future bus routes, the streetcar, and intercity train.**

The emphasis in the report on mixed-use seems to be aimed at making downtown more profitable and attractive to consumers as opposed to making the Ronstadt a space that enhances community experience and utility. There is *not* consensus on purpose; commerce-oriented outcomes (private interest) is what often comes to the forefront; DNaRC is opposed to a vision that privileges private inurement—that is, that puts private uses and private gain over the quality use of the public space for the purposes for which it was intended.

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

The report presented several potential project goals. DNaRC views and comments on each are provided in the table below.

Tabili Attachment A3

Proposed Goal (from RTC Community Planning Report)	*Support*	*Neutral*	*Oppose*
Ongoing dialogue and negotiation between Sun Tran, the City of Tucson, and developers, and the affected [downtown] neighborhoods	•		
Evolution from "transit" center to "transportation" center with accommodations for buses, the Modern Streetcar, bicycle and bikeshare, pedestrians, car-share, vans, shuttles, taxis, and other forms of transportation	•		
Work closely and slowly with Sun Tran	•		
Satisfy Sun Tran needs	•		
Significant improvement in level of service, efficiency, quality, amenities, comfort, and convenience so that development can be a "win" for transit users	•		
Open urban space useful to the community	•		
Open urban space useful to the community and integrated into an active well-used commercial setting			•
Maintain historic urban fabric and involve Tucson Pima County Historic Commission in the design process	•		
Exciting architecture with a strong connedion to Tucson	•		
Heavy involvement of the arts in development		•	
Development driven by feasibility of land uses in the marketplace			•

Mixed Use	Depends on the use:		
Supporting transit and transit riders	•		
(e.g., Sun Tran office at which passes can b e purchased on site)			
Creating more public space	•		
Private spaces/ private commercial			•
Land use to go to:	Depends on the use:		
Market-rate housing			•
Commercial/retail			•
Public health		•	
Food		•	
Open space	•		
Adequate parking		•	
Workforce housing	•		
Educational		•	
Care and protection for [existing] downtown businesses	•		
Involvement of [existing] merchants in developing the site	•		
Involvement of bus riders in developing the site	•		
Improved ability of the City of Tucson to develop better documents that include milestones, timelines, and deliverables and protect the public's interest in the site	•		
Developers with public/private partnership experience that demonstrate a commitment to transparency, consensus building, and strong/positive government relationships			
A two-stage process for the selection of developers: stage one would be request for qualifications (RFQ), and stage two would be request for proposals (RFP); deliberate—not fast—timeline for RFQ/RFP (September - November 2013 for stage one, January-April 2014 for stage 2) with a public review process	Oppose at this point; it is too early in process to issue an RFQ		
Pre-leasing and incentives (programmatic, financial, political, regulatory) to the public sector to reduce risk	Any leasing must be clearly tied to public benefit; any revenues received from leases must be used directly for support and improvement of transit system. Any joint/commercial development should raise additional direct revenue for the transit system (not the general fund), enhance system ridership, and benefit public transit.		

Tabili Attachment A4

Works Cited

Jaffe, Eric. "Public Transit is Worth Way More Than You Might Think," Atlantic Cities (14 August 2013).

Federal Transit System Administration, *Guidance on Joint Development Circular* [proposed], 2013.

"Notice of Final Agency Guidance on the Eligibility of Joint Development Improvements Under Federal Transit," 72 Federal Register 25 (07 February 2007), 5778- 5794.

About DNaRC

A standing committee of the Downtown Tucson Partnership, the Downtown Neighborhoods and Residents Council (DNaRC) is comprised of the leadership of ten mixed-income neighborhoods, representing nearly 10,000 households. By living in and near downtown, these renters, homeowners, and property owners have made an investment in the social, civic, and economic well-being of downtown Tucson. DNaRC is committed to the ongoing prosperity of downtown and surrounding neighborhoods.

DNaRC serves as a conduit for downtown area neighborhoods and residents to stay informed about current and future plans for downtown. The council also provides a forum to ensure that neighborhoods are heard regarding the issues that accompany downtown development.

Tabili Attachment B1
Attachment B = 1 pg.

Downtown Neighborhoods and Residents Council
Position Statement on Ronstadt Transit Center

The Ronstadt Transit Center (RTC) enter is a unique and valuable resource for downtown, downtown neighborhoods and other stakeholders, and the entire region's residents.

The assumption, held by some interests, that the RTC should (or needs to) move is incorrect, and needs to be evaluated. In fact, for best use of current bus and future bus, streetcar, and intercity train riders, the RTC's use as a regional transit center needs to be upgraded and expanded.

It is premature for the Mayor and Council to issue a request for qualifications. Additional steps need to be taken prior to issuing the RFQ, with priority given to a larger, more inclusive public process.

In the near term, it is difficult to predict the future of downtown and transit needs; Downtown Links, Sunlink/Modern Streetcar, and other transportation projects will change the traffic and transit patterns. Moving forward quickly with changes to the RTC may lead to unforeseen consequences; mistakes are likely to be cast in concrete, which will be difficult—if not impossible--to change.

Accurate and complete data are necessary to support any decision, and need to be gathered *before* any RFQ is issued. A survey of current and potential transit users is key, along with the collection of new data on current bus usage (and limitations). Based on those facts and data, any resulting plan needs to present a long-term vision for an integrated multi-modal transportation center/system.

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

Downtown neighborhoods individually, and DNaRC as a representative committee, have an interest in a successful transit system and will assist the City in an open, public process to accomplish the goals we suggest.

Tabili Attachment C1

Attachment C = 2 pgs.

DNaRC Position Paper 3 on Ronstadt Transit Center
DRAFT

Introduction

On March 20, 2014, Jim Hannan of Bus Friends Forever (BFF) wrote an eloquent summary of the current state the Ronstadt Transit Center (RTC) and adjacent properties and submitted it to City of Tucson staff. He made a number of points with which the members of DNaRC agree, that are consistent with our previous position statements about the RTC and its "redevelopment."

This statement, our third regarding the RTC, highlights key points and suggested steps on which we agree with BFF.

Our Concurrences with Bus Friends Forever

Given that the City is moving forward with its request for proposals, DNaRC expects the city to select a development that produces additional revenue for the bus system, improves the experience for transit riders, and also makes the RTC more welcoming to all Tucson residents. BFF asked a question that we think is important to answer before a selection is made:

> * What is the target amount of transit revenue to be raised from the future development? It would seem that any proposal would need to meet this criteria before any other.

Development on the site may take as long as five years to complete.

> * In the interim, there are easy, low-cost steps that can be taken now to improve the center for both transit users and the other downtown denizens.

Ronstadt is thriving as a transit center and works very well from an operational point of view. It is safe and clean, has good signage, comfortable benches, and cooling towers. Mayor and council need to embrace the Ronstadt and acknowledge what a great job it does now in terms of its mission, which is to move bus riders into and out of the city core.

However, there are other basic amenities that would improve the functioning of the RTC: upgrade of the restrooms; re-opening and staffing of the information booth for all transit riders (including streetcar) and downtown visitors; and a secure place to lock bikes. These should be as soon as possible.

> * Ronstadt provides the only semi-public space on the east side of downtown. There are currently signs and ordinances that tell people that Ronstadt is only for bus riders. This should change immediately, to re-instate the RTC as a fully public space. It should be re-animated as a public square; following are suggestions, most made by BFF, for how to do so.

1. There is about an interior sidewalk area that would be very welcoming to small scale street vendors, who would bring people to the area. There is physical space for probably at least 25 spaces, while still allowing for some open bench seating on the fence wall. The City could

Tabili Attachment C2

chalk mark locations on both Congress and 6th streets and start charging a nominal fee for usage, say $5 per day on a first come, first served.

2. On the west side of the center, there is a gravel buffer zone between the bus bays the sidewalk and on Congress and 6th. There are several large mesquite trees and palm trees as landscaping, and the ground is covered with a people unfriendly large gravel. Change the gravel to a more-foot-friendly pea gravel and grass. Add movable tables and chairs. Open up the area to food trucks, which would cater to both bus riders and other downtown users. The trucks can access the site from the rolled curbs on southwest corner.

3. The staff inside kiosk would handle the vendor payments and site selection on the perimeter of the site. (Perhaps staffed with Downtown Tucson Partnership docents or staff.) They would also be Visitors Bureau, with brochures and other material for downtown tourists.

4. The fence panels inside the arcade are of a size that could be used to exhibit artwork. A art installation program, like that done on Toole Avenue in the Warehouse Arts District, should be started.

5. Lastly, it would make sense to encourage and make it easy for groups, formal and informal, to use the west side for small special events.

Additional Thoughts

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

About DnaRC

A standing committee of the Downtown Tucson Partnership, the Downtown Neighborhoods and Residents Council (DNaRC) is comprised of the leadership of 17 mixed-income neighborhoods, representing nearly 20,000 households. By living in and near downtown, these renters, and homeowners have made an investment in the social, civic, and economic well-being of downtown Tucson. DNaRC is committed to the ongoing prosperity of downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. DNaRC serves as a conduit for downtown area neighborhoods and residents to stay informed about current and future plans for downtown. The council also provides a forum to ensure that neighborhoods are heard regarding the issues that accompany downtown development.

From: "Robinson, Marilyn E - (marilynr)" <marilynr@email.arizona.edu>
To: Rebecca Ruopp <rebecca.ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>
Date: 2/3/2015 10:11 AM
Subject: Ronstadt Transit Center RFP suggestion

Rebecca,

Thank you for an inclusive stakeholders' meeting last Friday. I am not sure that I have attended a meeting that included such a diverse cross-section of those interested in a project where all sides seemed comfortable actually contributing to the discussion. I would say that is a compliment to your organization and facilitation skills and style!

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

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

Thanks for this opportunity.

Marilyn Robinson

Rebecca Ruopp - Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project

From: Casa Maria Soup Kitchen <casamariatucson@yahoo.com>
To: Rebecca Ruopp <rebecca.ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>
Date: 2/5/2015 9:20 AM
Subject: Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project

To: Rebecca Ruopp

From: Brian Flagg 520-624-0312

Re: Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project

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

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

I know that the Tucson Bus Riders Union is ready and committed to working with you to make this process as transparent as possible.

Thank you.

Rebecca Ruopp - Ronstadt Transit Center RFP Phase II Comments

From: Jim Hannan <ursus154@gmail.com>
To: Rebecca Ruopp <Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>
Date: 2/6/2015 9:18 AM
Subject: Ronstadt Transit Center RFP Phase II Comments
Attachments: BFF RTC comments 2.6.15.doc

Dear Rebecca,

Thanks for all the work you and the Office of Integrated Planning is doing on this project. I've attached comments as a word document, and pasted below.

Jim Hannan

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
RFP – Phase II Comments
Bus Friends Forever
2.6.15
Bus Friends Forever (BFF) mission is to advocate for a strong vibrant bus system in Tucson. We appreciate this opportunity to submit written comments on the RFP. Our comments are in two parts, general comments and specific comments on the RFP Phase II documents.

General comments

BFF has been a part of the stakeholder meetings for the Ronstadt Transit Center (RTC) since they began. While we support improvements to the RTC, we have also found the joint development project to be somewhat of a solution in search of a problem. Fairly arbitrarily, the city decided to push together three very different parcels and call for a development plan that would change or integrate all three. The BFF position is that two of the three parcels are actually working well. The third parcel, the Toole lot, is not currently utilized at its best and highest use, but it's unclear if this project will optimize its development.

In our opinion, the RTC site functions very well for its three clients: the Sun Tran bus system, the bus riders and the City of Tucson. The RTC serves thousands of people every day, with amazing efficiency. With over 25 years of service in its current location, the RTC continues to seamlessly allow for buses to move through the site, and to allow for bus riders to arrive, depart and transfer. The size of the current location is ideal, with perhaps room to add additional buses over time, as the bus system continues to expand. The exterior of the RTC is also currently a great usage of open space, serving to provide seating along Congress and 6th Street, and also is now being utilized for small vendors during special events. This is not to say that improvements are not needed to the RTC. In fact, the Tucson Bus Riders Union conducted an open house at the Rialto Theatre last year, attended by hundreds of bus riders. The issues that came up over and over were for small scale measures, including cleaner bathrooms and human staffing of the central kiosk. The city could have spent some of the current $2 million transit grant for some of these improvements, but instead decided to spend funds on the two parking lots north of the RTC.

The Madden triangle parcel is perhaps the best utilized surface parking lot in all of downtown. The 50 space lot is always full every day of the work week, with employees and clients of Madden Publishing. BFF has called for allowing for free parking after hours during the work week and on

weekends. Apparently the revenue from the current $5 off hours charge is received by Madden under a somewhat awkward arrangement with the City of Tucson. We believe that it would be beneficial to the exciting night and weekend scene on East Congress to have a nearby free parking lot with 50 spaces. Otherwise, this is a tough site for any development, with its shape, small footprint, and the fact that it is bisected by three streets. The Pennington street side serves as egress and ingress for many buses during the day. If anything, BFF believes it might be advantageous to keep the triangle as surface parking, in the event that the RTC needs to expand its footprint, if it is politically feasible to close Pennington. However, it should be noted that the city is currently in the process of spending transit funds on re-aligning the Pennington and Toole intersection, calling into question whether Pennington would ever be closed off.

The Toole lot is a prime lot for a development project. Now that the city has obligated part of the $2 million FTA grant for its cleanup and grading, there is some nexus to the RTC, but only in the sense that transit funds have been deployed there. However, trying to tie development of this parcel to the two other parcels seems to be a real stretch. In the future, we envision Toole as some kind of high rise development, perhaps mixed use commercial, residential or some type of art space that would be an extension of the Warehouse Art District. Six months ago, BFF questioned the use of FTA funds on Toole, simply because it might make development more cumbersome moving forward. One suggestion for the Toole lot is to move the Greyhound bus station to that site, perhaps for a 5 year lease. The city is obligated to find a new site, now that the current site has been obligated for a Rio Nuevo project. Bringing Greyhound back to the center of town and close to the Ronstadt is an actual demonstration of the catchphrase, multimodal transit. A 5 year lease would allow for other parts of downtown to develop, including the very large empty lot on Broadway and 4th Avenue, making the city's Toole lot more valuable in the future.

Specific comments

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

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

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

4. We propose the following scoring system to evaluate the two proposals:

10% - Project feasibility. How likely is the proposal to actually happen?

40% - Project revenue. How much additional revenue does this proposal net the city?

25% - Project value added. How does this proposal significantly enhance this part of downtown? Does it make available resources that are not currently available?

25% - Project design. How does the project reflect on, and expand upon the beauty of the current RTC? How does the design enhance the streetscape in the two other parcels?

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

6. We recommend that the city's Transit Task Force be incorporated into the RFP process. The proposal that is selected by the evaluation committee should go first to the Transit Task Force for review before going to Mayor and Council.
7. Bus Friends Forever is concerned about actual implementation of an accepted proposal. The City of Tucson has a poor record in achieving results in downtown development projects. Because of the unusual nature of this project, it is extremely important that safeguards are in place to ensure that the development that is proposed, is actually built, and that the projected revenue is paid to the city. The city should set up an oversight committee, including stakeholder members, to ensure that full compliance is achieved.
8. The suggested project timeline is optimistic and perhaps unrealistic. In particular, the evaluation committee may need more time for deliberation, especially considering that the city plans to engage third party professionals to evaluate the project financials and design features.

Rebecca Ruopp - Comments on RTC RFP - Downtown Innovation District + Startup Tucson

From: Tony Ford <tony@startuptucson.com>
To: <Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>
Date: 2/6/2015 9:44 AM
Subject: Comments on RTC RFP - Downtown Innovation District + Startup Tucson

Good Morning,

-- The Ronstadt Transit Center redevelopment will be the most influential public project in downtown for the next decade. It is vital that we plan for the present and future of transit and benchmark best practices from growing, vibrant cities. To that end, critical components of the RTC that can support best practices from leading researchers and other successful downtowns should be directly named in the RFP to ensure that proposals are inclusive of the key drivers for downtown Tucson's continued resurgence. **Specific RFP suggestions are in bold.**

First, some key statistical correlation from the 2014 Milken Index found at the link below. Please note Tucson did not perform well in this index compared to past years, despite our booming downtown., largely because other cities are more focused on driving the next generation of resident and economic participant (Gen Y).

http://assets1c.milkeninstitute.org/assets/Publication/ResearchReport/PDF/Milken-Institute-Best-Performing-Cities-Index-2014.pdf

Cities we compare ourselves to are on the move.

Austin #2

Portland #16 (up from #21 last year)

Yet, we lag behind, despite our improvements in the past years.

Tucson, AZ #161 (down from #115 last year)

Why does this matter for the RTC? Because elements of this project can provide the drivers of our continued city revitalization. Failure to include them can at best impede and at worst derail the revitalization process for decades.

"The Milken Index is more closely associated with arts and cultural talent (.35) than science and tech talent (.30) or business professionals (.24)."

"The Milken Index is negatively associated with the share of commuters who drive to work alone (-.31) and positively associated with the share of take public transit to work (.26)."

It is important to move from a car focused downtown to a diverse transit downtown where bike, ride share, bus, walking and cars can each find appropriate and easy access. Gen Y workers seek urban density and alternate transportation methods. RTC is a critical component to the economic development of our city as transportation plays a vital role in revitalizing urban centers as the hub of new business, tech business development and attraction of younger workers.

Further critical components can be found in the Brookings Institute's 1999 study on successful downtown redevelopment programs. It is useful to note that many of the cities called out as using best practices in the Brookings study are now performing better in the Milken Index.

http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/1999/10/downtownredevelopment%20moulton/moulton.pdf

"Housing Must Be Downtown's Political and Business Priority"

"Downtown neighborhoods must be clean (maybe with less meticulous grooming than their suburban counterparts), and must above all be safe from threats and crime."

Please note the critical nature of the above. According to TPD reports while there were only 6 violent crimes in the downtown area in the past 60 days, there were more than 60 arrests in the RTC. We must be proactive in addressing crime reduction at the RTC if we are to develop a thriving downtown area.

"Keeping Up Green Space. Downtown dwellers are urbanites, but open space is still an ingredient of neighborhoods. With an increased residential population comes an increased need for park space."

Following on the above key benchmarks and recognizing that the only entity that can protect green space, create public art space and require the right mix of elements in downtown is the City of Tucson, please note the following suggestions for addition or clarification in the RFP.

I) Green/Programmable Space

The economic development impact of green space planning in urban revitalization is well documented. Again, only a governmental body can realistically require, plan for and protect green space effectively as the pressures of corporate shareholder responsibility usually drive a maximum square foot use, even when all research demonstrates green space will drive a higher ROI for the remaining rental and retail properties. The City of Tucson must be the champion of this cause.

http://atfiles.org/files/pdf/Economic-Benefits-Active.pdf

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

II) Housing

Housing must be a part of the mixed use proposal. Current downtown housing vacancy rates are at 3%. This means that not only is there a strong need for more housing, but that the price pressure for current housing will leave behind a segment of our population if not explicitly provided for in the RFP.

A successful proposal must include housing at both market rate and low income housing interspersed with specific housing units designed for artists, independent creative's or entrepreneurs.

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

III) Safety

Currently the RTC is the highest crime location in a increasingly safe downtown. This is a negative situation for transit riders as they deserve safe, clean, well functioning facilities. The current level of crime at RTC is untenable for the support of a continued growth and resurgence downtown.

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

IV) Architecture

This is a rare chance to create a jewel in the crown of downtown, a development of architectural design that becomes the showpiece of downtown. Most developers are severely limited by the requirements of shareholders to maximize profits with low cost per square foot buildings that generate high dollars. The city can and should require the use of developments on its property to benefit even passersby with the aesthetic improvement of the downtown environment.

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

V) Future Technologies

The reality of transportation development is that the pace of innovation and revolutionary improvements is increasing. By 2017 Google self-driving cars will be offered commercially, by 2019 the big three will follow. By 2026 some analysts are suggesting widespread adoption due to the 90% reduction in auto injuries currently projected from this technology which will save $450 million annually in injury costs.

This is one example of a significant change in transportation infrastructure as self driving cars require far less road space due to dramatically increased vehicle density. It is not the only one.

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

The above are suggestions to better align the RFP with the economic development, urban development and transportation development needs of Tucson. With the right RTC development downtown Tucson can continue to grow, expand, and improve as a driver of overall health of Tucson.

Sincerely,

Tony Ford

Chair, Downtown Innovation District

Justin Williams,

CEO, Startup Tucson

From: Donald Ijams <dsijams@gmail.com>
To: Rebecca Ruopp <Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>
CC: Nicole Ewing-Gavin <Nicole.Ewing-Gavin@tucsonaz.gov>, ruth beeker <beeke...
Date: 2/6/2015 11:50 AM
Subject: Comments on Jan 30 Ronstadt Transit Center RFP Draft

Rebecca,

Here are my comments related to the January 30, 2015 draft of the Ronstadt Transit Center RFP.

My approach was to look at the draft from the perspective of the recently adopted TCC Chap. 2 Article III, Sec. 2-46 wording that referenced the City Manager implementing and sustaining:

"An inclusive environment in which residents are provided an opportunity for meaningful participation throughout City planning and decision-making processes."

I am working from the assumption that third parties who do the City's work are also covered in this inclusive environment. Third party work with insufficient opportunity for meaningful public participation has plagued previous City projects.

Therefore, I looked for public involvement references in the RFP draft. The VI. Phase II Submittal Requirements seemed to be where the inclusive environment would be discussed:

---

7. Public Engagement Plan

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

At a minimum, Offerors will:

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

My reaction to reading this wording, with the inclusive environment in mind, is that there is not enough guidance provided to offerors as to the background and new levels of participation now required. In one place you say "throughout the development process" and in another place you say "throughout the design phase." Which is it? I am reminded of Jan Ceverlli's warning that effective monitoring is needed to assure that what makes it onto the ground is correct vis-a-vis the plans.

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

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

From: "les_p_hackenslash@yahoo.com" <les_p_hackenslash@yahoo.com>
To: <rebecca.ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>
Date: 2/6/2015 1:48 AM
Subject: RTC RFP questions

Hi, Rebecca:
As requested, below are some questions about the RTC RFP.
Thanks so much for your (and the other OIPers') work on making the RFP process more inclusive of community concerns. :^)
Cheers,
Les.

__BEGIN__

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

Q2: Under the summary of FTA's "Fair Share of Costs" criterion, it is stated that all tenants must pay rent reasonable to cover their share of operating costs (i.e., no gifts of free rent). Does this extend to community services (as covered in "Fair Share of Revenue")? E.g., if the final project has a retail component for which high rents are charged to subsidize a community center (which pays token rent), would that fly if the total of rents collected exceeds the totality of operating costs? (Sorry if this is spelled out in the actual FTA document.)

Q3: Under Section VI "Phase 2 Submittal Requirements", item 3 "Project Description", can there be added a requirement for "in-situ" renderings that show the final structures as they will be amidst their surroundings (i.e., and not sitting alone on a vast empty plain as renderings are usually done)? Sure, I'd like to have drawings of the buildings alone so I can focus on the lines and design, but I'd also like to see how they'll look with the MLK apartments next door, across from Hydra and the pizza place, and so on.

Q4: Section VI, item 7: Do we want minimum requirements for the public engagement plan? How binding will the descriptions be in terms of quality and quantity of interactions? If they promise Cadillac engagement but only deliver Yugos, what happens?

Q5: Section VI, item 8: I assume the contestants will be thoroughly background- checked to catch any history or other data that will likely not be revealed through the carefully chosen submitted references? We're not going to just take them at their word, are we?

Q6: Section VI, item 9: Do we want to recommend that the contestants attend the public proposals unveiling forum?

Q7: Evaluation Criteria, item A.1.: Do we want to clarify that even the prettiest of balconies and rooftop gardens will not count towards "open space" requirements for the purpose of this project? (Somewhere in the bowels of the UDC, rooftops can count as open space if there is a shade structure or something like that.)

__END__
#EOF.

attachment follows

Rebecca Ruopp - Phase II Ronstadt RFP

From: "Robert M. Kaye" <r_m_kaye@hotmail.com>
To: Rebecca Ruopp <rebecca.ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>
Date: 2/8/2015 7:01 PM
Subject: Phase II Ronstadt RFP
Cc: Nicole Ewing-Gavin <nicole.ewing-gavin@tucsonaz.gov>, Lynne Birkinbine <...
Attachments: Ronstadt RFP Phase II Draft Text, RMK Redlines, 2.8.15.doc

---

Rebecca:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the RFP and to do so in the Word version of the document you sent me Friday. The attached redlined version of the document should be relatively easy to read and to work with, but if you need me to, I will produce a version in which the comments are incorporated.

I did have some technical problems with the formatting of the original document when I tried to add material. This is most obvious on page 1 (the calendar) and on page 19, section f ("Demonstrate financial capacity"). In the latter, I just couldn't get the numbering and the indents to work properly. Further, in Transportation and Infrastructure on p. 4 and elsewhere, because of my struggles with formatting in Word, I made lists as numbered items within a paragraph. They might work better as bulleted entries.

As you requested, I focused on what I believe are substantial issues. Here are notes on the most important ones: (page number references are as per the redlined document)

1. Calendar, p. 2. I spent some time thinking through the logistics and timing for the City and the proposers. Rather than writing a comment, I chose to propose some specific dates. Also, I added several steps in the evaluation process that I felt were missing.
2. Communication and Participation, p. 5. In several places in the document, I re-worked comments on public engagement to include local businesspeople and to suggest that the process needs to extend well past the point of final approvals on the project. While it is my suggestion, it's the City's call.
3. I. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, p. 13. As I mentioned to Lynne on Friday, I have significant concerns about a few of the procurement technicalities embedded in the document. In some cases, it was easy enough to suggest an edit or an addition. But in my opinion, this section needs to be *fixed*: There needs to be a provision for the submission of confidential information. See also the edits I made to section K, WHERE TO SUBMIT PROPOSALS in which I've added text on how to submit confidential information. Note also, that the latter section K doesn't actually say *where* to submit proposals. Please add that info there.
4. 1. Contact Information, p. 16. As written, the Phase II submittal requirements would disqualify the Alexander Group's proposal or force them to retire from the process or force them to spend the time/effort/money to create an Arizona corporation without any assurance that they would win the competition. The edits I have made here are crucial to avoiding these outcomes.

Kaye Attachment 1
Attachment = 21 pgs.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Request for Proposals – Phase II
Preliminary Draft Text, January 30, 2015

DRAFT SECTIONS FOR REVIEW

I. Request for Proposal (RFP) Process & Status

II. Phase II RFP Overview

III. Project Purpose & Goals

IV. FTA Guidance

V. Instructions to Offerors

VI. Phase II Submittal Requirements

VII. Phase II Evaluation Criteria

PLEASE PROVIDE COMMENTS BY FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 6th, TO Rebecca Ruopp, Office of Integrated Planning, by one of the following methods:

Email: **Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov**

Phone: **(520) 837-6973**

Drop off: **Office of Integrated Planning, 149 N. Stone Ave.**

Thanks.

Kaye Attachment 1
Attachment = 22 pgs.

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Request for Proposals – Phase II
Preliminary Draft Text, January 30, 2015

DRAFT SECTIONS FOR REVIEW

I. Request for Proposal (RFP) Process & Status

II. Phase II RFP Overview

III. Project Purpose & Goals

IV. FTA Guidance

V. Instructions to Offerors

VI. Phase II Submittal Requirements

VII. Phase II Evaluation Criteria

PLEASE PROVIDE COMMENTS BY FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 6th, TO Rebecca Ruopp, Office of Integrated Planning, by one of the following methods:

Email: **Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov**

Phone: **(520) 837-6973**

Drop off: **Office of Integrated Planning, 149 N. Stone Ave.**

Thanks.

Kaye Attachment 2

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Request for Proposals – Phase II
Preliminary Draft Text, January 30, 2015

I. REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) PROCESS & STATUS

For the Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project, the City is using a two-phased Request for Proposals (RFP) evaluation process. Phase I, which requested Offeror's Statements of Qualifications, was completed on December 16, 2014, when Mayor and Council approved the recommendation of Evaluation Committee to move forward to Phase II with both of the Offerors who submitted in Phase I being invited to submit proposals for Phase II. The Offerors and their Phase I RFP submittals can be viewed at http://oip.tucsonaz.gov/integrated-planning/ronstadt-transit-center-joint-development.

The Phase II RFP, as represented by this document, requires Offerors to submit detailed project proposals, provide a public presentation, and may include interviews and discussions about the project proposal. The evaluation of Phase II Proposals will be separate from the Phase I Proposal evaluation. There will be no carry forward of scoring or ranking. The evaluation committee from Phase I will evaluate Phase II proposals.

If after proposals have been submitted and evaluated an Offeror is selected by Mayor and Council to proceed, the Offeror will be invited to enter into negotiations with the City for a Ddevelopment Aagreement. The City may define Terms and Conditions for a Ddevelopment Aagreement, including, but not limited to, Insurance, Performance Surety and/or Fidelity Bonds, Key Personnel, Conflict of Interest, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Joint Development requirements, etc.

Should the City decide to enter into a Ddevelopment Aagreement, it shall make an award that is deemed to be in the City's best interest. A final award is contingent upon approval of the negotiated Development Aagreement by the Tucson Mayor and Council and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Project Timeline

Following is an estimated timeline for activities from the Issuance of the Phase II RFP through the Award of the Joint Development Project.

~~Stakeholder Meeting re Phase II~~	~~January/February 2015~~
~~Mayor & Council Review of Phase II RFP Scope *(Executive Session)*~~	~~February 2015~~
Issuance of Phase II RFP	February XX, 2015
Proposers conference, meetings with City and Sun Tran staff, and site visit	March 6, 2015
Deadline for questions from proposers	May 22, 2015
Due Date for Phase II Proposals	~~May/~~June 5, 2015
Interviews with proposers (if needed)	June 18, 2015
Public Design Presentations and Feedback	~~May/~~June 19, 2015
Proposer responses to public feedback on design presentations	July 10, 2015
Committee Phase II Evaluation	~~June/~~July 2015

Formatted Table

Comment [RMK1]: Not material to the proposers and not consistent with the lead-in sentence.

Comment [RMK2]: The proposers conference should be approx. two weeks after the issuance of the RFP.

Comment [RMK3]: The deadline for questions should be 10 **business** days prior to the proposal due date.

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Comment [RMK4]: The deadline for responses to public feedback should be 15 **business** days after the public feedback is received. The City should commit to producing its own *condensed and prioritized* summary of the comments.

Kaye Attachment 3

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Request for Proposals – Phase II
Preliminary Draft Text, January 30, 2015

• Committee Recommendation to Mayor & Council *(Executive Session)*	August 2015
• Announcement of results of proposal selection process	August 2015
• Preliminary FTA Review	Submit August 2015
• Development Agreement Negotiation	Fall 2015
• Formal FTA Review and Approval	Submit Late 2015
• Final Development Agreement to Mayor & Council	Early 2016

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

II. PHASE II RFP OVERVIEW

The City of Tucson seeks a qualified development team to plan, design, obtain permits, construct, and own, lease, and/or manage components of an integrated multi-modal transit/mixed-use center on the 4.7-acre project area site, which includes the existing Ronstadt Transit Center (RTC) and two additional parcels currently used for parking.

A successful project proposal must be responsive to both the City's purpose and goals and to the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA's) recently released Joint Development Guidance. The project purpose and goals were presented in in the Phase I RFP and are repeated in this RFP in *Section III* below. Because FTA funds were used to acquire property included in the designated project site, the FTA has a financial interest in this proposed joint development project. Careful review and consideration of the FTA's guidance for FTA-Assisted Joint Development, which is highlighted in *Section IV* of this document, is critical as the FTA will be party to the decision on any final award.

Section V provides instructions to Offerors on preparing a Phase II proposal. *Section VI* lays out what is required for inclusion in an Offeror's submittal. *Section VII* provides the criteria that will be used in evaluating any proposals received, including the weight that will be given to each criterion, as well as some general provisions for considering proposals. *Section VIII* is the Phase II Submittal Form that must be completed and provided with any submitted proposal.

The final section of this Phase II RFP, *Section IX* provides background references that may be useful in the preparation of a Phase II proposal. Included in Section IX is a link to the Phase I RFP, which beginning on page 4, provided descriptions of the project context, site specifics, City development process, and potential City incentives. Please note that all the information included in Section IX can be found on the City of Tucson, Office of Integrated Planning website, http://oip.tucsonaz.gov/integrated-planning/ronstadt-transit-center-multi-modal-mixed-use-development-opportunity.

Kaye Attachment 4

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Request for Proposals – Phase II
Preliminary Draft Text, January 30, 2015

III. PROJECT PURPOSE & GOALS

The project purpose and goals, which were provided in the Phase I RFP, are repeated here, with some slight formatting modifications, to reiterate their importance. The purpose and goals represent the outcome of many hours of thoughtful deliberation by City staff and stakeholders working together to find agreement on a variety of issues put forth by a range of interests from bus riders to businesses, to developers, to downtown neighborhoods and more. A successful Offeror will clearly demonstrate how the proposed project meets the purpose and goals.

Purpose

The overall purpose of this project is to create a distinctive, multi-modal transit center and mixed-use development that contributes to an active, economically robust downtown, by achieving the following goals:

Goal A: Uses & Character

The project should incorporate (1) a transit center with similar or improved services, (2) private development featuring a mix of uses, and (3) public open space, which are thoughtfully integrated and serve a diversity of people working, living, and visiting downtown. Examples of types of land uses that are encouraged include residential, retail, daily services (e.g., daycare, grocery, pharmacy), employment, educational uses, and recreation and entertainment venues.

The project should incorporate community open space that is urban in character, well integrated with surrounding uses, highly visible to and actively used by people of all ages, incudes some natural features, and has a clearly responsible entity in charge of its programming and maintenance.

The design of the project should create a signature destination that integrates the arts, recognizes the community's cultural diversity, includes sustainable/environmentally sensitive design, activates the streetscape, and offers architecture responsive to the urban historic fabric and views. Sensitivity to the needs of downtown neighborhoods, transit users, adjacent properties, and local downtown businesses is important.

Goal B: Transportation and Infrastructure

The project should be based on thoughtful site design that considers: 1) ~~not only~~vehicular access, parking, and pick-up/drop-off for all site users (e.g., residents, visitors, guests, shoppers, transit riders, and people employed at the site); 2) transit and other transportation services and access (e.g., Sun Tran buses, paratransit, public or private shuttle busses, taxis, and car services); 3) truck access and off-street truck loading (e.g., routine major deliveries, trash/recycling haulers, and express package delivery services) for all the uses and users at the site; 4) pedestrians and bike riders; and, 5) egress provisions for special events. ~~, but also~~The project access plan should ~~contributes to improving~~help facilitate ~~surrounding~~ multi-modal transportation connections ~~circulation~~in downtown Tucson.

The project should ~~incorporate establishment~~re-envision and recreate ~~of~~ the Ronstadt Transit Center as ~~an~~ a flexible, adaptable hub that can serve multiple modes of transportation over time, including, but not limited to, public buses, shuttles, bicycles, and pedestrians. It should provide connections to the

Kaye Attachment

modern streetcar and Amtrak inter-city rail, and should accommodate complementary programs and facilities such as bike share, car share, ~~drop-offs, and~~ taxis, and car services.

The project should enhance the physical infrastructure and facilities for current bus riders and increase the appeal of transit to new riders. Examples of improvements identified by community members as desirable include incorporation of retail, food, and services; better designed bathrooms; air conditioning; shade~~s~~; drinking fountains; and possibly a children's play area.

The project should provide pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to surrounding uses; to walkways/alleys, roadways, and bikeways; to adjacent residential and commercial areas; and to transportation modes, such as between the bus facilities and the modern streetcar line at the southern boundary of the RTC project area and the Historic Train Depot at the northeastern end of the property.

Goal C: Financial and Economic Vitality

The project should be delivered in a timely manner providing an ~~sufficient~~ infusion of private investment ~~to~~ that will economically benefit public transit, the City's tax base, and downtown revitalization efforts.

Goal D: Communication and Participation

Over the course of the project planning, permitting, design, construction and long-term operations, t~~T~~he project team should be committed to regular, collaborative meetings and communication with the City and other agencies, and ~~community~~ engagement with local businesspeople and other community stakeholders.

Comment [RMK5]: Whether it uses this language or other, the City needs to specify the time period over which the public engagement process will occur.

Kaye Attachment 6

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Request for Proposals – Phase II
Preliminary Draft Text, January 30, 2015

[PLEASE EXPLAIN IF THE TEXT BELOW IS TAKEN VERBATIM FROM THE FTA REGS AND OTHER GUIDANCE MATERIALS, IF THE TEXT IS A SERIES OF EXERPTS, OR IF THIS MATERIAL PARAPHRASES THE REGS.]

IV. FTA Guidance

FTA allows real property that was previously acquired with FTA assistance to be used for joint development. Because the proposed project site fits this description, the project sponsor is required to comply with recent Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance on joint development, i.e., Circular 7050.1, August 25, 2014.
http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_C_7050_1_Guidance_on_Joint_Development_Circular.pdf

A key condition of the FTA requirements is that the joint development must not interfere with the City's continuing control over the use of project property or the City's ability to continue to carry out the originally authorized purpose for which the property was acquired. In addition, the joint development project must satisfy all four of the FTA eligibility criteria presented below.

Please Note: The intent of this section is to highlight the FTA criteria so that anyone reviewing the proposal will be aware of them. However, this section is not intended to substititue for the Offeror's careful review of Circular 7050.01.

FTA Eligibility Criteria

As an FTA-assisted capital project, a joint development project must satisfy the following four eligibility criteria. Please note that the following annotated text is quoted directly from FTA Circular 70501.01, with page citations provided.

FTA Criterion One: **Economic Benefit**
(Page III-3, FTA Circular 70501.01)

An FTA assisted joint development project must either (a) enhance economic development or (b) incorporate private development:

(1) Enhance Economic Development. The project sponsor may satisfy this criterion by demonstrating that the joint development will add economic value to privately or publicly-funded economic development activity in close proximity to a public transportation facility.

(2) Incorporate Private Investment. Private investment need not be monetary. It can take the form

Kaye Attachment 7

of real property, commercial or residential development, or some other benefit to be generated initially or over the life of the joint development. The amount and form of private investment will be negotiated between the project sponsor and its joint development partners. *[Please note: For the Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project, FTA's term "project sponsor" would apply to the City of Tucson and the term "joint development partners" to the successful Offeror.]* While FTA will not set a monetary threshold for private investment, it can decline approval for a joint development project if the level of private investment is not meaningful to promote an economic benefit.

Kaye Attachment 8

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Request for Proposals – Phase II
Preliminary Draft Text, January 30, 2015

***FTA Criterion Two:* Public Transportation Benefit**
(Page III-4, FTA Circular 70501.1)

The joint development project can either (a) enhance the effectiveness of a public transportation project to which it is related physically or functionally, or it can (b) establish new or enhanced coordination between public transportation and other modes of transportation.

(1) Enhances the Effectiveness of a Public Transportation Project and Is Related Physically or Functionally to That Public Transportation Project. Any reasonable forecast of how the joint development will enhance the effectiveness of a public transportation project will satisfy this criterion. These impacts may include, but are not limited to, any of the following:

- Increased ridership
- Shortened travel times
- Improved/enhanced wayfinding
- Deferred or reduced transit operating or capital costs
- Improved access or connectivity to public transportation

The alternative requirement for a physical "or" functional relationship allows a joint development to be built separate from, but in functional relationship to, a public transportation project. A joint development satisfies this element if it has a physical or functional nexus to a public transportation project.

(a) Physically Related. A joint development is physically related to a public transportation project if there is a direct physical connection to public transportation services or facilities. Some examples of physical relationships are:

- Projects built within or adjacent to public transportation facilities
- Avenues of access that connect directly to public transportation, e.g., bicycle paths, pedestrian paths, or parking facilities
- Connections between public transportation and airports, train stations, and other transportation facilities
- Projects using air rights over public transportation facilities

(b) Functionally Related. A joint development is functionally related to a public transportation project if by activity and use, with or without a direct physical connection, it enhances the use of, connectivity with, or access to public transportation. A joint development can also be functionally related to a public transportation project if it provides a transportation-related service (such as remote baggage handling or shared ticketing) or public access to community service such as daycare or health care).

FTA's considerations include, among other things, whether there is a reduction in travel time between the joint development project and the public transportation facility, reasonable access between the joint development and the public transportation facility, and increased trip generation rates resulting from the relationship between the joint

Kaye Attachment 9

development and the public transportation facility.

A functional, rather than physical, relationship permits a FTA assisted joint development to be located outside the structural envelope of a public transportation facility and even to be separated by an intervening street, major thoroughfare, or unrelated property. However, a functional relationship will not ordinarily extend beyond the distance most people can be expected to safely and conveniently walk or bicycle to use the transit service.

(2) Establishes New or Enhanced Coordination between Public Transportation and Other Transportation. FTA will accept reasonably supported judgments of new or enhanced coordination from the project sponsor.

(a) "Public transportation" is defined as "regular, continuing shared-ride surface transportation services that are open to the general public or open to a segment of the general public defined by age, disability, or low income," and it does not include school bus, charter, sightseeing, intra-terminal or intra-facility shuttle service, courtesy shuttle service for patrons of one or more specific establishments, intercity bus transportation, or intercity passenger rail transportation provided by Amtrak. FTA interprets the term "other transportation" to mean all forms of transportation that are not public transportation, including, but not limited to, airplane, school bus, charter bus, sightseeing vehicle, intercity bus and rail, automobile, taxicab, bicycle, and pedestrian transportation.

(b) Connections that can establish new or enhanced coordination between public transportation and other transportation may include proximate or shared ticket counters, termini, park-and-ride lots, taxicab bays, passenger drop-off points, waiting areas, shared or coordinated signage, schedules, ticketing, and bicycle paths and sidewalks that connect public transportation to other transportation facilities. Projects that shorten the distance between public transportation termini and other transportation shall be presumed to enhance coordination. Pedestrian and bicycle improvements that are physically located outside the structural envelope of a public transportation facility may nonetheless be functionally related to the public transportation.

FTA Criterion Three: Fair Share of Revenue
(Page III-6, FTA Circular 70501.1)

A "fair share of revenue" is the division of revenue generated from a joint development project that the project sponsor and its partners negotiate and agree that the project sponsor will receive. The fair share of revenue may be amortized over the life of the project. FTA has determined that the minimum threshold for the amount of revenue that the project sponsor receives cumulatively from a joint development must be equivalent to the amount of the original federal investment contributed to the joint development project. *[Please note: Federal funds were used in the acquisition of portions of the proposed joint development project site totaling $ - to be inserted.]* FTA grant funds or other FTA-assisted project property acquired for the purpose of joint development are included in this threshold. The project sponsor must report to FTA the source and expected amount of such fair share of revenue. FTA reserves the right to decline funding for or approval of a joint development project if the project does not generate a minimum threshold of revenue for the

Formatted: Highlight

Kaye Attachment 10

project sponsor.(1) To qualify as a fair share of revenue, FTA requires the following:

(a) The project's sponsor's General Manager or Chief Executive Officer must certify, following reasonable investigation, that the terms and conditions of the joint development are commercially reasonable and fair to the project sponsor, and that the share of revenues generated for public transportation satisfy FTA's threshold requirement;

(b) FTA must review and approve the amount and source of revenue; and

(c) Such revenue must be used for public transportation services. This enhances the ability of a public transportation provider to negotiate for financial benefits in exchange for the benefits it will convey through the joint development.

(2) Community Service or Publicly Operated Projects: When a joint development project is a community service or publicly operated facility, FTA recognizes that the revenue generated by the joint development project may be less than what would be generated from commercial, residential, or mixed-use development projects. As such, the resulting "fair share of revenue" can be less than the amount of the original FTA investment contributed to the project, but must be based upon the actual revenue generated by the community service or publicly-operated facility.

***FTA Criterion Four:* Fair Share of Costs**
(Page III-7, FTA Circular 70501.1)

A joint development must provide that a person making an agreement to occupy space in a facility constructed with FTA assistance must pay a fair share of the costs of the facility to the project sponsor. "Person" here includes natural persons as well as businesses. FTA will not attempt to define what amounts to a fair share of the costs of the facility and will not impose a particular valuation methodology. FTA will accept commercial valuation methodologies used by the project sponsor to determine a fair share of the costs of the facility. However, FTA reserves the right to decline project funding or approval if the rental payment, or other means, is less than the actual cost to the project sponsor to operate and maintain the space in its facility.

The fair share may be paid in the form of rental payments, but may also take other forms, e.g., operating and maintenance agreements. Project sponsors and their partners/tenants have flexibility to form agreements other than for rent, so long as the value of such an agreement is at least equal to the costs of operating and maintaining the leased space.

Kaye Attachment 11

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Request for Proposals – Phase II
Preliminary Draft Text, January 30, 2015

V Instructions to Offerors

A. DEFINITION OF KEY WORDS USED IN THE SOLICITATION

For purposes of this solicitation and any subsequent contract, the following definitions shall apply:

City: The City of Tucson, Arizona

Contract: The legal Development Aagreement executed between the City and the Contractor/Consultant. The Contract shall include this RFP document incorporated herein by reference, all terms, conditions, specifications, scope of work, amendments, the Contractor's offer and negotiated items as accepted by the City.

Contractor/Consultant: The individual, partnership, or corporation who, as a result of the competitive solicitation process, is awarded a contract by the City.

Contract Officer: The City employee or employees who have been designated specifically to act as a contact person or persons to the Contractor, and is/are responsible for monitoring and overseeing the Contractor's performance under this Contract.

Director of Procurement: The contracting authority for the City, authorized to sign contracts and amendments thereto on behalf of the City.

May: Indicates something that is not mandatory but permissible.

Offeror: The individual, partnership, or corporation who submits a proposal in response to solicitation.

Shall, Will, Must: Indicates a mandatory requirement. Failure to meet these mandatory requirements, if they constitute a substantive requirement, may, at the City's sole discretion, result in the rejection of a proposal as non-responsive.

Should: Indicates something that is recommended but not mandatory. If the Offeror fails to provide recommended information, the City may, at its sole option, ask the Offeror to provide the information or evaluate the proposal without the information.

B. INQUIRIES

Any questions related to this Request for Proposal shall be directed to the Contract Officer whose name appears on the cover page and in the header of each page. An Offeror shall not contact or ask questions of the department for whom the requirement is being procured. The Contract Officer may require any and all questions be submitted in writing. Offerors are encouraged to submit written questions via electronic mail or facsimile, at least ~~five~~ ten business days prior to the proposal due date. Any correspondence related to this solicitation should refer to the Request for Proposal number found on the cover page and in the header of each page, and to the page and paragraph number. An envelope containing questions should be identified as such, otherwise it may not be opened until after the official proposal due date and time. Oral interpretations or clarifications will be without legal effect. Only questions answered by a formal written amendment to the Request for Proposal will be binding.

Kaye Attachment 12

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Request for Proposals – Phase II
Preliminary Draft Text, January 30, 2015

C. AMENDMENT OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

If any amendments to this Request for Proposal are issued, the Offeror shall acknowledge receipt of such amendments by signing and returning them by the specified due date and time.

D. FAMILIARIZATION OF SCOPE OF WORK

Before submitting a proposal, each Offeror shall familiarize itself with the Scope of Work, laws, regulations and other factors affecting contract performance. The Offeror shall be responsible for fully understanding the requirements of the subsequent Contract and otherwise satisfy itself as to the expense and difficulties accompanying the fulfillment of contract requirements. The submission of a proposal will constitute a representation of compliance by the Offeror. There will be no subsequent financial adjustment, other than that provided by the subsequent Contract, for lack of such familiarization.

E. PREPARATION OF PROPOSAL

1. All proposals shall ~~be on~~include the completed forms provided in this Request for Proposal package. It is permissible to copy these forms as required. Facsimiles or electronic mail proposals shall not be considered.

2. At a minimum, the proposal shall include the signed Offer and Acceptance form, signed copies of any solicitation amendments, completed Price Page and a response to all evaluation criteria.

3. The Offer and Acceptance page shall be signed by a person authorized to submit an offer. An authorized signature on the Offer and Acceptance page, Proposal Amendment(s), or cover letter accompanying the proposal documents shall constitute an irrevocable offer to sell the good and/or service specified herein. The Offeror shall submit any additional requested documentation, signifying intent to be bound by the terms of the agreement.

4. The authorized person signing the proposal shall initial erasure, interlineations or other modifications on the proposal.

~~5. In case of error in the extension of prices in the proposal, unit price shall govern when applicable.~~

Comment [RMK6]: Not applicable here.

~~6.~~5. Unless otherwise noted, ~~P~~periods of time, stated as a number of days, shall be in calendar days.

~~7.~~6. It is the responsibility of all Offerors to examine the entire Request for Proposal package and seek clarification of any requirement that may not be clear and to check all responses for accuracy before submitting a proposal. Negligence in preparing a proposal confers no right of withdrawal after the due date and time.

~~8.~~7. The City shall not reimburse the cost of developing, presenting, submitting or providing any response to this solicitation.

Kaye Attachment 13

~~9.~~8. The Offeror must list any partners, team members, consultants, and subcontractors to be utilized in the performance of the services specified herein. For each partner, team member, consultant, and subcontractor, details on respective qualifications must be included.

Comment [RMK7]: I can't seem to get this text to format properly: The kerning (spacing between characters) is wrong.

F. TAXES

The City of Tucson is exempt from federal excise tax, including the federal transportation tax.

G. PROPOSAL/SUBMITTAL FORMAT

One (1) original and twelve (12) copies (13 total) of each proposal should be submitted on the forms and in the format specified in the Request for Proposal. Offerors shall also submit one electronic copy of the proposal on ~~edCD, disc~~ or zip ~~disc~~ drive in MS Office ~~2003~~ 2010 or .pdf format. Any confidential information shall be submitted on a separate ~~edCD, disc~~ or zip ~~disc~~drive. The original copy of the proposal should be clearly labeled "Original" and shall be single-sided, three hole punched and in a binder. The material should be in sequence and related to the Request for Proposal. **The sections of the submittal should be divided with labeled tabs and should include at a minimum the following sections: the completed Offer and Acceptance Form, all signed Amendments, a copy of this Request for Proposal document and the Offeror's response to the Phase II Submittal Requirements, including the completed ~~Price Page~~Financial Proposal. Additionally, the sections of the Submittal Requirements should be tabbed.** Failure to include the requested information may have a negative impact on the evaluation of the Offeror's proposal.

Comment [RMK8]: Update the technology to the present day and con firm the City's capabilities to "read" the material that is submitted

H. PUBLIC RECORD

All proposals submitted in response to this Request for Proposal shall become the property of the City and shall become a matter of public record available for review subsequent to the award notification.

I. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION [This section must be reconsidered and rewritten]

The City of Tucson is obligated to abide by all public information laws. If an Offeror believes that any portion of a proposal, offer, specification, protest or correspondence contains information that should be withheld, a statement advising the Contract Officer of this fact should accompany the submission and the information shall be so identified wherever it appears. The City shall review all requests for confidentiality and may provide a written determination to designate specified documents confidential or the request may be denied. Price is not confidential and will not be withheld. If the confidential request is denied, such information shall be disclosed as public information, unless the Offeror submits a formal written objection.

Comment [RMK9]: Proposers should be able to submit data on financial capacity, the banks/lending institutions/other sources of capital they will access, and the pro forma in confidence. Other cities do this, and Tucson can, too. Without this, the proposers will not submit the kind of information in the detail the City needs to see to evaluate the proposals.

J. CERTIFICATION

By signature on the Offer and Acceptance page, solicitation Amendment(s), or cover letter accompanying the submittal documents, the Offeror certifies:

1. The submission of the offer did not involve collusion or other anti-competitive practices.
2. The Offeror shall not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment in violation of Federal or State law.

Kaye Attachment 14

3. The Offeror has not given, offered to give, nor intends to give at any time hereafter, any economic opportunity, future employment, gift, loan, gratuity, special discount, trip, favor, meal or service to a public servant in connection with the submitted offer.
4. The Offeror hereby certifies that the individual signing the submittal is an authorized agent for the Offeror and has the authority to bind the Offeror to the Contract.

K. WHERE TO SUBMIT PROPOSALS

In order to be considered, the Offeror must complete and submit its proposal to the City of Tucson Department of Procurement at the location indicated, prior to or at the exact date and time indicated on the Request for Proposal cover page. The Offeror's proposal shall be submitted in a sealed envelope. The words "SEALED PROPOSAL" with the REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL TITLE, REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NUMBER, PROPOSAL DUE DATE AND TIME and OFFEROR'S NAME AND ADDRESS shall be written on the envelope. [As noted in "I" above, there needs to be a provision for the proposers to submit and the City to receive confidential data. Assuming the City can resolve this, the proposers should be advised to submit confidential financial data in a **separate** envelope with the words "SEALED PROPOSAL" with the REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL TITLE, REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NUMBER, PROPOSAL DUE DATE AND TIME and OFFEROR'S NAME AND ADDRESS and CONFIDENTIAL FINANCIAL DATA written on the envelope.

Formatted: Font: Bold

L. LATE PROPOSALS

Late proposals will be rejected.

M. OFFER AND ACCEPTANCE PERIOD

In order to allow for an adequate evaluation, the City requires an offer in response to this solicitation to be valid and irrevocable for ninety (90) days after the proposal due date and time.

N. WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSAL

At any time prior to the specified solicitation due date and time, an Offeror may formally withdraw the proposal by a written letter, facsimile or electronic mail from the Offeror or a designated representative. Telephonic or oral withdrawals shall not be considered.

O. DISCUSSIONS

The City reserves the right to conduct discussions with Offerors for the purpose of eliminating minor irregularities, informalities, or apparent clerical mistakes in the proposal in order to clarify an offer and assure full understanding of, and responsiveness to, solicitation requirements.

P. CITY OF TUCSON BUSINESS LICENSE

It is the responsibility of the Contractor to have a City of Tucson Business License throughout the life of this Contract or a written determination from the City's Business License Section that a license is not required. At any time during the Contract, the City may request the Contractor to provide a valid copy of the business license or a written determination that a business license is not required. Application for a City Business License can be completed at http://www.tucsonaz.gov/etax. For questions contact the City's Business License Section at (520)

Kaye Attachment 15

791-4566 or email at tax-license@tucsonaz.gov.

Q. AWARD OF CONTRACT

Notwithstanding any other provision of the Request for Proposal, the City reserves the right to: (1) waive any immaterial defect or informality; or (2) reject any or all proposals, or portions thereof; or (3) reissue the Request for Proposal.

A response to this Request for Proposal is an offer to contract with the City for a Ddevelopment Aagreement based upon the terms, conditions and Scope of Work contained in the Request for Proposal. Proposals do not become Contracts unless and until they are executed by the City's Mayor and Council and the City Attorney. A contract has its inception in the award, eliminating a formal signing of a separate contract.

R. PROTESTS

A protest shall be in writing and shall be filed with the Director of Procurement. A protest of a Request for Proposal shall be received at the Department of Procurement not less than five (5) working days before the Request for Proposal due date. A protest of a proposed award or of an award shall be filed within ten (10) days after issuance of notification of award or issuance of a notice of intent to award, as applicable. A protest shall include:

I. The name, address, and telephone number of the protestant;

II. The signature of the protestant or its representative;

III. Identification of the Request for Proposal or Contract number;

IV. A detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of protest including copies of relevant documents; and

V. The form of relief requested.

Kaye Attachment 16

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Request for Proposals – Phase II
Preliminary Draft Text, January 30, 2015

VI. Phase II Submittal Requirements

Proposals must address, at a minimum, each of the items listed below and in the order presented. As noted in Section V.G. of this RFP, the sections should be divided with labeled tabs.

1. Contact Information

(a) Provide primary contact information for the authorized representative, including name, title, address, telephone numbers and electronic mail address.

(b) Describe the contracting entity that the Offeror anticipates would be entering into ~~contracts~~ the Development Agreement with the City. At the time ~~T~~the contracting entity enters into the Development Agreement with the City, it must be organized and in good standing under the laws of the State of Arizona ~~prior to entering into contracts with the City~~.

Comment [RMK10]: As written, this EXCLUDES the Alexander company! The sentence needs a clarification. Even so, Alexande r might balk at this.

2. Executive Summary

(a) Provide a narrative summary of the overall proposal not to exceed two pages using ~~font size~~ 12 point type.

3. Project Description

(a) Clearly detail and define the project, including, but not limited to:

i. Proposed uses

ii. ~~Gross~~ Proposed square footage of project components and aggregate square footage.

iii. Building heights (feet and stories)

iv. Number of parking spaces (structured or surface)

v. Expected number of construction jobs, with supporting data

vi. Expect number of permanent jobs, with supporting data

vii. Estimated construction costs

viii. Estimated project costs (all costs)

(b) Provide a rendered site plan showing placement of proposed structures and public realm elements, the functional interconnection of interior and exterior uses and spaces, building elevations, and other graphics that demonstrative high quality project design sensitive to the surrounding development, and historic resources, the desert environment, the northern viewshed

(c) Provide a narrative description of the utilization of the site.

(d) Describe the incorporation of sustainable practices, such as LEED certification

(e) Describe the community open space features and programming

(f) Describe public amenities both with and adjacent to the site that activate the pedestrian environment

Kaye Attachment 17

(g) Provide a circulation plan showing transit, vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian routes within and around the site. Plan should be informed by a traffic analysis to determine the ability of the surrounding roadway network to handle transit vehicle operations and additional traffic and parking demands projected to be generated by the project.

(h) Provide a comprehensive project schedule addressing project development phases, including, but not limited to, planning, entitlements, design, plan review, permits, construction, and long-term operations and occupancy.

(i) Provide a construction mitigation plan outlining strategies to maintain: 1) vehicular, truck, and bus operations and pedestrian and bike access in the project area; 2) ~~facilitate~~ passenger access to bus and streetcar boarding locations; ~~and protect~~the integrity of public utilities, streetcar infrastructure, ~~and~~ historic resources, such as the historic depot;~~,~~ and, 3) adjacent residential and commercial properties and continuous access to them; and, 4) the quality of the downtown environment.

4. Integration of Transit Use

(a) Describe how the transit facilities and uses will be integrated with the other proposed project elements.

(b) Describe how the project will enhance the transit use, including, but not limited to:

i. Operational needs of the bus system and its passengers

ii. Connectivity between transit, other modes of transportation, and other land uses

iii. Public and administrative functions such as ticket vending and sales, customer service, security, public restrooms and amenities (e.g., seating, shade, trash receptacles, signage), and storage

5. Response to City Goals & Plans & FTA Requirements

(a) Describe how the proposed project achieves the City's Project Purpose and Goals presented in Section III of this RFP.

(b) Describe how the proposed project meets the FTA eligibility criteria highlighted in Section III of this RFP, as well as other FTA requirements

(c) Describe how the project conforms with applicable adopted City plans and regulations

6. Team

In the Phase I submittals, Offerors provided their proposed project teams and information on the proposed team members' qualifications relevant to the proposed joint development project. For the Phase II submittal, Offerors shall provide, at a minimum, the following information related to the team. Please note that if an Offeror's proposed team includes modifications from that proposed in the Phase I submittal, those changes should be noted and explained.

(a) Confirm the team composition and describe the role of each of firm(s) and individual team members. Include project write-ups and resumes, highlighting project ~~work~~ experience relevant to the RTC Joint Development Project.

Kaye Attachment 18

(b) Provide an organizational chart that illustrates the role of each proposed team member.

(c) Provide team members projected availability to work on this project.

7. Public Engagement Plan

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

(a) Develop a plan for involving the local businesspeople and other interested public parties throughout the planning, permitting, design, construction, and operational phases of the project.

(b) Attend meetings with City staff, Planning Commission, and City Council as needed.

8. Business Plan & Financial Capacity

(a) Confirm intention to be a long-term partner with the City in this project and propose a mechanism for interaction with City staff, transit operators, local businesspeople, and other community members.

(b) Describe the preferred methods of site conveyance that complies with continuing control of the transit function by the City per FTA guidelines.

(c) Provide a Business Plan that includes the following:

i. Research/market demand data that demonstrates the project's viability

ii. Utilization of the project site and required forms of control of the site [Might be covered elsewhere] ??? Formatted: Highlight

iii. Anticipated qualified tenants/buyers/operators for the completed project

iv. Development costs, including all construction costs, soft costs and contingencies [Have also asked for costs under 2.b. above] HUH??? Formatted: Highlight

v. Operating pro forma, including all revenues, expenses, debt service, taxes, and other assessments for at least 10 years after occupancy

(d) Provide a Management Plan for the site's administration, operation, marketing and maintenance to achieve the goals of the joint development over time working closely with property owners, tenants and residents who work or live on-site.

(e) Demonstrate and quantify maximization of long-term benefits for the City. These benefits may be measured several ways, including, but not limited to:

i. Development of a project that supports multiple functions, including a multimodal transit facility and provides tax revenue benefits

ii. Construction of high-energy efficient and sustainable building(s)

iii. Recovery of the financial investment made by the City over a defined period of time

Kaye Attachment 19

iv. Creation of a high-quality, accessible spaces for public use that enhances downtown and transit use.

(f) Demonstrate financial capacity – Confidential Data

i. Provide a master project budget – including all hard costs and soft costs – with a ~~C~~clear strategy and schedule to fund all project costs

~~i.~~ii. Provide a project pro forma for the predevelopment phase of the project through construction and the first ten years of project operations.

iii. Identification of sources, types, and amounts of equity, debt financing, grants, and other funding sources anticipated

iv. Describe and quantify shortfalls in the project financing plan, if any. Propose a level and form of financial assistance that fills a clearly described financial gap in the proposal.

~~ii.~~i.

~~iii.~~v. Citation of other projects in which the types of equity, financing, grants, and othe funding sources identified were successfully utilized by the Offeror

~~iv.~~vi. Provide clear and compelling information to demonstrate financial capacity to execute and complete the project successfully, including a Dun and Bradstreet credit report and references from lenders/investors.

(g) Requested City assistance

i. Clearly outline the proposed business terms. Proposer requests for City assistance (if any) should only be for assistance that the City can reasonably accommodate, and should specify details such as type of assistance, length of agreement term, commencement and completion dates, etc.

ii. Requested level of assistance must be clearly and quantitatively demonstrated to be less than the public benefit generated by the project.

iii. Describe and quantify the economic, fiscal, employment and other tangible public benefits generated by the proposal that are beneficial to the City and the public. Qualitative public benefits such as social goals may be included as support to the well-defined quantitative benefits.

~~iv. Request a level of financial assistance that fills a clearly described financial gap in the proposal.~~

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Right: 0", Space After: 10 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Comment [RMK11]: This should be clearly identified as CONFIDENTIAL DATA.

9. Public Presentation

Following the Phase II submittal, the City will organize a forum to publically present the proposals. Within ~~2 weeks~~ 15 business days following the public presentations, project teams will provide to the Procurement Department their responses to stakeholder comments received through the forum. The Procurement Department will make these responses available to the Selection Committee for review.

Kaye Attachment 20

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Request for Proposals – Phase II
Preliminary Draft Text, January 30, 2015

Phase II Evaluation Criteria

A. [Draft] Specific Criteria

Formatted: Highlight

Proposal will be evaluated based on the following specific criteria:

1. Joint Development Project Description: Has the Offeror clearly detailed and defined the physical and operational aspects of the proposed joint development project? Has the Offeror demonstrated a high quality- project design sensitive to its surroundings? Does the project include ~~a~~ community open space(s) and other public amenities that will activate the pedestrian environment?

2. Integration of Transit Use: Has the Offeror clearly described how the required transit facilities, uses, and purpose will be integrated with the proposed project. Does the proposal clearly describe enhancements to the transit use, including, but not limited to, operational, connectivity, and physical enhancement?

3. Response to City Goals and FTA Requirements: Does the proposal demonstrate how the proposed project will achieve the City Purpose and Goals presented in Section III of this RFP?

4. Team: Is the team composed of ~~the appropriate~~highly skilled members to develop the specific joint development project proposed? Do the individual team members have the necessary qualifications experience, and availability to fulfill their assigned roles for this project?

5. Public Engagement: Does the proposal provide a thoughtful plan for meaningful ~~engaging~~ engagement of the public in the project development process going forward?

6. Business Plan & Financial Capacity: Does the proposal provide sufficient evidence that the Offeror is committed to long-term partnership with the City? Does the proposal offer viable, well-reasoned Business and Management Plans? Has the Offeror demonstrated how long-term benefits for the City will be maximized? Does the proposal include a viable strategy for funding all project costs?

B. Other Evaluation Tools

The following methods may also be used in the evaluation process:

(a) Interviews: The City reserves the right to conduct interviews with the Offerors at any point during the evaluation process. However, the City may determine that interviews are not necessary. In the event interviews are conducted, information provided during the interview process shall be taken into consideration when evaluating the stated criteria. The City shall not reimburse the Offeror for the costs associated with the interview process.

(b) Additional Investigations: The City reserves the right to make such additional investigations as it deems necessary to establish the competence and financial stability of any Offeror submitting a proposal.

(c) Prior Experience: Experiences with the City and entities that evaluation committee members represent and that are not specifically mentioned in the solicitation response may be taken into consideration when evaluating offers.

Kaye Attachment 21

Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project
Request for Proposals – Phase II
Preliminary Draft Text, January 30, 2015

(d) Multiple or Joint Awards: To provide adequate contract coverage, at the City's sole discretion, multiple awards may be made. For this same purpose, the City reserves the right to request that team members be added to teams or that teams be joined.

Rebecca Ruopp - RTC RFP comments

From: Margot W Garcia <mgarcia@vcu.edu>
To: "Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov" <rebecca.ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>
Date: 2/8/2015 10:03 PM
Subject: RTC RFP comments

Comments on Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development Project, RFP-Phase II

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

Margot Garcia

Tucson Transit Task Force

mgarcia@vcu.edu

Rebecca Ruopp - Phase II Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development RFP

From: Barbara Brookhart <bbrookhart@gmail.com>
To: Rebecca Ruopp <Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>
Date: 2/9/2015 7:08 AM
Subject: Phase II Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development RFP

February 8, 2014

Rebecca R. Ruopp
Principal Planner
Office of Integrated Planning
149 N. Stone, 2nd Floor
Tucson, AZ 85701

Phase II Ronstadt Transit Center Joint Development RFP

Thanks for an opportunity to comment on the above captioned RFP. I mentioned at the stakeholders meeting as to how exciting downtown Tucson has become with all of the new things that are happening. My personal favorites are the new cutting edge restaurants and drinking establishments.

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

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

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

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

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

An assisted living facility provides good jobs, but not the clientele for the retail shops and restaurants as would other uses, as most residents have health problems that would not allow them to independently use local restaurants or entertainment venues. The only time residents get out and about is when they take a bus of ten people to Applebee's. I truly appreciate the needs of seniors, as my sister is an A.L. resident, but this site and any development in downtown needs the type of uses that will help create an 18-hour neighborhood that will make the streets lively, safe, and walkable, especially at night.

I have walked from City Hall meetings to the RTC at night, and not only do I feel like I need to run through the library park to be safe, but waiting for my bus at the Ronstadt Center can be uncomfortable. Several weeks ago when I was waiting after an early evening meeting, and the antics of the kids and street people at the terminal was "weird" and made me feel unsafe, even for me as an ex-New Yorker who has seen everything on the NYC subways at night.

I have read some of the Tucson BRU and Bus Friends Forever concerns, many of which are valid, especially about how the transit center will be valued, and how that revenue will be returned to transit. They will never be happy with any location change or closing of the Congress Street entrance. They will continually need to be catered to. Maybe a pro-bono consultant, such as a retired Real Estate Asset Manager, or someone they respect and trust at UA could work with them on the standard way to calculate the real value of the RTC, and what realistically should go back towards bus services. They are now using off- the-wall figures for their calculations.

The focus and name of this RFP is the RTC, and if its constituency isn't satisfied with how the terminal is being upgraded or rebuilt, then there will be a major problem with lawsuits in the future. As a 10-year member of a Brooklyn Community Board, I was involved with the Atlantic

Yards project in Brooklyn. The many community law suits successfully stopped the project for over 12 years. The terminal for the Long Island Rail Road and nine subway lines has been upgraded, and the Barclays Center where the Nets play has been built, but the mega housing project is still mired in lawsuits and crony capitalism.

I dearly love the bus people, but there needs to be a productive next level of discussions and negotiations with them if the RFP is to move forward without lawsuits. Their concerns should somehow be mitigated soon, as no developer will want to get entangled in this kind of dispute. Any new problems since the original stakeholders group meetings should be addressed up front, instead of during the *Public Design Presentations and Feedback* sessions, after design plans have already been completed.

I suggest that this would speed up the community process and partially pre-empt some future problems, and enable the two developers to have answers or design solutions to community concerns at the time of the sessions.

Sincerely,

Barbara Ann Brookhart

[illegible]
Tucson, AZ 8571[illegible]
[illegible]
Mobile: 917.409.[illegible]

Rebecca Ruopp - Re: Ronstadt Transit Center Phase II RFP Draft Comments

From: saba1492 <saba1492@gmail.com>
To: Rebecca Ruopp <Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>
Date: 2/9/2015 9:06 AM
Subject: Re: Ronstadt Transit Center Phase II RFP Draft Comments

Good morning, Rebecca. Lots of distraction over the weekend and a busy day for me today; and Richard's out of town for some days, but all will be well. Thank you.

Overall I am impressed with the thoroughness of the document, especially the submittal requirements, with the possible exception that no. 7 on public involvement might be made more specific. You have included a great deal and been very clear.

I gather, from the comments that have been shared with me, that many of them focus on the evaluation criteria and the concern that those should be made more quantifiable in the interest of accountability. They are all phrased as Yes or No questions and are pretty subjective and nonspecific, but that points to the job of the selection committee.

My real concerns are less with the RFP itself-- I really do think you all have done a good job of incorporating the various concerns and specifying the constraints and desires-- but with the process that we have to trust.

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

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

Let me know if I can be of help in any specific ways as you prepare the next version of this document and get ready for the upcoming meeting. Thank you again for all of your diligent work and good communication.

Suzanne

Suzanne Schafer