Attachment A

Summary of the Judge Doyle Square RFQ/RFP Phase and Negotiation Phase

The issuance of a Request for Qualifications (RFQ)/Request for Proposals (RFP) was the product of a significant planning and decision process with the Common Council. On July 17, 2012, following Council directives in February and June of 2011, the Common Council directed the Judge Doyle Square Staff Team to draft an RFQ for development teams for Judge Doyle Square (Blocks 88 and 105) using the Findings and Recommendations of the Judge Doyle Square Staff Team Report and the Blocks 88 and 105 studies as the basis of the RFQ/RFP. The Common Council also established the Judge Doyle Square citizen committee to oversee the RFQ/RFP process.

The Common Council reviewed and approved the issuance of the RFQ on February 5, 2013, and directed the Judge Doyle Square Committee to (1) review the RFQ submissions and recommend to the Common Council those teams to be invited to participate in the RFP stage, the second stage of the Judge Doyle Square selection process and (2) recommend the proposal requirements for the RFP stage by the end of June 2013.

On February 18, 2013, the RFQ was issued and four responses were received by the submittal deadline of April 30, 2013. The Judge Doyle Square Committee (1) established an RFQ selection process and criteria on April 15, 2013, (2) invited three of the four responders on May 9, 2013 for an interview (one responder withdrew from consideration after the invitation was extended), (3) conducted the two interviews on May 16 and 29, 2013 along with reference checks of the two teams. The Judge Doyle Square Committee (1) administered the selection criteria on June 11, 2013 and determined that the JDS Development LLC and the Journeyman Group have the experience, capability and project concept that meets or exceeds the City's expectations and (2) received and reviewed the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) document from the Staff Team.

The Common Council on July 16, 2013, (1) reviewed and approved the RFP for the Judge Doyle Square project; (2) invited JDS Development LLC and the Journeyman Group to participate in the RFP stage and (3) directed the Judge Doyle Square Committee to review the RFP submissions and to recommend a Judge Doyle Square development team for the Common Council's consideration by the end of November 2013. The Request for Proposals was issued on July 17, 2013 and two responses were received by the submittal deadline of September 30, 2013.

The Judge Doyle Square Committee (1) established an RFP selection process and criteria on September 17, 2013, (2) conducted the two development team interviews on October 14 and 16, 2013; (3) held a public feedback meeting on November 5, 2013, (4) received a staff report from the Judge Doyle Square Staff Team on October 28 and December 2, 2013, and (5) solicited additional feedback from the development teams on December 16, 2013 and January 28, 2014.

The Judge Doyle Square Committee completed its analysis of the two RFP responses on February 3, 2014 and found that JDS Development LLC offered the best combination of project features, feasibility and development attributes which would strike the most advantageous balance for achieving the City's Judge Doyle Square goals and the potential best overall value. Having held 18 meetings since the Committee members were appointed by the Common Council in October 2012, it concluded its work and recommended that the Common Council provide negotiating instructions for the Mayor and Judge Doyle Square Staff Team in the negotiation of a final development agreement.

On February 25, 2014, the Common Council directed that the City enter into negotiations with JDS Development LLC to undertake a mixed use development called Judge Doyle Square. In approving that action, the Common Council memorialized the following Preamble to the Resolution, as follows:

Judge Doyle Square represents an important opportunity to add another dynamic and high quality, tax-generating development for the benefit of the City and its other taxing jurisdictions on two currently tax-exempt parcels. Judge Doyle Square can be a destination for residents, employees and visitors by expanding and unifying the restaurant and entertainment district on the south side of the Capitol Square. It's the first City initiated development project as a result of the new downtown plan and is intended to:

- Utilize two City-owned, tax-exempt parcels to significantly expand the City's tax base and employment by replacing an obsolete parking facility, activating South Pinckney Street and improving the pedestrian connections between the Square and Monona Terrace;
- Unlock the development potential of the sites through careful selection of mixed uses that includes residential, retail, restaurant, bicycle and parking facilities, and a hotel;
- Retain and grow the business of the Monona Terrace Community and Convention Center;
- Increase economic and retail activity from additional convention attendees, visitors, downtown workers and residents.

The result of this effort will be a healthier downtown though increased property values, added employment opportunities and downtown residents, improved public facilities; and additional external capital injected into the region's economy by visitors to Madison.

To be successful however, the project must meet the City's land use and urban design objectives for the currently City-owned, underutilized and tax-exempt property on South Pinckney Street between East Doty and East Wilson Streets.

The Judge Doyle Square development must also be affordable for the taxpayers

and be efficient in the use of the City's financial resources. The City has an unusual opportunity to fashion a project to re-build the functionally obsolete Government East parking ramp, using the property as a catalyst for new tax producing development. This opportunity can significantly improve the walkability of the CBD which is the most important element to improve the CBD as a destination. The inclusion of a bicycle center will also address the City's multi-modal transportation objectives.

Providing an additional hotel room block would be a most important controllable issue to keep Monona Terrace a productive catalyst for attracting visitors, and the outside capital that visitors bring, to fuel our regional economy. In meeting this objective, the new hotel however must not compete with Monona Terrace. Equally important, the new hotel should minimize any negative impact on the existing downtown hotels during the absorption of the new hotel rooms into the marketplace.

Achieving these objectives must not harm the Madison Parking Utility's ability to implement its capital plan to maintain the City's parking facilities in the CBD over the next twenty years.

Finally, keeping the Madison Municipal Building (MMB) in civic use will help achieve the City's desire to maintain a nexus of City offices together in the CBD and continue the historic use of the building as an important civic building. The new structures in Block 88 must be of high design quality, respecting the design requirements of the MMB as a National Register of Historic Places building, and create a project design that is compatible with surrounding buildings and uses.

Following the Council's action to select JDS Development LLC to develop the project and authorize negotiations, the Mayor appointed the City Negotiating Team on March 10, 2014. The kick-off negotiating session was held on March 18, 2014.

A total of eleven negotiating sessions were held on April 8, 22 and 30, May 13 and 22, June 3 and 17, July 15 and 17, and August 1, and 15.

The Negotiating Team reported to the Board of Estimates on six occasions on March 31, April 14, May 12, June 9, July 7 and July 28. In addition, design workshops were held with City Staff and JDS Development on April 1 with follow-up sessions on April 22 and May 13.

At the June 9, 2014 meeting of the Board of Estimates, the Board provided feedback to the Negotiating Team on the orientation of the hotel tower on Block 88 in an east/west configuration on the block, including construction in the "U" of the Madison Municipal Building. The Negotiating Team also reported on the status of the design progression and the financial plan development.

On August 22, 2014, the City Negotiating Team issued its Report to the Common Council requesting that the negotiation period be extended through October 15, 2014 to allow the City

Negotiating Team and JDS Development LLC to frame alternatives that will significantly lower the level of City investment for further consideration and direction.

On September 2, 2014, the Common Council extended the negotiation period with JDS Development LLC, directing the City Negotiating Team to work to significantly reduce the level of city financial participation for the project and to report back to the Common Council by November 1, 2014.

Five negotiating sessions were held from September 3 through October 21, 2014 and the City Negotiating Team provided updates to the Board of Estimates on September 30 and October 13, 2014. On November 3, 2014, the City Negotiating Team issued its report to the Common Council recommending that negotiations continue with JDS Development LLC based on the developments concepts presented in its report with a final development term sheet to be completed for Common Council consideration by May 1, 2015.

Attachment B Concept Drawings for Large Parking Floor Plates under Judge Doyle Square









Attachment C

Opinion of Probable Cost for Large Parking Floor Plates under Judge Doyle Square

OPINION OF PROBABLE COST BLOCK 88 PARKING GARAGE - Judge Doyle Square MMB to Pinckney Street (345 Stalls)- With Retail (9,000 SF) September 25, 2014

Description	Est. Qty.	Unit		Unit Price		Amount
DEMOLITION						
Demolition of MMB Annex	160,000	CF	S	0.35	S	56,000.00
	100,000	01	9	Total	-	56,000.00
EXCAVATION				iotai	9	50,000.00
Excavation for Parking Garage	41,360	CY	S	17.50	S	723,800.00
Excavation for Wall Footings-Perimeter & Interior	210	CY	s		s	7,350.00
Excavation for Column Footings	1.310	CY	s		s	45,850.00
3	1,010	0.	Ŷ	Total	s	777,000.00
SOIL RETENTION				rotar	Ŷ	111,000.00
Soil Nailing along Streets	9,200	SF	S	40.00	S	368,000.00
Drilled Piles & Lagging Along MMB	4.100	SF	s		S	328,000.00
		-		Total	S	696,000.00
BACKFILLING					•	
Backfill Foundation Walls along Streets	1,870	CY	S	23.00	S	43,010.00
				Total	S	43,010.00
GROUND WATER CONTROL						
Dewatering during Construction	1	LS	S	30,000.00	S	30,000.00
Underfloor Drainage Grid	48,500	SF	S	2.25	S	109,125.00
Perimeter Drain Tile	900	LF	\$	18.00	S	16,200.00
Sump Pumps	1	LS	S	50,000.00	S	50,000.00
Damp Proof Foundation Walls	22,800	SF	\$	3.00	S	68,400.00
				Total	\$	273,725.00
CONCRETE						
Wall Footings	105	CY	\$	300.00	S	31,500.00
Column Footings w/Mud Mats	960	CY	\$	330.00	S	316,800.00
Mat Foundation for Crane	90	CY	\$	350.00	\$	31,500.00
Concrete Sealer	85,680	SF	\$	0.35	\$	29,988.00
Elevator Pits/Walls	300	SF	\$	30.00	\$	9,000.00
Stair Walls	2,500	SF	\$	35.00	S	87,500.00
Elevator Walls	2,000	SF	\$	35.00	S	70,000.00
Above Grade Cladding		SF	\$	40.00	\$	-
Foundation Perimeter Walls	19,350	SF	\$	38.00	\$	735,300.00
Inter-Level Ramp Walls	3,450	SF	\$	38.00	\$	131,100.00
Columns	400	CY	\$	360.00	\$	144,000.00
6" Concrete Slab-on-Grade	47,520	SF	\$	6.50	\$	308,880.00
* 9" Parking Level Slabs (PT)	85,680	SF	\$	32.00	S	2,741,760.00
Stairs/Ramps to MMB & Pinkney	50	SF	\$	35.00	\$	1,750.00
Concrete Stairs (8 stairs@2 flights)	8	Flights	\$	10,000.00	\$	80,000.00
Site Work / Streetscape	1	LS	\$2	250,000.00	\$	250,000.00
				Total	\$	4,969,078.00
INTERIOR SPACES						
Ramp Office/Breakroom/Toilets Allowance	1	LS	S	50,000.00	S	50,000.00
Mechanical Rooms	800	SF	\$	70.00	\$	56,000.00
Elevator Equipment Rooms	200	SF	\$	75.00	\$	15,000.00
Steel Rails	160	LF	S	75.00	S	12,000.00
** Glazing	1,800	SF	\$	100.00	\$	180,000.00
Doors	12	EA	\$	200.00	\$	2,400.00
				Total	\$	315,400.00

* Includes 9,000 sf of retail at Wilson Street Level - \$444,150

** Includes 1,500 sf of Storefront along Pinckney and Wilson Streets - \$150,000



OPINION OF PROBABLE COST BLOCK 88 PARKING GARAGE - Judge Doyle Square MMB to Pinckney Street (345 Stalls)- With Retail (9,000 SF) September 25, 2014

ELEVATORS						
Public	2	EA	\$ 50,000,00	S	100,000.00	
	-		Total	-	100,000,00	
UTILITIES				Ť		
HVAC	133,200	SF	S 2.50	S	333,000.00	
Electrical	133,200	SF	S 3.50	S	466,200.00	
Plumbing	133,200	SF	S 2.50	S	333,000.00	
Utility Relocation/Upgrade	1	LS	\$125,000.00	S	125,000.00	
Fire Protection	133,200	SF	S 2.50	S	333,000.00	
			Total	\$	1,590,200.00	
ACCESS CONTROL SERVICES						
Security	1	LS	\$ 75,000.00	\$	75,000.00	
Revenue Control	1	LS	\$250,000.00	S	250,000.00	
Signage & Stripping	1	LS	\$250,000.00	S	250,000.00	
Temporary Guardrail at Elevated Slab Edge	650	LF	\$ 20.00	-	13,000.00	
			Total	\$	588,000.00	
GENERAL CONDITIONS						
Hoisting Equipment-Cranes	133,200	SF	\$ 2.50	S	333,000.00	
Winter Construction	1	LS	\$200,000.00	S	200,000.00	
Contractor General Conditions	133,200	SF	\$ 3.50	S	466,200.00	
			Total	\$	999,200.00	
			TOTAL	\$	10,407,613.00	
	C 0/		Tana 9 Tanting	~	004 450 70	
	0%		Fees & Testing	⊅	624,456.78	
			SUB-TOTAL	\$	11,032,069.78	
	7 1/2% Const	ructio	n Contingency	\$	827,405.23	
		c	GRAND TOTAL	\$	11,859,475.01	***
Total Parking Stalls			345			

Total Parking Stalls Cost per Parking Stall 345 \$ 34,375.29

NO LAND COST INCLUDED IN GRAND TOTAL

In providing Opinions of Probable Costs, the Client understands that the Consultant has no control over the cost or availability of labor, equipment or materials, or over conditions or the Contractor's method of pricing, and that the Consultant's Opinions of Probable Construction Costs are made on the basis of the Consultant's professional judgment and experience. The Consultant makes no warranty, expressed or implied, that bids, quantities, or negotiated costs of the Work will not vary from the Consultant's Opinion of Probable Construction Cost.

*** Costs do not include any land purchase, permits and fees, bonds/insurance/builders risk, interest payment or other soft costs

Plan includes 9000 square feet of retail space at the Wilson Street level. Cost for this space includes \$32/sf for PT slab, \$0.35/sf for concrete sealer, and \$11.00/sf for MEPFP, \$6.00/sf for Hoisting Equipment and Contractor GC. 9,000 sf x \$49.35 = \$444,150. Cost also includes \$150,000 for storefront glazing along Wilson and Pinckney Streets for a total cost of \$594,150.



OPINION OF PROBABLE COST Judge Doyle Square Tunnel Connection under Pinckney (98 Stalls) September 24, 2014

Description	Est. Qty.	Unit		Unit Price		Amount
EXCAVATION Excavation for Tunnel Connection	0.445	014	~	17.50		
Excavation for Wall Footings-Perimeter & Interior	8,145 30	CY	s s	17.50 35.00	SS	142,537.50
Excavation for Column Footings	95	CY	S	35.00	ŝ	1,050.00
Excavation for Column Footings	95	UT	\$	Total	\$	3,325.00
SOIL RETENTION				Total	\$	140,912.50
Soil Nailing at Streets	3,330	SF	s	40.00	S	133,200.00
	0,000	01	Ŷ	Total	S	133,200.00
BACKFILLING				· o tur	·	100,200.00
Backfill Foundation Walls & Above Tunnel	620	CY	S	23.00	s	14,260.00
				Total	S	14,260.00
GROUND WATER CONTROL					3	
Underfloor Drainage Grid	17,950	SF	\$	2.25	\$	40,387.50
Perimeter Drain Tile	130	LF	\$	18.00	\$	2,340.00
Damp Proof Foundation Walls & Tunnel Cap Slab	21,280	SF	\$	3.00	\$	63,840.00
				Total	\$	106,567.50
CONCRETE						
Wall Footings	15	CY	\$	300.00	\$	4,500.00
Column Footings w/Mud Mats	95	CY	\$	330.00	\$	31,350.00
Concrete Sealer (Tunnel Floor)	17,950	SF	\$	0.35	\$	6,282.50
Foundation Perimeter Walls	2,450	SF	\$			93,100.00
Columns	53	CY	\$	360.00		19,080.00
6" Concrete Slab-on-Grade	17,950	SF	\$	6.50		116,675.00
9"Parking Level Slab (PT)	17,950	SF	2	\$32.00	\$	574,400.00
12" Tunnel Cap Slab	17,950	SF	\$	40.00	\$	718,000.00
Rebuild Pinckney Sreet	1	LS	\$	50,000.00		50,000.00
UTILITIES				Total	\$	1,613,387.50
HVAC	35,900	SF	s	2.50	s	89.750.00
Electrical	35,900	SF	s	3.50	s	125,650.00
Plumbing	35,900	SF	s	2.50	ŝ	89,750.00
Utility Relocation/Upgrade	1	LS		200,000.00	ŝ	200,000.00
Fire Protection	35,900	SF	S	2.50	s	89,750.00
	00,000	0.	Ť	Total	s	594,900.00
ACCESS CONTROL SERVICES						
Security	1	LS	S	1,000.00	s	1,000.00
Signage & Stripping	1	LS	S	1,500.00	\$	1,500.00
				Total	\$	2,500.00
GENERAL CONDITIONS						
Hoisting Equipment-Cranes	35,900	SF	\$	2.50	s	89,750.00
Winter Construction	1	LS	\$	2,000.00	\$	2,000.00
Contractor General Conditions	35,900	SF	\$	3.50	\$	125,650.00
				Total	\$	217,400.00
					120	
				TOTAL	\$	2,829,127.50
	C 0		-	s & Testing		
	07	AVE	rees	s a resulig	\$	169,747.65
			6	UB-TOTAL		2,998,875.15
			3	UB-TOTAL	->	2,990,075.15
	7 1/2% Const	ructio	n C	ontingency	¢	224,915.64
				sundency	4	224,313.04
		(GRA	ND TOTAL	\$	3,223,790.79 *
					-	0,220,100.10
Total Darking Stalls Schome 2				0.0		

Total Parking Stalls Scheme 2 Cost per Parking Stall

98 \$ 32,895.82

NO LAND COST INCLUDED IN GRAND TOTAL In providing Opinions of Probable Costs, the Client understands that the Consultant has no control over the cost or availability of labor, equipment or materials, or over conditions or the Contractor's method of pricing, and that the Consultant's Opinions of Probable Construction Costs are made on the basis of the Consultant's professional judgment and experience. The Consultant makes no warranty, expressed or implied, that bids, quantities, or negotiated costs of the Work will not vary from the Consultant's Opinion of Probable Construction Cost.

* Costs do not include any land purchase, permits and fees, bonds/insurance/builders risk, interest payment or other soft costs



OPINION OF PROBABLE COST BLOCK 105 PARKING GARAGE - Judge Doyle Square Site of Existing GE Ramp (335 Stalls) - With Retail (2,950 SF) and Loading Dock (6230 SF) September 25, 2014

Description	Est. Qty.	Unit		Unit Price		Amount
DEMOLITION						
Demolition of Superstructure	1,803,000	CF	\$	0.50	\$	901,500.00
Demolition of Slab-on-Grade	52,000	CF	s	0.40	\$	20,800.00
Demolition of Footings	30,000	CF	s	0.40	ŝ	12,000.00
Demonitor of Poolings	50,000	01	φ	Total	\$	934,300.00
EXCAVATION				Total	φ	934,500.00
Excavation for Parking Garage	31,180	CY	\$	17.50	\$	545,650.00
Excavation for Wall Footings-Perimeter & Interior	200	CY	\$	35.00	\$	7,000.00
Excavation for Column Footings	1,310	CY	\$	35.00	ŝ	45,850.00
	1,010	01	Ψ	Total		598,500.00
SOIL RETENTION				rotar	Ŷ	000,000.00
Soil Nailing along Streets	9,600	SF	\$	40.00	\$	384,000.00
Drilled Piles & Lagging Along North Wall	4,000	SF	S	80.00	ŝ	320,000.00
	1,000	01	Ŷ	Total	\$	704,000.00
BACKFILLING				rouir	*	701,000.00
Backfill Foundation Walls along Streets	1,310	CY	\$	23.00	\$	30,130.00
5				Total	\$	30,130.00
GROUND WATER CONTROL						
Dewatering during Construction	1	LS	\$	30,000.00	\$	30,000.00
Underfloor Drainage Grid	51,800	SF	\$	2.25	\$	116,550.00
Perimeter Drain Tile	660	LF	\$	18.00	\$	11,880.00
Sump Pumps	1	LS	\$	50,000.00	\$	50,000.00
Damp Proof Foundation Walls	15,950	SF	\$	3.00	\$	47,850.00
				Total	\$	256,280.00
CONCRETE						
Wall Footings	120	CY	\$	250.00	\$	30,000.00
Column Footings w/Mud Mats	960	CY	\$	300.00	\$	288,000.00
Mat Foundation for Crane	90	CY	\$	350.00	\$	31,500.00
Concrete Sealer	98,510	SF	\$	0.35	\$	34,478.50
Traffic Membrane		SF	\$	2.00	\$	-
Elevator Pits/Walls	770	SF	\$	30.00	\$	23,100.00
Stair Walls	1,730	SF	\$	35.00	\$	60,550.00
Elevator Walls	3,000	SF	\$	35.00	\$	105,000.00
Inter-Level Ramp Walls	2,250	SF	\$	40.00	\$	90,000.00
8" Block Wall	8,000	SF	\$	8.00	\$	64,000.00
Foundation Perimeter Walls	17,700	SF	\$	38.00	\$	672,600.00
Columns	340	CY	\$	360.00	\$	122,400.00
6" Concrete Slab-on-Grade	51,744	SF	\$	6.50	\$	336,336.00
9" Parking Level Slabs (PT)	81,380	SF	\$	32.00	\$	2,604,160.00
Stairs/Ramps to Pinkney	130	SF	\$	36.00	\$	4,680.00
Concrete Stairs (4 stairs flights vary)		Flights		8,000.00	\$	64,000.00
Site Work / Streetscape	1	LS	\$	200,000.00	\$	200,000.00
				Total	\$	4,730,804.50
INTERIOR SPACES						
Mechanical Rooms	300	SF	\$	70.00	\$	21,000.00
Elevator Equipment Rooms	300	SF	\$	75.00	\$	22,500.00
Steel Rails	160	LF	\$	75.00	\$	12,000.00
Glazing	740	SF	\$	100.00	\$	74,000.00
Doors	20	EA	\$	200.00	\$	4,000.00
				Total	\$	133,500.00

13-5576 BLOCK 105 PARKING GARAGE/RAMP - Judge Doyle Square



OPINION OF PROBABLE COST BLOCK 105 PARKING GARAGE - Judge Doyle Square Site of Existing GE Ramp (335 Stalls) - With Retail (2,950 SF) and Loading Dock (6230 SF) September 25, 2014

ELEVATORS						
Public	4	EA	\$	60,000.00	\$	240,000.00
Freight	1	EA	\$	70,000.00	\$	70,000.00
				Total	\$	310,000.00
LOADING DOCKS						
Loading Dock with Leveler	2	EA	\$	20,000.00		40,000.00
				Total	\$	40,000.00
UTILITIES HVAC	445.070	0.5				
Electrical	145,270	SF	\$	1.50	\$	217,905.00
Plumbing	145,270		\$	3.50		508,445.00
Utility Relocation/Upgrades	145,270		\$	2.50		363,175.00
Fire Protection	1	LS SF	0	\$125,000.00		125,000.00
	145,270	55	\$	1.50	-	217,905.00
ACCESS CONTROL SERVICES				Total	\$	1,432,430.00
Security	1	LS	\$	70,000.00	¢	70.000.00
Revenue Control	1	LS	s	250,000.00		70,000.00 250,000.00
Signage & Stripping	1	LS	S	250,000.00	-	250,000.00
		20	Ŷ	Total		570,000.00
GENERAL CONDITIONS				rour	Ψ	070,000.00
Hoisting Equipment-Cranes	145,270	SF	\$	2.50	\$	363,175.00
Winter Construction	1	LS	\$	200,000.00		200,000.00
Contractor General Conditions	145,270	SF	\$	4.00		581,080.00
				Total	\$	1,144,255.00
				TOTAL	\$	10,884,199.50
		C0/ A				
		0% A	VEF	ees & Testing	\$	653,051.97
				SUB-TOTAL	¢	11,537,251.47
				SUBTICIAL	-	11,557,251.47
	7 1/2% Co	nstruc	ction	Contingency	S	865,293.86
				5,		
			G	RAND TOTAL	\$	12,402,545.33 *
Total Parking Stalls				335		
Cost per Parking Stall (Total)			\$	37,022.52		
-						
Total Retail Area (SF)				2,950		

NO LAND COST INCLUDED IN GRAND TOTAL

Total Loading Dock Area (SF)

In providing Opinions of Probable Costs, the Client understands that the Consultant has no control over the cost or availability of labor, equipment or materials, or over conditions or the Contractor's method of pricing, and that the Consultant's Opinions of Probable Construction Costs are made on the basis of the Consultant's professional judgment and experience. The Consultant makes no warranty, expressed or implied, that bids, quantities, or negotiated costs of the Work will not vary from the Consultant's Opinion of Probable Construction Cost.

* Costs do not include any land purchase, permits and fees, bonds/insurance/builders risk, interest payment or other soft costs

13-5576 BLOCK 105 PARKING GARAGE/RAMP - Judge Doyle Square



6,230

Attachment D Summary of Key Judge Doyle Square RFQ/RFP Requirements and General Conditions

RFQ/RFP Requirements

- The RFQ/RFP required that a proposal to maintain the MMB as a city office building be submitted with the option to propose an adaptive reuse of the building. The RFQ also stated that a "proposal to use MMB for another purpose would have to be an exceptional proposal..."
- 2. The RFQ/RFP required that the responses "incorporate exciting urban design and appropriate architectural themes, scale and massing to create a project design that is compatible with surrounding buildings." The RFQ also stated that Pinckney Street from Monona Terrace to the Capitol Square should be a "destination quality space."
- 3. The RFQ stated that the City intended to select the team that offered "the best value to the City." It further stated, "The City will determine the potential best value by comparing differences in project features and feasibility, and development team attributes, striking the most advantageous balance for achieving the City's goals for Judge Doyle Square."
- 4. The RFQ stated that "the parking structure should be designed "at an affordable cost to the parking utility and its customers..."
- 5. The RFQ stated repeatedly the desire for a "destination quality space", "weighted heavily toward a pedestrian experience" to "enliven Pinckney Street and create a sense of place."
- 6. The RFQ required that the response include "a preliminary staging plan to maintain the current parking supply during construction."
- 7. The RFQ required the project "develop the sites at an urban density compatible with surrounding buildings." The RFQ also stated that "the massing concept for the redevelopment is envisioned to be relatively dense, and thus maximize the amount of above-grade development. Judge Doyle Square should be weighted heavily toward the pedestrian experience."
- 8. The RFQ required a mixed use development but land uses other than a hotel, a bicycle center, retail and restaurants at grade and parking (i.e. office and commercial spaces, residential housing, community spaces and public open spaces) were "encouraged but are not mandatory."
- 9. The RFQ stated, "The City prefers the parking for the development be placed below ground. However, the City will consider visually appealing above ground parking as long as there isn't any structured parking facing the sidewalk."
- 10. The RFQ and the RFP required a 250 room block as a mandatory component of the response.
- 11. The RFQ required "a description of the type of hotel product(s) to be developed, the type and amount of function space to be included, if any, and an analysis of how the hotel component will complement/compete with Monona Terrace. The City believes its most significant meeting space need is for additional break-out rooms."

- 12. The RFQ and RFP required the "identification of the national affiliation (hotel Flag) and the national sales force and reservation system for the hotel use(s)."
- 13. The RFQ and RFP didn't require a specific size of any new hotel, only that a 250 room block was required. In addition, the RFQ and RFP didn't specify the amount of function space for any hotel.

RFQ/RFP General Conditions

- 1. In the event that a proposer does not meet one or more of the requirements, the City of Madison reserves the right to continue the evaluation of the proposal that most closely meets the requirements of the RFP.
- During the evaluation of proposals, the City reserves the right to contact any or all proposers to request additional information for purposes of clarification of RFP responses, reject proposals which contain errors, or at its sole discretion, waive disqualifying errors or gain clarification of error or information.
- 3. At any phase, the City reserves the right to terminate, suspend or modify this selection process; reject any or all submittals; and waive any informalities, irregularities or omissions in submittals, all as deemed in the best interests of the City.