



RFI Request for Interest - Response Addendum

SALT RIVER PIMA-MARICOPA INDIAN COMMUNITY

DOBSON SITE

REDEVELOPMENT

Prime ±270-Acre Commercial Development
Opportunity Along the Salt River in Arizona's
Scottsdale South Submarket

December 12th, 2025



General Statement:

There have been a significant number of questions submitted requesting details and timelines associated to the potential development of a casino property, a Dobson Rd. bridge as well as if SRPMIC would consider uses not currently permitted such as non-Community Member residential.

The RFI, which is the first step of a larger RFP process, was created to not only understand what development opportunities may exist for the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community to consider but also how these opportunities may help in the decision making associated to the casino/bridge/non-permitted use requests.

Although detailed answers to these questions are not available at this time, they will be addressed in the future RFP, currently scheduled for March 2026 (which is subject to change). Even with these current unknowns we encourage interested parties to continue with submitting RFI responses by the January 30th deadline.

- **Question: Have you considered an alternative site for casino relocation?**
 - Response: The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC or Community) Gaming Enterprise is currently only evaluating the land associated with the RFI process for the potential construction of a new casino that would replace the current Casino Arizona property. Highlighted in visuals throughout the RFI, the land located to the east of the proposed Dobson Road alignment has been the primary focus of evaluation.
- **Question: If a developer/investor/capital partner brings financing for the project including for a new Casino Arizona could the tribe potentially offer percentage participation in casino revenues?**
 - Response: Please note that the RFI is not seeking proposals for casino development. The RFI specifically seeks non-casino development that would stand on its own or complement a potential future casino whose exact location and program will be determined in the future. If it was ultimately decided by the Community that there will be a new casino property built within the RFI site it would be owned and operated completely by the Community and not looking for partners.

- **Question: Will the archeological and environmental be completed by the Tribe?**
 - Response: The selected developer will be responsible for completing all archaeological, cultural and environmental reviews required as part of the business leasing process. These reviews will be conducted at the developer's expense and coordinated with SRPMIC's Environmental Protection and Natural Resources Division, and with the Tribal Historic Preservation Office. While additional studies may be required, please note that a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment and Geotechnical Exploration have been conducted and are included in the RFI appendix.

- **Question: Where will you be posting appraisals, you currently have commissioned?**
 - Response: Appraisals for the land associated with the RFI can be downloaded from the following link: https://srpmic-nsn.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/Dobson-Redevelopment-Project-Aite-Appraisal_April-2025.pdf

- **Question: What is the time frame for deciding if the Casino is part of the development or not. As it is a potential anchor for the site, its existence and time frame are important.**
 - Response: The information included in the RFI associated to a potential casino development is all that is currently available. All information associated to the potential future development of a casino will be addressed in the future RFP.

- **Question: Have the Tribal Members submitted their own RFI responses on what is wanted/needed?**
 - Response: Appendix B7 which can be found on page 71 of the RFI provides an executive summary of the open house style outreach events hosted in 2019 to discuss potential future development in the southern portion of the Community which includes the land associated with the RFI. Although specific details beyond that found in this appendix are not being made public it can be shared that desired developments spanned all development categories which is another reason this RFI encourages interested parties to submit suggestions and proposal for what they believe is the highest and best use of the land.

- **Question: Apartments have been prohibited in the past; will that continue to be the case here and moving forward**
 - Response: The Dobson Site Redevelopment RFI encourages interested parties to submit suggestions and proposals for what they believe is the highest and best use of the land. If the proposed use is not currently allowed, such as non-community member residential. SRPMIC leadership will consider this feedback carefully and provide resulting guidance in the future RFP.

- **Question: FEMA does not oversee the reservation but has the tribe had any studies done to this area for possible flood zone?**
 - Response: SRPMIC has never participated in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP); however, maybe there are small areas of the Community where we could partner with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) on mapping and other improvements that would alleviate hazards and promote sovereignty at the same time. There is some existing Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) mapping from FEMA that was done in the 1990s and last updated in 2013. Those FEMA maps should have been “clipped” along the Community’s south boundary given the Community’s south boundary was permanently fixed by Public Law 95-399, 95th Congress, or alternatively labeled as “Zone D – Areas with possible but undetermined flood hazards”. No flood hazard analysis has been conducted by FEMA in deference to the Community’s sovereignty and being tribal lands.

SRPMIC does not have any FLO-2D models south of the Arizona Canal. We do have the final drainage report from the Maricopa County McKellips Road (SR 101 to Alma School Road) Widening Project (MCDOT # TT0342) that shows the drainage area upstream of the SRMG Dobson site and includes a HEC-1 model (pre vs. post). To obtain this work product, please request it through purchasing-bids@srpmic-nsn.gov.

- The Community is currently working with AECOM and the Maricopa County Flood Control District to get the existing hard bank levee certified by FEMA. Part of AECOM’s work included a seepage analysis, inundation, and breach modeling. The Community and FCD are working on a plan to clear vegetation from a 20-foot clear zone on both sides of the existing levee although the actual work may not take place until Fall 2026.

- **Question: If a developer invests heavily in an RFP response with a proposal that necessarily includes the proposed Dobson bridge as part of the proposal's circulation plan, what happens if Dobson is not ultimately funded or built?**
 - Response: The information included in the RFI associated to Dobson Road and bridge is all that is currently available. Additional information associated to the potential future development of Dobson Road and Dobson Road Bridge will be addressed in the future RFP.

- **Question: Are there any development ideas the tribe is completely against?**
 - Response: The Dobson Site Redevelopment RFI encourages interested parties to submit suggestions and proposals for what they believe is the highest and best use of the land. If the proposed use is one that is not currently permitted, discussions will take place with SRPMIC leadership on how to properly respond to that specific use request.

- **Question: Is the SRPMIC General Plan from 2016 the most up to date for the community's goals?**
 - Response: The General Plan adopted December 13, 2006, is the most recent version. For clarification, no General Plan updates occurred in 2016.

- **Question: Is the Pre-Proposal Conference recording of the meeting and attendee list being made available?**
 - Response: The recording is not being made available, but the presentation displayed during this conference can be found on the following website: <https://srpmic-nsn.gov/dobsondevelopment/>.

- **Question: Is it possible to have multifamily, other than Community, on the site?**
 - Response: The Dobson Site Redevelopment RFI encourages interested parties to submit suggestions and proposals for what they believe is the highest and best use of the land. If the proposed use is not currently allowed, such as non-community member residential. SRPMIC leadership will consider this feedback carefully and provide resulting guidance in the future RFP.

- **Question: The need to know if the Casino is part of this project or not is critical. When will that be determined?**
 - Response: The information included in the RFI associated to a potential casino development is all that is currently available. All information associated to the potential future development of a casino will be addressed in the future RFP.

- **Question: What land-disposition structure (lease vs JV vs hybrid) aligns with SRPMIC's long-term objectives?**
 - Response: Although a traditional land lease is considered the priority deal structure, the Community is open to evaluating all proposals that come from the RFI and RFP process including specific deal terms or variations that provide best value for the Community.

- **Question: What are the environmental or geotechnical conditions that could materially affect site readiness?**
 - Response: Environmental and geotechnical studies conducted on the site have been provided in the RFI. The readiness and responsibility of site preparation will be based on the proposed development opportunity and can be discussed as part of the future RFP process.

- **Question: What infrastructure (roads, utilities, bridge) is committed, what is conceptual, and what is unfunded?**
 - Response: The information included in the RFI associated to Dobson Road, utilities and bridge is all that is currently available. Additional information associated to the potential future development of Dobson Road and Dobson Road Bridge will be addressed in the future RFP.

- **Question: What Community-driven outcomes (jobs, culture, sustainability) are non-negotiable in the master plan?**
 - Response: At this stage of potential development exploration nothing is considered non-negotiable. RFI responses may propose a range of community-driven outcomes, including but not limited to, employment, cultural considerations, and sustainability. Should any proposed outcomes warrant further clarification or direction, SRPMIC will address them in the future RFP.

- **Question: Will SRPMIC provide any financial incentives or offsets (impact fee, infrastructure credits, tax adjustments)**
 - Response: Deal points which could include elements such as incentives or offsets will be considered when presented as a formal response to a future RFP. If specific request is presented in a RFI response that SRPMIC feels is worth commenting on, it will be done so within the future RFP.

- **Question: Are there use restrictions, cultural overlays, or reserved parcels that constrain program design?**
 - Response: The uses allowed in the various zoning districts are listed in Table 4.1 of the SRPMIC Zoning Ordinance which can be found through a link on page 38 of the RFI. The Community is open to considering development proposals for the highest and best use for this site and has several tools to allow additional uses through our Community Public Hearing process, subject to Council approval.

- **Question: What deliverables does SRPMIC expect in the RFP stage to demonstrate capability and alignment?**
 - Response: The RFP will request financial offers and development concepts from interested respondents, based upon project scope and requirements determined through the RFI process. This includes financial models, conceptual images, and responses to specific requirements of the RFP.

- **Question: What environmental and archeological studies have you commissioned and when will results be shared?**
 - Response: Environmental and geotechnical studies conducted on the site have been provided in the RFI.

- **Question: What location on the East side is the proposed casino going to be located?**
 - Response: The information included in the RFI associated to a potential casino development is all that is currently available. All information associated to the potential future development of a casino will be addressed in the future RFP.

- **Question: Will SRPMIC entertain additional adjacent land discussions that allow for a larger master planned development?**
 - Response: The RFI and future RFP will be focused on the approximately 270 acres located in the areas shown on page 7 of the document. If a master planned development required even more acreage, the land labeled Future Development Opportunity to the north could be discussed.

- **Question: Assuming that ADOT/State of Arizona funds the bridge over Salt River, who is responsible for the development of Dobson Road north of the river south of McKellips.**
 - Response: The development of Dobson Road would not be the responsibility of the developer

- **Question: What is the approval process for a new casino. When would you expect that you would know if that was approved.**
 - Response: The information included in the RFI associated to a potential casino development is all that is currently available. All information associated to the potential future development of a casino will be addressed in the future RFP.

- **Question: If the new casino is built, would the existing Casino Arizona be available for redevelopment.**
 - Response: The information included in the RFI regarding a potential casino development is all that is currently available. Any additional information associated to the potential casino development will be addressed in the future RFP.

- **Question: Is the Community interested in a Joint Venture whereby the land is committed to a joint venture and the ownership and proceeds of the development are shared.**
 - Response: Although a traditional land lease is considered the priority deal structure, the Community is open to evaluating all proposals that come from the RFI and RFP process.

- **Question: Is the site a Brownfield?**
 - Response: No, the Dobson Redevelopment site as shown in the RFI is not a Brownfield.

- **Question: What deciding factors does SRPMIC envision for infrastructure, remediation, structural land compaction?**
 - This question is related to the items shown in Table 9 on page 43 of the RFI. Please review the corresponding text in Section 5.5 also located on page 43. All areas currently designated as developer or TBD responsibility can be negotiated as part of the RFP selection process.
- **Question: Have there been any past surveys completed on the site, and would it be possible to obtain copies of them?**
 - Response: A topographic survey was last conducted in 2022. Please note that the site may have changed since this survey. To request the .dwg file please use the following Bluebeam link (<https://studio.bluebeam.com/share/2ycniws3t4ivfg>) or request it directly through purchasing-bids@srpmic-nsn.gov.
- **Question: Is it possible to obtain a copy of the title report?**
 - Response: A Title Status Report (TSR) can be made available once a project moves into a formal proposal phase which will be during or after the future RFP process.
- **Question: Should it be assumed that once design/construction moves forward, SRPMIC third party consultants will be required**
 - Response: The SRPMIC Procurement Policy that may impact future design and construction projects can be found in Appendix B6 on page 70 of the RFI. Participation by SRPMIC Community Member and Native-owned businesses but may be included as a scoring category in the future RFP.
- **Question: Is there a specific reason why the community chose this site for development?**
 - Response: The following video, which can also be found on the Dobson Redevelopment website (<https://srpmic-nsn.gov/dobsondevelopment/>) will help explain the reason behind the Community evaluating this site for future development. <https://vimeo.com/1103852912?fl=pl&fe=cm>
- **Question: What is the time frame of Salt River Materials Group finalizing their cleanup and vacating the site?**
 - Response: Salt River Materials Group is currently in the process of cleaning up and vacating the site. A more detailed timeline will be provided in the future RFP, but we do not anticipate their timeline to negatively impact future development opportunities.

- **Question: Were there any mining pits on the eastern portion of the site?**
 - Response: Pages 32 and 33 in the RFI show previous mining locations which includes a majority of the eastern portion of the site.
- **Question: Has the site ever flooded?**
 - Of course, the site flooded in pre-historic and ancient times; however, tribal staff is unaware of any site flooding since channelization of the Salt River and construction of the Salt River North Bank Levee in the 1999/2000 as part of the State's Red Mountain Freeway (Loop 202) project. The stated purpose of the bank protection was to stabilize the alluvium bank of the river channel, thus preventing lateral migration and protecting both the freeway roadways and structures as well as the existing effluent recharge ponds located a short distance north of the hard bank on west end of the redevelopment site.

The material selected for use in the bank protection was Cement Stabilized Alluvium (CSA), generally known as soil cement. This material consists of a blend of native alluvium, cement, fly ash, and water, laid down in 9-inch lifts, after compaction, 8 feet wide and then compacted to a high density by roadway compaction equipment. The CSA is essentially a low strength concrete. Due to the presence of native alluvium and relatively low cement content, the in-place material has an appearance of an alluvium bank although much more regular in section.

The toe-down depths provided for the bank protection design were based on a number of considerations, including long-term channel degradation and armoring, local scour, general scour, bend scour, pier scour, etc., as well as the presence of both active and abandoned sand and gravel extraction operations. The required toe-down varies from as little as 15 feet to as much as 35 feet, depending on the specific location and conditions. To obtain a copy of the As-Built drawings, please request it through purchasing-bids@srpmic-nsn.gov.

A minimum of 2 feet of freeboard above the 100-year water surface elevation was provided along the hard bank project length (from Pima Freeway east to Longmore Road). It is important to note that the design flow of 215,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) at the time of construction was based on the pre-

Roosevelt Dam Expansion project! For anyone that does not know that \$430 million dam modification project raised the height of the dam by 77-feet and expanded the lake's water conservation storage capacity by 20%. After completion of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam expansion in 1996, the 100-year flow in the Salt River in this project area was reduced to 169,000 cfs, which means that the 100-yr water surface elevation would in fact be lower, increasing the amount of freeboard. This also means that the structure was designed for a much larger 100-yr event than actual conditions; thereby providing additional capacity and safety factor.

The bank protection proposed, in the strictest sense, is generally a levee although this is only because of the presence of the percolation ponds behind both the existing and proposed bank of the river. Local drainage does not have a significant effect on the bank protection since the site generally intercepts local flow.

The Community signed an Intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC) in 1999 giving the operation and maintenance of the structure to them. In addition to the structure, FCDMC maintains a restrictive excavation (mining) area prohibiting excavation below the design invert grade, within the river, and prohibiting excavation to fifty (50) feet north of the hard bank toe, angling downward at a 1.5 to 1 slope, as shown in Exhibit "C" attached to the IGA. The FCDMC has conducted regular routine inspection and maintenance since the construction was completed. A review of the latest FCDMC inspection and maintenance record from May 2025 did not reveal any significant concerns. The structure appears to be functioning properly.

The Community is currently working with AECOM and the FCDMC to get the existing hard bank levee certified by FEMA. Part of AECOM's work included a seepage analysis, inundation, and breach modeling. The Community and FCD are working on a plan to clear vegetation from a 20-foot clear zone on both sides of the existing levee although the actual work may not take place until Fall 2026.

- **Question: When it comes to foundation drilling are there any restrictions if groundwater is hit due to the proximity to the riverbed?**
 - Response: No, as long as good standard practices are being followed to not pollute the groundwater
- **Question: Will SRPMIC accept multiple proposals from one organization?**
 - Response: Yes, multiple proposals will be accepted from one organization that represent different acreage needs and development types.
- **Question: Have there been any recent economic impact studies completed on the site? If yes, are these available?**
 - Response: No, there have not been any recent impact studies completed on the site associated to the RFI
- **Question: Can design firms partner with multiple developers?**
 - Response: Yes, designer firms are permitted to partner with multiple developers.
- **Questions: Will the land be leased or is a land use license an option?**
 - Response: Development will occur through a long-term business lease with the Community. This lease will conform with SRPMIC's Code of Ordinances and applicable federal law.
- **Question: Is there a desire to create a Tempe Town Lake concept here and have you worked with SRP/State on its potential design?**
 - Response: SRPMIC is not planning on exploring the creation of a Tempe Town Lake water concept. This does not deter a response to propose this concept as part of an RFI and/or future RFP response. If proposed this concept would more than likely be the financial responsibility of the proposing organization.
- **Question: Is the Community aware of any grants or other investment incentives to be utilized for the land development.**
 - Response: Please review the final paragraph of section 5.5 located on page 43 for information associated to potential incentives available for the site. Any incentives dealing directly with SRPMIC can be negotiated as part of the RFP selection process.
- **Question: Will the sign-in sheet from the December 10th site visit be published?**
 - The sign-in sheet will not be published.