



## Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

January 26, 2022 (5:45pm – 7:45pm)

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)



## Final Minutes

### 1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Quorum was established and the meeting was called to order by Colby and Ruth at 5:49pm

#### Members Present:

Selina Barajas  
Jill Brammer  
Jennifer Flores  
Colby Henley  
Craig McCaskill  
Katharine Mitchell  
Grecia Ramirez  
Ruth Reiman  
Miranda Schubert  
Catlow Shipek  
Tarik Williams  
Jonathan Crowe  
Rod Lane  
Paki Rico

#### Members Absent:

Mia Hansen  
Liz Soltero

#### Staff:

Patrick Harley  
Monica Landrage-serrano  
Scott Robidoux  
Jenn Toothaker  
Collin Chesston  
Donavan Durband

#### Observers:

Kylie Walzak  
Barbara Brookhart  
Suzanne Schafer  
Ben Buehler-Garcia  
Evren Sonmez

#### Facilitation:

Tahnee Robertson  
Colleen Whitaker

### 2. Housekeeping

- Introduction of new member Miranda Schubert (DTM appointee)
- Approve past meeting minutes
  - Corrections. Ruth - change to TDM from DTM. **Motion to approve December minutes with correction - Colby, Second - Ruth**
- Member recruitment
  - Vacant seats: City Manager, Ward 2, and Ward 5. Please share the application link with anyone who might be interested ([link](#)).
  - This is Colby's last meeting representing TTF. They will fill this seat.
  - Selina now lives in Ward 5. Can she move to this seat and open her current seat? Patrick will follow up.

- New co-chair volunteer - Jill
- Meeting time decision: Proposal to move meeting time 15 min earlier to 5:30-7:30p)
  - No members expressed problems with this time. All thumbs up. Consensus approval.
  - **Motion to move meeting start time to 5:30p - Ruth; Second - Colby**

### 3. Beyond Bike Lanes: An Introduction to higher-comfort bikeway design - Colin

*Chesston, City of Tucson*

*Colin shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here:*

History of bikeway design guidance in the US - the regulatory framework:

- Surprising early examples of good design (e.g. protected bike lanes in the 1960s)
- Early organizing of bicycle advocates focused on bikes being assertive and acting like vehicles
- Europe took a different approach which resulted in a very different experience for cyclists.
  - The Netherlands spends \$29.53 per capita on bicycling. In the US we spend \$2.35 on walking and bicycling combined.
  - Colby - <https://www.instagram.com/p/CXIRiO1AaS/> 0.5% of Dutch cyclists wear helmets. Yet theirs are the safest streets on earth. Why? They understand it's more effective to slow cars, build protected infrastructure, and nurture a culture of everyday cycling. Not force the most vulnerable to armor up.
- 4 eras of bicycle facility design:
  - Vehicular cycling (late 1990s)
  - The awakening (early 2000s) - realizing we had problems; learning from others
  - A start (2010-2012) - more and better design guidance
  - Maturity (2017 onward) - guidance from FHWA and NACTO. These are integrated into the City of Tucson Design Guide

Bicycle facility types

- Facility selection – there is an existing methodology to measure traffic stress in different environments. Speed and volume are key factors.
- Context is critical - choose the right design for the right location
- Shared Lane Markings
  - Not an actual facility. Many in Tucson (including on bicycle boulevards)
- Bicycle Boulevards
  - Incorporates many things, not just pavement markings (e.g., speed humps, traffic circles, wayfinding, crossing improvements, etc.)
- Conventional Bike Lanes
  - In Tucson these are mostly found on big roads. New guidance suggests this is not recommended.
- Buffered Bike Lanes
  - No physical protection. Buffer created only by paint.
- Protected Bike Lanes
  - Low cost and easy to do. Can use parked cars as the buffer, or planters, plastic bollards, etc.
  - Landscaping can also be used - hope to do this here with Green Stormwater Infrastructure fund projects.
  - Can mark lane with brightly colored paint (Tucson has done this)
- Raised Protected Bike Lanes
  - Expensive, and not as easy to do in retrofit
- Two-way Protected Bike Lanes
  - Limited applications. Save space.
  - Important not to use this on two-way streets with lots of driveways. Use on one-way streets

Reach out if you have questions or want to talk about bikeway design policy ([collin.chesston@tucsonaz.gov](mailto:collin.chesston@tucsonaz.gov))

#### Questions/Discussion

- Jonathan – it's important to understand that lots of Tucson and Pima County is suburban. This will likely always be the case. We need to learn from rural and small town examples and standards. We don't have enough bike boulevards, and there are many busy 4-6 lane arterials. Need to keep looking for ways to provide facilities for these situations.
- Selina - love all the examples. One thing that is important here is street lighting. Are there any examples of something like floor lighting for bike lanes? We also have Dark Skies regulations here to consider.
  - Collin - haven't seen floor lighting. There are post-mounted lights on bollards. For street lighting on a bike boulevard you probably want brighter light. The newer LED lights that face down are compatible with Dark Skies rules
  - Selina Barajas - Solar lighting!
  - Barbara Brookhart - have seen light poles that have both street lights and pedestrian level on the same pole
  - Suzanne Schafer - lighting the ground level would have a very positive effect for safety.
  - Grecia - More solar lighting options would be awesome
  - Miranda - see <https://techcrunch.com/2016/10/07/poland-builds-a-solar-powered-bike-path-that-glows-a-ghostly-blue/>
- Barbara - This is the information on the 8th Avenue bike lane. <https://www1.nyc.gov/html/dot/downloads/pdf/2014-11-bicycle-path-data-analysis.pdf>
- Catlow - priority for Move Tucson is getting more funding going toward alternative transportation funding. Thanks for highlighting this.

#### **4. Easement Parking – Proposed code update** *Donovan Durband, Park Tucson*

- Park Tucson is recommending a change to the city code parking chapters that would further restrict the ability to park in the area off the street in an easement area.
- Donovan screen-shared the code language (current and proposed revised version)
- In 14 neighborhoods in the permit program, parking in the easement (even if allowing 4 feet) would be prohibited. Would continue to be allowable in the rest of the city.

#### Questions/discussion

- Jonathan - have you considered impacts to commercial properties?
  - Donovan – we are trying to establish a good pedestrian environment. In places like 4th Ave or downtown, don't think the impact would be applicable to many businesses there.
- Ruth - who issues the ticket?
  - Donovan - Park Tucson enforcement agents. The 14 neighborhoods that participate in the permit program are patrolled on a daily basis. Park Tucson writes about 250 citations/year for this type of violation. They can also patrol city wide when there are requests.

#### **5. 1st Avenue update** - *Ruth Reiman*

- Background - RTA requests outstanding projects from jurisdictions where the scope could be adjusted to reduce cost. The City of Tucson submitted 1st Ave. It is on the RTA as 6-lane expansion. After review the City decided to move to a 4-lane complete streets modernization
- CSCC voted and unanimously in support of the 4-lane options. Mayor and Council also supported this.
- It went to the Technical Management Committee (TMC) of the RTA in September. No agreements or decisions were made.
- It then went to the RTA board in December. There was concern about downsizing since this was not

what was on the ballot. The big issue is that RTA doesn't have the funding for 6-lanes.

- In January it went back to TMC, which pushed it to a project review task force (sub-committee) that will review projected costs. They will make a recommendation back to the TMC who will make a recommendation back to the RTA board.
- Hopefully they will support the 4-lane option. Not sure what happens if they don't, as there isn't sufficient funding for 6 lanes. There was some discussion to push it into RTA Next to fund fully and do 6-lanes.
- This could all take a few months.

#### Questions/Discussion

- Patrick – the City is now in a holding pattern. Can't get agreements in place to release the regional funding until it is agreed upon by the RTA board. No current timeline.
- Jonathan - does this refer only to the city part of 1st? (yes - between Grant and River)
- Colby - based on our climate and funding situation, and pedestrian safety situation, etc. it would be borderline criminal to widen. Hope this committee holds firm in support of a 4-lane option.
- Patrick - this committee can communicate outside of the city staff; can communicate directly to RTA.
- Ruth - highly recommend using the press; get your voice out. RTA has a call to the audience
- Catlow - what is the timeline? Are the new members for RTA Next different than those who would decide on this?
  - Ruth - think there is now a 3-month timeline for current review. The Citizens Advisory Committee is the planning committee for RTA Next. Think this new group is good, in my opinion.
- Paki - can confirm from PAG RTA that this is now going through the committee. We are looking for new committee members to fill up to a 35 member committee. Tomorrow the board will look at selection committee recommendations. After this there will be further discussion about what RTA Next will look like.
  - Link to RTA Board December meeting: <https://youtu.be/Dh36M-Za4b8>
  - Miranda - The December meeting was very interesting, I definitely recommend watching if you haven't already

#### 6. Committee letter writing role *Colby*

- We as CSCC have the opportunity to communicate directly with Mayor and Council and other bodies (e.g. other jurisdictions and RTA).
- Don't want the group to feel limited by the agenda. Talk to co-chairs and get topics on the agenda.
- Need to be careful to speak to media on personal basis, unless the body comes together and supports a position.
- How this process has worked in the TTF – the topic is a discussion item on an agenda, then vote on general position to communicate. Then someone drafts a letter and brings it back. At next meeting the draft letter is discussed by committee (try not to word-smith). If it's generally on target we vote to approve and send the letter. Writing can be done by committee, or the chair, or someone can be nominated.
- In TTF we have written about 4 letters in my time. If there are issues we think aren't getting attention, or a perspective we want to make sure gets consider.
- Patrick - this is definitely your committee. You are not restricted to only communicate on issues that staff brings.

#### 7. Transportation Funding Initiative - *Patrick* (note: this item was erroneously agendized as Prop 101 Extension)

- \$13 billion in overall needs were identified in Move Tucson. The implementation plan identified that \$5 billion is achievable in the planning horizon.
- Prop 101 will expire in June. This was approved as a ½ cent sales tax for public safety for road

maintenance. This is about \$20 million dollars that will be lost from budget.

- Council has been discussing an initiative to replace Prop 101, which would be on the ballot in May of 2022. It would be tax neutral, by simply extending the previous increase. Looking at ½, ¾ and 1 cent increases.
- The manager has organized the different funding levels into different categories (pavement, transit and complete streets) (see info shared by Patrick ahead of meeting)
- ½ cent level would mean about 100% of funds going to pavement - focus on neighborhood streets (every neighborhood street in next 10 years). Would not focus on named projects. Council is focused on local street investment.
- This is all getting wrapped up with the continuation of Tucson in RTA. Issues - weighted representation on PAG and RTA board and clear blue print on delivery of current projects in RTA 1.
- Current status - RTA and PAG will meet tomorrow to discuss some of the requests of the City. Mayor and Council will meet Monday to finalize the package that will be submitted to the state. Ballot language has to be done by Feb 1 in time for the May election.

#### Questions/Discussion

- Ruth - once they decide what to put forward for a vote, how do we promote it?
  - Patrick - after submittal, the city will focus on the development of campaign. This will be run more out of the City Manager's office.
- Ruth – there is a lot of talk about federal infrastructure money. This usually requires a match. Could sales tax money be used as match?
  - Patrick – it depends on what gets passed. There are other fund sources also being considered. There may be a way to use some of the complete streets projects as part of a federal match. Other opportunity - retiring some bond debt to the state. In 2024 \$11 million will open up that we don't currently have access to. That money could be used as match. Council is also discussing \$5-15 million out of the General Fund to supplement.
- Ruth - after 10 years and paving all the streets, are we done? Or do we need more money then? Is it an endless process of always having to find money to pave?
  - Patrick – unfortunately that is kind of how pavement works. The issue is we under-invested for a long time and we are now in a big hole. Need to get on a more proactive pavement preservation program.
  - Colby - this is why road widening just adds a new debt in perpetuity (maintenance costs).
- Kylie Walzak - Has everyone heard here yet that Tucson has THE BEST Complete Streets policy in the entire country?! <https://m.facebook.com/livingstreetsalliance/posts/4580351658680900>

### 8. Field trip

- The group discussed potential dates and did a quick poll.
- Consensus agreement for February 20th at 9:30am. Meet at 1st and Copper

### 9. CSCC Hub

Park Tucson - *Jill*

- Curb Study - please take a moment to take the survey and share widely ([link](#))
- Visit Tucson parking maps for gem show are out
- Business district discussed bikes and scooters - trying to be more responsible.

Transit Task Force (TTF) - *Colby*

- Focusing on funding and where things will go with RTA etc.
- Fare-free operation of transit system during Covid has been a good experiment. Rather than going back to gathering fares, we are thinking about what it would mean to continue this.
- Jennifer - are you tracking ridership? →
  - Katharine: ridership info by service and route: <https://www.suntran.com/about/>

- Sun Tran Operations Report - October 2021 is the most recent posted <https://www.suntran.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/OCTOBER-21-MONTHLY-OPERATION-REPORT.pdf>. And December <https://www.suntran.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/DEC-2021-ST.SL .SV-MOR.pdf>
- Grecia - how long are they thinking of waiving fees?
  - Colby – The waiver is currently valid through June, but this conversation is about finding funding to make it long-term.

Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) *no rep present*

Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC) - *haven't been meeting; no quorum, looking for members*

Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) - *vacant*

## **10. Future agenda topics**

- Grecia - review of different transportation funding sources
- Selina - Public art projects and street elements and street furniture
- Colby - community engagement plan and performance metrics
- Ruth - EV infrastructure

Patrick – note that all active transportation projects can be found here: <https://dtmprojects.tucsonaz.gov/>

**Meeting was adjourned at 7:45 by Colby and Ruth**