



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

March 23, 2022 (5:30pm – 7:30pm)

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)



Approved Minutes

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Quorum was established and the meeting was called to order at 5:30pm by Jill

Members Present:

Selina Barajas
Jill Brammer
Rhonda Bodfield
Jennifer Flores
Katharine Mitchell
Grecia Ramirez
Ruth Reiman
Catlow Shipek
Wesley Tolliver
Tarik Williams
Jonathan Crowe
Rossio Araujo
Paki Rico

Members Absent:

Craig McCaskill
Liz Soltero
Miranda Schubert

Staff:

Patrick Harley
Ana Marrufo
Chris Desborough
Bob Roggenthen
Blake Richards

Guests:

Alejandro Angel (Psomas)

Observers:

Ben Buehler-Garcia
Scott Robidoux

Facilitation:

Tahnee Robertson
Colleen Whitaker

2. Housekeeping

- Approve past meeting minutes
 - Paki – Correction noted via email ahead of the meeting: The RTA Board approved 10 new CAC members on January 27, 2022
 - **Move to approve past minutes with correction as stated - Ruth; Second - Jill**
- Introduction of new members:
 - Wesley Toliver is replacing Colby as TTF representative
 - Rossio Araujo will replace Rod Lane in the ADOT seat.
- Field trip: Sunday, April 3rd, 9:30am - South 12th Avenue. Have not yet selected the best meeting location. Patrick will update the meeting invite with this info. Project manager, Jessie Soto, will join us for discussion. This will be an opportunity to look at what we can achieve with a small budget.

- Cyclovia: March 27th. They are still looking for volunteers - contact the Living Streets Alliance if you are interested.

2. Grant Road Improvement Project: Phase 5 and 6 Update - Bob Rogenthin & Alejandro Angel

Alejandro shared a presentation which can be shared with anyone on request. Main points are summarized here:

Project Overview and Status

- This is an RTA corridor project from Oracle to Swan
- Design concept completed 10-15 years ago
- A Citizens Task Force has been active since 2007
- Phases 1 and 2 are complete
- Phases 3 and 4 - has been designed; contractor should start work later this year
- Phases 5 and 6 – Section from Fremont to Sparkman. This is tonight’s discussion
- This fits within the Design Guide category of an Urban Thoroughfare - Regionally Significant Corridor. Using a target speed of 35 mpg
- Timeline
 - Design began in 2020. Virtual meetings in spring 2021
 - 30% designs submitted in Aug 2021
 - Anticipated completion - 2023
 - TBD - Property acquisition and construction

Ped/bike crossings

Proposed Approach - Provide protected crossings at least every ¼ mile. Align crossing with Bike Blvd Maser Plan and major transit stops.

Routing of cyclists at frontage roads

3 segments on corridor with frontage roads (westbound Park to Mountain, eastbound Highland to Warren, eastbound Norris to Wilson). What is the preference for bikes here? The proposal is to route them to frontage roads. But there will also be a shoulder on Grant, so bikes can choose to use this (signage will recommend using frontage road).

Feedback:

- Jonathan – at the intersection of Highland and Grant, instead of forcing bikes to stay in the travel lane and make right, you could open up the curb at the intersection and let bikes squeeze in.
 - Will try. Great idea.
- Ruth - you don't have to expand into the frontage roads?
 - In this case the roadway is being moved into the north. The houses east of Highland on the north will be taken out.
- Tarik - due to business on Grant, a buffer is a good idea to ensure bike safety and comfort.
 - Where there is a frontage road should we keep a buffer or use this area for something else?
 - Tarik - prefer buffer
- Rhonda - are there safety statistics to help inform this decision?
 - Buffers do help significantly. The question is, if we direct cyclists to the frontage road, do we still need buffer?
- Catlow - two concerns as a cyclist: 1) if traffic is backed up you may get cut-through vehicle traffic on frontage roads and possible bike-car conflicts; consider how to prevent cut-throughs and/or give bikes priority in this zone; and 2) what happens when bikes re-emerge onto the roadway; want to give cars time to shift back over. Might be okay to not have buffer on Grant, providing these other considerations are taken care of. Always in favor of more landscaping and less hardscape.

- Don't expect Grant to be backed up here; this is the point of the project.
- Catlow - was thinking about possible backed up traffic when someone hits the HAWK
- Wesley - understand those cyclist concerns. I think a frontage road would be safer than bikes on the road.
- That is the current assessment as well. The frontage road will be very low speed - could add traffic calming as well.
- Jonathan – seems that the buffer on the bike lane here is less important due to the frontage road. Wonder if the City would consider eliminating the bike lane entirely and using only a frontage road, allowing the roadway to be narrowed and encouraging lower speeds and less weaving?
- Catlow - to keep roadway narrow you can also widen the landscaping median

Routing of bikes at indirect lefts

Proposed approach: Revise design to remove cyclists from conflict area at the bulb out (protected bike lane). Bikes can proceed during red vehicular signal indication.

Pilot treatment for buffered bike lanes

Have looked at a variety of options here. The issue is there are a lot of business driveways, and drainage issues (south to north). To help deal with distracted driving recently installed some pilot programs in Phase 2

- Mumble strips - in testing these didn't provide much feedback to driver; not as excited about this
- RPMs - provided better driver feedback and improved bike lane visibility (this is the proposed approach, and is also being done in Phase 3/4)

Feedback:

- Grecia - do RPMs have night reflectors?
 - Yes.
- Jennifer - want to see uniform treatment of bike lanes on Grant
- Ruth - have you considered not putting bike lanes on Grant at all, and just directing people to parallel bike boulevards?
 - Yes, this was discussed and evaluated in 2012. The challenge - there are businesses on Grant, so bikes will have to ride at least a certain length of Grant; commuters also will have to ride for some distance on Grant. Trying to provide both options (Bike Boulevards and safe riding on Grant)
- Jennifer – I do see cyclists commuting on Grant, or accessing the bus who have to ride on Grant because Bike Boulevards are too far away.
- Jonathan - the safer option is to place any bike facility behind the curb. This is the way that cycle paths are being built downtown and in other big cities. This is somewhat of a hybrid that does poorly for both; allows for fast cars and dangerous conditions for cyclists.

Mountain avenue intersection

Proposed approach (30% design) - No left turn lanes from Mountain to preserve function as a bike corridor. Will also incorporate split phasing for cyclist safety. Would the group prefer a protected intersection, similar to Grant/Alvernon?

Feedback:

- Ruth - What is status of Phase 3 and 4?
 - Bob - All utilities except telecoms are ready to start. Expecting five different companies, and allowing three weeks for each company to move their facilities. Looking to finish this in April/May. Will start going out for proposal and bids end of May. Construction should begin 60-90 days later (likely August). It will be a 2.5 year project, similar to Broadway. It is roughly Palo Verde to Swan.
- Catlow - 1) agree that protected behind the curb is the preference. On Mountain I have seen lots of

accidents where a bike is waiting - extra protection is good; 2) how can we make this more transit oriented; if not now, how can we plan for future transit success? 3) re: Michigan left – I like keeping the bikes protected.

- Transit: have been trying to provide good amenities at stops. Have also been working with Sun Tran - one concern there is that too many pullouts make it hard for them to get back on the roadway. Want to make buses more competitive, and not have to yield to cars. But there hasn't been an additional high capacity transit discussion.
- Catlow - at some point in future could we dedicate that right lane to a bus? Can we make sure that we are allowing for that future use?
- Tarik - would it be possible for this to be part of our field trip series? We could talk about it together and make a report? Is this an option?
 - Patrick - we can put this on the list for a future stop.
- Jonathan - would love a chance to review the full set of plans if that is possible. Depending on how long the frontage road is, you could pull the bus off the main road and use frontage road.
 - Anyone can get more info on website (grantroad.info). All the plan sheets are there.
 - Buses on frontage road have some pluses, but residents likely wouldn't appreciate this proximity.
- Patrick - what are benefits of the protected intersection at Mountain? We do see the right turn conflicts with bikes a lot.
 - It improves the angle at which you are seeing vehicles. It also provides a lower stress environment to wait for crossings.

3. Prop 411

Presentation from Clerk's Office - *Ana Marrufo*

- Just mailed out 286,000 postcards to active voters. Getting a lot of calls about the proposition.
- April 14 - publicity pamphlet goes out. One per household. This has all info received from Kaneen (who partnered with the City Manager's office), voting locations, deadlines and arguments.
- A total of 18 arguments were received in favor and 0 in opposition
- April 21 - open election warehouse as voting location
- Election day - 7 voting locations (can request replacement ballot, or vote in person). More drop off locations as well.
- Patrick - last meeting we had discussion about CSCC being involved in advocacy. What are differences in the roles as CSCC official member vs. private citizen?
 - Members of CSCC are considered public officials. You cannot disseminate any info as a commission, but as an individual you can.
 - You can participate in M&C Call to the Audience. "My name is x, I am part of CSCC, but I am here as an individual and representing myself."
 - Can distribute pamphlets as individuals. Can mention you are a member of CSCC, but that you are distributing information as an individual.
 - Look at City website - political activity guidelines (Ana will share with Patrick)
- Ruth - can I sign a letter to editor as co-chair of the CSCC?
 - Not sure. Will find out. Think this may be okay.
- Ruth - can we get the 5 page document from Kaneen?
 - Ana can forward the digital version. It is very well written, and does mention the CSCC role
- Patrick – we have a number of hardcopies and can get anyone a stack if you'd like to distribute.
- Ana - there are over 200 extra copies of "The Choice is Yours" that can be share with CSCC after they are made public.

Coordination on efforts to undertake:

- Ruth – I am working on a letter to the editor based on Tim Steller's article today. This would be in support of 411. Would like to send it to Jill and maybe she can sign as co-chair? Anyone who would like

to read please give me your email I can send to you to review and possibly sign. I'm also working with Palo Verde neighborhood association to get safe crossing for the new Dairy Queen going in on Alvernon.

- Patrick - Pamphlets will be available at Cyclovia, on our field trip, and/or you can contact me.

4. Transportation Funding Overview - Patrick Hartley

Patrick shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here:

- We generally have about \$250-300 million/year for DTM, which includes everything. Currently have about 289 FTEs. This comes out of City budget. Most of the funding is set aside for the purpose of transportation, but some is drawn from the General Fund.
- Primary sources:
 - HURF (Highway User Revenue Fund). This pays for things like staff, building, studies, and road maintenance
 - RTA
 - General Fund - primarily for transit operations
 - The three above comprise about 60% of the budget
 - Other sources include: Regional HURF, Federal Funds, Prop 407, Prop 101
- HURF
 - Approximately \$47 million per year
 - Sources: gas tax, diesel fuel, registration fees, vehicle license tax
 - The distribution formula can be found on ADOT website
 - Per the State Constitution, this cannot be used for transit
 - Upcoming opportunity - some of the current HURF is debt servicing, which will be coming off the books next year. There are some proposals for how to spend this additional revenue.
- Regional HURF
 - Approximately \$25-30 million to PAG, which is then distributed to the member jurisdictions.
 - The amount the City of Tucson gets varies annually
 - Due to RTA shortfalls, all Regional HURF is committed to RTA capital projects until 2026
- HURF Challenges
 - Purchasing power has decreased. AZ has not raised our gas tax in 31 years. There are inflation impacts. It is now 48% of what it once was.
 - This is also a use tax.
 - Fleet fuel efficiency has increased by 20%, therefore contributing 20% less into this pool.
 - What happens to this source as we see more electrification of the vehicle fleet?
- RTA
 - \$50-60million/year
 - ½ cent regional sales tax. The uses were defined in the ballot. For example, it cannot be used on paving.
 - Focused on delivering named projects (big things like Grant). Due to current cost constraints categorical projects are not being funded. Categorical projects are systemic (i.e. sidewalks, greenways, etc.).
- General Fund
 - \$40-45 million/year for transit
 - Got a lot of federal Covid relief funds to help offset the General Fund contributions to transit.
 - In 2022 M&C made a \$14 million one-time transfer for pavement rehab.
- Impact Fees
 - \$5-6 million/year
 - Developer pays to the city to add capacity to the network to address impacts of a specific development. Must be used in area of City where the development is occurring.
 - Cannot use it for maintenance, it has to be used to increase capacity and add new features to the system.

- Federal Formula Highway Funds
 - \$22 million/year
 - These are committed for completing the RTA
 - Federal funds add cost and complexity to our projects (i.e. environmental clearance, public engagement, extended timelines). Try to put this funding to projects that already have a federal nexus.
- Federal Formula Transit Funds
 - \$15-17 million / year
- Federal Competitive Grants
 - These are variable and highly competitive
 - This money helped complete the street car
 - This year looking to fund the 22nd Street bridge, and the Safe Streets for All grant
 - The recent federal transportation bill includes a number of new competitive funding opportunities, and a number of complete streets elements. Should know more in the next months about eligibility and distribution.
- City Funding Initiatives
 - Prop 407 - Bond fund for parks and transportation connections. \$10m/year goes to transportation. The challenge is that this is a fixed amount, so won't increase with inflation like a sales tax; project costs are escalating.
 - Prop 101 - ½ cent sales tax that expires in June for pavement improvements. This is what would be replaced through Prop 411. This would increase the funding for transportation, because 411 is 100% for transportation.
- Current Budget vs. Funding Target
 - If 101, 407 and RTA expire we will see decrease in about \$90 million of our budget.
 - Move Tucson target is to increase funding by about \$120 million/year.
- Federal and state sources aren't growing with the needs of the community, so we are more reliant on local sources.

Questions/Discussion

- Catlow - think the TTF is also interested in how to diversify funding for transit. Considering other local options - have we considered starting to build momentum for a local gas tax, or other options like bed taxes or property taxes?
 - 407 is currently funded on a bond for property taxes. Could perhaps extend in 2028. Some of the bed tax may already be tied up in RTA funding.
 - Pima County is using some property taxes to invest in road maintenance; could explore this also.
 - At some point we will have to transition from the gas tax to some sort of use tax.
- Jennifer - is there a way to prioritize which projects will be completed first with 407?
 - There is a bond oversight committee that is helping with those discussions. They are going to try to hit all the projects, but there will need to be trade-offs within the projects.

5. Downtown Links and Broadway update - *Patrick Hartley*

- Downton Links is in Phase 3 (under construction).
 - The intention is to pull traffic off of Congress, also additional bike/ped facilities, etc.
 - Goal is to complete by summer of 2023. Closure of 6th Ave until early May.
 - Will next close 6th between Church and east of Stone.
 - Project is on schedule
- Broadway - Euclid to Country Club
 - Aiming to complete by June 2022.

Questions/discussion

- Jill - are there detours planned for the 6th street closure for car, ped and bike?
- Patrick - the Public Info Office can share more.
- Catlow - can we think about how to celebrate Downtown Links in a different way? Can we close off Broadway and Congress during different hours of different days?
- Jill - the police would love to see a pedestrian only situation in the entertainment areas during entertainment-heavy times. Think a lot of people feel the same way about this.
- Blake Richards - love the ideas, can follow up on these. Also note we are making good progress on hiring the new Director.

6. CSCC Hub

- Park Tucson - *Jill*
 - Met yesterday briefly. Lost quorum a bit early. Overview of revenue and Amanda Valenzuela shared a video about how to park in downtown.
- Transit Task Force (TTF) - *Wesley*
 - In process of trying to get in contact with City Council to form a subcommittee on alternative funding sources to continue fee-free transit. This is in early stages.
- Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC) - *Tarik*
 - Still no quorum. Need to fill committee positions. Contact Ian Sansom if you are interested.
- Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) - *no member present. Still seeking a replacement.*
- Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) - *no member present. Still seeking a replacement.*
- Jennifer – wondering if can we consolidate some of the committees, given all our vacancies?

7. Wrap up and future agenda items

- Share any ideas with Patrick. Next month we will talk about the Grant UPP project.
- Tarik - could we ensure our next field trip is aligned with when things are happening on Grant and when decisions need to be made?
 - Patrick - it is still in early design phase, so there is still plenty of time.

Meeting was adjourned by Jill and Ruth at 7:25