



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

September 28, 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 by Miranda at 5:35pm

Members Present:

Selina Barajas
Rhonda Bodfield
Jill Brammer
Jennifer Flores
Sophia Gonzalez
Riley Merline
Katharine Mitchell
Ruth Reiman
Miranda Schubert
Paki Rico
Tarik Williams
Jonathan Crowe

Members Absent:

Craig McCaskill
Grecia Ramirez
Catlow Shipek
Liz Soltero
Rossio Araujo

Staff:

Patrick Harley
Andy Bemis
Davita Mueller

Observers:

Ben Buehler-Garcia
Evren Sonmez (LSA)
Scott Robidoux (TAA)
Diana Amado (Ward 6)

Guest Presenters:

Tom McGovern, RTA CAC

Facilitation:

Tahnee Robertson
Colleen Whitaker

2. Housekeeping

- Approval of past minutes and subcommittee meeting minutes - no corrections
 - **Move to approve: Rhonda; second - Miranda**

3. RTA Next Update - Tom McGovern, CAC Chair

Tom provided an overview of current work and progress of the CAC

- Have completed work on guiding principles and goals, taking comments into account
- A Project Evaluation Tool working group has been established and will determine evaluation measures and assess the data to score projects. Will likely identify a top tier of projects.
- The overall budget may be about \$1billion - waiting for overall guidance from the board.

- The Technical Management Committee (TMC) held an all-day workshop last week to prioritize the original \$4.5 billion wish list of 108 projects submitted by jurisdictions. The region was divided into 6 geographic sub-areas for evaluation. Currently at about \$2 billion.
- Once the board accepts the draft plan, then public input and feedback will occur.
- Next steps for CAC:
 - Nov - master list of projects (will need to identify matching funds for some projects)
 - July 1 - recommend draft plan to the board
 - Public outreach
 - End of 2023 - approval of final plan to send to voters

Questions/Discussion

- Rhonda - where does safety fall when evaluating these projects?
 - Safety is a key goal for the projects. A vast majority of projects will have a safety aspect. PAG maintains a number of safety metrics to reference.
- Ruth - RTA board meetings refer to a "regional" plan - has this been defined?
 - The approach so far has been - *we'll know it when we see it*. It is something that is important. Corridor definition is probably as close as we're likely to come to defining regional. Will ask if projects meet the needs of the region. If a large part of the constituency feels left out, they won't vote for it. It's our duty to ensure there is something important in all the sub-areas, and that they are knit together into a plan that you would recognize as regional.
- Patrick - can the public see the project list that is being evaluated?
 - The packet for Monday's meeting has been posted.
- Paki - All 108 projects are on the website, and the City's projects have been added. Thursday was a successful meeting. All jurisdictions were represented.
- Andy - agree the workshop was successful, and great to be in-person again. Didn't see the projects flagged for potential exclusion in Thursday's meeting summary. (Paki noted she is working on this and hoping to share with the CAC on Monday. Andy will send the list of those missing)
 - Tom - these are listed as "for possible future consideration"

4. Project Review: Church Avenue Complete Streets Project *Andy Bemis*

Andy shared a brief presentation. Main points are summarized here:

- *Project location:* Church from Cushing to Franklin
- *Overview:* Will be resurfaced as part of Prop 101
- *Goals:* improve overall safety; enhance bike access, comfort and convenience; improve bus operations; ensure efficient vehicle operations; improve pavement
- *Elements:* Bike lanes, pedestrian crossing, left turn lanes, curb ramps, on-street parking/loading, bus-only waiting areas.
- There are low traffic volumes here relative to the number of lanes. Removing one of these will fill a major gap for biking community, without negative impact to vehicular traffic.
- *Network connectivity:* Church is the middle point between two bikeway projects currently in design (8th Ave and 9th Ave/Castro)
- *Downtown access:* There are presently no continuous north/south bike facilities in downtown. And there are relatively few low-stress options to get into downtown by bike.
- *Schedule:* Currently at 60% design stage; looking to break ground in the middle of next year.
- *Website:* [Feedbackonchurchave.com](https://feedbackonchurchave.com)

- There is an interactive feedback tool on the website – have gotten a lot of good feedback. Overall heard a lot of support for lane removal and bike lane addition, desire for landscaping, high-vis/decorative crosswalks. Concerns: operations for all modes, issues at Cushing/Church intersection, signal timing issues, removal of parking south of Broadway
- Current plans: not quite at formal 60% plan. Andy shared a draft via screen share. The official 60% plans will be uploaded to project website as soon as they are ready.
- There will be coordination with the Downtown Links Project
- Additional funds for some elements will be needed - one potential source is Prop 411
- The CSCC will have the opportunity to provide feedback once the 60% plans are finalized. Andy can join a future meeting if desired.

Questions/Discussion

- Miranda - excited about this as someone who bikes downtown. The interactive tool is great. Is input being sought on an on-going basis? And have you received a lot so far?
 - Yes, have received good input to-date. Would like to close that to be able to digest it so that input isn't trickling in - right now it is not active for leaving new comments.
- Riley - like the map that shows how this links to other bike infrastructure projects. Glad to see that you highlighted areas that are not comfortable to all ages. Re: TCC and parking - seems there is a big focus on transit down there. Want to encourage the planners to think about the value of these parking spaces that could be used for other things like trees, sidewalks and bike infrastructure. On 9th Ave intersection - will northbound be also for cars, or just for bikes?
 - Cars are still moving through this section (9th Ave)
 - We have heard similar comments about parking – current plan removes 30 parking spaces between Cushing and Broadway. Do recognize this can cause issues for some locations - we're working on this.
- Ben (observer) - Can construction be timed to avoid major TCC events like the SAHBA home show? What is timing for skate park facility under I-10?
 - Yes there is a need for a lot of construction coordination - this will be done by the project and construction project managers. This may be a 3-4 month construction time. Unsure on skate park timing.
- Evren (observer) - thinking about TCC and event traffic: in this case it was possible to accommodate both vehicular traffic and bike lanes, but what would the outcome have been if this wasn't the case? Is there room for improvement in the Design Guide to help guide us in situations like this?
 - Andy - there was an attempt to codify those priorities in the Design Guide. In this context, the downtown street types have recommended priorities. But this isn't necessarily a typical segment when you consider all the destinations along this route. Note also that there are a number of additional needs on this segment that can't be done through Prop 101 funding (working on plans for this and future funding options).
 - Patrick - applying the guidelines is always a challenge. We do want to look at things on a realistic case by case basis.

5. Transportation Infrastructure Costs - Patrick Hartley

Patrick shared a brief presentation. Main points are summarized here:

- Note that the cost estimates shared here are general and are used to develop planning-level project estimates. Project costs get refined during project design, and can vary widely based

on project-specific challenges. Recent inflation has also made cost estimation particularly difficult.

- Pavement - Cost per lane mile
 - Local street: Preservation (\$10-60k), Rehab (\$170-215k), Reconstruction (\$275-500k)
 - Major Street: Preservation (\$10-135k), Rehab (\$170-285k), Reconstruction (\$500k)
 - Preservation work saves money in the long-run
- Pavement Markings: \$60k/mile
 - Try to pair bike and pavement projects to be more efficient with funding
- Fiber: \$75-250k/mile
 - This improves communications between signals. Can also provide infrastructure for first responders.
 - Cost variance depends largely on if this is above ground or under ground
- Curb: \$50/linear foot or \$200-250k/mile
 - Recall that curbing changes the drainage of the roadway
 - New roadways don't typically include guttering
- Raised Median: \$500-750k/mile
 - These offer a significant safety benefit
- Landscaping and GI: \$400 - 540k/mile
- Sidewalks: \$12/sq ft. or \$750 - 800k/mile with 6 ft. sidewalk on both sides
- Curb Ramps and Driveway Reconstruction: \$5k-\$10k/ramp or driveway
- Shared-Use Path:
 - Path only - \$300-500k/mile
 - With lighting, landscape and crossing - \$1.7million per mile
- Protected Bike Lanes
 - Object protected - \$50-100k/mile (1 side)
 - Median protected - \$250 -300k/mile (1 side)
 - Riley noted that the safety differences between these are huge.
- Lighting - \$625k/mile
- Enhanced Crossings
 - HAWK/BikeHAWK: \$200-260k/location
 - RRFB: \$30-50k/location
- Bike Boulevard: \$350-500k/mile
- Speed hump: \$5k
- Soft costs: Design (15%), Construction Management (10%), Contingency (20%), ROW (25-200%)

Questions/Discussion

- Selina - when bike projects go through different jurisdictions like South Tucson, how are amenities like street lighting executed? Do the projects have to be in the City boundary?
 - For the City to fund them, they have to be. From time to time there are agreements with the City of South Tucson. Lighting is usually cost constrained based on Prop 207.

6. SSIP Subcommittee Update - *Miranda and Patrick*

Miranda shared an overview of the subcommittee meeting. Main points summarized here:

- The subcommittee met with the goal to bring an SSIP back to CSCC for review and approval.

- Approval is needed to trigger the City to begin putting Year 1 projects into the docket for design. Need to balance the need to understand the projects as much as we can, but not delay getting the Year 1 projects going. CSCC will weigh in on project designs as they move forward.
- The project framework shows how 411 projects are being layered on top of pavement projects.
- Costs estimates are very conceptual and will be worked out later in design review
- Considerations moving forward
 - Equity – the approach may mean that wards don't get identical \$ amounts. Staff approach is being driven by Move Tucson equity analysis. This could be a good future discussion for CSCC.
 - Bikeway projects sections is still incomplete - will have an additional meeting to look at this.
 - Subcommittee suggested the addition of the following to the project list: other projects/funding available, total \$ of each projects, level of safety service for each project.
- Potential delay - there is another oversight committee that needs to weigh in, but it won't be created until Oct 5.
- All are welcome to join the subcommittee!
- Riley - can Andy join for the bikeway specific meeting? (Patrick will enquire about his availability)

Patrick shared an overview and orientation to the project framework spreadsheet

- Safety improvements are being layered over pavement projects
- The example of Bilby was used to better understand the framework (the Map Tucson tool was used to show aerial imagery for context)
- Some members expressed interest in seeing the project list (Patrick will share)

7. CSCC Hub

- Park Tucson (Jill) - Met yesterday. Continued discussion on neighborhood issues and raising parking fees. Curb study is still on-going.
- TTF (Riley) - passed a motion to recommend the City find funding for permanent fare-free transit. Also had large presentation on Ronstadt transit center design - this has been ongoing for over a decade. Clear that they are not using a complete streets framework. Members raised this; don't want this re-design to happen in a bubble. Possible future agenda item?
 - Patrick - there was a Toole Ave conceptual vision done recently that overlaps this area
 - Ruth - are free-fares system wide? (SunTran, SunLink and SunVan)
 - Davita - M&C are discussing how to move forward on this. Invite all to do the online survey if you are interested in sharing feedback (<https://www.suntran.com/publicinput2022/>)
- BAC (Sophia) - no quorum at last meeting

8. Wrap up and future agenda items

- *Is there interest in a streeteries field trip with happy hour?* - multiple members expressed interest
- Future agenda items: Rondstadt center redesign

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30pm