



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

March 22, 2023 (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 5:35 pm

Members Present:

Selina Barajas
Rhonda Bodfield
Jill Brammer
Marshall Davis
Charley Earley
Jennifer Flores
Sophia Gonzalez
Craig McCaskill
Riley Merline
Katharine Mitchell
Grecia Ramirez
Ruth Reiman
Miranda Schubert
Liz Soltero
Rossio Araujo
Jonathan Crowe
Paki Rico

Members Absent:

Tarik Williams

Staff:

Patrick Harley
Collin Chesston
Jenn Toothaker
Jim DeGrood
Gabriela Barrilla-Longoria
Davita Mueller

Guests:

Adam Gomez (Kimley – Horn)

Observers:

Evren Sönmez
Kylie Walzak
Ben Buehler-Garcia
Tres English
Slick
Ryan Johnson

Facilitation:

Colleen Whitaker

Summary of decisions/actions

- *Approval of past meeting minutes.* Minutes are approved with the edit to remove that the “IOAC is very understanding” of CSCC work. Motion to approve with edit – Rhonda; second – Miranda
- *Approval of 36th street roundabout.* Motion to advance the project to Year 1 – Rhonda; second – Miranda
- *Approval of mini-grant framework.* Motion to approve the Tucson Delivers Safe Streets Neighborhood Safety Mini Grant program framework, including the equity components as described in the framework document – Miranda; Second – Rhonda
- *Establishment of retreat planning subcommittee.* Rhonda, as co-chair, called the retreat planning subcommittee.

1. Housekeeping

- Member introductions for new members
- Approval of past meeting minutes
 - Sophia – small edit re: collaboration with the IOAC. The minutes state that they are “very understanding” of what CSCC does; this is not accurate.
 - **Move to approve March minutes with noted edit – Rhonda; Second – Jill**

2. 36th Street /Campbell Roundabout - Collin Chesston, Vanessa Rodriguez, Adam Gomez

Collin shared a brief introduction:

- This project came out of site visits related to separate projects. The city team visited and walked/biked these corridors. They discovered this intersection is at the confluence of 3 different prop 407 projects trying to enhance safety for people walking and biking.
- They noticed this intersection is challenging for bikes and pedestrians. It is often unclear who has the right of way. They began to develop ideas.
- City hired Kimley Horn to help with a feasibility study. The main findings of this will be shared by Kimley-Horn.

Vanessa introduced herself as the project manager for the walkability project on north side of 36th.

Adam shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here.

- This is a great opportunity to analyze an intersection with many multi-modal future projects.
- Intersection evaluation considers all practical, feasible solutions.
- There are not too many crashes at this intersection, and they aren't very severe. But this doesn't mean there isn't a potential for severe crashes in the future. With increased pedestrian and bicycle activity in the future this is an important consideration.
- They found the peak hour level of service = C (minimal delay).
- They looked at three alternatives: signal, maintaining all-way stop, and roundabout.
 - Signal cons: there are already many in Tucson. There is an existing signal less than 1000 feet away on Kino.
 - All-way stop cons: does this promote pedestrian/bike safety? They found not much pedestrian activity in the area. This may be because it's not a very welcoming intersection as-is. There is also a sight distance issue; it's too high and promotes higher speeds.
 - Roundabout considerations: High upfront cost, but lower than signal in terms of longevity and maintenance. Helps reduce speeds.
- Components of the roundabout proposal:
 - Fairly compact footprint
 - It all fits within right-of-way (this helps keep costs lower)
 - Improves access control – will promote easier accessibility for businesses in the area
 - Includes bike/ped facilities – allows bikes to flow with traffic, as well as bike ramps to allow bikes to leave bike lane and ride on 10' multi-use path through the intersection
- This project meets 3 of 4 street safety improvement criteria:
 - Sidewalk and ped accessibility improvements
 - Bike network enhancements
 - System wide safety improvements

- (Traffic Signal Technology updates doesn't apply here)
- Public opinion – typically see up to 82% approval rating over time (doesn't happen immediately, people need to get used to it).
- Adam shared a video of how this might function.

Questions/discussion

- Sophia – will this be like the roundabout at Costco or the one at Menlo Park? Is there an option for green infrastructure to further slow traffic?
 - Costco is an example of what can go wrong when things aren't properly designed. Here we will have a raised central island. This will promote staying in single lane.
 - Menlo park is smaller. It is relatively efficient, although there are some safety issues.
 - Highest speed people can go through here will be between 21-23mph
 - Collin – city is working with GSI folks to hopefully identify opportunities for green infrastructure here.
- Craig – huge fan of roundabouts from living in other places. Wish the city had considered Valencia / Kolb for roundabout instead of Michigan left. Feels like there are more accidents now. Glad we are considering roundabout here – feels like forward thinking.
- Marshall – is the school entrance considered entry/exit, and will cars be able to make left turn?
 - It will be exit only. This could be revised, but there are other driveways that allow for more channelized flow.
- Marshall – will this roundabout be sufficient for traffic volumes there?
 - This will provide a level of service “A” for the next 40+ years based on today's traffic and incorporation of a growth rate factor.
 - Collin – in comparison to performance with 4-way stop, which makes traffic worse.
- Grecia – excited to see this project. Will the project also lower the speed limits here?
 - 21 mph is fastest that a vehicle could come through this roundabout. Not going to change speed limits along 36th, although this could be changed with future projects.
 - Collin – south Campbell is a bike boulevard, and we will add traffic calming. Speed limits will be changed to 20mph. Looking at additional lowering is something we could consider.
 - Grecia – since this is a school zone, shouldn't the speed limit by 15mph. or only during pick up/drop off? -> Unsure about school zone policies – will need to look into this.
- Rhonda – do we expect traffic flow to be as heavy as the video?
- Sophia – Agree it looked a bit scary for pedestrians. Drivers will need to stop before the curb. Will we see same disregard for crosswalk?
 - Adam – there will be advance signage for ped crossings. 30-50' before intersection. There are other mechanisms we can use for advance warning. These are being implemented across the country. 1000's in areas with even higher pedestrian traffic; very effective. It will take time for people to get comfortable with, and need education. Feel confident that Tucson will catch onto this quickly.
 - Collin – FHWA numbers indicate that roundabouts increase pedestrian safety by ~30%. This is also designed for 15mph. Note the crosswalk is set back; this allows drivers to make decision to yield to ped independent of decision to enter the roundabout.
- Liz – used to work in this area, there are lots of kids crossing to Circle K. Glad crosswalks will be set back. Will be important to keep high visibility around roundabout.

- Charlie – there is a discussion about roundabout in my neighborhood. A resident who is vision impaired has expressed there is increased danger due to lack of ability to hear when/where traffic is coming from. This applies to where the crosswalk sits in relation to actual circle.
 - Adam – there is a 25' set back. All crosswalks will have truncated domes for visually impaired people. There is also a refuge with truncated domes.
 - Collin – have worked in other areas where roundabouts have been installed. It can be confusing; a new experience to adapt to. Could be scary at times. Successful examples have included training to help understand the route; this is pretty typical. Agree the learning curve is more intense for visually impaired.
- Scott (O) – there is a charter school to east of Circle K. Is there sufficient queuing space to facilitate left turn into traffic flow and hold additional vehicles? Looks like a solid yellow line would prevent this.
 - Adam – it is a double yellow, but can be used as dual left. This is just concept level. It will be revised to meet the needs of the area during design.
 - Collin – we will do targeted outreach to stakeholders near this intersection, once we know if there is support to advance the project.

Consensus decision process

- Patrick – The proposal is that this project is moved into the 5 year tentative program. Seeking today approval to move this project forward. This doesn't require additional funding. The request is to shift funding. Proposal is to split funding between bikeways element and pedestrian element – there will be benefits to both groups. The effect is that a project on Swan (Broadway-Speedway) will be shifted to Year 6 in order to front load this project. But also opens up more funding in bikeway element.
- Ruth – do we have to change what has already been proposed?
 - Patrick – Don't need to change anything, but the Swan project will move out to a later year and open up more funding in bikeway element. But it doesn't increase the funding commitment over the 5 years.
- The city is seeking tonight formal approval from CSCC to - *advance \$1.3 million for this project within this first 5 year program, to begin design in Year 1.*
- Consensus check – any member who cannot support? → none. Consensus support.
- **Motion to advance the project to Year 1 – Rhonda; Second – Miranda**

3. Neighborhood Safety Plan - Gabriella

Gabriella shared an overview presentation (same information that was shared with members before meeting). Main points are captured here:

- City is seeking approval to proceed with the proposed program concept and equity framework to begin standing up the Mini Grant application process.
- Vision: Establish an inclusive, community-led process to deliver neighborhood safety improvements across the city, prioritizing under-resourced neighborhoods who could not otherwise fund their own traffic calming projects through the existing Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP)
- Funding Source: Tucson Delivers: Safe Streets. Projections indicate total funding to be \$450k/year, \$2.2M over 5 years.
- CSCC Role – serve as the Mini Grant review committee to help DTM staff decide which projects to fund.
- Eligibility – neighborhood streets only.
- Includes new or enhanced traffic calming elements (enhanced with Green stormwater

infrastructure or asphalt art).

- Gabriella shared a few images of recent traffic calming projects around town
- Equity framework: Equity will be applied in 4 ways:
 - Community engagement and targeted outreach to under resourced areas
 - Scoring: CSCC will review applications using a scorecard that includes “equity” as a main criteria (with 50% total weight)
 - Community Led: A bottom-up approach that empowers residents to ID their own needs and propose solutions in the design phase vs staff proposing projects without community buy-in.
 - Funding: establish a floor where at least 60% of funding will go to highest and higher equity zones, per Move Tucson equity analysis
- Equity metrics:
 - Location benefits-based
 - Impacts-based
 - Community-engagement based
- Proposed Approach: Year 1 Pilot – this will be refined at end of year 1 with evaluation
 - Small funding set aside for unfunded traffic calming projects from NTMP that have already been approved, but not started. (\$75k). These will be overlaid with equity data.
 - Rolling call for applications for new Traffic Calming Mini Grant Program (\$275k) – rolling application is a lesson learned from Tucson Clean and Beautiful. Will establish a cut off for the year to review what has been received so far.
- Proposed ways for an application to demonstrate community buy-in:
 - Names of 3 community members who are in favor of the project, or
 - Letter of support from formal or informal neighborhood group
 - Once selected the applicant needs to get 60% support (via petition) of those on the street, within 60 days.
- The program will be evaluated and refined as needed for Year 2
- Timeline: design and construction could begin as early as Fall 2023/Spring 2024

Questions/Discussion

- Patrick – city is seeking approval of framework as proposed, or with changes as requested by CSCC members.
- Grecia – can schools apply (I work in a school that has lots of traffic)?
 - Yes, a school can apply. It just needs to be located in a neighborhood. Applicant could be an individual, a school or a business (as long as in neighborhood).
- Liz – appreciate the menu of different traffic calming options. For rendering of these it will be important to make sure it doesn’t show components that won’t be a part of this. For CSCC review, can you estimate how much time this might take and how it might work?
 - Will depend how many applications are received. The first pass of eligibility would be done by staff (e.g. ensuring it’s in a neighborhood). If the full CSCC isn’t interested, it could be done by a subcommittee. Could perhaps be a one month period of reviewing and scoring.
- Sophia – what is the wiggle room on timeline? Summer community engagement – stuff does still happen, but there is typically less going on. Will this affect the Fall 2023 construction target?
 - There is an urgency to deliver projects in Year 1. Definitely hear the point about

summer community engagement. With rolling applications we can continue to do engagement beyond September.

- Marshall – can we receive instructions on how to re-create the map of projects overlaid with equity zones? Will the projects be scored all together, and then ensure that at least 60% are in equity areas.
 - Yes, they will all be scored together, and then look at distribution. If there are not 60% in equity zones we can ask why and think about other ways to encourage projects.
 - The Move Tucson equity data is publicly available through Map Tucson.
- Ruth – are the neighborhoods responsible for maintenance of the projects?
 - Yes, but have also identified existing resources that can help with this. Tucson Water Storm to Shade group provides maintenance in high priority areas. We will definitely need to work this out; want to establish resources for those neighborhoods that need maintenance assistance (e.g. workshop or funds).
- Ruth – when funding doesn't exist for maintenance from another program, can we require that people demonstrate a maintenance plan as part of the application? There is a traffic circle in my neighborhood that I had to water by hand because no one was maintaining them. Maintenance wasn't handled well in my neighborhood.
 - We do want to learn from lessons of what hasn't worked. Have talked to Tucson Clean and Beautiful. There are multiple different strategies. We do want to encourage more GSI.
- Ruth – can neighborhoods with existing projects apply for money to maintain what they already have (e.g. Pima, Alvernon to Columbus)?
 - This was an initial question, but the department didn't think this would align with Truth in Taxation. Partnering with Tucson Clean and Beautiful may help us connect neighborhoods with maintenance resources.
- Riley – as people are trying to determine if a project is eligible, they may not know if a street is a collector or not. Can you do any of these projects on a road that will then be re-paved? Or would they want it to be re-paved first?
 - This could be dealt with in review stage with CSCC. Staff could be liaison to help make sure things are aligned with paving schedules.
 - We can prioritize in the tools and materials a way for people to know what their street is classified as.
- Tres (O): I have some relevant experience with design and construction of neighborhood traffic circles. I built the first permitted circle in Tucson 40 years ago. It cost 1/25 of the city's design, and is in better condition than other traffic circles built 20 years ago. If the City doesn't change the design requirements, only a handful of systems will be built and nothing significant will be achieved for millions of dollars.
- Rhonda and Miranda would like to see the community engagement plan in an upcoming meeting.

Consensus decision process

- City is seeking approval of the Tucson Delivers Safe Streets Neighborhood Safety Mini Grant program framework, including the equity components as described in the framework document.
- Any members not able to support this, or any concerns? → no one. Consensus approval.
- **Motion to approve the Tucson Delivers Safe Streets Neighborhood Safety Mini Grant program framework, including the equity components as described in the framework**

document – Miranda; Second - Rhonda

4. Annual Report – Patrick

- Committee is required to submit an annual report. Rhonda put this together. Any final comments before it goes to City Clerk office?
- Ruth – great job Rhonda! Did we prepare a list of RTA projects in the CSCC in 2022? (it was 2021). Can you add under “significant accomplishments” it doesn’t say Prop 411 to clarify these actions?

5. CSCC Hub

- Park Tucson - *Jill Brammer* → no update
- Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC) – *Tarik (not present)*
- Transit Task Force (TTF) - *Riley Merline* → the tour finally happened.
- Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) - *Sophia Gonzalez*
 - BAC is interested in communication between IOAC and CSCC. Due to comments about Downtown Links projects, trying to get meeting with 22nd bridge manager.
- Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) - *no representative*

9. Wrap up and next steps

- IOAC/CSCC Communication – some members are interested in working on this. Could this be an April retreat agenda item, or does the group want to form a subcommittee to address this?
 - Sophia – it would be good to have as a retreat agenda item. Would like to work through some options beforehand.
 - Patrick – this would need to be an official subcommittee
 - Interested members – Sophia, Liz, Jill
 - Jenn – this could be a subcommittee on “retreat prep” → members are good with this.
 - **Rhonda, as co-chair, called the retreat planning subcommittee.**
- DTM update – Patrick
 - IOAC meeting last week expressed interest in revisiting the collector street program and the overall sequencing of the pavement management, using an equity framework consistent with Move Tucson. There are good opportunities here to ensure we are working in lock step.
 - Jim - collections of the revenue are strong (~\$45M in overall collections to-date).
- Ruth – the RTA subcommittee met. The group decided to postpone further activity while there remain so many unknowns.
 - Miranda – we met ahead of M&C receiving the project list from City Manager Ortega. The project list was more reflective of Move Tucson projects, so it felt more reflective of our community. If there is anything to rally around, it might be in support of this project list. There is a lot going on behind the scenes and the situation is developing rapidly. The subcommittee is here if people want to meet or discuss more.
 - Patrick – RTA Board is meeting tomorrow. 1st Ave is on the agenda.
- Retreat will be April 22nd at TEP building downtown. The City will provide lunch.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 by the co-chairs.