



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

August 23, 2023 (5:30-7:30pm)

Zoom



Approved Minutes

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Quorum was established and the meeting was called to order by co-chairs at 5:30pm

Members Present:

Selina Barajas
Rhonda Bodfield
Jill Brammer
Marshall Davis
Charly Earley
Jennifer Flores
Sophia Gonzalez
Craig McCaskill
Riley Merline
Ruth Reiman
Luis Salgado
Miranda Schubert
Liz Soltero
Rossio Araujo
Jonathan Crowe

Members Absent:

Grecia Ramirez
Tarik Williams

Staff:

Patrick Harley
Gabriela Barillas
Kara Lehmann
Jim DeGrood

Observers:

Evren Sonmez
Felipe Ladron de Guevara
Ben Buehler-Garcia
Logan Byers
Paul Smith
Kristin McRay
Dale Calvert
Mike Mayer

Facilitation:

Colleen Whitaker

Summary of actions and decisions

- Approval of June minutes: Motion to approve – Miranda; Second – Rhonda
- Limberlost funding: Motion to approve funding for Limberlost: Rhonda; Second – Miranda
- Neighborhood Safety funding request: Motion to approve funding for all four projects as presented: Miranda; Second – Rhonda
- Appoint new co-chairs (Sophia and Miranda): Motion – Rhonda; Second - Miranda

2. Housekeeping

- Approval of June minutes (there was no July meeting): No corrections or edits. Motion to approve – Miranda; Second – Rhonda

3. Prop 411 Funding Request: Limberlost (Part 2) [Decision item] – Patrick

Patrick shared a brief reminder overview of the approval request. The item was presented during the June meet as well. Main points summarized here:

- The City is seeking approval of funding to extend the previously approved Limberlost Complete Streets Safety Project from Stone Avenue to 1st Ave.
- This aligns with initial period paving gap and is consistent with tentative 5 year plan.
- Since the June meeting there was also a walk and talk for members at this site.

Discussion/questions:

- Sophia – the walk through was very good and reviewing the presentation was very helpful. There is a lot to learn about Prop 411. Thanks for the additional deliberation time. It's very important for us to understand fully what we are voting on. Feel confident in moving forward to vote.
- Marshall – this project is a good idea because it ties projects together into a finished Limberlost.

Consensus deliberation and decision:

- No members requested additional deliberation time. All ready to vote.
- No members indicated they would not support approving funding, therefore consensus approval is granted.
- **Motion to approve funding for Limberlost: Rhonda; Second – Miranda**

4. Neighborhood Safety Funding Request [Decision item] - Gabriella Barillas

Gabriella shared an overview of the funding request. Main points are summarized here:

- The City is seeking authorization of funding for 4 projects.
- While awaiting new proposals for the mini-grant program the idea is to move forward with projects from the NTMP program that have approvals and are still unfunded, and have overlap with 411 work and potentially also high equity areas.
- Estimated cost of 4 projects being presented tonight: \$65k. This would allow about \$10k to be carried over to the mini-grant program.
- Total funding for 411 neighborhood traffic calming this year is anticipated to be \$450k. Funding set aside for NTMP is \$75k

Project 1: Flowing Wells Speed Hump

- *Location:* Across street from Flowing Wells High School.
- *Why now:* set to be paved in coming months, has all approvals, will allow cost-savings on mobilization of equipment, minimize neighborhood disruptions.
- *CSCC priorities – safety:* The area performs “fair.”
- *CSCC priorities – equity:* The area scored “higher”

Project 2: South Park Speed Hump

- *Location:* Ward 5 near Silverlake
- *Why now:* has all approvals, will be repaved in phase 1
- *CSCC priorities – equity:* in an area that scored “highest”
- *CSCC priorities – safety:* adjacent to a park and Holliday Elementary. Rates as “fair”

Project 3: Sarnoff Speed Humps (3)

- *Location*: east side on Sarnoff
- *Why now*: has all approvals and is set to expire this year
- *CSCC priorities – equity*: not in a high equity area, but adjacent to one that is “highest” level
- *CSCC priorities – safety*: no existing traffic calming on this ½ mile stretch. Street design is a straight travel path. Close to elementary school.

Project 4: Rose Neighborhood Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) Traffic Circle

- *Location*: Ward 1, South 13th
- Tucson Clean and Beautiful (TCB) has already developed a plan and approached City with funding request. Two traffic circles are part of the request – TCB will fund one, and the request is for the city to fund the second. TCB has engaged in a collaborative planning effort with the neighborhood.
- *Why now*: has all approvals, opportunity to leverage funding, cost saving in planning design and mobilization
- *CSCC priorities – equity*: the area scored “highest” and 66 in tree equity score (it is likely maintenance will be covered)
- *CSCC priorities – safety*: corridor for kids walking to CE Rose school; scored “poor” in safety analysis

Discussion/questions

- Marshall – For South Park – would you hold off on installing until paving starts? (yes). Flowing Wells: shouldn't this be less than \$7k if it is being re-paved at the same time.
 - Flowing Wells: This is an estimate, and it could certainly be lower. If funding is approved the City would have the contractor add it to the scope of work.
- Ruth – Traffic circle: is this 4-way stop? (answer: 2-way). The rendering looks very small
 - The image is not an engineering plan, it's just a concept. City is now making circles larger.
- Ruth – is one speed hump sufficient?
 - They do typically work better in pairs. Flowing Wells is just one, but it is a shorter street segment. This would still make a difference.
- Ben – so many traffic circles become trash collectors – can we add maintenance to application. Also we need to include TFD in design to ensure fire trucks can navigate.
 - Logan (TCB) – it does have the space for a ladder truck.
 - Gabriella – TFD is automatically included in agency approvals.
- Rhonda – support the package of projects. All are either in, or very close to, an equity area. All have heavy pedestrian opportunities (schools, parks). Seems like a reasonable request. Appreciate cost sharing of TCB.
- Sophia – agree. The presentation was helpful. Important that all City designs include the actual intended vegetation. There is neighborhood energy around these projects. Feels important to approve them. Curious in general to understand more about speed humps.
 - We can include info on speed humps in the mini-grant materials being developed now.
- Sophia – what was the decision about funding across wards for this?
 - There is not a set amount for each ward office, but it is guided by the evaluation of proposals based on criteria. Over the 10 years there should be time to have projects across the City. The ward offices and Office of Equity are supportive of this approach.
- Mike (observer) – who will maintain plants in traffic circle?

- This depends on where the neighborhood ranks on the Tree Equity Score. If it is a high score then it gets full maintenance through Storm to Shade program. Those that are moderate priority get some maintenance. Those below this are maintained by neighborhood. Can double check this and get further clarification directly from Storm to Shade.
- Logan – TCB is contractor in Storm to Shade program.
- Mike (observer) – are speed humps or chicanes more effective at traffic slowing?
 - Jonathan – DTM typically measures traffic speeds pre and post improvement to determine effectiveness. Empirically these do slow speeds.
 - Evren - Seattle did a study and documented a 93% reduction in crashes after traffic circles were installed.
 - Gabriela – part of the mini-grant program will do some data collection so we can develop local statistics on impacts to safety.
- Marshall – good idea to tie these to paving projects. Happy to approve.

Consensus deliberation and decision:

- No members requested additional deliberation time. All ready to vote.
- No members indicated they would not support approving funding, therefore consensus approval is granted.
- **Motion to approve funding for all four projects as presented: Miranda; Second – Rhonda**

5. IOAC tentative approval of Collector Street Program List - CSCC Review

Patrick shared a background overview of the task before the council:

- Prop 411 set aside \$15M a year for five years for pavement improvement on the collector network. The goal is to re-pave every local street in Tucson in 10 years.
- 20% of the funds were set aside for the safety program.
- The IOAC is the body determining which Collector Streets are included in the 5-year plan
- M&C gave direction to find opportunities to “layer” projects and funding sources to deliver more impactful complete streets projects.
- Previously the CSCC has established that Collector Streets will be top priority for project layering with 411 safety funds.
- The IOAC tentatively approved the 5-year collector project list at their June meeting. Their direction was that the list be presented to the CSCC for comments and recommendations before final approval. Their approach prioritized the list on a “worst-first” approach. Purpose tonight is to get any feedback or recommendation from the CSCC.
- Staff has looked at how these “worst first” relate to Move Tucson priority projects to identify layering opportunities (these materials were shared with CSCC members ahead of the meeting).

Jim DeGroot (IOAC staff liaison)

- This project list was presented at June IOAC meeting. Streets identified are all considered very poor; not all very poor roads are represented in this list (funding ran out at about OCI of 38; 40 and below is considered very poor).
- They were on the fence about some projects (e.g. Tucson Blvd between 22nd and Broadway because of potential impact of upcoming closure of 22nd street viaduct over railroad).
- Their recommendation was based solely on overall condition. Where there is opportunity to layer, they would like to get these moving first.

- IOAC is eager to get feedback from CSCC.

Discussion/questions

- Riley – clarification on type of feedback IOAC wants?
 - At this point it is really about what is on/off this list. Group could make specific recommendations about locations, or recommend additional criteria to be considered in prioritization.
- Rhonda – appreciate IOAC asking for input and being collaborative. IOAC approach has been very different with only considering pavement. Our work has been informed by equity and safety. Our feedback may include referencing some our criteria. There are opportunities in this list to advance Move Tucson projects.
- Dale Calvert (IOAC chairman) – interested in hearing what CSCC has to say. We do have some prioritization built in. Biggest priority is to fix as much pavement as quickly as possible. Prop 411 is first opportunity for a comprehensive approach to getting streets up to date. The money available is not enough to fix all collectors. We would like to blend our priorities with your ideas.
- Miranda – appreciate IOAC request for input. Equity is the cornerstone of our work and how we are thoughtful about prioritization. Juggling all the considerations is definitely challenging. Seems many Tier 1 Move Tucson projects didn't make the cut off. Want to understand more about how/if equity or Move Tucson was a consideration. Thought Move Tucson was supposed to be our blueprint for transportation planning.
 - Jim – criteria was only overall road condition. Did think about how to incorporate equity, and had challenges with this. For example, when two areas of high/low equity front the same roadway, how do you evaluate this? With neighborhoods we used "if it touches it, it counts." Didn't do this with roads. Felt that those coming from different equity areas are mobile across the whole network. Layering is where we would see impact of equity.
- Rhonda – when does IOAC need feedback?
 - Jim – have deliberately not put a timeframe on it. There is an abundance of work to do. Have been focused up to now on neighborhood/local streets. Approved layered projects first (like Bilby). There is time to deliberate.
- Ruth – why does Tucson stop at 6th street?
 - Jim – solely based on Overall Condition Index (OCI). Anything over 38.4 was not funded due to lack of funds.
- Sophia – appreciate the transparency around the decision-making here. Want to discuss how equity is being defined. It really is about those who are most vulnerable – those walking and biking as their primary transportation. Roads in disrepair are dangerous for users. Also want to consider the history of exclusion from road maintenance. Regarding 6th St and road diet – how will this proceed? Does reconstruction prevent us from looking at road diets in the future? Sad to see 36th won't be repaved, but happy to forego for higher equity area work. Will Silverbell near Tumamoc get any repaving? Do others have any projects they're disappointed not to see in this list?
 - Jim – the ordinance limits us to deal with only collector streets. Silverbell is not on this list, so not eligible under this funding source. May be good to revisit the classification in future.

- Dale – Silverbell from St. Mary’s to Congress is a Prop 101 project, but has been delayed due to water line issues. (Jim – there was a bid on this project recently, so it should begin to move now).
- Patrick – 6th St: without the repaving as a trigger to re-do lanes, it does present some challenges moving forward. There may be an opportunity to look at safety exclusive funding to continue the evaluation independent of paving work. The consequence of this – line obliteration is hard when not doing repaving work.
- Sophia – would be good to get some more clarity in the future about some of the terms and processes for this.
- Riley – has there been feedback from Council members on this list?
 - Jim – council members are interested, but the IOAC is making the call. There is an interest in ward proportionality, while understanding that not all wards are created equal.

Member deliberation on approach for this item

- Rhonda – How do we as CSCC want to engage on this? Subcommittee? Share recommendation to review through lens of equity and safety to see what changes?
- Marshall – would be good if we could overlay approved repavement across the equity map.
- Miranda – supportive of taking more time, and appreciative we have the opportunity. Like map suggestion. Would like to forge a better model moving forward – don’t want to be in this situation in the future. Ideally everyone would bring a complete streets lens to what they are doing; an equity lens in all spaces. Would a subcommittee composed of both bodies make sense?
- Rhonda offered to draft a response to reflect this.
- Miranda – most people likely don’t have time for subcommittee. Like idea of kicking it back with request to review with equity and safety lens.
- Sophia – would be good to see Move Tucson list in comparison to this list.
- Patrick – reminder that Move Tucson prioritization is largely based on equity and safety. Would a formal letter be beneficial, or is a motion tonight suitable?
 - Jim – as our chair is also here, we can convey the feedback to IOAC next week. This will be on agenda (CSCC update is standing item). Would be good if a CSCC member could join (Ruth volunteered). Perhaps we could look at those roads on the border of OCI cut off and have Move Tucson priority?
- Colleen screenshared a summary of recommendations heard thus far to share back to IOAC:
 - *Is it possible for the IOAC to review the current list through the lenses of equity and safety and see if anything changes?*
 - *Possibly include the overlay of this list onto the equity map*
 - *Compare Move Tucson and this list*
 - *(Jim suggested possibly looking at those below OCI of 45)*
- Members felt this was a complete list of recommendations at this point. This will be shared back with IOAC at next meeting. Dale was also comfortable with this approach.
- Patrick will share IOAC next meeting invite with full CSCC.

6. Co-chair nominations

- Miranda and Rhonda have completed their terms as co-chairs. Role of co-chairs is to meet with facilitators and Patrick for one-hour ahead of council meetings to plan the agendas.

- Rhonda – the role is a privilege and has been a great experience.
- Miranda – have learned a lot in this role, and enjoy doing it. The facilitators and staff make it easy. Good collaborative relationship.
- Sophia volunteered to be co-chair. Miranda offered to stay on for another term as there were no other volunteers.
- **Motion to appoint Sophia and Miranda as co-chairs of CSCC: Motion -Rhonda; second - Miranda**

7. CSCC Hub

- Park Tucson (Jill)
- Transit Taskforce (Riley)
 - Haven't met since June, no quorum for a couple meetings. TTF is now the Tucson Transit Advisory Committee, and a permanent committee.
 - Big focus now on COA (Comprehensive Operational Analysis). DTM is doing surveys and proposing route changes. This can be found online. Some pop-up events happening around town. Aug 31 meeting will have a presentation on this.
 - Fareless transit has been continued indefinitely
- BAC (Sophia)
 - Had recent presentation on public health component of traffic violence. Take aways – there is lack of data on this issue. Departments are not talking to each other to develop a full picture analysis.
 - Sophia shared reports via chat.
 - Spoke with TPD about their recent report out on fatalities. There is a request to meet and discuss how to talk about these crashes differently. Want to change reporting around fatalities for ped/bike users.
- PAC - no member
- CODI – no member

7. Wrap up

DTM Update – Patrick

- Just had 58th fatal of the year. Tracking almost exactly last year. No improvements yet.
- M&C has changed quorum rules for all BCC. It is now a majority of seated members, not all seats. Our quorum will now be 8.
- Sep 14 – first public meeting for Bilby Road.
- Grant Phases 3 and 4 will go into construction later this year
- 101 paving projects also moving forward
- Annual revenue are in (not yet official) – coming in above target for Prop 411. Jim will present more specifics to IOAC at their next meeting.
- Members – Paki has resigned from PAG and will no longer be on this council. Katharine is now working with City of Tucson, so also no longer on CSCC

Future agenda items

- Speed humps 101

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30