



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

September 27, 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
Ruth Reiman
Luis Salgado
Miranda Schubert
Liz Soltero
Rossio Araujo
Jonathan Crowe
Tarik Williams

Members Absent:

Craig McCaskill
Riley Merline
Grecia Ramirez

Staff:

Patrick Harley
Andy McGovern
Gabriela Barillas
Kara Lehmann
Jim DeGroot

Observers:

Evren Sonmez
Ben Buehler-Garcia
Scott Robidoux
Lee Miller

Guest speaker:

Carolyn Campbell, RTA CAC

Facilitation:

Tahnee Robertson

Summary of actions and decisions

- Approval of August minutes: Motion to approve – Miranda; Second – Sophia
- Funding request – Street lighting (Country Club and S. Nogales) - Motion to approve funding for Nogales Hwy streetlighting – Sophia; Second – Miranda (Note that funding for Country Club was not approved at this time).
- 411 Mini-grant program - Motion to approve the evaluation plan – Sophia, Second - Miranda

2. Housekeeping

- Approval of August minutes : No corrections or edits. Motion to approve – Miranda; Second – Sophia

3. Funding request: Street lighting (Country Club/S. Nogales) [Decision item] – Patrick

Purpose: Staff is seeking funding to advance the project.

Patrick shared an overview of the project and funding request. Main points are summarized here:

- The request is to advance funding for street lighting on S. Nogales and Country Club Rd.
- This project was in the existing tentative 5 year program. The city is now moving on these federally funded projects, and needs to advance funding prior to finalizing the 5-year program.
- Project goals: improve lighting and safety for all users
- Project has funds through HSIP (Highway Safety Improvement Program). The award is not sufficient to cover the cost of both projects.
- Need about \$1million to advance the project. Funding would come from 411 System wide Safety Improvements.
- Why now: Design has started, and timing can be tricky with federally funded projects. Need to move more quickly to meet obligations.
- Safety performance:
 - Nogales Hwy – intersection is “poor” and corridors are “fair,” 294 crashes from 2018-2022, 14 of these were severe and 4 were fatalities. 78% of severe crashes occurred at night.
 - County Club – intersection is “fair” and corridor is “poor,” 395 crashes from 2018-2022, 18 were severe and 3 fatalities.
- Equity
 - Nogales – project is within “high” or “highest” equity area
 - Country Club – only the southernmost extent is within “high” or “highest” equity area
- Impact on draft 5-year plan
 - Minor impact. Both projects were already identified, but costs have escalated.
 - Costs increased by \$255,000 from original budget.
 - Request is to increase to \$1 million and advance the projects.

Discussion/questions:

- Andy McGovern - Note that crash data is from 2018-2022, but the original grant application was approved only looked at 2013-2017. This is an ongoing safety problem on both roadways.
- Marshall – there has been construction on S. Nogales for some time now. Would these lights interfere with that work?
 - Andy – that is underground utility work. This work would avoid all those facilities.
- Ruth – have some concerns about Country Club. Do we need to approve both, or can we split them?
 - Andy – they are two separate federal grants.
- Ruth – on Country Club, where will the lights go? There are no sidewalks on the majority of this. Sidewalks are needed more than lighting right now.
 - Andy – these funds are only for streetlights. No other amenities are included. The first step on Country Club is to do a ROW evaluation and see what there is room for.
 - Ruth – will streetlights need to be ripped out to put sidewalks in at some point?
 - Andy – there may be a possibility to get lights up against property lines and have enough room for sidewalks. But probably not 7’ sidewalks.
 - Ruth – could the curbs move into the street and narrow the street to accommodate better sidewalks? Concerned that street light funding will be wasted when we go back to re-do Country Club properly.
 - Patrick – in the event that the Move Tucson Country Club project moves forward, noting it has no committed funding now, there would be opportunities to move curb

- and increase ROW if necessary and change the corridor. But now that project is costly and not moving through any known funding streams.
 - Ruth – will putting in street lights now reduce the priority for modernizing Country Club later?
 - Patrick – no, the project will remain on the list. We may end up doing it in piece meal fashion if we can't find full amount with one option.
- Tarik – ultimately we want streetlights and sidewalks. Hoping the design can think ahead for future sidewalk construction. Both are a priority.
 - Andy – we do understand there is limited space here. Once we have preliminary layouts we can identify the various options and work with DTM staff to figure out next steps.
- Sophia – Nogales seems more obvious. Ruth raises some good points about Country Club. If we say yes to Country Club, what are we saying no to? SSIP is only for certain things yes?
 - Patrick - SSIP is 411 safety plan and is pretty expansive. HSIP has a range of improvements that can be done, but safety improvements have to meet cost benefit threshold. Funding would come from both for this.
- Charly – if Country Club isn't approved for additional funding, what happens to the federal funds?
 - Andy – we will move into first phase of design with existing federal funds. The initial analysis will be done to then sit down and figure out the next steps.
- Tarik – is part of the concern that if we don't approve now, we will end up with an unfinished project that may cost more later on? We don't want to say no to street lights and then possibly not even get sidewalks later on.
 - Andy – constructions costs are high now. Cost estimates for these projects were done at the end of 2018. The latest updated cost are based on street lighting costs from Broadway widening. Any spent federal funds that don't result in a complete project need to be paid back to ADOT.
- Sophia - So it's \$1M total extra from what was already approved for streetlights on both projects? What's the total cost of both projects?
 - Patrick – the total cost is \$1,050,000 (\$200k is shortfall on Nogales and \$800k is shortfall on Country Club. \$255k comes from the original cost estimate that has now gone up.
- Ruth – once you decide where to put streetlights do you need neighbor approval?
 - Andy – yes, we'll definitely have neighborhood involvement. This will be part of design.
- Ruth – What happens if people don't want the lights? Would lights be on both sides?
 - Andy – if there is disagreement it would become a decision that goes up to City Manager's office and maybe even M&C. Don't yet know where proposed lights would go – need to do evaluation first. Initial investigation will cost 85-100k.
- Ruth – if the project is not feasible will you have to pay the money back?
 - Andy – probably, although in some cases these situations have resulted in the project being written off.
- Sophia - We can benefit from hearing back from the investigation

Consensus deliberation and decision

- *Initial sensing for consensus – who would not be able to support at this time?*
 - Ruth – supportive of Nogales, but not supportive of Country Club project. It's a big hit on 411 money and getting tired of projects moving to the front of the line. I would

prefer not to use 411 funding for this. Feel the City can find the funding elsewhere if they want to do this project.

- Marshall – what is the timetable for returning funds if they project isn't completed?
 - Andy – unsure. Anticipate the design consultant will need at least 6 months to get their preliminary work done. Expect to know more next summer.
- Charly – why is the shortfall for each project so different, if this is about increase in materials cost?
 - Andy – Country Club is 50% longer. Initial construction cost estimates on these varied also. Not entirely sure why. Nogales will be much easier to construct.
- Sophia – how much time do we have to decide on Country Club?
 - Andy – don't anticipate we'll be able to know more until next spring or early summer. We need to show ADOT some expenditures. We can launch into Country Club investigation with the federal funds and take it one step at a time.
- Miranda – Nogales seems straightforward and a lower price tag. Feel comfortable voting on this tonight. Feel re-assured that there is time to deliberate more on Country Club. And it will be good motivation to finish the 5-year plan.
- *New proposal is to move forward to authorize funding on Nogales only*
 - All members showed a "thumbs up" in support of this revised proposal. Consensus approval is granted.
 - **Motion to approve funding for Nogales Hwy streetlighting – Sophia; Second – Miranda**

4. RTA Update - Patrick, Carolyn

Carolyn shared an update of RTA and CAC work. Main points are summarized here:

- First 4.5 years focused on multi-modal roadway projects, with help from Technical Management Committee (TMC).
- Over the last few they have begun to develop recommendations – one from TMC and one from CAC. There is some work to do now to try and develop a single recommendation.
- CAC recommendation has a bit less for multi-modal roadways, and more for transit. This is the biggest contentions between the recommendations.
- Cost estimates for site specific roadway projects is done – they have come in at about 40-100% higher than the original estimates. Due to this jurisdictions are looking at possibly cutting projects. CAC is re-ranking projects to address this funding shortfall. This will be shared with the TMC.
- CAC has developed a total amount for transit. Now working on how to apportion this over sub-categories.
- The board has requested the draft final recommendation to be shared with public by December.

Discussion/questions

- Miranda – prioritizing transit and safety, with less priority on roadways is very aligned with goals of this group. Is there anything CSCC can do to support the push for greater funding for transit and other principles where we align?
 - Carolyn – there have not been many public comment submitted. City of Tucson projects came from the work of CSCC and Move Tucson, so those priorities are aligned. Anything the CSCC can do to forward your work once this goes before voters would be helpful.

- Miranda - For those less familiar with RTA: <https://rtamobility.com/who-we-are/>
- Feel free to drop articles that are helpful for newer members or audience members on RTA - PDF of an article from August of this year (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/18MjgbmyJIZldfVjVvYHOw3OqOiUCwLKc/view?usp=sharing>)
- Sophia - At the BAC, I asked if they were going to change their public engagement strategy/funding. It sounds like nothing has been decided on related to changing this. A letter outlining with CSCC would like to see could be useful.
- Patrick – Council will talk about RTA at the next study session.

5. 411 Safety Mini-grant program project review criteria [Decision item] – Gabriella

Gabriella shared an overview presentation. Main points are summarized here:

- Call for applications will go out in mid-October
- Stage 1 - Eligibility Requirements
 - Does it meet minimum requirements (local street, neighborhood support)
- Stage 2 – Scorecard summary table
 - Weights: safety (30%), built env/road design (20%), resiliency (5%), equity (35%), community readiness (10%)
 - Equity is also applied because >60% of funding is awarded in high priority areas
- Stage 3 – Qualitative/open-ended questions
 - To address gaps in data (e.g. not all crashes being reported).
 - Question to address “known problems,” and ideas for heat mitigation
- Stage 4 – Tabulation of scores and ranking review
 - Staff will review and score
 - If there are two similar proposals in the same place they could be consolidated
- Stage 5 – CSCC approval of project list
 - Top 10 projects will be presented to CSCC in ranked order
 - CSCC will advance about 5 projects for the pilot year phase.
- Next steps
 - Looking for CSCC feedback on website and application (by 10/6)
 - Materials are being translated into Spanish once they are final
 - Program will launch on 10/16

Discussion/questions

- Sophia – how did you test this framework?
 - Used the scenario of Rose Neighborhood Traffic Circles. Used the scorecard and mock application.
 - Also completed a literature review of similar programs across the country and the ARPA process (American Rescue Plan Act). Also relied on Move Tucson and partner feedback.
- Charly –how long might you wait for proposals to come in before seeking approval for first round? Second –how do rental properties effect the process of getting neighborhood support?
 - Timeline – applications are submitted on a rolling basis. Those submitting before end of February will be included in first review. Anticipate first review process to be about a month, with approval from CSCC in March and design in summer.

- City is using the NTMP policy as a guiding framework for the petition and neighborhood support process. This requires 60% or more approval from adjacent neighbors – this is households, not property owners. This process will not happen at the early stages, only once the project has been selected and in design. The application includes a simple litmus test of 3-5 neighbors who are supportive.
- Patrick – we need approval of evaluation criteria from CSCC.
 - *Consensus* - No members shared concerns – all thumbs up.
 - **Motion to approve the evaluation plan – Sophia, Second - Miranda**

6. Five Year Plan: Process for finalizing

Patrick shared an presentation in the form of a “pop quiz”. Main points are summarized here:

- How long will revenue be collected under 411?
 - 10 years
- What percentage of 411 is set aside for pavement and safety?
 - 80% pavement/20% safety
 - CSCC is responsible for 20%, IOAC is responsible for 80%
- What is the estimated annual revenue of 411 safety program?
 - \$15M
- What are the four funding categories of 411 safety element?
 - Sidewalk and ped improvements (30%), bike network enhancements (20%), systemwide safety improvements (30%), traffic signal technology upgrades (20%)
- What is the collector program?
 - Supplemental funding approved by M&C with the passage of 411
 - Pavement improvements on collector streets. Funding comes from HURF, with supplement from general fund money.
- How much money did M&C direct to the Collector Street Program annually?
 - \$15M/yr for 5 years
- What are the two levels of prioritization included in the Prop 411 Safety Plan (SSIP)?
 - Layered projects and spot improvements
- What are layered projects?
 - An approach directed by M&C to bring together different funding sources to deliver larger, more impactful projects. CSCC is layering funds on the Collector Street program to deliver these.

Collector Streets Program Update

- Timeline to date:
 - June 2023 – IOAC tentatively approved their 5-yr program based on a “worst first” approach; requested input from CSCC
 - Aug 2023 – CSCC recommended considering pavement with slightly better condition (up to OCI 45) and inclusion of CSCC goals (e.g. nexus with equity zones, or named Move Tucson project)
 - Aug 2023 – IOAC was supportive of looking at the expanded list.
- Hope to get a final recommendation from CSCC. Patrick shared information ahead of meeting, and reviewed during meeting.
- Staff reviewed the list and looked for layering opportunities, including projects currently unfunded below OCI 45

- Staff created an interactive map to look at how projects overlay on equity areas
- Timeline from now
 - Recommendation from CSCC regarding the list (Oct) for approval by IOAC by end of year.
 - CSCC will then identify which streets to “layer” on, and associated timelines.
 - CSCC will then be able to finalize the 5-year SSIP in Spring 2024.
 - Near the end of the year we can evaluate year 1 projects and costs, and think about 6 year (rolling plan).

Discussion/questions

- Liz – how would it work if there are project opportunities that are not on this list?
 - The 5 year plan will give us an identified list of priority projects. If other opportunities arise, the request would come to the CSCC. This would require an authorization of funds, and an associated removal of a project of similar cost. This will make it easier to weigh trade-offs of any one-off requests.
- Ruth – should we assume that streets on the top of the list are the start of the 5 year plan? If so do we need to prioritize the list?
 - Don’t need to prioritize now. This will be part of SSIP development. Staff will work on cost estimates, and can then discuss how we prioritize or sequence based on total funding need.
- Marshall – the equity map overlay is helpful.

SSIP subcommittee

- Miranda – the subcommittee made good headway when working on year 1. It felt like a good iterative process. Encourage members to get involved.

7. CSCC Hub

- BAC (Sophia)
 - BAC is creating a new subcommittee to create a better process for receiving information from TPD, and work with the medical examiner in terms of what data is collected and reported on. Contact Sophia if you are interested in joining (Marshall interested).
 - Jonathan – the County received a Safe Streets for All Grant and will be partnering with the City. Will be 1.5 year study to deep dive into fatalities and severe crashes and developing recommendations to reduce/eliminate.

8. Wrap up

DTM Update – *Patrick*

- Just experienced 69th roadway fatality of the year – just ahead of this time last. Still on track for about 100 this year. This year pedestrian fatalities are down, but vehicle fatalities are up.
- 411 paving update (Jim De Grood) - Several new projects are beginning now. Many surface treatments starting too. Fall will be busy. Keep track of these on Tucson Delivers webpage.
- Oct 18 – Bilby Road neighborhood outreach event.
- Plan Tucson – Transportation, Mobility and Access Working Group met the first time today. Next meeting is Oct 23.

November/December meeting scheduling – options include Nov 29 or Dec 6.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30