



Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the **Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission** and to the general public that the **Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission** will hold the following meeting, which will be open to the public.

Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission
P.O. Box 27210
Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210
(520) 791-3221 (Voice)
(520) 791-2639 (TDD)

MEETING MINUTES **DRAFT**

Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission **(Prop. 411) Tuesday, April 29, 2025, at 5:30 p.m.** **Parks and Recreation Administration Building,** **Mesquite Conference Room 900 S. Randolph Way,** **Tucson, AZ 85716**

For members of the public who wish to address the commission during **Call to the Audience**, we ask that you please email your request to Amanda Valenzuela at amanda.valenzuela@tucsonaz.gov or call 520-600-8229. The email should include your full name, mailing address, and phone number. Also, please specify if you would like to be added to our email distribution list for future notifications and updates. **Please send your email no later than 10 a.m. Tuesday, January 28, 2025.**

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call** – Commission Chair E. Liane Hernandez called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m. Roll call was taken, and quorum was established, 8 -1.

Present			Absent
E. Liane Hernandez City Manager	Jon Aitken Ward 4	Jesse Lugo Ward 5	Bruce Burke City Manager
Dale Calvert City Manager	*Colin Oglesbee Ward 2		Cynthia Harper- Ayala City Manager
Laura Dent Ward 1	Ian Johnson Ward 3		Paul Smith Ward 6

***Colin Oglesbee arrived at 5:47 p.m.**

2. **Approval of Minutes – January 28, 2025** – Commission member Jesse Lugo made a motion to approve the January 28, 2025, meeting minutes as submitted. Commission member Dale Calvert seconded the motion. **The meeting minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.**

3. Call to the Audience (10 minutes) – Two members of the community addressed the IOAC members.

- Isabel Doe – representing the Menlo Park neighborhood. She was at the January 28, 2025 IOAC meeting. Reminds the commission that she had requested a road counter for Cedar and Grande, between Grande and Cuesta due to volume of traffic. They've been notified that their roads will be repaved in 2026. It has been three months since the request, work on water lines has not commenced, nor have the road counters been deployed. The roadway is crumbling, traffic is horrible, on the weekends it's worse due to off-road vehicles. Requesting, on behalf of Menlo Park, that the work be expedited. She would appreciate it if Laura Dent would provide updates on the road counter and road work at the next meeting.
- Beth Wilson - representing Pueblos de las Catalinas neighborhood. Her neighborhood has never been repaved since '77. People have fallen, it's pretty dangerous to traverse by foot. She was inquiring about an update on the neighborhood being moved up on the schedule.
- Chair member Liane Hernandez reminds the audience members that the committee is listening to the questions and requests being made by community members, but due to open meeting laws the committee cannot respond directly to them. However, there is an agenda item on how to consider neighborhood requests for acceleration. She thanks them for attending the meeting.

This is the time when any member of the public may address the Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission. Due to time constraints, the total time allocated for this is 10 minutes. Individuals are allowed three (3) minutes each. Due to Open Meeting Law, Commission Members cannot discuss topics that are not on the agenda. Items brought up by the public may be considered as an agenda item for a future meeting.

4. Prop 101 Updates – Program Manager Jim DeGrood provided updated financial information for Prop 101 Arterial Roads Program and Local Street Program. He defined costs through March 31, 2025, and projected balance. Discussion was held. **No action was taken.**

- a. Arterial Streets – expenditures have been largely focused on **Arterial Package 12** Silverbell Rd which was completed earlier this fiscal year. Citywide Fog Seal program is now complete; we spent just under \$900,000.
- b. **101 Arterial Package 10**, Stone Ave has been repaved. The Cushing St project and design is anticipated to spend another ~\$6,000,000, likely to occur next fiscal year. A lot of work still pending in the downtown area due to water modifications, plans are scheduled to be complete by this summer. Over the course of the next two years, we'll remain mindful of the event cycles downtown when scheduling work on new projects. The major project currently underway is Fifth Street, with an anticipated cost \$28 million. This is more than we have programmed for, so you'll see that we are running on a deficit expenditure projection of \$2.3 million. We'll need to find funds and identify ways we can trim our budget to cover these costs. Safety features were added to the Silverbell Rd project that were not covered by Prop 101, that's why you see the negative \$600,000 balance on the project. It's a credit back from Prop 411 Safety funds that were expended on this project. We expect completion by calendar year 2026 or 2027 for the remaining Prop 101 arterial projects.

Commission member Ian Johnson asked for clarification on fiscal year versus calendar year. Jim DeGrood explained that fiscal year spans from July 1 through the following June 30, we are currently finishing up FY 25.

c. Revenue Report

Arterial Roads –	Prior Year Expenditures	\$43,613,233
	Fiscal Year 2025 Expenditures	4,120,880
	Anticipated Expenditures	41,600,000
	Total Projected Expenditures	\$89,334,113
Residential Streets	Prior Year Expenditures	\$46,014,344
	Fiscal Year 2025 Expenditures	393,149
	Anticipated Expenditures	-
	Total Projected Expenditures	\$46,407,493
	TOTAL Projected Expenditures	\$135,741,606

- 5. Prop 411 Updates** – Program Manager Jim DeGrood presented detailed information on which neighborhoods in the Initial and Phase I Projects List had pavement resurfacing completed, and which projects are under contract/imminent or bidding. Mr. DeGrood noted that within the Neighborhood Streets – Initial Projects list – all neighborhoods with resurfacing work were either completed or under contract, except those with pending Tucson Water improvements. He also provided updated financial information for Prop 411.

No action was taken.

a. Initial Projects List –

Pavement Resurfacing Substantially Complete

- 52 Neighborhoods improved
- 24 Neighborhoods with Mill/Fill (45% of area completed)
- 28 Neighborhoods with Surface Treatments (55% of area completed)
 - Multiple treatments – 39%
 - Preservation – 16%
- Remaining work: Myers, Yale Estates, Barrio Viejo being coordinated with Tucson Water, Limberlost Road being layered with Safety improvements (30% design), Pantano Overlook, North mall, Elvira and 4th Avenue preservation

b. Pavement Resurfacing Projects – Work Under Contract / Mobilizing

- Rolling Hills Neighborhoods
- Jefferson Park, Monterey Addition
- Ward 5 Repaving Package 1 – Mortimore Addition, Southland Park, Los Ranchitos, Desert View
- Ward 5 Repaving Package 2 – Southland Park, Los Ranchitos
- Spring 2025 Surface Treatments
- Ward 2 & 6 Repaving – Venice Addition, Carlos Terrace and Glenn Heights, Swan Way, Speedway Addition, Pima Verde/Cloverleaf, Cloverleaf/Warsaw and Camp Lowell
- Ward 4 Repaving – Sutton Place, Palm Grove Clusters, Pine Grove, Escalante Place

c. Preservation Projects

- Pantano Overlook – Under Contract
- Mission Manor Neighborhood – Preservation Work after Tucson Water work

Commission member Ian Johnson asked for clarification on Highlands, which is Rincon Heights, if it was on the initial project list and if it's complete. Jim DeGrood stated that it is not complete and was not on the initial project list.

d. Phase I Resurfacing Projects – Work Under Contract / Mobilizing

- Rolling Hills Neighborhoods
- Jefferson Park, Monterey Addition
- Ward 5 Repaving Package 1 – Mortimore Addition, Southland Park, Los Ranchitos, Desert View
- Ward 5 Repaving Package 2 – Southland Park, Los Ranchitos
- Spring 2025 Surface Treatments – Palo Verde Park: Prudence to Pantano Parkway, Jesse Owens Park, Rancho del Este
- Ward 2 & 6 Repaving – Venice Addition, Carlos Terrace and Glenn Heights,
 - Completed: Swan Way, Speedway Addition, Pima Verde/Cloverleaf, Cloverleaf/Warsaw
 - Adding: Camp Lowell, Speedway Pinecrest and Avondale
- Ward 4 Repaving – Sutton Place, Palm Grove Clusters, Pine Grove, Escalante Place all under construction

e. Phase 1 Construction

- Winterhaven/La Madera/Racquet Club, Amphi Area projects are complete
- Vista del Rio, Colonia Verde Amphi Area, Kennedy Park Estates, Menlo Park, El Rio Acres/Ironwood Hills, Riverside Park, AutoMall, the Crossings, Indian Trails are completed
- Rolling Hills Neighborhoods, Ward 2 & 6, Escalante Terrace, Sutton Place, Pine Grove, Olive Grove, Palm Grove Clusters are under construction

f. Phase I Surface Treatments

- Fall 2024 package A includes Rose Hill, Enclave, Rincon Heights and Catalina Heights subdivisions are completed
- Fall 2024 package B includes Ironwood Ridge, Saddlewood Ranch, Enchanted Hills, Oak Park at Midvale
- Spring 2025 Packages include Rancho del Este, Pantano Overlook, Vista del Sierras, Concord Hill, Mañana Vista, Sherwood Village Terrace

Commission Chair Liane Hernandez asked for clarification on the blue squares that are identified in the maps. Jim DeGrood explained that in the Phase 1 program they overlayed the Capital Improvement Program from Tucson Water to improve coordination.

g. Phase I Projects in Pricing

- Sutton Place, Cedar Grove & Lincoln Park, Hearthstone Hills, Harrison Hills, Avondale, Farmington Addition, La Madera

h. 411 Revenue Actuals (unaudited) and Expenditures

	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	Collected to-date
Better Streets	\$ 54,392,303.27	\$ 63,475,464.53	\$51,019,902.22	\$168,887,670.02
Safe Streets	\$ 13,598,075.82	\$ 15,868,866.13	\$ 12,754,975.55	\$ 42,221,917.50
TOTAL	\$ 67,990,379.09	\$ 79,344,330.66	\$63,774,877.77	\$211,109,587.52

Financial Overview

Contracts issued, plus change orders: \$ 162,117,753

Prop 411 Better Streets Revenue through 3.31.2025:	\$ 172,152,990
Unencumbered Balance:	\$ 10,035,237

Commission member Colin Ogelsbee asked if there have been any increases in price from Contractors or any overages in recent months? Jim DeGrood explained that he is always evaluating cost, that in recent months not very many projects have gone out to bid. As he prepares for upcoming bids he looks at price per square yard on mill and fill projects. In the previous fiscal year, we had an average of \$23.58 per square yard, this year we started high at around \$24.60 per square yard. Earlier in the year, pricing was not as favorable, but recent projects have been fairly reasonable. A lot of it has to do with how we assign risk, I require contractors to take the risk on projects that are longer. When we actually pay out, we only pay what the adjusted prices are.

Commission member Colin Ogelsbee asked if revenues and costs are fairly even for now, Jim DeGrood states that they are.

Program Manager Jim DeGrood continues with Construction Progress Overview.

- Neighborhood streets resurfaced to-date: 281 miles (19.8% of City streets)
- Streets currently under contract, yet to be paved: 126 miles (9.1% of City streets)
- Currently pricing: 29 miles (2.1% of City streets)

We now have approximately 31% of the roads either about to be under contract, under contract, or complete. Jim DeGrood expects to have a modest balance by the end of the fiscal year. Come July 1, 2025, the \$18 million worth of projects will be accounted for in the encumbrances, and will be comparing it to the actual funds.

Commission member Ian Johnson asks if the 30% of work that is now complete is characteristic of the remaining 70%, in the sense of difficulty and pricing? Program Manager Jim DeGrood responds stating that we've been taking the "worst first" approach. The worst projects will need the more aggressive treatments. What balances that is that 70% of neighborhood streets are in very poor condition. If you combine poor and very poor condition, that's about 80%; so, we still have a lot of significant work ahead. As time passes, the streets that we haven't treated yet will continue to decline. In the final phase we may see some benefit and put more money towards preservation. Going into Prop 411 we did a lot of surface treatments on our bicycle network. We'll probably look at going back to those and using a better treatment. That won't occur until the third phase.

Commission member Jesse Lugo states that twelve years ago it was estimated that all neighborhood streets would cost \$700 million. Could you give us an update on that in the next meeting, what the cost is for neighborhood streets from June moving forward. Program Manager Jim agrees to provide an update, and states that \$700 million is probably fairly close.

Program Managers goes on to review monthly collections and aggregate and compare

it to encumbrances and expenditures. Expenditures flattened out a bit due to staffing transitions. With Gabe Rason now on board, more work is projected to go out this summer totaling up to about \$18 million.

Commission member Colin Ogelsbee asks if state shared revenue challenges are impacting DTM staffing. Program Manager Jim DeGrood responds that DTM is definitely affected by the challenges with state shared revenue. It has made a big impact on the City's general fund budget. However, a lot of DTM's funding comes from the Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF). The general fund does however pay for Transit. That will be stressed by the state shared revenue challenges. HURF doesn't grow as fast as we need it to, so we'll have to look to sales tax to do our basic road projects in the future.

Commission member Colin Ogelsbee clarifies that he's asking specifically about DTM's ability to contract construction work out. Program Manger Jim DeGrood states that the funds aren't there for us to put projects out.

Commission member Jesse Lugo mentions that in the past electric vehicles didn't pay HURF funds. He asks if Jim DeGrood can provide an analysis on how many electric vehicles impact Pima County and Tucson that have depleted some of the funding from HURF. Program Manager Jim DeGrood states that this is happening statewide and that ADOT would be better equipped to track that data. He also states that electric vehicles have a disproportionate impact on the roads. They are much heavier and therefore they do more damage to the roadway as they're traveling.

g. Projects in Development (FY 26)

- Ward 2 – Verde Vista, Kingston Knowles, Windsor Park, San Fernando & San Paulo are Tucson Water projects and we'll be paving as they complete their water work. Final phase of La Madera, North of Blacklidge, in conjunction with Granada Park, Flowing Wells, Downtown area neighborhoods

Commission Member Ian Johnson mentions the bicycle boulevards that were previously mentioned, those streets that were prioritized will be in rough shape in 10 years. When nearby neighborhoods are receiving mill and fill treatments, can the previously preserved streets with bicycle boulevards also receive treatment. They are heavily used bike areas. It would be a shame if all bike boulevards in the downtown area are in poor condition. Program Manager Jim Degrood goes on to explain that we are trying to get the lifespan out of the investment that we made. If Alameda through Menlo Park is the roadway in question, additional treatment was just completed. With that, we actually did go into other neighborhoods, with authority from the commission, we've added bike boulevards to existing projects. We've extended West into the Menlo Park and El Rio neighborhoods to do the bike boulevards. We are definitely doing that on respective bike boulevard projects. If they are in reasonable condition, we are at time bypassing them. It's definitely something that I'm sensitive to.

Commission member Jesse Lugo asks in reference to bike lanes, the City is putting concrete parking blocks to separate traffic from pedestrians and bicyclist, what's the point? He goes on to state that a majority of them are hit by cars. It's just a matter of time before they hit that concrete barrier and crosses that median, it's going to hit somebody. Program Manager Jim DeGrood mentions that those concrete barriers have been installed on the Barraza Parkway, this is something that the Complete Streets Coordinating Council is working on and identifying which projects those are going on. To my knowledge we haven't had an accident. The concrete barriers prevent vehicles from straying into the bike lane, I think that's the rationale, to protect those more vulnerable roadway users.

Commission member Jesse Lugo asks if runner lanes would be more cost effective and better prevent cars from straying into the bike lanes. He goes on to ask how we are going to sweep the 8 ft bike lanes. Program Manager Jim DeGrood states that DTM has to deploy the smaller parking lot sweeper to get into the smaller bike lane areas. Commission member Jesse Lugo goes on to state that he believes that City is doing poor maintenance on the bike lanes. We have to make sure that those bike lanes are clear of debris in order to keep bicycles safe. Final question is how many street sweepers does that City have? Program Manager Jim DeGrood states that he does not know the answer to that but estimates between 10-15. He goes on to state that we try to get every street swept annually. Commission member Jesse Lugo follows up with a concern regarding striping. The majority of street striping can't be seen at nighttime. He states that they need to be refreshed bi-annually. Program Manager Jim DeGrood responds that with Prop 411, when a new bag of asphalt goes down, you can't immediately stripe it with the higher quality product. You have to do a temporary striping while the pavement cures and ages. Then, about a month later we use Thermal Plastic, and that generally has a 7-8 year life on it. We also have a new paint truck at the City that is being used to refresh striping.

Commission member Dale Calvert asks a question on Phase 1 project list – are they all of the projects from phase 1 or will they be carried over? Program Manager Jim DeGrood states that phase 1 will extend into fiscal year '27. This only shows the mill and fill projects. Surface treatments will take place in the Fall. There's a tentative list of projects that have not been reflected on these maps.

Commission member Ian Johnson asks if the plan is to mill and fill the neighborhoods near west University and downtown. If Tucson Water states that they aren't able to complete the Water work when declared, will we continue to go in with multi-level surface treatments? Program Manager Jim DeGrood states that we've been consulting with Tucson Water, and this is the program that was presented. Tucson Water did not have any issues with the program.

- 6. Collector Street Program Update** – Mr. DeGrood presented detailed information on the progress of the Collector Street Program, including completed collectors and collectors in construction. In addition, Mr. DeGrood provided updates on collector design progress, collectors in bid or preparing for bid, and upcoming collector projects. He also gave financial information on Collector Program costs. **No action was taken.**

Construction Progress on Collectors, Completed

- 6th Avenue, Thoroughbred Road to Drexel Road

- Old Spanish Trail, Broadway to Harrison
- Starr Pass and Players Club Drive
- Greasewood, Ironwood Hills to Speedway: Completed sidewalk, curb ramps and surface treatment
- Tucson Boulevard, 22nd Street to 6th Street
- Tucson Boulevard, Grant Road to 6th Street
- Elm Street, Campbell Avenue to Tucson Boulevard
- Stella Road, Wilmot Road to Camino Seco

Collectors in Construction

- Kenyon Drive, Pantano Road to Camino Seco
- Sarnoff Drive, Broadway Blvd. To Pantano Parkway
- 29th Street, Kolb Road to Avenida Guillermo
- Prudence Road, 22nd Street to 29th Street
- Park Avenue, Ft. Lowell to 2nd Street
- 6th Avenue, Drexel Rd to Valencia Rd

Collectors now Pricing

- Calle Santa Cruz, Irvington to Valencia

Design Progress on Initial Collectors

- Elvira, Plumer to Palo Verde – design at 90%, water conflicts
- Flowing Wells, Miracle Mile to Grant and Glenn, Flowing Wells to Oracle – design at 90%, water conflicts
- Euclid/18th/Warehouse/Cherry – design initiated
- Silverlake/Cherrybell/Fairland – 90% plans
- Bilby Road – 60% plans

Recent Activity

CSCC has identified priority projects, releasing the following additional projects to commence as “pavement only” projects:

- Greasewood Road, Speedway Boulevard to Anklam Road
- Greasewood Road, Starr Pass Boulevard to San Juan Trail
- San Jual Trail, Greasewood Road to Mission Road
- Silverlake Road, 6th Avenue to Saint Benedict

Commission member Jon Aitken asks if collector streets are typically more expensive than neighborhood streets? Program Manager Jim DeGrood says yes, because we typically go with a more aggressive treatment.

- 7. Proposition 411 Local Streets Phase II Proposal** – Transportation Program Coordinator Peter Kane presented a PowerPoint on the Phase II Proposal for consideration, including financial information, OCI date, Inspection data, and maps. He outlines the assumptions and considerations for Phase II, which covers 3 years FY27-FY29.

Program Manager Jim DeGrood thanked Peter Kane and Todd Kessler for their work on the Phase II Proposal for consideration. Mr. DeGrood explains that this is the same selection criteria used for Phase I program – Lowest OCI modified by equity and distributed by Ward proportionality. Tonight, we are looking for direction. Moving forward, we can work on developing a list of neighborhoods. If

you are comfortable with it, we can take it to the next step and start identifying neighborhoods, getting it out to utility companies to start interacting with them. Mr. DeGrood appreciates any feedback and requests direction from the Commission.

Commission Chair Liane Hernandez asks for clarification on the green bars depicted on the Phase II Target/Actual with Ward Area graph indicate. Program Coordinator Peter Kane explains that they reflect the amount of pavement that is in local streets.

Commission member Laura Dent asks if it takes into account newer parts of town versus areas that have been deteriorating for so long, and are more historic, places that have seen more historic disinvestment. How do you navigate and integrate that here? Program Coordinator explains that the Equity Index gets us closer to having that considered. It looks at households below the poverty level, demographics, access to vehicles, etc. It takes a lot of data from the census and puts it into digestible OCI that gets factored in. Program Manager Jim DeGrood adds that newer neighborhoods don't have the bad pavement scores that disinvested neighborhoods have. So they won't be considered as rapidly. They might be considered for preservation, so that the asset remains intact, but they typically aren't scoring as poorly as the other streets.

Commission member Laura Dent then asks if the scoring looks at the proportionality of the investment, it looks at the prioritization of projects within the Wards? Mr. DeGrood responds that yes, and within the Wards we look at the most disinvested areas and try to prioritize them.

Commission member Ian Johnson provides an example and asks if there were a Ward that had a majority of brand new streets, would we continue to proportionally allocate funds to them? Program Coordinator Peter Kane states that funds would most likely go towards preservation, based on what was voted. Todd Kessler then states that the answer is yes. He goes on to explain that the green bar on the graph in terms of area reflects if it's a local street that is maintained by the City of Tucson, regardless of condition or equity index score. It's just the area that was used to pencil out the money distribution. When it comes to using the funds, the lowest OCI did have an influence from the department of equities priority index. This is consistent with what we did in the Phase I direction provided by the Commission.

Commission members states that maybe in the next phase we consider if ward proportionality still makes sense. Program Coordinator Peter Kane explains that preservation, in terms of cost, is significantly less.

Program Manager Jim DeGrood states that he is looking for direction, perhaps a motion, to accept the proposed Phase II maps and move to finalizing the neighborhoods for the next meeting.

Commission member Jon Aitken states that he has a question for Peter. He explains that in Phase I there were a lot of issues with utilities. He asks if it's feasible to have the Phase II proposals completed within the proposed timeline. Program Coordinator Peter Kane states that they did not look at utilities. The Phase II proposal is based solely on OCI with equity. Todd Kessler then explains that part of the reason they are presenting the Phase II Considerations is to start having those conversations with utilities to start coordination and engagement. Program Manager Jim DeGrood states that DTM has been working continuously with Tucson Water to try and understand what their needs and issues are. We would like to get on their program.

Commission member Jon Aitken asks a question specific to Ward 4 and mentions that there are substantial projects currently taking place. When you have two different funding sources butting up against each other, and heavy equipment is damaging the roads, who pays for it? Program Manager Jim DeGrood explains that Prop 411 won't pay for any of it, since the program is for neighborhood roads, not arterials. Additionally, DTM does not have a funding source for

maintenance on roadways. The RTA can fund improvements and expansion projects that are on the RTA plan. If they aren't on the RTA plan, we don't have a funding source identified for them.

Commission Chair Liane Hernandez states that we have an action on the table for the Phase II resurfacing program and asks if anyone would like to make a motion.

Commission member Ian Johnson states that he would like to move that we proceed with the current selection. That it seems to check all the boxes that the commission hashed out early on in the scoring. **Commission member Dale Calvert seconds the motion.**

Commission member Jon Aitken asks if 10% more projects can be added to future considerations should utility work cause any issues. Program Manager Jim DeGrood suggests that as we head into Phase III and start having those obstacles, that we seek authority from the Commission.

Commission Chair Liane Hernandez mentions the motion that's on the floor and asks for roll call. **Motion passes unanimously.**

- 8. Consideration of Neighborhood Requests for Accelerated Resurfacing –** Mr. DeGrood presented a PowerPoint with information on the process for determining which neighborhoods are selected for resurfacing treatment, and how the Overall Condition Index (OCI) is factored. Mr. DeGrood noted the benefits of treating specific geographic areas as a block, including cost efficiencies. He also showed Calle Alegre as an example where accelerated resurfacing could be considered. Mr. DeGrood also presented two recommendations for allowing citizens to be included in nearby projects

Recommendation 1: Neighborhood Request

Neighborhoods (or streets) in Very Poor condition which are in an area not scheduled for repaving due to surrounding roads being in better condition, may request the IOAC to have their streets resurfaced with the next nearby project.

Recommendation 2: Staff identification of an opportunity to improve an isolated roadway
Streets in Very Poor condition which are not in an area scheduled for repaving and are less than ¼ mile in total length may be resurfaced with a nearby project. The IOAC shall be informed of the decision at their next meeting.

Commission member Colin Ogelsbee states that he would like to move to approve recommendation two, for the purposes of equity.

Commission member Jon Aitken states that from a money perspective, this is an additional expense. Where is this money going to come from? Program Manager Jim DeGrood states that we have enough flexibility in our funds to do this. I believe that we will find that some of our phase II projects will be delayed due to utility issues. Rather than moving to Phase III early, we could consider these other project requests.

Commission member Ian Johnson expresses his interest in Recommendation 2. Stating that residents will present opportunities for added projects regardless.

Commission Chair Liane Hernandez mentions that we have a motion on the floor and ask if anyone seconds the motion.

Commission member Laura Dent states that she likes the spirit of the first

recommendation.

Commission member Dale Calvert asks if Commission member Colin Ogelsbee would like to amend his motion and vote for both recommendations.

Commission member Colin Ogelsbee withdraws his initial motion and states that he would like to proceed with implementing both recommendations. Commission member Dale Calvert seconds the motion. **Motion to proceed with implementing both recommendations passes unanimously.**

- 9. Complete Streets Coordinating Council Update** – Mr. DeGrood provided an update on the April 23, 2025, CSCC meeting, including a letter of support for Plan Tucson, a presentation on the Major Streets and Routes update, and awarded grants for the Mini Grant Program.

Commission Chair Liane Hernandez asks if the commission will be receiving notification on which grants were awarded. Mr. DeGrood states that he can provide that information to the commission.

Program Manager Jim DeGrood states that with the approval of both recommendations, he would like to schedule a formal consideration of Calle Allegre in late FY26. He suggests that we place Calle Allegre on the agenda for the next meeting.

- 10. Future meeting Date and Agenda items** - Commissioners discussed when the next meeting would be held and agreed on Monday, July 21, 2025, at 5:30 p.m., subject to room availability.

Commission member Laura Dent asks if an agenda item on public education can be added.

- 11. Adjournment** - Commission Chair E. Liane Hernandez adjourned the meeting at 7:27 p.m.

Due to Open Meeting Law, only those items on the agenda will be addressed at this meeting.

Action may be taken on any item. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Lindsey at 520-627-1611 or at lindsey.salcido@tucsonaz.gov. Please allow ample time to make these arrangements.