



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

December 10, 2025 (5:30pm - 7:30pm)

Zoom



Final Minutes

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Quorum was established and the meeting was called to order by co-chairs at 5:33pm

Members Present:

Marshall Davis
Ariel Gilbert-Knight
Sophia Gonzalez
Nikita Lindgren
Cytllali Gonzalez
Zach Coble
Samuel Paz (non-voting)

Staff:

James Castañeda
Ryan Fagan
Patrick Harley
Shamara Smith
Tahnee Robertson
Colleen Whitaker

Members Absent:

None

Observers

Laura Horley
James Wood
Nate Byerley
Vanessa Cascio (LSA)
Kevin Woldhagen
Mike Mayer
Scott Robidoux (TAA)

Summary of actions and decisions:

- *October meeting minutes:* Motion to approve – Marshall; Second – Sophia. All in favor; none opposed.
- *HAWK project funding:* Motion to approve up to \$500k for a package of 6 HAWKS – Sophia; Second – Marshall. All in favor; none opposed.
- *RTA Next Letter Subcommittee:* Motion to create subcommittee to draft the possible informational letter on RTA Next - Marshall; Second – Sophia. All in favor; none opposed.

Quorum was established and the meeting was called to order by co-chairs at 5:33pm

1. Housekeeping

- Approval of October Minutes. One spelling correction – Cytllali’s last was named mis-spelled. **Motion to approve October Minutes - Marshall; Second - Sophia.**

- New staff liaison - Ryan has stepped down and James Castañeda will be the new CSCC liaison. Ryan will still be around to present and observe. He shared thanks to the CSCC.
- James Castañeda is a Senior Project Manager in DTM, he has been with the City for about nine years.

2. CSCC Membership

Current roster overview - James Castañeda

- There are currently 6 seated CSCC members. There were two exiting Council members in wards 5 and 6 in the last election, so these CSCC terms expired with their council member. This has happened across other BCCs as well. This is why there are so few seated members for tonight's meeting.
- Several members desire to continue their appointments. James is hoping to have this resolved by January meeting. There are also potential new members from Park Tucson and TTAC.
- Sophia prepared an invite blurb for those who volunteered to invite friends or community members to join CSCC. James has sent this out. We will circle back on this topic in January. Please take a look at the email and invite folks to join.

Questions/discussion

- Laura Horley is attending tonight as a member for Ward 5, and didn't quite understand these logistics. James will reach out to Laura about continuing for Ward 5.
- Ariel got the blurb in the Neighborhood Association newsletter that will go out next week.

3. Funding request: HAWK projects - Patrick Hartley

Patrick shared a presentation; main points are summarized here

- Overview: the request is for supplemental funding to make a project whole. The City is currently in design on 6 different HAWK projects across the City. Two are being designed as bike hawks.
- There have been significant cost escalations, so an infusion of funds from the Prop 411 Safety Program is required. There is \$3.9M available through the federal government. The latest estimate is \$4.3M. The gap is about \$400k. The price of HAWKs has really increased.
- Program is funded under HSIP (Highway Safety Improvement Program)
- Project is consistent with Move Tucson systemic improvement needs.
- This was originally for 10 locations; they have already had to cut 4 from the original award due to cost escalation.
- The future locations could be brought back to CSCC at a later date.
- There is a 2027 deadline for construction to start; due to the use of federal money that is

non-negotiable. To hit this deadline, the City's needs to engage with ADOT soon, and they need to have a local funding commitment before going to ADOT.

- Coordination with ADOT is needed because there are a couple of locations that require ROW activities. The biggest consideration for the schedule will be addressing ROW challenges.
- Equity impact - 4 of the 6 locations are in high to moderate/high equity priority areas.
- Connectivity
 - Two locations have been identified that are tied to current or future bike boulevards (Ft. Lowell-Balboa/Castro and Speedway/Sahuara)
 - Speedway/Sahuara is the key crossing enhancement needed to advance this bike boulevard. This HAWK is needed for the bike boulevard project to move forward.
 - 4 of the 6 locations are located at bus stops.
 - Many are near community destinations (i.e. parks, schools).
- Safety
 - There were 6 fatal crashes and one incapacitating crash over the last 5 years across these locations.
 - These areas have documented safety challenges.
- Budget request: seeking \$500k
 - Current deficit in safety category is about \$150k in the 7-year plan. This would take that to \$650k. There are some ways to make this up: revenues coming in strong, or existing projects may come in lower, or we are dipping into year 8.
 - Overall there is about \$12.8M remaining in this category for the entire 10 year program.
 - If CSCC chooses not to authorize the funding, DTM will need to re-evaluate the project and cut 1 or 2 locations.

Questions/discussion

- Marshall – the Swan/Cecilia location would be just down the street from an existing HAWK crossing. What are rules for placement?
 - The goal is to provide 600' of separation within the City.
- Marshall - with the recent death of cyclist at a HAWK crossing, is it possible to convert them all to bike HAWKs?
 - This would be a scope change in a federal project. If this was a locally funded project it would be easier to adjust.
 - Marshall - would green paint count as scope change? (likely)
 - Ryan - It's about \$50k more to switch to a bike HAWK. Given that these are federally funded it would be tricky to make changes of that nature at this point.
- Nikita - have heard in the news about pedestrian and bike funding being cancelled. Is the ADOT funding swap secure, or could it be pulled?
 - This is a "formula program" - funding has been set aside for this purpose by Congress and distributed to the states. This gives a high degree of certainty. These are safety funds, which gives more confidence that there will be no

rescissions.

- Nikita - is it ever possible to do raised crossings at any of these? These are big roads, but it is the only way to get traffic to slow down. Even if only on Ft. Lowell, as a test.
 - The City policy is not to install vertical traffic calming on arterials. Things might change, but this is the current policy.
- Nikita - are we confident that the price of the HAWKs will be the same by 2027?
 - No, but there is an escalator built into the estimates. We won't know for sure until we get the contractor prices. Unfortunately we have been unpleasantly surprised recently about the cost of these HAWKs.
 - Nikita - some folks feel like the City is just throwing HAWKs at things and it's very expensive, and still requires drivers to stop in a place they don't want to stop. See comments on 1st. Ave project.
 - Patrick - If this is authorized we will cap at \$500k, and if it exceeds that we'll come back to the CSCC to discuss the path forward.
- Ariel - what was the rationale for these six, and what were the other four?
 - Don't recall all. One was on Grant/Edith. This is ranked as high need so will get additional funding. There were a variety of reasons, including anticipation of ROW challenges, and cost escalations.
- Ariel - all these projects got funding because there are safety issues, and we know HAWKs address this. I am in favor of approving the funding. At the Kolb/Rosewood location I was once very close to getting hit, and have been wanting a HAWK there.
- Sophia - all the locations are high pedestrian areas; these are important projects to push through. On the south side HAWKs are not currently effective ways to provide safe crossings. But it is still important to have something for the time being; we don't yet have a better solution. Who are the City staff or community groups going to the capital and applying pressure for funding cuts to other projects?
 - There is a City liaison that works with the Congressional delegation to advocate for the City's interest.
 - Sophia - it would be great to know more when transportation issues are included.
- Mike Mayor (observer) - is there any safety benefit to having the HAWKs look more like regular stop lights, and is that cost-prohibitive?
 - Full signals are considerably more expensive, and there are also additional requirements. There will also be additional operational impacts to traffic, but also a potential safety trade-off. This is a balancing act.
- Sophia - Specific HAWK setup is important to know in order to share input that feels cross-checked by anecdote and feasibility.

Decision-making consensus process

- Ask: The City is seeking up to \$500k for a package of 6 HAWKS to leverage federal funds
 - Anyone who would not be able to support this? - No members
 - All member showed "thumbs up"; this is consensus support.
 - **Motion to approve the funding - Sophia; Second - Marshall**

4. Call to the audience

- Vanessa Cascio introduced herself to the CSCC. She is the new ED of the Living Streets Alliance and a resident of Ward 6. She was part of original team that lead the engagement around the Complete Streets Policy. This is her first CSCC meeting. She is here to listen and learn and see how things have progressed.

5. RTA Next Letter

- Sophia - at the last meeting we voted to write a letter of support for the RTA with conditions. In light of the recent LSA letter and CSCC members checking in with their council members and representing organizations, we wanted to check back in on this.

CSCC member updates on RTA next check-ins:

- James W. - spoke with BAC at last meeting. I am a very strong no against RTA Next for a variety of reasons. RTA One was an unambiguous disaster. There are not any reasons to think RTA 2 will be better. It didn't reach the goals or complete many of the total projects. They have been able to direct funds from other place to fill holes, so it's not just the half-cent sales tax. City of Tucson only occupies one seat on the board. In the previous RTA there would be 2 or 3 people blocking things that were otherwise clear consensus. Very dysfunctional. A half-cent sales tax for 20 years is a big deal. There is zero public oversight. 20 years is a long time to give someone blank checks. When projects were changed, the pedestrian and bicycle projects got kicked out first. For these reasons, and more, I am a very strong no on RTA Next. Wish I could be a voting member today.
- Ariel - spoke with Council member Cunningham, who is supportive. I would vote for a letter of support. It is imperfect, but something is better than nothing. We will be able to complete some Complete Street aligned initiatives that we wouldn't be able to do otherwise.
- Zach - this was a topic at the last CODI meeting. Commissioners didn't have much comment. I shared the materials with them. Personally I am supportive of more ADA safety features and para-transit funding. But if we do write a letter of support, I would want to note that the information provided to public isn't specific in terms of goals and objectives; it's not clear what flexibility the municipalities would have in RTA Next with regard to this type of funding.
- Sophia - I represent Ward 1 on the Council. With the Mayor able to be more involved in RTA Next, we were able to negotiate more for projects and those on the south and west side. With the timing of the special election in March (could talk about how these disenfranchise community members), and in a year with federal funding being cut, Ward 1 does not see another option. They want to secure some type of funding for transportation and transit. Fare free travel and accessible travel are in peril. To take away funding that would support a BRT study or street car feels ill-timed with nothing to replace it. Ward 1 does resonate with the criticisms shared – e.g. not accountable, no

oversight, Tucson's share of funding doesn't make sense.

- Sophia - CSCC has been writing letters to build credibility and grow advocacy. We are missing a whole lot of members tonight. With a mix of those who support, I'm wondering about actually writing a letter?
- Marshall - we have only 6 voting members here tonight; by January we should have 4 more. Even if we delay the decision on writing a letter, we could still get something approved in February ahead of the March vote. We could start drafting a letter now based on the info we have so far, and then when there are more people in January we could hold a fuller vote on what CSCC wants to do. James W. brought up valid criticisms. LSA's criticism has a lot of good points. Is something better than nothing? If we miss this opportunity, how long would current projects realistically be delayed?
- Vanessa Cascio - LSA has been following this issue for some time and has been very involved. Some board and staff participated in the Citizens Advisory Committee. LSA's main concerns:
 - Safety - in many regions there are safety and performance metrics. In the past 20 years of the last RTA, our roads are more dangerous than ever. RTA Next continues this pattern without safety benchmarks or data driven goals. No strategy for prioritizing areas where people are most at risk.
 - Process - the CAC was made up of residents who were side-lined and disbanded before they saw the final plan. This was put together behind closed doors with political deal-making. A process that excludes community voices can't create a plan that reflects community priorities.
 - Transit - this is the best investment a growing region can make. RTA offers only partial funding for a single BRT with no commitment to build out a regional network. This is status quo funding to build out status quo transportation.
 - As Tucsonans we have critical policy documents (Move Tucson, Climate Action Plan) and we have a right to ask why we are subsidizing road expansion in other jurisdictions.
 - Tucson tax payers pay for an outsized amount of this for the voice that we get.
 - With a new ED at the helm of RTA, we now have the opportunity to redo this process.
- Sophia - would like to see a panel on this. It would be healthy for discourse. All these concerns are well articulated. And we also have a responsibility to the ward or organization that we represent. Maybe we can write an unapproved letter of support and focus on the issues of concern raised today. There may be further discussion on this topic. But if we have something drafted we can discuss and pivot as a fuller council feels we should in January. Is the group okay with this?
- Zach - Seems we could draft a letter with some of this info from our discussions, and maybe we as a group can't really come to consensus. This wouldn't necessarily be a letter of support, but could be a letter of information that could be helpful. What we support and why.

- James W. - where will the letter be sent?
 - Sophia - will be sent to M&C and shared at a M&C meeting. Beyond that it is up to us. In the past we have sent out press releases. Ruth used to send letters to the editor and write opinion pieces. We have options.
- Marshall - we could draft an informative letter that outlines pros and cons and the nuances. We could bring up that when RTA presented to the CSCC they informed us we have some leeway to include complete streets elements in our own roads. Sometimes there are projects that cross boundaries and are unfinished. It would be hard to coordinate in the future across these municipalities. If people feel strongly about this, an informative letter could be more helpful.
- Nikita - an informational letter with pros and cons could be better. Conditional support can just be framed as support and folks ignore the conditions. It could be misrepresented. I have a lot of concerns and don't support.
- Ariel - would the informational approach be read as objecting? It could be easy to cherry-pick the informational cons and assume this is an objection. I'm not opposed to an informational letter, but concerned it could be mis-represented.
- Sophia - when we talk about complete streets having teeth, we are missing the accountability, enforcement and standard setting (e.g. is this a C+ complete street?). We haven't yet built this. We may need to do some skill-building and start writing case studies on transportation projects that are complete streets, vs. those that aren't. Without this it's hard to point out when we are seeing areas of real improvement.
- Sophia - Could City staff attest to flexibility of design on RTA arterial projects?
 - Patrick - we were deliberate in the types of projects that were submitted for RTA Next. These are Tier 1 Move Tucson projects, with distribution across the City; trying to be proactive in safety and equity. Where some flexibility was lost in RTA One, many projects were driven by the capacity determination. There were some cases where significant negotiation ended in some scope change. But most of the projects now are modernization projects - things like no additional travel lanes, safety improvements, etc. We are proposing to include a couple of widening projects on the east side (Mary Anne Cleveland and Harrison).
 - There are some other areas where flexibility is built in and varies from RTA One. As a public official I cannot advocate one way or another; I am just providing info. There is \$100M set aside for active mode safety improvements to be defined through a separate process. This is allocated directly to City of Tucson, so no additional review through RTA. These can evolve over the 20 years.
 - Arterial pavement money will be flexible. There is \$30M for traffic signal enhancements. None of these have specific projects, and can go through separate processes to identify priorities; so different from RTA One.
- Zach - if RTA Next didn't pass, would there be staffing concerns in the City in the future?
 - No, City staff are not funded through RTA. Most of the operating budget comes through the state gas tax. Other outside funding is being pursued because the gas

- tax hasn't been raised since 1991, and it can no longer pay for what we need.
 - In actuality we would have to staff up to deliver these projects if it passes.
- Nikita - \$100M for City of Tucson; what percentage of the overall budget is this?
 - Patrick - think the total is around \$2.5 or \$2.6B. The City has more than 50% of the overall share with all pieces considered. In the event that revenues come in high, there is a formula that would increase the City's share.
- James W. - in the event it does not pass, it seems City of Tucson would try to pass another proposition to continue the projects in some way. How much would the tax have to be to pay for our City projects?
 - Patrick - based on current collections, through 411 we pull \$80M annually. So over the 20 years we would have about \$1.6B. So a half-cent would likely fully fund what is in RTA Next, potentially with some extra.
- Sophia - each of us should commit to send info to James C. so he can compile this and provide to subcommittee.
- Who is interest in a subcommittee?
 - James W., Ariel, Zach, Sophia, Marshall, Nikita
 - Any opposition to forming subcommittee? – None. This is consensus approval.
 - **Motion to create subcommittee to draft the possible informational letter on RTA Next - Marshall; Second - Sophia**
 - James C. will doodle members for a meeting.

6. CSCC Hub

- Park Tucson - *no member*
- Tucson Transit Advisory Committee (TTAC) - *no member*
- Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) - *James Wood*
 - Lee Miller gave a presentation on the East side bike boulevard. BAC really didn't like the changes that have been made. They want to make clear that they should be consulted about these decisions earlier. Surprised it happened without BAC being consulted.
 - Ariel - is this something we should follow-up on, or have a future agenda item on? If there are lessons or best practice from this that could help educate the CSCC I would be interested in learning more.
 - James - the BAC want to be approached in the design phase. If CSCC is approached about a project in the design phase with bike infrastructure it might be on me to ask that the City approach the BAC as well. The BAC doesn't have a list of all bike related projects and when they are in design. A list might be helpful, although realize there are many projects. Seems BAC is rarely approached on these projects. Lee Miller was very receptive to the feedback.
- Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) - *Zach Coble*
 - Spoke with DTM about project management and contractors doing work in ROWs, and issues with creating accessible alternative paths during construction.

Some members shared extreme difficulty with Grant/Alvernon intersection. Suggested notifying disabled pedestrians earlier along the path so they don't hit dead ends.

- Sophia - definitely want to work on this in the future.
- Nikita - do these issues get reported through 411? What is the process?
- City residents can report issues. The project manager shared the detailed issues and actions. They are required to create accessible paths within their contract, but things don't always happen correctly.
- Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission (IOAC) - *no representative*

7. Wrap up, future agenda items, DTM update

- DTM staff/project updates - *James Castañeda*
 - Alamo Wash shared use path - completed first round of public outreach. Currently in design concept phase. First round presented a couple different alignments. Project team now reviewing to see what is feasible.
 - Downtown Links - ribbon cutting is Feb 20th
 - 22nd St bridge - have notice to award to contractor. Open House on Jan 14th. Feb 4th is the groundbreaking.
 - Sophia - have heard frustrated comments from community about timelines being pushed. What is City sharing when timelines get pushed.
 - James C. - Now that the funding is fully identified, the City is committed to very strict timeline. Groundbreaking is set in stone. We do recognize there have been challenges to this point.
 - 1st Ave - project team reviewing outreach comments
 - Bilby - plans are complete; construction to start in Spring or Summer next year
 - Limberlost - 90% plans. Public outreach on 12/13 at Limberlost Park.
 - Fairview modernization - just kicked off.
 - Grant Road 3/4 - on track to complete late next year.
- Nikita - funding was allocated for Mountain protected bike lanes. What is the status?
 - First round of public outreach was in October; planning another round tentatively scheduled for the first week of February. Will report out in the January meeting. Plan is to move quickly to construction by summer of next year. There were some striping improvements on Mountain/Grant that are already in place.
- Marshall - would it be possible to have somewhere on the website to post all the letters that CSCC has written?
 - James C. can reach out to Public Information team about this. At a minimum these are captured in M&C agenda appendices.
- Upcoming meetings: Jan and Feb virtual, March in-person
- Future agenda items (review list)
 - BAC feedback on bike boulevards.

Meeting was adjourned by co-chairs at 7:30pm