



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

January 15, 2026 (5:30-7:30pm) – Special Meeting

Zoom



Final Minutes

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Quorum was established and the meeting was called to order by co-chairs at 5:35pm

Members Present:

Marshall Davis
Nikita Lindgren
Cytllali Gonzalez
Zach Coble
Dale Calvert
Samuel Paz (non-voting)

Staff:

James Castañeda
Tahnee Robertson

Observers

James Wood
Linus Friedman (LSA)

Members Absent:

Sophia Gonzalez
Ariel Gilbert-Knight

Quorum was established and the meeting was called to order at 5:35pm

1. Call to the audience – no speakers

2. RTA Next Letter Discussion

Marshall noted that the purpose of this special session is to discuss development of a letter from the CSCC on RTA Next. At the previous meeting it was suggested that the council might develop an informational letter, exploring pros and cons.

Current thoughts on the letter:

- James W – we need a letter that lays out a list of concerns; Mayor and Council have already expressed support. Some concerns: lack of public insight and involvement, this has all been closed door. Lack of representation for Tucson compared to the amount of money we have put in. The vast amount of funding has come from Tucson, but we only have one representative, same as the others.
- Nikita – unbalanced representation is also my main concern; we should have more representation on the board.

- Zach – the percentage of funds dedicated to pedestrian safety is fairly low in the plan, compared to roadway improvements for drivers. This feels inadequate for what Tucson is trying to do.
- James W – there also lack of funds dedicated to transit. We want funding dedicated to priorities that Tucsonans have already expressed (pedestrian, cyclist and transit).
- Zach – even with all the info on the RTA website, there is a lack of detail and transparency on projects dedicated to safety, ADA, and active transportation.
- Dale – as a member of the project selection committee for the 2006 plan and this plan, I will likely abstain from voting on the letter. Having spent many hours on this I can give some more info. In terms of the ADA components – the funding in this category are things that are not part of the major projects. All the major projects have descriptions, and virtually all have separate pedestrian facilities. But those facilities are not separately stated in this part of the plan; they are rolled into actual project costs. For example on 22nd from I10 to Kino, sidewalks would be included in that project.
- James W – we would expect that it wouldn't need to be broken out. If we are talking about developing a road, we would expect that it is a complete road.
- Zach – the issue is that with the information provided by RTA for the overall category of ADA and safety, it is hard for members of the public to figure out what it means and what is included.
- Dale – agree it is difficult, but this has a reason. These are funds that will be assigned to projects moving forward, these are not specific projects. E.g. in the 2006 plan, HAWK signals fell under this category. They were not part of the ballot issue, but there was money set aside from them. But the actual projects they would be included in had not yet been identified.
- Zach – in briefings with RTA outreach team, they didn't have good examples of these. In describing these to the public, an example of what could be included would be helpful.
- James W – the Living Streets Alliance has provided a lot more detail on this. In the first RTA, in cases where there were not yet projects identified, the remaining funds were swept into roadway projects. The concern here is that it is not clear that this funding will actually be there for the categorical elements. This is related to lack of oversight.
- Nikita – with the Broadway redesign, the pedestrian and bike facilities got paired down by the end due to project cost overruns. An oversight committee would help with something like this – who decides what gets cut?
- James W – we need meaningful public oversight, not just advisory committees. Something like Prop 411 would be good – some way to veto some decisions. Some way for the public to have a say.

Marshall asked if members had any comments in support:

- James W – have heard from many people that the change of leadership is welcome. There is a belief that this may make it function better. Also, they are apparently using a less optimistic model for revenue. Finally, there is more money set aside to Tucson for safety related projects than previously (~\$100M); although this is in the categorical funds.
- Marshall – doesn't Tucson have a lot of leeway in how Tucson projects are implemented?
 - James C – there are current RTA projects, like 1st Ave, where a citizen advisory committee has been established to help ensure the improvements are in line with what community members want to see. For City of Tucson projects, we would

seek to tailor those through the lens of complete streets and active modes, and include as much meaningful input for those as possible.

- James W – do the CACs have veto power?
 - James C – the design team for 1st Ave is working closely with advisory committee and trying to include what we're hearing. Veto would depend on what was being asked.
- Dale – I was on the early design committee for Grant Road and Broadway. In those committees, there were certain priorities set by them that excluded some things. On Broadway, the landscaping was restricted because the committee had put a priority on preserving as many of the historic buildings as possible.
- James W – it seems like in a majority of cases they will listen to us. But Prop 411 is different – CSCC has control over a certain portion of the budget. So CSCC can say yes or no to certain projects. This model instills more confidence. It seems like something this big should warrant more than just advise.
- Marshall – this does support transit in rural areas in Pima County that otherwise would be hard to get funded.
 - James W – this is positive, but LSA shared with us that it was just too little support.
- Zach – they fund paratransit (Sun Van and Dial a Ride)
- Marshall – it will provide funding to improve roads in areas where we expect to see growth.
 - Nikita – I don't necessarily want to see road widening.
- Dale – on the roadway projects carried over from the previous plan there are scope changes in most of them (not Grant Rd). Mostly this has been to reduce the size of the projects from the original design. This is good; scope changes were needed. The projects in here are beyond the point where they can change, they are on the ballot. But there can be changes and comment about how the public input should look. You could comment on projects. There are 6 or 7 reasons that this is a better plan from the City's viewpoint than the 2006 plan - e.g. the revenue estimate is more pessimistic, and built in ways to deal with more funding than expected as well. Also, in the previous plan one of the big battles was about not having repaving in the plan. The 2006 plan did not include this, and this one does. This is a good thing. Mayor Romero had to fight to get the high capacity transit project included. Another thing that has been added is \$121M for the bus frequency route and service area expansion.
- Cytllalli – agree with recommendations to make sure it remains equitable and there is accountability. Is there data collection that will be included in the measurements of the plan? With City of Tucson being so deadly for pedestrians, this would be beneficial.
- James W – this was one of LSAs points; there are no actual metrics by which to judge success or failure.
- Dale – these projects descriptions drive the audit by the State of AZ, which will be done every five years. The State will look to see if the money was spent as it was laid out in the ballot. This provides some accountability. This was also done on the 2006 plan.
- James W – the fact that these audits were occurring, and RTA One went the way it did, may be concerning. It might not be catching issues we are concerned with.
- James C – if anyone has questions or clarifications to follow-up on this can be done. Regarding buckets of potential additional revenue – I'm unsure of the specific mechanics, but believe that if there are surplus revenues the City of Tucson is assigned

to get up to 75% of the surplus until a threshold of 55% of total collections is achieved. Can confirm this.

- Nikita – confirming that would be useful. In a quick look, it appears there is currently 4-5 times as much money for extra road stuff as there is for everything else.
- Nikita – in a previous meeting I think it was suggested that if the City did our own sales tax we would end up with more money than we are getting through RTA. Is this correct?
 - James C – RTA Next is a ½ cent sales tax. Prop 411 is also a ½ cent sales tax. RTA is a longer timeline, so the totality of collections is greater. If the City did our own tax, we would keep 100% of it. Can bring more information to the next meeting.
 - James W – I recall this also. I think they said that Prop 411 would raise about the same amount if it went for 20 years.

Marshall screen-shared a summary of CSCC input generated thus far to inform the letter. The group continued to discuss and refine:

Cons:

- Lack of public oversight. Better guardrails to protect project funding through meaningful public oversight.
- Lack of proportional representation. Seats on RTA Board should be based on financial contributions.
- Lack of detail in projects specific to ADA or safety. Need better description on type of projects.
- No metric to judge success or failure of projects. Specifically, as it relates to modes of transportation outside of personal vehicles.
- Concerns with road widening and suburban sprawl should be considered more in projects. Public transportation should be considered over road widening and continued sprawl (Land use and development patterns).
 - Note: LSA made specific recommendations about which road widening projects should be replaced by transit.

Pros:

- Change in leadership will result in better collaboration with the municipalities.
- More money set aside for safety related projects for City of Tucson than in the past.
- Tucson will be able to control public input to projects specific to Tucson. And that includes meaningful input such as a citizens advisory committees.
- Sun Tran serving rural areas, but we would also like to see the proportioned amounts increased. This point also serves for Sun Van and paratransit in general.
- Scope changes in projects from the original RTA list resulted in better right-sized projects and in some cases resulted in smaller or no widening needed.
- Less optimistic revenue model for revenue generation will result in better budgets; Due to pessimistic revenue projections there are buckets of additional money that could result in more projects and this is proportioned based on municipality size.
 - One consideration here is that we can't count on this revenue, and costs continue to increase.

Refinements and further discussion:

- Marshall – should all these points be included in the letter?
- James W – we might consider having pros, cons and neutral points. For example, the Sun Tran point is that it's good, but we want more. The scope changes might also fit into this category.
- Marshall – maybe we should present cons first, and pros second. But if something has two facets, perhaps that gets left in the second half?
- Zach – we might also want to acknowledge the reality that the City Council has decided to put this on the ballot and hopes that voters will approve. The City is supporting this. We could add that as members of the CSCC we decided to make this statement to help Tucson residents better understand the parameters of what RTA Next is and what it could do.
 - There was some discussion about whether, and when, the City Council had made this statement. It was noted that the Mayor did come out with a formal letter of support.
- Nikita – this is a special election. Is RTA funding this?
 - Dale – yes it is funded by RTA. The package is put together by RTA, the RTA board passes it to go on the ballot. The ballot language is set. It then went to Pima County Board of Supervisors to go on the ballot.
- Dale – if this doesn't pass, the 2006 plan will terminate in July and there will be a fall-off of money until such a time as the City could get something else on the ballot, or RTA puts together another package. Many things will stop because there will be no money to pay for them. This is the reason for the March special election timing.
 - James W – is it true that projects already started will be completed?
 - Dale – any 2006 project will continue, but new projects funded by RTA Next would not move ahead. So, the segment of Grant road currently under construction is funded. But RTA Next money is required to do the intermediate section. If RTA is not funded, that project would not exist as an RTA project. There would likely be a multi-year gap in funding to get another RTA plan. The City of Tucson could go for their own funding; there would still be time constraints involved in this, but it would likely be faster.
- Marshall – seem to recall that Ward 1's position is that the Mayor is more involved this time, and they don't really see an alternative to RTA Next.
- Dale – several of the things we see in RTA Next are here because of the Mayor and the work she did in the RTA board. The RTA is a plan for the entire county, that includes joint planning between the governments. When you go it on your own you don't do this, which has advantages and disadvantages, e.g. the Valencia project has required a lot of coordination, as well as the ADOT widening of I-10 to align with future access to the airport. Note that the RTA doesn't build projects, these are built by the host community.
- James W – the ballot language is final, we can't change it. Perhaps this should be acknowledged, in some way. The changes we are asking for can't really be implemented. But at least there is a record of the concerns.
- Marshall – we want to point out flaws and let voters decide if these warrant a rejection of the plan.
- Nikita – how long did Prop 411 take to get together?
 - Dale – this came together fairly quickly, but we were defining a class of projects, not specific projects. IOAC has been deciding this along the way, after it was

approved. It may have been about a year total. With RTA this work had to be done ahead of time.

- Marshall – can James C get more info on this? (yes)
- James C – Prop 411 was about a year or so in planning, but didn't include the specific project planning.
- Dale – we might consider stating support for inclusion of funds for high capacity transit system.
 - James W – this again has pros and cons.
- Dale – bus frequency route and service area expansion and paratransit services are good. They are nice, but the committee would have liked to see even more money into transit from the project selection committee.

Next steps:

- Marshall will draft a letter. James C will send it out to all members ahead of the next meeting and discuss during the next regular CSCC meeting in January.
- If any members would like to check in with their appointing officials or committees, please share any RTA feedback for consideration in our next meeting with James C.
- James C – items for follow-up:
 - Confirm excess revenue collections distribution
 - Confirm what a potential revenue would be for a City only initiative
 - Confirm timeline for development of Prop 411 (i.e., what would it look like if RTA fails and the City wants to put something together?).

Meeting was adjourned at 7:31pm