



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

July 24, 2024 (5:30-7:00pm)

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:

Jill Brammer
Zach Coble
Marshall Davis
Jennifer Flores
Ariel Gilbert-Knight
Sophia Gonzalez
Ruth Reiman
Liz Soltero
Miranda Schubert
James Wood
Jonathan Crowe (NV)

Members Absent:

Charly Earley
Riley Merline
Craig McCaskill
Luis Salgado
Tarik Williams
Rossio Araujo (NV)

Staff:

Ryan Fagan
Patrick Hartley
Shamara Smith
Monica Landgrave-Serrano
Kara Spinney
Ben Elias

Observers:

Dora Maldonado
Mike Mayer
Ben Buehler-Garcia
Roger Carrillo
Dennis
Moira Alexander
Jim Glock

Facilitation and documentation:

Tahnee Robertson
Colleen Whitaker (post-meeting)

Summary of actions and decisions:

- June meeting minutes: Motion to approve – Miranda; Second – Marshall. Consensus approval.
- Project review subcommittee minutes: Motion to approve – Marshall; Second – Miranda. Consensus approval.

2. Housekeeping

- June meeting minutes - no corrections; consensus support to approve. **Motion - Miranda; Second - Marshall**
- Approval of project review subcommittee minutes – no corrections. Consensus support from subcommittee members to approve. **Motion – Marshall; Second - Miranda**

3. Call to the audience

- Mike Mayor with Country/Glenn Neighborhood Association - The NA has submitted a proposal for CSCC consideration for sidewalks on the east side of Tucson Blvd between Grant and Glenn. There are only partial sidewalks here - it is a safety and accessibility issue for those biking, walking, or those with wheelchair or stroller. Would like this to be considered as future project. There are two schools in the neighborhood.
- Jim Glock with West University Neighborhood Association – The NA has funding to provide sidewalks (funds from developers, residential parking permit program proceeds). Want to construct this between Euclid and 4th Ave. Tucson City Code Section 20-260 is problematic because it allows parking between curb line and property line, which inhibits the development of sidewalks. There is 20’ of ROW and the streets that are 40’ wide, so plenty of space. Want to use space for sidewalks and also water harvesting. Request that CSCC ask the Park Tucson Committee to reconsider this portion of the code, at least as it relates to West University.
 - Jill – would like to add this as a future agenda item. Park Tucson has tried to address this as well.

4. Country Club Rd Improvement Project (22nd to Aviation) and Tucson Blvd Sidewalk Project (Grant to Glenn) – Ryan Fagan

Ryan shared a presentation, main points are summarized here.

- Two potential projects have been proposed by community members to CSCC – Country Club and Tucson Blvd.
- Country Club Rd, 22nd to Aviation - modernization project
 - Improvements - sidewalks, ADA upgrades, curb, bike lanes, lighting, drainage improvements
 - Connects to shared use paths and also a funded bike boulevard on 27th street.
 - Tier 2 Move Tucson project
 - Community input – requests for modernization from two residents of Julia Keen and one from Barrio Centro. One concern is traffic detouring onto Country Club during 22nd bridge construction.
 - Near but not adjacent to highest equity focus areas.
 - Safety – performance is “poor”
 - Estimated cost (note there are some uncertainties) - \$7M - \$9M. May need to reconstruct pavement and possibly relocate electrical polls – who pays for this depends on prior right, which is still uncertain.
 - Possible lower cost alternative: 6’ asphalt path on west side. About \$370k. Similar to project on Columbus Blvd. Full modernization could wait until 22nd reopens (2028 or later).
- Tucson Blvd, Monte Vista to Spring
 - Goals – improve safety, walkability and accessibility
 - Improvements – complete sidewalks, ADA upgrades
 - Connects to sidewalks on Grant and Glenn (existing and funded)
 - Tier 2 Move Tucson project
 - Community input – requests from two residents of Country Club /Glenn NA, including letter from president.
 - Not adjacent to a high or highest equity focus area

- Safety – performance is “fair” (note this is a mid-block segment, which generally has less crashes)
- Estimated cost ~\$1M
- Financial impacts to draft SSIP:

Improvement	Sidewalk and Pedestrian Accessibility	Bicycle Network Enhancements	Systemwide Safety Improvements
Total 7-year budget	\$31,500,000	\$21,000,000	\$31,500,000
Remaining uncommitted	\$1,177,927	\$3,780,509	\$9,976
Country Club Rd Modernization	\$5,830,000-\$7,700,000	\$280,000	\$880,000-\$1,080,000
Country Club Rd Asphalt Path	\$370,000		
Tucson Blvd Sidewalks	\$1,000,000		

○

Questions/discussion

- Marshall – for Country Club how long would the cheaper option last?
 - Not entirely sure. Columbus has been in place for about 6 years.
- Marshall – would Tucson Blvd also include sidewalk repair on existing sidewalks?
 - The cost estimate doesn’t include this, but the estimates are conservative. Ideally repairs could be wrapped into the cost.
- Miranda – it looks like we have room to fund the asphalt path for Country Club and maybe the bike network enhancements, but seems the rest doesn’t pencil out. For Tucson Blvd – how much would it increase the cost to extend to Grant, and if it is not funded out of SSIP what other options does neighborhood have?
 - Bike enhancements would be curb protected bike lanes, which couldn’t be done without the full drainage improvements. So this isn’t a stand-alone improvement
 - Sidewalks – there is good sidewalk from Spring to Grant on Tucson Blvd. This is about filling in gaps from Grant to Glenn.
 - Budget – ultimately the SSIP could be changed to accommodate Country Club, but it would be a substantial change. By comparison the only project similar in cost to Country Club is the Columbus modernization and it is about 5 times longer. Most projects are substantially less expensive than this. An alternative would be to commit funding beyond the seven-year horizon, which would restrict further flexibility. This would represent about 1.5 years of sidewalk funding as part of SSIP.
- James – is there crash data that excludes Aviation and 22nd for Country Club project? I live near here, and this area seems safe.
 - Could share later (note: Ryan worked on this during the meeting and shared a summary at the end indicating lower crashes without intersections).
 - Generally, the major concerns for Country Club were bicycle and pedestrian safety. There was one severe ped crash that occurred outside of major intersections, and no severe bike crashes that occurred in the project area.
- James – for asphalt path how much space does it occupy? At the moment this is a good road to bike on because it has big shoulders and nice dirt path. Concerned that asphalt path might make biking worse with marginal improvement to walking.
 - Asphalt path would be separated from roadway by a few feet. Look at examples of Columbus north of 22nd St.
- Ariel – for asphalt path, how effectively would this address neighbors’ concerns and is there neighborhood interest? What role would this type of community feedback play in our decision-making process?

- This option came up fairly late. Had hoped someone from the neighborhood would be here tonight; have not yet reached out to the neighborhood with this idea. If funding were tentatively approved this could include outreach.
- Sophia – maybe instead of a paved path, more protection from car traffic would be desired? We don't know what the neighborhood priorities would be. It feels important because it's close to a large park – parks should have safe and comfortable pedestrian and biking connections.
 - Ryan screenshared the Columbus example.
 - Don't know if this option would fully address neighborhood concerns.
- Jennifer – speaking as CSCC and resident of Country Club /Glenn I am in favor of sidewalks. So many times have seen people in wheelchairs getting into bike lane because it is very patchy
- Moira (observer) from Barrio Centro NA – worked with Julia Keen and Flowers and Bullets on Country Club request. Would love to have a conversation about options and possibilities. There are many who do walk and ride along Country Club and don't find it very safe. Would love to review opportunities and associated costs.
 - Ryan reviewed the cost estimates for Moira and offered to reach out for further discussion.
- Zach – why would an asphalt path be considered temporary, and what would be a more permanent option?
 - It's not necessarily temporary, but more of an option that can be pursued as a shorter-term solution to address some of the concerns.
- Roger (observer) – note that for Tucson Blvd the neighborhood is requesting the east side be done, which would reduce the cost estimate. Could you consider doing only one half?
 - This is a possibility. But deficiencies on both sides were noted by neighbors, where east was first priority.
- Ariel – projects were included in SSIP with layering opportunities. Do either of these projects include layering?
 - These would be standalone projects; there is not additional funding identified for these.
- No members requested that these two projects *not* be considered as part of SSIP discussion in next agenda item.

5. Street Safety Improvement Plan – Patrick

- At last meeting we covered rationale and criteria for prioritization used by subcommittee.
- Through conversation with subcommittee, the proposal is now to commit 5 years of funding to layering projects. This gets about 6 layering projects. The subcommittee wants to take opportunities to deploy funds after 5 years to other critical pedestrian crash corridors. While there are some collector streets that are problematic, the pedestrian safety crisis is occurring on larger arterials.
 - Priority areas included: Ft. Lowell, Irvington, 22nd.
- Final draft proposed plan was shared with CSCC ahead of this meeting. Patrick screen shared the proposal for further discussion.
- The plan includes projects that are complete or previously committed in first two years.
- Summary of 7-year committed funding as part of current proposal:

	Sidewalks	Bikeways	Safety	Signals
Collector Cost Estimate	\$21,727,073	\$7,199,491	\$14,635,024	\$0
Other Projects Estimate	\$8,595,000	\$10,020,000	\$16,855,000	\$3,000,000
Available 7-year Budget	\$31,500,000	\$21,000,000	\$31,500,000	\$21,000,000
Total Committed	\$30,322,073	\$17,219,491	\$31,490,024	\$3,000,000
7-year Remaining	\$1,177,927	\$3,780,509	\$9,976	\$18,000,000
411 Safety Remaining	\$14,677,927	\$12,780,509	\$13,509,976	\$27,000,000

- In September the City expects to release a proposed plan for signals
- 6 proposed collector projects that cover 5 years of safety funding and include layering opportunities: Drexel, 29th, 36th, Fairview, Glenn, Columbus, Romero
 - Sophia – would be useful to know what is actually being proposed for these.

Patrick shared an overview of projects on street view

- Drexel – main issues are that it is unlit with 5 lanes in front of an elementary school. Proposal is to repave and include traffic calming, evaluate possible lane reduction, and include lighting. Will include a dip crossing of Santa Cruz and connection to all-weather access bridge.
- 29th – no sidewalk, 3 lane roadway without identified bike facilities, low traffic volumes; can evaluate for removal of center lane. Biggest challenges are navigating utility conflicts. Will evaluate need for additional lighting.
- Glenn – layer in funding with prop 407 funding and bikeway money. Minimal or no lighting, no sidewalks. Can evaluate potential for enhanced bikeways and possible removal of center turn lane.

Discussion/questions

- Marshall – has removal of center turn lane on Glenn been successful?
 - Think this has worked well. It is definitely not something that is undertaken lightly.
- Mike – have bus pull outs been considered on Glenn?
 - Premature to say; just getting into project development on this. Will be considered.
- Sophia – with all these projects we would want to have an assurance of being able to review element by element. Up to now we’ve spent 20-30 minutes for one project. This feels somewhat impossible; don’t know if we’ll get to the decision
 - This was the reason for the subcommittee to be able to dig into the projects individually.
- Miranda – agree it can feel impossible to consider a full package of projects. As a subcommittee we were thinking about the need to leverage funding in an effective way and impact as many projects as possible. We considered specific criteria for prioritizing. An important metric for us to consider as a committee is our impact on traffic violence, this is why the aspect of safety is included in the rubric. What does the CSCC think about the approach for prioritizing projects, more than specifics of each project? We have discussed these various considerations already as a committee.
- Sophia – would be good to hear from all members tonight.
- Zach – as a subcommittee participant I was struck by what we can really do with layering, and how collectors and arterials can work together to create larger impacts.
- Patrick - the value of a longer-term plan is that it provides more transparency to public, and allows us to line up project development years in advance rather than in a piecemeal fashion; there is more certainty. What would be lost with this plan is the ability to react to the one-off

requests that have been coming to CSCC. Members of CSCC had expressed frustration about the lack of a bigger context with individual one-off requests; a larger plan provides a way to understand real impacts of decisions and trade-offs.

Note also that three years are being left uncommitted, which allows us to re-evaluate and provide a budget buffer in the event of escalating costs. These projects are not yet being designed. The next step is to do the design and public outreach, which will then be brought back to CSCC at 15-30% design for input and feedback. But that is not possible until funding is authorized to being design.

Member round robin – how are members feeling about moving forward with this proposal?

- Miranda – as a member of the subcommittee I feel comfortable bringing this proposal forward after two meetings and extensive discussion.
- Liz – don't need further information. Good to hear about the three year buffer and room for further conversation. Feel secure in work of subcommittee.
- Jennifer – place trust in work of subcommittee.
- Zach – as a member of subcommittee I feel very comfortable with direction of proposed plan.
- Jill – don't need further info. This makes sense and it is more transparent to see the trade-offs. Appreciate the work of the subcommittee and trust their direction.
- Marshall – hard to find any fault in what the subcommittee has developed.
- James – feel like it is unrealistic to get the full level of information anyone would need to fully understand these projects. I did not attend the subcommittee although I had the chance; I do support what the subcommittee says.
- Sophia – need to understand the flexibility of project element decisions. What Patrick just described is helpful.
- Ariel – as a member of subcommittee I am comfortable moving this forward.
- Miranda – appreciate hearing form everyone, and understanding how newer members may feel a bit overwhelmed. I believe that our work as subcommittee was trusting processes and available data and information. This isn't a random list. We took an active role in curating what information was considered. Being cost effective by layering is really important. The Country Club project raised tonight represents a large portion of available funds. Just because some projects don't make it to the top, doesn't mean they're not deserving. There are many projects across the City that are worthy and aren't on this list. We just need more funding overall.
- Patrick – thanks for these questions. Note that this isn't the final word on these projects. One proposal is to revisit the plan every two years in the context of costs and revenues. If there is additional capacity we could consider adding more projects.
- Ryan – would be helpful to know what direction CSCC would like to take on Tucson Blvd and Country Club requests raised tonight.
- Zach – for Country Club I would like to hear more about what neighbors would think of the asphalt path and how this addresses their concerns. For Tucson it would be good to consider how funding at least east side sidewalks would fit into a future iteration of this plan.
- James – the full improvements to Country Club would not be able to happen before 22nd street bridge work (2028) anyway and it seems like the full price tag is irresponsible right now. The asphalt path and one side of sidewalks for Tucson sounds like it's something we could do

now. Good to understand that we could still have some flexibility with the SSIP moving forward.

Consensus decision process

- Patrick – The City is seeking approval by CSCC of the SSIP. Options for Tucson / Country Club are that they could be included now, or could be further discussed later.
- *Any members who cannot support approving SSIP as currently outlined, without addition of Country Club and Tucson at this time? – No members*
- *Members indicated support with indication of thumbs up, side or down:*
 - James – up
 - Sophia – side
 - Zach – up
 - Jennifer – up
 - Marshall – up (note that it's hard to say, but okay to move forward)
 - Liz – up
 - Ariel – up
 - Jill – up
 - Miranda – up
- There is consensus approval for the SSIP

6. CSCC Hub

- Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission (IOAC) – *Ryan*
 - No meeting this month. Next meeting is August.
 - Just held meeting on repaving Tucson and Elm
- Park Tucson - *Jill Brammer*
 - Met yesterday. Neighborhood Reinvestment Program – commission voted to cap reinvestment at \$3k/year and remove participation thresholds.
- Tucson Transit Advisory Committee (TTAC) – no member
- Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) - *James Wood*
 - No July meeting.
- Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) – *Zach*
 - Met last Wednesday and spoke with new City Manager. Discussed the need to include exceptions to City Code Chapter 25 which requires private property owners to be responsible for sidewalk maintenance. No solid plan yet.
 - Zach shared SSIP with CODI members who were supportive of the approach. Members of CODI are interested in follow up at design stage; design elements can help or hinder access.

7. Personal Complete Streets experiential opportunity for the month

For August meeting: try to visit a small business and notice the street infrastructure around it (streetery, buffer between road and walkway, etc.). Extra credit - get there in a mode other than a car.

8. Wrap up and DTM Updates

DTM staff/project updates:

- 22nd St. Bridge will close near end of year for construction.
- Stone Ave. cycle track extension – construction will begin in summer and should end before Tucson Meet Yourself this fall.
- Silverbell – construction is coming along. Discovered that some curb interspersed with flexible bollards is possible; this will increase cost, but will provide better protection.
- Grant 3-4 is moving, about two year project. There is still a funding gap on Grant 5-6 (short about \$50M). There is an ongoing cost to complete approach looking at cash flow and estimated expenses to develop strategies to fully fund. There may not be enough money to fund everything, so some may have to extend beyond RTA. Two RTA projects have been moved into RTA Next already.
- Valencia road widening is out for contract and will close in August.
- Next meeting of 1st Ave Citizens Taskforce is Aug 22nd – reach out to Patrick to get added to distribution list. Anticipate comprehensive public outreach this fall.
- Drexel bridge grant bid was unsuccessful – there were over 1,000 projects submitted nationally and only 100 were awarded. Project will be re-submitted next year.
- RTA and PAG boards meet tomorrow to discuss RTA Next Plan. Still anticipating May election.
- 411 repaving work continues
- Sophia – any lessons learned or analysis we can do of activity expected/seen when big rains and closures occur?
 - Patrick – this is typically a chance to look at drainage. Not really looking a lot at traffic volumes and flows in these situations.

Upcoming agenda topics:

- Marshall – detailed presentation on stoplights

Meeting was adjourned at 7:30pm