



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

July 23, 2025 (5:30-7:30pm)

Zoom



Final Minutes

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

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

Members Present:

Zach Coble
Marshall Davis
Ariel Gilbert-Knight
James Wood
Sophia Gonzalez
Miranda Schubert
Samuel Paz (non-voting)

Staff:

Patrick Hartley
Collin Chesston
Lee Miller
Shamara Smith

Observers:

Stacy Balstad

Members Absent:

Jill Brammer
Riley Merline
Jennifer Flores

Facilitation:

Tahnee Robertson

Summary of actions and decisions:

- Members decided to skip the August meeting. Next meeting will be September.
- *May meeting minutes:* No corrections. Motion to approve – Sophia; Second – Marshall
- *Main Avenue Complete Streets Funding Request:* Consensus approval of only the design (\$60k) and diagnostic fee (\$25k); City to return to the Council with the results. Motion to approve – Marshall; Second – Sophia.
- *Limberlost bike improvements:* Consensus support for \$500k option (flex-posts and curb). Motion to approve - Sophia; Second – Marshall.

2. Housekeeping

- **May meeting minutes** (note no meeting was held in June) - no corrections. Consensus approval. **Motion to approve - Sophia; second – Marshall**

3. Call to the audience - None

4. Prop 411 Financial Update – Patrick Harley, City of Tucson

Patrick shared a presentation. Main points are summarized below.

- Local Streets Paving program: \$180M collected as of June 30th, and expended \$138M
 - IOAC recently approved second phase of paving improvements
- Safe Streets Program (CSCC oversees): \$45M collected, \$9M expended

- 3 complete fiscal years of collection - ~\$15M/year. This is in line with what was anticipated in 1-year and 7-year safety plans.
- Running slightly ahead of projections.
- There is about a month lag in collections. Typically, about \$1.2M revenue/month.
- Expenditure is lagging behind the local streets program. This is due to complexity of design work on the layered programs. Expect this to change later this year and into 2026.
- Sidewalk and Pedestrian
 - \$1.1M spent
 - Largest projects – Greasewood sidewalks (\$581k - slightly under budget); Bilby Road (\$457 – can redistribute some of these funds). Bilby is at about 90% done.
 - Other project costs in this category are design costs
- Bike Network
 - \$2.1M spent
 - Aviation Greenway project is complete; in active construction on 9th/5th Blvd; Stone Ave bike track is complete; Park Ave/Ft. Lowell almost done
 - Other project costs are on-going design
- Safety Improvements
 - \$2.6M spent
 - This list is much longer – it includes the 10% set-aside funding for Neighborhood Traffic Calming
 - Largest projects – Golf Links/Pantano is complete; Bilby Rd design costs also show up here
 - Other projects – authorization for small dollar safety improvement projects (under \$100k).
- Traffic Signal Improvement
 - \$3.1M spent
 - Many signals have been updated
 - Year one is fully delivered
- 7-year funding projections
 - \$36M in the bank for projects that are ready to go
 - Sidewalks – anticipated deficit of \$275k (\$13.2M in uncommitted funding)
 - Bikeways – anticipated surplus of \$3M (\$12M uncommitted)
 - Safety – anticipated deficit of \$40k (\$13.4M uncommitted)
 - Signal – anticipated \$430k surplus (\$9.5M uncommitted)
- City staff can return to CSCC after some of the first capital projects are fully delivered to get a better sense of the actual construction costs. This will give a better sense of pricing and help think about future budgeting.
- City can also present on any of the projects advanced under the authorization for small dollar safety improvements.

Questions/Discussion

- Marshall – are obligations tracked (money committed to contractors that hasn't been invoiced yet)?
 - Yes; could share in the future. It is included in the full 7-year budget projections.
- Sophia – what are the big capital projects we're waiting for?

- Those that were layered on top of the paving projects – e.g. Columbus Blvd, Limberlost, 36th St, Drexel, 29th St., Fairview
- These take longer. About 12-18 months of design and a year of construction. Capital costs are usually \$10-20M.
- Sophia – for the deficit, what margin should we be worried about?
 - Difficult to predict with certainty. If we start creeping up to the yearly collections within the first seven years, that is when we may start thinking about tightening up spending. If there are uncommitted funds, does CSCC want to re-visit projects that have not yet begun?

5. Main Avenue Complete Street Funding Request - *Collin Chesston, City of Tucson*

Collin shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here.

- Project Overview
 - Near Dunbar Springs, north of downtown
 - Length: University to St. Mary's/6th St.
 - Issues – no formal pedestrian crossings at railroad; no protected bike lanes south of railroad crossing
 - Existing infrastructure – Bike Boulevard on 3rd (ends at Main), new project will be on Davis St. There is a gap here that could be addressed.
 - Zebra dividers on protected bike lanes in other areas have had some mixed reviews. May not recommend using these for this project.
 - Move Tucson project – Tier 2 priority
- Funding Request
 - Fill in sidewalk gaps across railroad tracks
 - Extend protected bike lanes
- Context
 - Working on Prop 407 project (El Paso and Southwestern Greenway extension) – exploring options for how this would terminate and connect to other things.
 - Public and Ward 1 have shared that the pedestrian connection across the railroad tracks is priority.
 - Reality of Prop 407 funding makes this difficult to implement with available funding. This is why City is seeking Prop 411 funds.
- Estimated Cost
 - Kimley Horn provided an estimate of \$1.1-2.5M.
 - Low-cost (\$1.1M) – 6' sidewalks, bikers use RRFB at Davis St. May be possible, but without consulting with UPRR, unsure if it would be accepted. There is a fee to do the diagnostic assessment with them.
 - High-cost (\$2.5M) – multi-use path on west side of Main, 6' sidewalk on east side of Main
 - City is requesting the higher cost option
- Alignment with CSCC priorities
 - Safety – fair rating
 - Equity – 85% of route not within equity focus area; 15% within “higher” category
 - Connectivity – makes important connections: University BB to El Paso and Southwestern; Castro BB connections.
- Why now?

- Basic pedestrian infrastructure is missing
- Install protected bike lanes
- Tried previously to do both these things, but were not successful with UPRR
- Why not do this?
 - Fairly high cost to fill small gap
 - Most of project not in high equity area

Questions/discussion

- Sophia – is this the only option available to fund this project?
 - Patrick – Prop 411 Safety Funds are the only ones available of sources that are readily available and have existing capacity. Other sources to fund this type of improvement would be RTA or Regional Transportation Alternatives Grant, but these are tied up now. There is no capacity under other programs like HURF.
- Sophia – there are lots of considerations related to scarcity in the community right now. Could we see examples of really good railroad crossings? What is the deadline on making this decision?
 - There is not a pressing deadline – this would be a new standalone project, not tying in with an existing project.
 - Will look for an example of the type of pedestrian crossing we would like to provide.
 - Patrick – there is one on the Julian Wash at Ajo.
- James – why do you anticipate UPRR will not accept the low-cost option? Also, it seems it could make sense to spend more on this because it is an important area that could create important connectivity. I currently avoid this area on a bike as it feels unsafe.
 - UPRR has highly specific design guidelines. They are unique from all other property owners – they have a 50' ROW on either side of the tracks. We have to ask permission to do anything in the ROW. They have a lot of power and can dictate the terms. They have signal cabinets in the way, and there are crossing arms are where we would like the crossing to be. The City may have to pay to move some of this equipment if they won't.
- Ariel – which bucket of funding would this come from? If the priority identified by public is the pedestrian connectivity, is there a cheaper option to provide only that component?
 - Patrick – proposal is that this would come equally from pedestrian and bikeway categories. We are running a deficit on pedestrian category. This would likely push us into spending year eight money (at full cost of \$2.5M). The bikeway budget has capacity within the seven-year horizon.
 - Collin – it is probably possible to do something just for pedestrian, and not bikes. This could be an option we ask Kimley Horn to develop. Unsure how much cost savings this would create, however. The pedestrian part is probably the most expensive part of the project.
 - Ariel – seems it would make sense to do both in this case.
- Zach – does doing pedestrian and bike improvements together create cost savings in terms of labor?
 - Collin – there might be some savings with doing these together. But from a construction perspective these are very different.
 - Patrick – reconfiguring the railroad and working with USPP is something we'd like to do only once. So, we want a single project if we're going ahead; only one project to pay the diagnostic fee for.

- Marshall – what is the timeline for tying into the greenway project? There are a lot of pieces here. How can we try to sequence the most cost-effective solution here?
 - The Prop 407 project is under-funded and over-budget, but City is committed to delivering. The current project ends at Cushing. From here to St. Mary’s is almost at 100% plan phase. Have not yet started designing up to University Bl, or over to 9th Ave. BB. This will be the most cost-effective way to connect the greenway to the BB network, for a bike.
- Sophia – the Ajo Way Loop connection to Julian Wash is a good example of a seamless crossing of tracks. It seems that in order to pursue approval with UPRR, we need approval for either of these options. Hearing a lot of agreement that this project would be beneficial for connectivity. There are a lot of other projects we are excited about. Can this project get pushed a few years, maybe wait to see where we’re at with funding in future?
 - Yes, it can be pushed out. One option, in order to be responsive to the public would be to advance the diagnostic to understand how much it is going to cost (\$1.1 or \$2.5M). Then CSCC could make a more informed decision.
 - Sophia – it will be more expensive if we push it forward. And those that live around the railroad have gotten the short-end of the stick up to now. So definitely want to honor the neighborhood concern around the safety of the crossing.
 - Patrick – note that this would be the first time the CSCC approved design funding for something that may not necessarily end up in a capital project. We would likely want to reserve the funding to make sure it isn’t committed to something else once the diagnostic is done.
 - Sophia – getting a diagnostic is futuristic, because this can serve other places around town. So it would be beneficial even if we didn’t pursue it right away.

Consensus decision process

Options:

- A – approve full \$2.5M
- B – approve only the design (\$60k) and diagnostic fee (\$25k) = \$85k
 - There would then be an update to the committee to decide whether or not to approve the full funding.

Deliberation:

- Sophia – hesitation about the RRFPB. In favor of Option B, however.
- Miranda – Option B
- Marshall – can we ask Kimley Horn to come back with more clarity about the layout (especially around the 5th St. and RRFB component)? It is too loose right now.
- James – is it likely UPRR would approve something now and then change their mind?
 - Collin – railroads are difficult to work with and can be capricious. They don’t document their design guidelines. But not aware of a situation of an agency going through this process and then having approval revoked.
 - Patrick – typically there is discussion with an engineer who represents the railroad. Then the next phase is internal review where they may ask for changes. Then we also have to go to ACC. Seems unlikely they would reverse after all these approvals.
- Any members who would not support option B? → no members
- Support for Option B – all “thumbs up” (indicating full support)

Consensus support to approve only the design (\$60k) and diagnostic fee (\$25k) and return to the Council with the results. Motion to approve – Marshall; Second – Sophia

6. Prop 411 Projects: Gollob-Igo Bike Blvd Update - Lee Miller, City of Tucson

Lee shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here.

- Far east side of Tucson
- Part of 20 miles of bicycle network going in on the east side. All the projects are being designed together.
- The project is in the Bike Boulevard Master Plan (2017), and a Prop 411 repaving layering opportunity.
- \$2.4M was approved by CSCC for the project
- Progress
 - Approaching 30% design
 - Have held two initial public outreach events – well received, positive feedback
 - Next engagement in fall
- Improvements:
 - New Bike HAWK, conversion of one HAWK to a Bike HAWK
 - Bike friendly crossings at 22nd and Golf Links
 - Traffic Calming
 - Wayfinding
- Seeking feedback on a specific location: north end of the bike boulevard at Speedway at a wash crossing. There are some drainage concerns. There is a possible alternative alignment on Ave. Ricardo Small.
- All are welcome to visit the [interactive map](#) for the project and see what feedback has been received and/or add their own.

Questions/discussion

- Sophia – can you share more about the engagement
 - Two events with 30-40 people each. Typical of BB events.
 - Some concerns about folks not enjoying traffic calming (speed humps) in their neighborhoods.
 - About 70 comments on interactive map – this is more than typical. Crossing improvements were appreciated.
 - General support for traffic calming
- Marshall – bypassing the wash area would save money, correct? Is there any plan for Wrightstown to add bike infrastructure?
 - Yes. But don't have the cost estimate yet to be more specific.
 - Patrick – there is a modernization project on Wrightstown identified in Move Tucson. It is not funded, very conceptual, and not likely to be built in next 10-15 years.
- Marshall – would sidewalk be expanded?
 - Yes, likely to 10' and to be more of a shared use path.
- Ariel – this and other 407 projects on the eastside are really exciting.
- Zach – what are differences between shared use path and sidewalk?

- A sidewalk is generally not wider than 6-7'. A shared use path is open to multiple modes, and is at least 8', and more often 10-12'.
- Sophia – how does this project fit into the equity framework?
 - Will share this information.

7. Prop 411 Funding Request: Limberlost Bicycle Boulevard - Patrick Hartley, City of Tucson

Patrick shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here.

- Request is for bikeway funding for extension of the Limberlost project scope. Current project from Oracle to 1st. Ave includes a variety of improvements.
- Limberlost is classified as a local street, so can't utilize the collector street funding for pavement work.
- With approval of Phase 2 local streets plan by IOAC this week, there is now pavement funding that will go into the next phase of Limberlost. So now seeking additional funding to extend the project limits to Campbell.
- This is a one-mile extension (Campbell to 1st. Ave). This will allow bike connectivity for all of Limberlost.
- The western ¼ of the road can incorporate bike lanes without widening the road. The remaining ¾ has a narrow pavement footprint, and the roadway is currently uncurbed. The proposal is to widen the road during re-paving, adding space for protected bike lanes.
- Not seeking funding for all the typical Complete Streets elements but will still create benefits for pedestrians as well.
- This is a Move Tucson Tier 2 project.
- Why now?
 - Cost savings by combining with Prop 411 repaving
 - Can integrate design with restriping during repaving
 - Significant bike improvements at relatively low cost
 - Extends protected bike lane west of 1st. Ave
- CSCC priorities
 - Equity – majority of corridor is within high equity focus area
 - Connectivity – connections to multiple existing funded bike facilities (e.g. Mountain Ave and the Loop). Connects to Rio Vista Elementary, parks and shopping areas.
 - Safety – current performance is “poor,” although most serious accidents are at the major intersections. Segment safety is also “poor.”
- Option costs
 - Option 1: \$300k – K71 flex-posts only
 - Option 2: \$500k – K71 flex-posts and precast curb
 - There is \$3.1M remaining uncommitted in bikeways category

Questions

- Marshall – what side of the road will bike lane be on?
 - Asphalt widening will be on north. Bike lane elements would be on both sides of the roadway.
- Stacy – if the speed limit is 35 here, the \$300k option might be best. Connecting to the Rillito is a great idea.
 - Patrick – we can also investigate dropping the speed limit down to 30 mph.

Consensus Decision Process

- Sophia – support Option 2 (\$500k). Reinforcing with concrete curb is a great idea.
- Marshall – Option 2 is a great addition to Limberlost
- James – support Option 2 with curb. This is important for feeling safe on a bike.
- Any member who would not support the \$500k option? → all thumbs up for this option.
Consensus support for \$500k option. Motion to approve - Sophia; Second – Marshall

8. CSCC Hub

- Park Tucson - *no member*
- Tucson Transit Advisory Committee (TTAC) – *no member*
- Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) - *James Wood*
 - No updates
- Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) - *Zach Coble*
 - No updates
- Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission (IOAC) - *no member*

9. Wrap up

- Summer meetings – proposal to skip August meeting.
 - Patrick confirms there are no critical funding decisions that would need to be made in August. We can come back in September with bike friendly speed humps on 9th.
 - Will skip August meeting.
- DTM updates - *Patrick*
 - Fall will be busy. Outreach on 411 projects will be happening, starting late September/early October. Will share dates with CSCC when they are confirmed.
- Future agenda items
 - Presentation on under \$100k projects – what has been completed, status, and how this mechanism is working.
 - Another in-person meeting (maybe September)
 - Biking opportunity: Ride 9th St. and look at the improvements and bike friendly speed humps (Collin). Probably wait until fall. City can provide Tugo bikes for this.

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