Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

May 28, 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
Riley Merline
Samuel Paz (non-voting)

Members Absent:
Jill Brammer
Jennifer Flores
Miranda Schubert

Staff:
Ryan Fagan
Shamara Smith
Mackenzi Wintermoyer
Stacy Balstad

Guests:
Felipe Ladrón de Guevara

Observers:
Mike Mayer (Country Club-Glenn NA)

Facilitation:
Tahnee Robertson

Summary of actions and decisions:

- *April meeting minutes:* No corrections. Motion to approve – Marshall; second – Miranda
- *Co-chairs:* Motion to approve Sophia and Marshall to continue as co-chairs – Zach; second – Ariel
- *MS&R letter of support:* Motion to send the letter to M&C– Sophia; second – Marshall

2. Housekeeping

- Co-chair nominations/approvals:
  - Sophia and Marshall are both willing to continue. CSCC bylaws allow three co-chairs. No other members volunteered.
  - Consensus approval to keep Sophia and Marshall as co-chairs. Motion to approve – Zach, Second – Ariel
- April minutes - no corrections. Motion to approve - Sophia; second – Marshall

3. Call to the audience - None

4. Drexel Road Modernization Project - *Felipe Ladrón de Guevara, Kittelson & Associates*

Felipe shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here:

- Project site – Drexel between approximately Mission and Midvale
- Project is split into west and east segments
- West segment
    - Doesn't go all the way to Mission Rd., due to City limits. DTM is in discussion with Pima County to see if the project can be extended to Mission.
    - Currently two lanes, one in each direction. No bike lanes, and no sidewalks.
- East segment (Oak Tree Dr to Midvale Park)
    - Lanes here increase to four, and then subsequently back to two
    - Includes a school crosswalk
- Project objectives:
    - Improve pedestrian facilities along corridor, ADA compliance, new pavement treatment, update pavement marking and signing, provide street lighting
    - West segment – reconstruct at-grade crossing, provide bike lanes, potential midblock crossing
    - East segment – protected bike lanes, potential raised median, enhance school crossing
- Data collection: Traffic volumes (24-hour counts)
    - West segment – 8,166/day
    - East segment – 5,172/day
    - Capacity of a two lane road is about 12-18k/day
- Existing traffic operations
    - Assessment of level of service (LOS) shows levels of A,B, and C on different segments.
    - Overall there is a good level of service and existing capacity
- Existing crash data (2019-2023)
    - 72 total crashes (3 pedestrian and 1 bike)
    - Removing Mission Rd intersection takes this down to 23 total crashes (2 pedestrian)
    - There is still room for improvement
- Public meeting at Grijalva Park on a Saturday in May
    - About 25 attendees, including school crossing guards
    - Those who were initially skeptical of the proposal shared that they felt very comfortable after attending the meeting
    - People support the sidewalk connection west of the branch of the Santa Cruz
    - Many safety concerns were raised about Oak Tree Dr.
    - Other concerns included school pick/up traffic issues, and some speeding/racing on Midvale Park and the need for a signal on Midvale
- Alternatives for community and CSCC feedback
    - Option 1: Maintain 5-lane section (Oak Vale and Midvale Park) with minor adjustments, enhanced pedestrian facilities, bike lanes remain unprotected, addition of street lighting.
    - Option 2: 3-lane roadway with protected bike lanes, wider bike lanes, ADA sidewalks, add street lighting; possibility for center islands.

<u>Discussion/questions</u>

- Sophia – what is the philosophy behind LOS ratings, and how often does this framework get updated?

    - This is based on the Highway Capacity Manual from the Transportation Reserve Board (TRB). This has a heavy emphasis on vehicles. It is updated about every seven years or so. The levels go from A to F.
- Sophia – what is the responsibility of Kittleson to present an option with 5 lanes and another option with 3 lanes. Could both options have 3 lanes with different features?
    - This was discussed with DTM, who wants to get input from community and be transparent about the options. Don't want to make assumptions about what will be preferred.
    - Ryan – DTM always looks at existing conditions to evaluate changes to roadway configurations. We would not propose something that isn't potentially beneficial. This is about priorities of things like vehicular capacity and bike facilitates.
- Ariel – based on vehicle traffic data, it sounds like there is plenty of capacity with just three lanes, is this correct? (Yes). And the community is receptive to reducing number of lanes? (Yes). In this case, in alignment with CSCC priorities, I am in favor of the option that reduces vehicle lanes.
- James – agree about supporting reduced vehicle lanes. Protected bike lanes are important to get people to start biking more. If the rest of the CSCC is onboard, I support the second option.
- Marshall – at the crossing on the west branch of the river it looks like the pavement is very rough. Are special treatments needed here due to water?
    - Yes. Pavement will be removed and may even remove more and bring in new material – perhaps concrete and not asphalt, or asphalt with a different construction method.
- Marshall – would the pedestrian bridge be connected to the new section of sidewalk that would be built?
    - Looking for community input on this. Can definitely do sidewalk at least to City limits, but would be better to extend this to the bus stop and intersection.
- Marshall – are vehicle counts expected to increase if the bridge gets built?
    - Yes, this is expected to increase but the lane reduction should not cause any issues. Any challenges would be at the intersections.
- Zach – feel supportive of option 2. Protected bike lanes would keep bikers more in bike lanes and not on sidewalks, which increases access for pedestrians and bikers.
- Sophia – option 2 is a street that aligns more with City values of being bike friendly, being safer and contributing to climate action. I think it's interesting that the practice includes offering the current option that doesn't meet these goals. This is a larger consideration and something for us all to think about. What is the landscaping budget?
    - Unsure what landscape budget is, this may be a DTM question.
    - Sophia – it can be misleading to community members if trees appear in images, but then don't get implemented. And they are so important.
    - Ryan – street trees can't be paid for with 411 funds. Can find out if Storm to Shade are involved in this project.
- Sophia – what is the minimum level of engagement required for moving ahead with project design?
    - Ryan – usually there are two rounds of meetings for a project. Unless major changes are requested at second meeting, normally another meeting is not done.
    - Sophia – what about the number of participants or comments?

    - Ryan – this varies a lot based on the project, how big it is and the community interest. It can sometimes be hard to predict.
- Mike (observer) – is it more likely to have a traffic incident on a road that goes from 2, to 4, and back to 2? Was this considered?
    - Some of the problematic behaviors we heard from the community (speeding, etc.) can result from going from 2 to 4 lanes when extra capacity is not needed.
    - Mike – was there any data taken on how many people currently walk or bike, and does the school encourage this with any programs?
    - Pedestrian and bike volumes were collected in one hour morning, midday and afternoon. So some of this data exists. Good suggestion about talking to the school.

CSCC Support: No members indicated they would not be supportive of option 2.

- It would be useful to see variations of option 2 next time. Felipe can do this, and can address some ideas they have for things like school drop off/pick up issues. They would like to share a preferred alternative with the community in August/September. Felipe could return to CSCC in June or July.

5. Sun Tran: 50th Anniversary and Complete Streets - *Mackenzi Wintermoyer, Sun Tran*

Mackenzi shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here:

- All transit users are pedestrians (or cyclists)
- Key design elements emphasized by Sun Tran: accessibility, improvements, bus pull outs, safe crossing, 11 foot bus lanes
- Bus Stop Accessibility
    - City has a detailed design on their website
    - They adhere to PROWAG (Public Right of Way Accessibility Guidelines) and ADA.
    - Need accessible routes to the bus stop, regardless of mobility devises.
- Sun Tran Funding
    - Funding comes mostly from DTM grants and advertising.
    - Sun Tran budget is operational and does not include capital improvement funding
- Safe Crossings
    - Prefer that pedestrians can cross behind the bus
- Bus Pull Outs
    - These are highly contested – drivers tend to like it, but bus drivers don't.
    - It is difficult for buses to get back into traffic once they pull out.
    - It is better if the pull out is located on the far-side of the signalized intersection
- Bus lane width
    - Preference is for 11 feet. The buses are about 9 feet wide.
    - Although this seems basic, it often gets forgotten.
- 50th Anniversary
    - Sun Tran started in 1975
    - Have been having several celebratory events around town
    - There are vintage bus designs rolling around town
    - More info is on the Sun Tran website, with stats, news, events, etc.

<u>Questions/discussion</u>

- Zach – with ADA and PROWAG, is there a census of the number of bus stops that meet these standards and those that don't?
    - There are about 2200 bus stops total. There are 210 that need improvement – these are the ones with highest ridership and obvious need.
- Zach – where does the funding come from for bus stop improvements?
    - Sun Tran is City of Tucson adjacent. Most funding is through the City. DTM does the improvements
- James – sometimes there are garbage cans at bus stops, and sometimes not. How is this decision made?
    - Ridership is considered to make sure that it is needed. Also want to consider how close it is to housing, so that it doesn't fill up with household trash. Right now it isn't possible to put one at every stop, but requests and need are considered.
- Sophia – what is the advertising budget?
    - Currently bus stops are funded by advertising at the stop. Lamar Transit Advertising handle ads.
- Sophia – how long is the waitlist for improvements to bus stops?
    - Every stop needs some type of improvement. Every bus stop has a priority score, which can be seen on website (based on things like ridership, proximity to essential services, major transfer points)
- Sophia – how is it decided which stops have a shelter?
    - In October of 2024 completed a contract to relocate stops from old inactive stops. If there are requests they are evaluated against the priority score. Requests can be made to the customer service line.
- Sophia – why do crosswalks need to be behind the bus?
    - If people walk in front of bus after they exit, the traffic behind the bus can't see them.
- Sophia – what is the current approach to lane width?
    - Some more recent projects try to slim roadways, and don't always consider bus width needs. There are issues with mirror strikes in lanes that aren't wide enough.
    - Ryan – where there are transit routes, we do try to accommodate the 11 foot request. There are always multiple needs being juggled. When there is sufficient space we want to accommodate the 11 feet. It's a case by case situation.
- Marshall – is there a preference for the type of protected bike lane?
    - Biggest consideration is that there is a gap for people to cross the bike lane in a mobility devise.

6. Sidewalks - *Sophia Gonzalez*

What does CSCC want to do related to sidewalks this year?

- Zach – have heard that it will cost over $1B to create a complete sidewalk network. This seems very improbable. Curious about data – there are various reports about where sidewalks exist and their condition. It would be great if there was a more publicly accessible sidewalk "dashboard."
- Marshall – sidewalk repair is an important issue. Where sidewalks fail, they often stay that way for a long time, even in really busy places. Could we develop some type of mini-grant program to rate areas and put funding toward sidewalk repair?
- Ariel – accessibility is a high priority for Ward 2, and sidewalks are a big priority within this. Would like to get a sense of the current state of sidewalks. Anecdotally it's not great, but it

would be better to understand the scope of the issue and potential funding, and opportunities for CSC too plug in.

- Marshall – the City previously had a program to support property owners to repair sidewalks. The owner paid a set amount, and the City contributed the rest. That program had almost 200 sidewalk projects on the waitlist last time CODI checked, primarily due to staffing (only two crews doing sidewalk repair). Even if there was funding, there may not be capacity to do the repairs very quickly. This is something CSCC could advocate for.
- Ryan – there was an extensive sidewalk survey done about a decade ago; unsure if there is a public facing version, but can look into this. We can get a presentation on this if wanted. The cost-sharing program is suspended due to expense, and unsure if it will come back soon or not. Finally, we are looking at about $1B to put accessible sidewalks on all City streets. This is equivalent to the City's entire share of RTA next, or a half cent sales tax.
- Sophia – a presentation would be great. Is it possible to get a GIS map to identify where there are no sidewalks? Now the City approaches sidewalks when there is a road project. Seems like sidewalks are more important on arterials and collectors, but not totally sure. It would be great to see a structured plan for sidewalks.
- Zach – could GIS be used to show accessible paths of travel for mobility devise users? Why does the City fund things through sales tax, and are there any other available funding mechanisms?
    - Ryan – the City can bond for capital improvements (e.g. Prop 407). At some point existing bonds will retire and new ones could be issued (voter approval). Bond funding is fixed, whereas those based on sales tax can vary (e.g. 411). Bonding costs more because the money is being borrowed, whereas sales tax is more a pay as you go situation.
- James – asphalt with dirt on the side is not great for pedestrians, but it is good for drainage. When sidewalks are implemented are there considerations for drainage design? Also, it sounds like people support a process to prioritize which sidewalks should be built first. Unsure how to best do this, but it seems useful.
- Next steps: co-chairs review these ideas and consider how to proceed.

7. CSCC Support for Major Streets and Routes Update

Marshall reviewed the draft letter he and Sophia prepared.

- There have been a couple presentations to CSCC about the MS&R update. This will be in front of the Planning Commission in June. The timing is good to provide a letter from CSCC in support of this plan.
- The group reviewed on screenshare, and Marshall incorporated edits. Edits were only small wordsmithing, no substantive changes.

Consensus approval process:

- *Any members not supportive of the letter?* → no members indicated there were not supportive. This is consensus approval to support the letter (with the small changes incorporated tonight). **Motion to send the letter to M&C on behalf of CSCC – Sophia; second – Marshall**

8. CSCC Hub

- Park Tucson - *no member*
- Tucson Transit Advisory Committee (TTAC) – Riley
    - No updates
- Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) - *James Wood*
    - Did not meet in May
- Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) - *Zach Coble*
    - Approved a memo to M&C asking them to consider a different contractor for Sun Van when this comes up again. CODI thinks other providers might provide better and more competitive service.
    - Heard from Jenn Toothaker about information related to ADA improvements that will be shared with ADOT.
- Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission (IOAC) - *no member*

9. Wrap up

- Summer meetings – check in on member availability for June 25, July 23, August 27
    - Marshall – good for all
    - Sophia – skipping August would be good (no decision was made)
    - Ariel – good for all
    - James – July meeting will be hard to make
    - Zach – may not make June meeting
    - Follow-up: Ryan contact members who were not here tonight and find out about their availability
- DTM updates - *Ryan*
    - Public meetings for Drexel Road project tomorrow and day after. Information is on webpage.
- CSCC vacancies
    - There are 8 vacant seats: Ward 4, Ward 5, Ward 6, Pedestrian Advisory Committee (sunsetting in June), City Manager, Mayor, Transportation Director (2)
    - If you know anyone, please contact Ryan, and share any ideas about how to spread information.
        - Try Living Streets Alliance newsletter
        - Sophia suggested Tucson Young Professionals advocacy arm
- Future agenda items
    - Follow-up on sidewalks Drexel Road options
- Complete Streets events
    - FUGA – this Friday is the last community bike ride - from El Pueblo to Valencia Rd followed by a parking lot party. FUGA has been gathering information about issues on Valencia Rd. There are several other events in June as well.

Meeting was adjourned by co-chairs at 7:20pm