



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

May 22, 2024 (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:

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

Members Absent:

Selina Barajas
Charly Earley
Craig McCaskill
Luis Salgado
Tarik Williams
Rossio Araujo (NV)

Staff:

Ryan Fagan
Patrick Hartley
Jim DeGroot
Monica Landgrave-Serrano
Blake Olofson
Davita Mueller
Shamara Smith

Observers:

Chris Lopez
Scott Robidoux
Ben Buehler-Garcia

Facilitation and documentation:

Tahnee Robertson
Colleen Whitaker

Summary of actions and decisions:

- April meeting minutes: Motion to approve – Sophia; Second – Marshall
- Tucson Blvd funding: Motion to approve the funding for enhanced bike lanes on Tucson Blvd: Sophia, Second: Marshall.
- Subcommittees: reconvene the project prioritization subcommittee to review scopes and costs for collector streets projects and prioritize improvements. Members interested: Zach, Miranda, Ariel, Sophia

2. Housekeeping

- April meeting minutes - no corrections; consensus support to approve. **Motion - Sophia; Second - Marshall**
- Summer meeting poll: June 26, July 24, August 28 - only one person cannot attend each meeting.

3. Call to the audience

- Chris Lopez - from the neighborhood between 22nd – Alvernon and Country Club - Aviation. Interested in improvements to Country Club. 30 years ago, when Aviation was constructed, residents were told this would include improvements such as bus stops, sidewalks, etc... Several years ago, the north side of 22nd had these improvements completed, but the south side is still not complete. Have been trying to figure out how to get this done.
 - Ryan shared his email for follow up

4. Current events

- Sophia - a couple months ago a FUGA member was seriously injured by a car entering the highway; they had been raising the danger of this area for some time. FUGA is committed to visibility of people biking, walking and rolling. When we hear statistics it's important to remember these are our family and friends. That is why we are all here - safer streets for people of Tucson.

5. Discussion of small project 411 funding authorization

Ryan provided an overview of this topic:

- This was raised by members at a previous meeting. Does the CSCC want to spend time reviewing small cost projects that meet the criteria of Complete Streets.
- Is the CSCC interested in identifying some criteria for projects that the City could authorize for funding without coming for CSCC approval. Some ideas shared were that this could be for projects under a certain dollar amount, and that perhaps it could be done on a trial basis.
- The City is happy to continue as usual, but up to CSCC if getting small dollar items off the agenda is desirable.

Member discussion

- James – how often do these types of issues arise, and how much time does it usually take?
 - Hard to say how often this might arise. A trial period could be beneficial.
- Ruth – supportive of setting an amount (\$100k), so that any project that is an enhancement of things like bike lanes, pedestrian facility, lighting (general accessibility projects) wouldn't need to come to CSCC.
- Miranda - \$100k sounds good for projects that are clearly under the category of safety improvements. Supportive of trial period. The more projects that are complete, the better. We don't have a lot of time in these meetings, and with more projects coming up want to make best use of CSCC time.
- Riley – prefer to see proposals each week. Hard to understand what issue this addresses. Have we been holding up a backlog of projects? If it is an issue, can we just find a way to expedite these in our meetings? Don't want to end up in a situation where there are a lot of projects approved that CSCC hasn't heard about.

- Miranda – it is less about a problem, and more about considering our future capacity. An expedited approach may work. We almost always run out of time. Intrigued about the possibilities for CSCC to move beyond small project discussions.
- Zach – interested in a “happy medium” approach. Many of the presentations, even on smaller projects, are very informative. Is it possible to develop a simple one-pager with key info and stats on the projects?
- Marshall – this approach would give DTM a way to move more quickly to implement enhancements on projects that are already in progress without having to wait a month for CSCC meeting.
- James – don’t have a good understanding of what \$100k covers.
 - Could cover things like striping enhancements, enhanced bike lanes. This wouldn’t cover much sidewalk length (maybe up to 100 feet). These are smaller enhancements on existing projects, rather than full projects.
- Riley - If we’re an oversight committee, we should look at everything, but this could perhaps be expedited. How will this work in practice? Will it take time to get updated on how funds will be spent? Was our decision-making ever holding up projects?
 - Things were not necessarily held up with current process. However, the CSCC wants to do the oversight is good; happy to do updates as often as needed. Could send out emails to CSCC to update as projects go through. Trial period could include a cap on dollar amount
- Ariel - supportive of a streamlined process. Do enjoy the project presentations and look at them beforehand. Could it be done on a case-by-case basis for whether we need a presentation or discussion? Do want to remain informed - a central way we can see what projects have been improved and we can get more info if desired.
- Zach - at a previous CODI meeting a DTM engineer was discussing placement of pedestrian infrastructure. Sometimes placement is an issue that can cause issues for disabled users. Having an opportunity to review how this might be implemented, and provide feedback, may be helpful, even if in brief form.
- Ruth - these projects are improvements. If we see a project under \$100k that is an improvement, it's hard to see that we would vote it down. Don't think these types of projects require a vote. Maybe they come monthly and inform us of projects that got these types of improvements. Don't think we would disagree on any of the types of enhancements we’ve seen so far, so we don't need to be involved in the decision but would like to be informed. DTM team knows about the budget, and if there is budget, I would always support these types of improvements or enhancements.
 - Clarification: this is only about funding approval. Projects can still come back to CSCC for design input.
- Sophia - there is a valid concern around projects that go out without CODI or accessibility approval. Is there a way to address this concern?
 - Ryan - funding approval and design oversight are separate items. If projects could be initiated without explicit approval, they would still involve the same design process. In some cases, these are small (like filling a sidewalk gap) and don't have any serious

design considerations. But some projects do require this, and we would continue to seek that input from CSCC.

- Zach - good with expedited process if it's not focused on the specifics of the design
- Marshall - possible criteria is if the project follows the CS guidelines; these encompass the things we are concerned about.
- Sophia - need to flesh out criteria a bit more, and what does the oversight look like.
- Riley - trial period would be okay. It's hard to picture what we are addressing right now. Is CSCC an obstacle to these things?
 - Ryan - no CSCC hasn't been an obstacle, and we don't want to try and create urgency where there isn't any. It's really more about whether or not you all think it is a valuable use of your time to spend on these types of small projects.
- Marshall - this started because of a recent project that was brought to us that felt like a no-brainer (not much money, not much design input). Minimal design input could be a criterion.
- Miranda - don't think this is motivated by us being an obstacle. It is really about efficiency; there is so much we could cover and spend our time on. What more could we be doing to meaningfully shape policy? It's a tall task and this is an urgent situation.
- Riley - this is helpful. Do feel comfortable moving forward with a trial period so we could see how it goes.
- Jennifer - could have a standing agenda item for small projects, with a chance to look at it beforehand. Then we are aware of it, but don't need to spend a lot of time discussing.
 - Tahnee - co chairs agenda meeting could be an opportunity to review this list and decide what might need more time.
- Ben (observer) - why not add it like the "Consent Agenda" on the Mayor and Council agenda? For those not familiar with the consent agenda, all details on each item are provided to voting members prior to the meeting for review. They can all be approved in total with a simple vote unless a voting member asks an item to be pulled for further discussion. Allows for full disclosure while saving time on the agenda. If a CSCC member wishes to pull it off the Consent Agenda, then the larger group can have a more extensive discussion.
- Sophia - could we use a survey to get input on criteria. Or members can feel free to email any thoughts on this.
- James - additional examples would be helpful. (Ryan develop examples and share over email)
- *No decision was made on this item. Next steps are for the co-chairs and staff to discuss and return with a suggested path forward at the next meeting. Below is a synthesis of the input on possible project criteria, and thoughts on how the process would work.*

Criteria for small projects that wouldn't require CSCC funding approval	Process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Projects under 100K ● Improvement projects: accessibility, safety, lighting, etc. ● Follows Complete Streets Guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Trial period (6 months? Budget threshold?) ● Still need a way for the CSCC to know about these projects ● Co-chairs could review and decide if projects should get more agenda time or not.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal design input required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could inform CSCC monthly on these projects Streamlined process for project review Standing item of DTM under 100K projects, and CSCC could do rapid approval
---	---

6. Crossing treatments overview - Blake Olofson, Traffic Engineering Administrator, City of Tucson

Blake shared a presentation; main points are summarized below:

- Every intersection in the City is a legal crosswalk, but most of them are not marked. Pedestrians have the right to cross at both marked and unmarked crossings. By law vehicles should yield. But it is not legal to cross mid-block between two traffic signals.
- There are three types of crosswalks: unmarked, marked controlled, marked uncontrolled
- Types of crossings: transverse and high visibility
- Arizona is a yield to pedestrian states, not stop for pedestrians - this is a decision made by every state.
- A Study from 2005 found that the crash rate at marked crossings was higher than at unmarked. This was confirmed. Unsure exactly why. May be that people had a false sense of security and believed cars would stop.
- FHWA guidelines have been developed for different types of streets. The range of mitigation goes from marked crosswalk all the way to HAWK.
- Types of mitigation tools and their costs:

- High Visibility Crosswalk (\$3,000)
- Raised Crosswalk (\$30,000)
- YIELD HERE for Pedestrian Signs and Markings (\$2,000)
- In-Street Pedestrian Crossing Sign (\$500)
- Curb Extension (\$50,000 incl ramps)
- Pedestrian Refuge Island (\$30,000 incl ramps)
- Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (HAWK) (\$350,000+)
- Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) (\$25,000)
- Flashing Signs (\$1,500 each)
- Flashing Beacons (\$1,000 each)
- PED XING Pavement Markings (\$3,000)

- No studies show that flashing signs do anything at all. The City is hesitant to use these, but they are placed on a case-by-case basis.
- Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) - \$25k
 - Doesn't require complete stop by vehicles.
 - Difficult to enforce noncompliance, and wide variation in compliance. Concerned that this device is not well understood by both vehicles and pedestrians.
 - Bicycles are considered vehicles in AZ. If there is a crash here, who is at fault? It is up to the court to decide.
 - There are two of these in Tucson (Congress/Bonita and Sunnyside High School). The yielding rate is not great, although slightly higher at night (~50%).

- Right now City staff is only comfortable with these in certain situations - 30 mph with 3 lanes or less and low traffic volumes. Need to ensure these are used in the correct context.
- HAWK (Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon) - \$350k
 - This technology was developed in Tucson.
 - 96% compliance rate by drivers and 92% compliance by pedestrians. Do hear anecdotally that people don't stop; there are outliers.
- Marked crosswalks are requested. The City has certain guidelines about when these would be used. There must be compliant ADA curb ramps (but there isn't funding for this).

Discussion and questions

- Sophia - this type of education is great and so important for CSCC. How is compliance rate derived? Does the chart account for speeding that happens in those areas?
 - Speeds - this is the posted speed. But we know people speed, so this is why the City is uncomfortable making decisions based on posted speed limits.
 - Compliance - the RRFB was based on 48 hours of video, in partnership with the UA. Four graduate students watched all the video and tabulated the behavior.
 - Do hear comments that people don't stop at these. But don't observe this as much as it's heard.
- Jennifer - Glenn/Treat is an area where people speed. The RRFB here was a great addition to the neighborhood.
- Ariel - why is a HAWK so much more expensive than other options?
 - 10 years ago, this cost was \$200k. The pandemic likely had an impact. The biggest costs are materials and getting power to a location. Glenn/Treat is solar, but has malfunctioned, so not in favor of this technology.
 - A regular signaled intersection is about \$800k.
- Marshall – there used to be a marked crossing near Broadway/Swan. It was somewhat erased, but not fully. There are some signs indicating the crossing. Is this safer?
 - The research shows a crash rate that is 5 times higher in these types of crossings. Right now, the internal process is that if something like this is paved over, the signs are removed.
- Patrick – references:
 - <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/safety/04100/04100.pdf>;
 - <https://azdot.gov/business/tsmo/operational-and-traffic-safety/az-step>
- Zach - If HAWKs are very expensive, what are other ways of increasing pedestrian safety? Would decreasing speed limit on roads with many lanes have a noticeable effect?
 - Every location is assessed on a case-by-case basis. Important to look at what speed people actually travel, not posted speed limits. This is what is considered.
- Zach - marked crosswalk request clarification

- This is an internal policy, and City is quite liberal with this. If it makes sense and it's possible, it's usually done. The biggest barrier is the ADA curb ramps - these are expensive and there isn't budget.
- Ariel - are decisions made in the design stage based on best practice, available budget, or some combination? For example, if a HAWK is the best solution is it recommended? Or are cheaper solutions considered for budget?
 - Blake provides his professional opinion on each case and hasn't seen deviations from this at the risk of safety.
- Blake – use the new 311 service. It is for all sorts of things (potholes, street sweeping, left hand turn signal too late, etc.)
- Contact Blake with further questions: blake.olofson@tuconsaz.gov

7. 411 funding request: Tucson Blvd buffered bike lanes - Ryan Fagan

Ryan provided a project overview; main points are summarized here:

- The project is for enhanced bike lanes in concert with repaving.
- Proposal: restripe the road to narrow vehicle lanes and add buffered bike lanes.
- Estimated cost for additional striping to create the buffers: \$15k
- Goals: improve safety for all users, leverage repaving work, provide low-stress bike facilities
- Equity: this area is within/adjacent to the highest equity need category.
- Connectivity: there are several bike facilities existing/planned that intersect or come very close.

Discussion and questions

- Sophia - supportive of approving funding
- Jennifer - press release says 6th to 22nd. But note that it is only to Broadway. Is this because it's too expensive to go to 22nd?
 - The City is trying to get this done before the 22nd St. bridge construction starts. Right now, only striping can be effected. From Broadway to 8th the road is very narrow and can't take bike lanes. In future, the pavement could be widened, but the ROW is tight. Another option would be to remove the center turn lane, but this may not be advisable due to traffic volumes.
- Riley - good to hear about this project. With respect to our previous conversation – note that this took about 6 minutes. However, if there were a lot of these in a meeting, it would add up.

Consensus decision process

Framed decision: Approval to fund enhanced bike lanes on Tucson Blvd through the 411-safety category.

- No members raised any concerns. All indicated a “1” which is full support.
- Consensus approval. **Motion to approve the funding for enhanced bike lanes on Tucson Blvd: Sophia, Second: Marshall.**

8. CSCC Hub

- Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission (IOAC) - *Jim DeGroot*
 - Met on April 22. No action items; mostly project updates. Got approval for Tucson Blvd project, which is now under construction.
- Park Tucson - *Jill Brammer*
 - Administrator is going to neighborhoods that participate in the reserved parking program. Still trying to staff up enforcement.
 - Sophia - would be great to understand the big picture vision of Park Tucson.
- Tucson Transit Advisory Committee (TTAC) - *Riley Merline*
 - Riley unable to attend. Monica shared that discussion focused on the Sun Van Comprehensive Operational Analysis
- Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) - *James Wood*
 - Last week new officers were elected. In process of trying to engage Pima County transportation about Dodge Blvd crossing at the Loop. This is unsafe due to quality of pavement and signage. County is forming a committee that will deal solely with the Loop (through NRPR). BAC has a liaison to this.
- Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) - *Zach Coble*
 - Spoke with Sun Tran about busing issues such as inconsistent tones/announcement of where buses are when they stop, and properly securing mobility devices.

9. Wrap up and

- DTM staff/project updates -*Ryan*
 - Have cost estimates for collector program; came in higher than what is available. This can be shared ahead of next CSCC meeting. May be good to reconvene project prioritization subcommittee to discuss these projects. Review scopes and costs for collector streets projects and prioritize improvements.
 - Who is interested: Zach, Miranda, Ariel, Sophia
- Future agenda items
 - No additions offered
- Personal Complete Streets experiential opportunity for the month
 - No time for this item.
- Ruth is stepping down; this is her last meeting. Ryan and members thanked her for her service.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:30pm