



## Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

April 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  
Jennifer Flores  
Ariel Gilbert-Knight  
Miranda Schubert  
James Wood  
Samuel Paz (non-voting)

**Members Absent:**

Jill Brammer  
Sophia Gonzalez  
Riley Merline  
Craig McCaskill  
Tarik Williams

**Staff:**

Ryan Fagan  
Andrea Altamirano  
Patrick Hartley  
Ben Elias  
James Castañeda  
Jesse Soto  
Shamara Smith  
Monica Landgrave-Serrano  
Shannon Jenkins  
Dora Maldonado

**Observers:**

Ben Buehler-Garcia

**Facilitation/documentation:**

Tahnee Robertson  
Colleen Whitaker

#### Summary of actions and decisions:

- *March meeting minutes:* No corrections. Motion to approve – Marshall; second – Miranda
- *Safe Streets Mini-Grants:* Motion to approve the Safe Street Mini Grant Option 1 list, with the revision presented tonight (adding back on the project that was inadvertently left off)- Marshall; Second - Miranda
- *Plan Tucson:* Motion to approve this letter be sent to Mayor and Council, with the changes suggested tonight - Marshall; Second - Miranda

#### 2. Housekeeping

- March minutes - no corrections. Motion to approve - Marshall; second – Miranda
- Co-chairs will be chosen at the next meeting

#### 3. Call to the audience - None

#### 4. Safe Streets Mini Grant Program Recommendations

Andrea shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here:

- There are a couple of changes and corrections to the presentation from last month:
  - A high scoring project was inadvertently left off of the Option 1 high ranking list. This is in an un-named neighborhood near Gardner St. and Cottonwood. The request is for three speed humps. It has a high TEPI score (95.51). Including this project is still in budget.
  - Garden District has 3 projects. Two of the projects have been combined because they are in the same area and are asking for similar features. This is more efficient.
  - South Park project - they are short two signature for completing the Neighborhood Traffic Management steps to get approval. So, the budget turns out to be a bit less. This has now been adjusted.
- Implications of going over budget (if members decide to fund additional projects)
  - May limit available funding for future projects within the 10-year cycle.
  - Future costs could rise due to tariffs or inflation, affecting project affordability.
  - Last year's CSCC approved a budget that was slightly over, but we ended up under budget in the end.
- Last month the CSCC talked about potentially adding projects from Ward 2 and Ward 4 (see Options 2a and 2b from last month's meeting)
  - Option 2a includes Old Ft. Lowell with a low TEPI score of 1.92
  - Option 2b includes Rolling Hills with TEPI score of 20.51
  - Rolling Hills does not have funding. Old Ft. Lowell does already have some funding for projects.
  - Both Options 2a and 2b would still result in 86% of awarded projects in low equity scoring areas.
- The City would like guidance from CSCC for next year - does CSCC want to see only top ranking projects, or see projects that are representative of all wards?

#### Questions/discussion

- Miranda - Would consider Option 1 or 2b. Old Ft. Lowell has already received funding and has a low TEPI ranking. Should we spend more money now or be concerned about reserving funds for future years? Coming from the nonprofit space where there is urgency to spend funds now given an uncertain future, wondering if we should take that approach here?
- Marshall - will the evaluation and ranking process remain the same next year? If we keep it under budget now, in outlying years we might have more money to put to other places that have lower equity scores. Okay with Option 1.
  - Andrea - The evaluation criteria and process is set and won't change for next year.
- James - Option 1 makes sense. Want to address the need where it is. Trying to adhere too much to the all-wards approach doesn't seem like the right way to go. Regarding budget, do

we have a reason to believe that funds will be reduced or taken away in the future? In favor of not going over budget this year.

- Ryan - don't think there is reason to be concerned about loss of funding through Prop 411. Maybe just general uncertainty about revenues and costs going forward.
- Miranda - I'm more concerned with costs moving forward than funding getting cut.
- Patrick - revenue has been running a bit above projects. But ultimately it is the decision of this group. Anything we spend now will possibly limit the ability to fund in years 9 and 10. If there are high priorities now that you want to approve, that is up to the Council.
- Ariel - the potential other projects in 2a and 2b are ranked much lower (14<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>). This seems like a big jump from the top 10. Are there other projects that could be funded if we didn't take the all-wards approach? What are the projects that are ranked 11-18?
  - Andrea - the next two ranking projects (#11 and #12) are Cherry Avenue (Ward 5, TEPI=77.56) and Sunnyside Neighborhood (Ward 5, TEPI = 94.23). The additional cost of approving these two is \$117k, which would be \$115,400 over budget.
- Ariel – it's hard to justify choosing a lower equity ranked project over either of these, if our direction is to focus on equity.
- Zach - leaning to Option 1. If we approved 2a or 2b, would it take a while for the project to be scoped, materials to be gathered, etc.?
  - Andrea - the South Park Ave project will get moving quickly. They have pieces in place and ready to go. Last year everything was installed by the end of December. Imagine this year will be similar.
- Zach - still feeling like Option 1 based on equity and not being able to predict the economics of the future.
- Miranda - support Option 1. All wards being represented doesn't seem sustainable; ward boundaries get redrawn. I support the equity and needs-based approach and don't support bumping others ahead of high-ranking projects just to get to all wards. Regarding budget - in future who knows how far our money will go (costs, tariffs, etc.)? But feel very comfortable moving forward with Option 1 with the additional project that was left off last time.
- Where did the all-wards idea come from?
  - Andrea - last year there were projects in all wards, it just happened to work out this way. Thought maybe this was a goal of the CSCC.
  - Patrick - when the program was set up it was made clear that this would follow the equity approach, not an all-wards approach. Staff just wanted to offer this to the CSCC as an option.

#### Consensus decision

- Any concerns with approving Option 1? → No concerns.
- All members shows “thumbs up,” which is consensus approval for this decision.

- **Motion to approve the Safe Street Mini Grant Option 1 list, with the revision presented tonight (adding back on the project that was inadvertently left off)- Marshall; Second – Miranda**

## **5. Major Streets and Routes Plan Update - Ben Elias, City of Tucson**

Ben shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here:

- The Major Streets and Route (MS&R) plan was established in 1982. It is a plan with a map that identifies the major streets, guides future improvements and establishes zoning setbacks from the right-of-way (ROW,) to accommodate the many uses occurring without employing unneeded acquisitions or demolition.
- Two street designations are included: arterial and collector.
- The plan hasn't been updated in about 10 years.
- Mayor and Council have provided direction for staff to return with more detailed recommendations and update the map.
- Impact to development: MS&R standards are triggered in certain situations:
  - New structure adjacent to a street that is in the MS&R
  - Changes of use (including new structure on vacant parcel)
  - Expansion of floor area of an existing structure
- There has been more than a year of work by the City to look at every street segment city-wide. They have developed a number of key recommendations.
- The biggest change is reduction in the suggest ROW width in 43% of roads. 31% of roads have no suggested change in future ROW. 22% of roads have a suggested ROW to match existing property lines.
- Other changes are reclassification of some roads. For example, if an arterial really doesn't have the traffic volumes that were anticipated, it could be changed to a collector.
- Some roads will be removed from the map - some of them were never built and there is no intention to build them now. Others may be outside of City jurisdiction (e.g. Davis Monthan)
- Next steps:
  - Staff are currently presenting the recommendations more widely to neighbors, stakeholders, commissions, etc.
  - A Story Map website was recently launched, and they are also collecting public comments on interactive feedback map and online survey.
  - There will be a virtual meeting tomorrow, and one in-person on Saturday.
  - Goal is to refine the recommendations and go to the Planning Commission for study session (May), a Public Hearing (June), and then go to Mayor and Council (August).

### Questions/discussion

- Ben Buehler-Garcia (observer) - How will this impact underground utilities, like Cox, that may already have infrastructure installed underground in the ROW that will now become private property?

- This is more of a real estate conversation. There is a real estate division that deals with utility easements. Mostly these are not located on the very edge of the rights of way. Utilities have been involved in these conversations. They are aware of the recommendations.
- Zach - What type of attributes led to 31% of streets not having a change in the proposed update?
  - The Street Design Guide includes a more prescriptive potential cross section of roadways. For all the collectors and arterials in the City, staff developed a spreadsheet with many attributes of roads. One of these attributes is how roads could be re-oriented within a general ROW width. So, for those that remain unchanged, it was thought that the existing ROW could be shifted in how it's being used, based in the Street Design Guide. We also considered whether there is a Move Tucson project on the street. Many roads do have very excessive ROW widths (up to 400'), so these were reigned in and made more responsive to the Complete Streets Policy.
- Marshall - What is the end goal of this update?
  - DTM uses the MS&R as a framework for what roads can be built, particularly the major arterials and collectors that create the backbone of the transportation network. We also have a growing network of mobility options (like Bike Boulevards) that layer onto this. It sets us up for delivering future transportation and mobility improvements. And offers additional options for infill development where this additional space is not needed. This also connects to the Community Corridors Tool (CCT), which has now passed. The CCT uses the MS&R.
  - Patrick - This is describing what DTM needs to execute future projects. It does not imply that there will be any conveyance of any ROW back to the private side. This will happen on a case-by-case basis. Reductions of ROW don't automatically become the property of the private entity.

## 6. Plan Tucson Letter - Marshall

- At the last meeting, the CSCC decided to write a letter of support for Plan Tucson. Marshall, with input from Sophia and Miranda, drafted a letter for consideration.
- Tahnee screen-shared the document and incorporated edits from members live.
- Only small wording edits were made. Marshall will incorporate the small edits.

### Consensus decision

- Any members not supportive of this letter with the small changes made tonight? → No
- All members shows “thumbs up,” which is consensus approval for this decision.
- **Motion to approve this letter be sent to Mayor and Council, with the changes suggested tonight - Marshall; Second - Miranda**

## 7. Sidewalks discussion (this agenda item was skipped as Sophia was not present)

## 8. CSCC Hub

- Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission (IOAC) - *no member*
- Park Tucson - *no member*
- Tucson Transit Advisory Committee (TTAC) - *no member*
- Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) - *James Wood*
  - Met quorum last week.
  - Two ongoing projects: bike theft on UA campus (had to send an official letter formally requesting data from UA); drafting a letter about Sabino Canyon and Tanque Verde (many cyclists think it is very unsafe, but is in the middle of a popular bike route)
- Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) - *Zach Coble*
  - Met with Sun Tran representatives on the draft of the Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) for Sun Van. While it had some helpful efficiencies, it also proposed cutting some optional service area hours. CODI will follow-up with a memo to M&C on this.
  - Ward 2 is hosting an open house discussion section on the Sun Van COA next Monday at 2pm.

## 9. Wrap up

- Co-chair nominations:
  - The role includes a one-hour meeting to help co-create the agenda with Ryan and SDR.
  - Soliciting nominations now, and plan to approve next month
  - No one volunteered.
  - Marshall - it's fun to get to set the agenda every month. Will continue as long as can.
  - Ryan noted bylaws say we can have 2-3 co-chairs
- DTM updates - *Ryan*
  - Upcoming meetings for MS&R updates: Saturday at Donna Liggins)
  - Tomorrow there is a meeting for the Drexel and Gollob-Igo Bike Boulevards
  - Drexel Rd public meeting: May 3rd at Grijalva Park, 9am.
- Future agenda items
  - Marshall - Prop 411 financial update
  - Zach - glad we are going to tackle the sidewalks topic in an upcoming meeting
  - Miranda - Traffic calming on major streets, and Community Engagement plan and performance metrics
  - Ariel - Community Engagement plan and performance metrics
  - Ryan - if there are any field trips people are interested in let us know
    - Marshall - something related to Grant roadwork related to Complete Streets.
- Note there are currently a number of open seats on the Council: Ward 5, Ward 6, City Manager, Mayor, Transportation Director (2)
  - Zach - how do people apply?
    - Ryan – There is a special application for CSCC. Will email to members.

**Meeting was adjourned by co-chairs at 7:00pm**