



## Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

March 26, 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:

Jill Brammer  
Zach Coble  
Marshall Davis  
Jennifer Flores  
Ariel Gilbert-Knight  
Sophia Gonzalez  
Riley Merline  
Miranda Schubert  
James Wood  
Samuel Paz (non-voting)

#### Members Absent:

Craig McCaskill  
Tarik Williams

#### Staff:

Ryan Fagan  
Andrea Altamirano  
Collin Chesston  
Cesar Acosta  
Shamara Smith  
Monica Landgrave-Serrano

#### Observers:

Ben Buehler-Garcia  
Felipe

#### Facilitation:

Colleen Whitaker

### Summary of actions and decisions:

- *February meeting minutes:* No corrections. Motion to approve – Marshall; second – Sophia
- *Safe Streets Mini-Grants:* Motion to approve the top 8 ranking projects – Sophia; second – Marshall (with the option to discuss the other projects presented at the next meeting with additional information from the City on possible impacts of going over budget).
- *St. Mary's Shared Use Path:* Motion to approve funding for the full extension on St. Mary's (option 2) – Sophia; second – Marshall
- *Plan Tucson:* Marshall and Miranda will draft a statement in support of Plan Tucson and present it for discussion and possible approval at the April meeting.

### 2. Housekeeping

- Approval of February minutes
  - No corrections
  - **Motion to approve the February minutes - Marshall; Second - Sophia**

### 3. Safe Streets Mini-Grant Program Recommendations – *Andrea Altamirano, City of Tucson*

Andrea shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here:

- The program is funded through 411 for neighborhood safety improvements. Budget for this year is about \$450k.
- To qualify the street must be residential or local, no collector or arterial streets are allowed.
- 2024 projects:
  - 13 projects were funded. 3 of these are still pending for various reasons.
  - Total budget was \$450k; ended up with surplus of \$8,908
- Review process:
  - Stage 1: Small review team to assess if basic criteria have been met, the application has champions, and confirm the request is actually for traffic calming.
  - Stage 2: Score cards with quantitative data (85% of score)
  - Stage 3: Review of qualitative data (15% of score)
  - Stage 4: Review committee ranks and scores each application. Scope of work and cost of each project is estimated.
  - Stage 5 (current): Share recommendations with CSCC and get approval of projects to select.
  - Final Stage: Notification of applicants and begin implementation.
- Criteria:
  - Safety (30%)
  - Build environment/road design (20%)
  - Resiliency (5%)
  - Equity (35%) – note that CSCC previously decided to allocate 60% of funds to “higher” and “highest” equity areas.
  - Community readiness (10%)
- An insight from this year is that landscaping for traffic circles and chicanes should be included in the budget (~\$5k for a traffic circle and ~\$5k for one set of chicanes)
- The program includes an agreement with Storm to Shade to review plans prior to implementation of traffic chicanes for GSI review. Residents also commit to watering vegetation during the establishment phase (~2 years).
- 2025 Applications
  - 54 received, 4 were ineligible
  - 50 applications were scored
  - 2 high ranking applications from 2024 were included in this round (unsuccessful applications are kept in the queue for two years)
- The review team has developed a recommendation for the CSCC that includes 3 options. Andrea briefly reviewed the projects that are included in the three options.

*Options for CSCC consideration:*

- 1: Fund only the top 8 ranking projects, which includes Wards 1,3,5,6. Does not include projects in Ward 2 or 4. This option is in budget.
- 2a: Includes the top 8 ranking plus the highest-ranking projects in Ward 2 and Ward 4. This is overbudget by about \$68k. Still has 86% of projects in medium high or high equity priority areas
  - The Ward 2 project in this option would be Old Ft. Lowell with a EPI score of 1.92
  - The Ward 4 project is South Harrison with a EPI score of 54.49

- 2b: Includes the top 8 ranking plus the highest-ranking project in Ward 4 with a second highest ranking project in Ward 2 that has a higher EPI score. This is overbudget by about \$67k. Still has 86% of projects in medium high or high equity priority areas
  - The Ward 2 project in this option would be South Harrison with a EPI of 54.49
  - The Ward 4 project is still South Harrison with a EPI score of 54.49

### Questions/Discussion

- Marshall – we may not have a surplus once pending projects come in, correct?
  - Yes, this is a potential surplus at this point.
- Sophia – for the Ft. Lowell project: is it possible to re-name a street? Drivers are looking for Ft. Lowell and don't really mean to end up on a neighborhood street.
  - The City met with the residents and they noted that Google also takes residents through Ft. Lowell. They have contacted Google to try and get this changed. Unsure about the name change, but this is part of the problem.
- Ariel – is there an official requirement to have one project in each ward? Do we need clarification on that, it could impact which proposal we approve.
  - Ryan confirmed that there is not an official requirement to have projects in all wards.
- Marshall – is the Ft. Lowell project part of any 411 re-paving?
  - The area is not part of the resurfacing program. The neighborhood may have gotten funding from the Ward 2 office to do the work that has already been completed.
- Zach – on the Columbus project they opposed speed humps, do we know why?
  - Likely just a matter of preference. Speed humps are more effective, but chicanes and traffic circles also provide beautification.
- Riley – it would be good to see an option that is in-budget with all wards represented, but wouldn't stand against option 1 if there is a lot of support for that. Also, the chicanes on Cuesta in Barrio Hollywood seem ineffective compared to chicanes in other areas. It was somewhat disappointing that it felt these did very little to slow traffic. In the future it would be good to make these bigger on wider streets. Lastly, why are the landscaping costs on the circles and chicanes so high?
  - Cuesta chicanes: there may be the consideration of people wanting to park on the road. Can talk to the team about this.
  - Unsure about the landscaping costs
- Miranda - Is there a benefit to completing more projects sooner and going over budget? What is the impact on planning for future years if we go over budget? Does it diminish what we can do next year?
  - Not sure about the long-term budget impacts, but can look into this. It is possible there is a lot of uncertainty about costs moving forward (tariffs, etc.). The majority of projects last year went through quickly because they were incorporated in 411 projects. This year a lot of the 411 work has already been done in some of these neighborhoods.
- Ariel – as the Ward 2 representative I am supportive of an option that has representation for all wards. The project for the last fiscal year in Ward 2 won't happen until 2027. This is quite a while without any of the mini-grant program monies going toward ward 2. Would be good to see an option that is within budget and includes all wards, but know that would involve difficult choices of what to drop.

- Sophia – initially feel supportive of Option 1. The scoring is in line with how we are trying to make decisions on projects. Would like to hear more about the ranking system. A ward like Ward 2 has historically received more funding and infrastructure.
  - The City of Tucson has worked to imbed equity into all projects and has developed the Tucson Equity Data Strategy (TEDS) to help do this. The scoring rubric is based on this data and includes an EPI score (Equity Priority Index). Want to ensure there is fairness and inclusion, using data as a driver of equity.
  - Once general requirements are met, the ranking and scoring is based on data – equity, safety, built environment, etc.
  - The review team does their own scoring and then they discuss. The process is very transparent and fair, based on the rubric.
- Colleen – does the City need a decision tonight? What would happen to the timeline if the Council wanted more information and didn't reach a decision tonight?
  - Residents have been told the decision will be made in April and they will be notified. The next CSCC meeting isn't until the end of April. Andrea will be off that week, so would not be available to present additional information. She would need direction from CSCC to know exactly which applications to pull, if that is what is wanted.
- James – feel supportive of the ranking process, so do feel less attached to all wards idea. The Ft. Lowell project has an extremely low EPI score, and it is very expensive as well. In Options 2a and 2b why did those Ward 2 and 4 projects get presented, instead of other projects?
  - These are the highest-ranking projects in those wards
- James – what happens if neighbors don't do the required watering?
  - If there isn't watering Storm to Shade likely wouldn't take those projects. Normally residents are invested and willing to help. The ones that were installed in 2024 had resident support for watering. In one of them, Manzo Elementary is doing water harvesting to maintain one of the chicanes.
- Zach – Could we approve top 8 tonight and get more information on the impact to the rest of the program of going over budget, and then consider the projects in Ward 2 and 4 next month? The top 8 project's equity scores far outweigh the Ward 2 and 4 options; would hate to delay these. But do feel like we need more information about the other projects before deciding.
  - Yes, the CSCC could do this. The additional projects could also be considered alternates as well.
- Ariel – very supportive of this suggestion. And appreciate the additional clarification on the role of equity in the scoring. This makes it much easier to understand why Ward 2 is less represented amongst the wards. Do the unsuccessful applicants get additional information about why they were not chosen?
  - Yes, they are provided with information about how they could improve their application. They can choose to re-apply with an updated application, or just keep their current application in the pool for the following year with the same ranking.
- Jennifer – historically Wards 2 and 4 have been very well taken care of. Like Zach's recommendation. Also think Miranda has a good point about maybe doing more now, sooner.
- Sophia – reminder that we have been here before when we were considering ranking other projects. We don't have to take projects off the list; they stay on the list and we try to revisit them in the future.

- Anyone who cannot support approving the top 8 tonight? (with the option to revisit the additional proposed projects at a subsequent meeting with more information) → No members had concerns about approving the top 8 tonight. This is consensus support for the top 8 projects.
- **Motion to approve the top 8 ranking projects for the Safe Streets Mini-Grant – Sophia; Second – Marshall.**
- Information members would like to inform further discussion on additional projects:
  - Zach – how would approving the projects in Wards 2 and 4 impact the budget in years to come? Is there a way to forecast the impact of inflation, tariffs, etc.?
  - James – what are the implications for going over budget. Knowing this we can decide how aggressive we want to be. Would also maybe like more info about projects we haven't seen. Maybe we should drop the all wards idea.
  - Jennifer – curious about the Ft. Lowell project. Have they explored other options, like perhaps getting some signage from the City to encourage people to not go down the street?

#### **4. St. Mary's Shared Use Path Proposal - Collin Chesston**

Collin shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here:

- This is a funding request for Prop 411 safety funds for a shared use path along St. Mary's Rd.
- Existing conditions: incomplete sidewalks, lots of driveways, lots of fast traffic.
- This is an expansion of an existing pedestrian safety and walkability project funded through Prop 407 on the west side of St. Mary's between Silverbell and I-10. That funding is to fill in sidewalk gaps, landscape, lighting, etc. It is not a bike project, and it is not for a shared use path.
- Through outreach work the City heard that the proposed path doesn't connect to the desired destination of the Safeway. The idea developed to do a shared use path on the south side of St. Mary's that would also connect to the new HAWK at Cherokee.
- There is also an existing shared use path along Silverbell that could also get connected with an even further extension of the shared use path.
- Initial design concept: Cuesta to Cherokee shared use path
  - This extends the shared use path to Safeway and to the HAWK
  - If the CSCC doesn't fund this, it would remain a 5' sidewalk.
  - Cost: \$107,360
- Expanded design concept: Cuesta to Silverbell
  - This goes even further (full frontage of Safeway) and gets to the protected bike lanes on Silverbell
  - Cost: additional \$250,000 on top of the initial concept (total ~\$360k) – note this is a less certain estimate.
- Safety info: Safety performance is "poor." 53 crashes between 2019-2023.
- Equity info: Project is located in area with highest concentration of mobility vulnerable population.
- Connectivity: there are a number of existing and proposed projects in the area (the Loop, Ontario-Macedora Bike Blvd, Menlo Park Bike Blvd, etc.)

Questions/discussion

- Ariel – do we have \$360k of funding available?
  - Ryan – the bicycle category has capacity. About \$3 million dollars.

- James – the seven-year safety plan on CSCC website says the bikeways category has approximately \$3million remaining.
- Zach – where exactly does the \$250k option get people as compared to the other option?
  - Option 1 gets to the entrance to Safeway and the HAWK
  - Option 2 extends the full frontage of the Safeway shopping center to Silverbell. It is an additional ~800’.
- Riley – I am supportive of the full extension. Sounds like we have the funding. I have spent many years biking in this area. It’s crazy here for pedestrians and cyclists. There are many entries and exits and so many people trying to cross St. Mary’s here. It’s amazing to see this possibility for this area. This is a great project that would be great to see here and in other parts of Tucson in the future.
- Sophia – supportive of funding the full project. This is an important corridor that connects the hospital, Pima Community College, grocery stores, etc.
- Miranda – supportive of funding the full scope. This ticks all the boxes of things we should be doing.
- James – once the design is more complete, if the budget turns out to be more would you need to come back to be re-approved?
  - Ryan – if there is modest cost overrun the City would likely not come back to CSCC. There is not any formal guidance, however, on what level of excess would require revisiting the CSCC. The council could decide to make this a rule if wanted.

#### Consensus process

- Any member not supportive of funding the full project? → No members; all in support. Consensus approval.
- **Motion to approve funding for the full shared use path extension on St. Mary’s – Sophia; second – Marshall**

### 5. Plan Tucson update – Cesar Acosta, City of Tucson Planning and Development Services

Cesar shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here:

- Plan Tucson is currently in Phase 3 of engagement. Community engagement has been going on for over 1.5 years.
- In December of 2024 the Preliminary Draft Plan was released (see [plantucson.org](http://plantucson.org))
- Cesar focused on highlighting revisions of most relevance to the CSCC
- In January the Plan Tucson team got feedback from the community about the plan, including:
  - Goal 13 - *Expand access to high quality transportation choices, enhance access and improve the condition of City streets and other infrastructure*
  - Goal 14 - *Ensure comprehensive and inclusive land use planning for a well-designed vibrant community.*
- The Plan Tucson team has made about 44 policy revisions and 10 changes to the development guidelines based on feedback
- There is now a new policy in Goal 13, based on feedback from CSCC and other transit supporters in the community: *Continuously evaluate transit service provision to identify opportunities to expand the Frequent Transit Network, increase and extend service hours, transit coverage and invest in infrastructure that supports speed, reliability and service quality.*

- There is also a new policy in Goal 14: *Promote a safe, clean and attractive community by supporting the code enforcement and building inspection divisions and ensure compliance with City codes.*
- A change to policy language in transportation is:
  - Draft policy: Improve the road conditions to reduce traffic crashes and improve public safety.
  - Revised policy: improve road conditions **and implement design features** to reduce traffic crashes and **enhance** public safety.
- A change to policy language in land use is:
  - Draft policy: Increase awareness of and access to home repair programs, especially for seniors and disabled residents.
  - Revised policy: Increase awareness of and access to home repair programs, especially for **populations vulnerable to displacement such as seniors and residents with disabilities.**
- Some changes were also made to the Building Blocks and Development Guidelines. Some new guidelines were added to better support accessibility (i.e. universal design and ADA standards). The team also heard from the Dark Skies community, so has added more language about enforcing the outdoor lighting code.
- The first public hearing was held on March 12<sup>th</sup>. Commissioners wanted to see more action items. The team informed them that these more specifics are in the variety of other more specific/functional plans that exist (e.g. Move Tucson).
- The community had comments about undergrounding utilities, urban heat island and ensuring that the Vision statement is more prominent.
- The team is working to develop a website for the final plan where the community can explore policies and see links to more specific action items in the related functional plans.
- This revised draft is a better document due to the feedback from CSCC and others up to now. Thank you for helping to make this a better reflection of our community.
- Next steps:
  - The 2<sup>nd</sup> public hearing was rescheduled (due to not meeting quorum). This will be on April 9<sup>th</sup>. This is a great opportunity to share final feedback.
  - April 22<sup>nd</sup> Mayor and Council will vote to put the plan on the ballot.
  - May 20<sup>th</sup> hope to have another M&C public hearing and vote to adopt the final plan. This will be what is voted on in November

#### Questions/discussion

- Sophia – will outreach continue until the election?
  - Yes, once the plan is adopted in May there will be outreach. Want to get to as many public events as possible to let people know what the plan is and that it will be on the ballot.
- Colleen - Does the CSCC want to take any action regarding Plan Tucson?
- Zach – writing a statement to Mayor and Council from CSCC would be great.
- Marshall – agree this would be good. We would need to get a letter ready for approval at the April meeting.

Marshall and Miranda volunteered to write a draft statement in support of Plan Tucson. Guidance from the group for the letter:

- Sophia – it would be strategic to say something about the funding. We just saw that Prop 414 didn't get passed. Some kind of statement to point out the importance of funding the projects that we dreamed of through Plan Tucson would be good.
- Zach – good to note that Tucsonans have supported funding of transit and public infrastructure in the past (e.g. through 411). It is important to emphasize the goals within Plan Tucson that address these things, and that this can help meet community where we are at. Dreams need to be funded.
- Miranda – agree with these points and can help draft the statement.
- Sophia – we could potentially do a press release as well or write the statement more like a press release. Urge the public to see that the things in Plan Tucson are important and highlight the things in it that are of most importance to CSCC.
- Miranda – Tie specifics in Plan Tucson to the priorities of CSCC and the bigger picture of why these things are important and deserve to be funded.

## 6. CSCC Hub

*Due to limited timing only one-time sensitive update was shared*

- Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) - Zach
  - Sun Tran will have a community meeting on April 22<sup>nd</sup> 2-4pm at the Ward 2 Office that will go in depth on Sun Van's Comprehensive Operational Analysis that could have impacts on service delivery and service scope.
  - Sophia – this is a big anniversary for Sun Tran. With things on the chopping block for funding we should also copy/paste what we do for Plan Tucson and be vocal about supporting Sun Tran as well.

## 8. Wrap up

DTM updates

- April 6<sup>th</sup> is Cyclovía.
- Many projects with public meetings over the next month, mostly bike/ped projects.
- Beginning outreach on Major Streets and Routes update in the next month.
- Ryan will send a follow-up email with more details on all these things.

**Meeting was adjourned by co-chairs at 7:33pm**