



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

January 28, 2026 (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 5:33pm

Members Present:

Dale Calvert
Marshall Davis
Ariel Gilbert-Knight
Josué Licea
Cytllali Gonzalez
Zach Coble
James Wood
Dario Andrade Mendoza (*not sworn in yet*)
Samuel Paz (non-voting)

Members Absent:

Sophia Gonzalez
Nikita Lindgren

Staff:

James Castañeda
Patrick Harley
Shamara Smith
Blake Olofson
Collin Chesston

Observers:

Ben Buehler-Garcia
Kevin Woldhagen
Vanessa Cascio (LSA)

Summary of actions and decisions:

- *December Council meeting minutes and January Subcommittee minutes:* Motion to approve – Marshall; Second – Ariel. All in favor; none opposed.
- *RTA Next Letter:* Marshall will update based on feedback and bring an updated letter for potential approval to February meeting.
- *6th Ave. Shared Use Path funding:* Motion to approve up to \$200k for completion of the 6th Ave. shared path extension project – Marshall; Second – Josué. All in favor; none opposed.

Quorum was established and the meeting was called to order by co-chairs at 5:33pm

1. Housekeeping

- Ariel will act as second co-chair for tonight's meeting, as Sophia is absent.
- New member introductions: Dale Calvert and Josué Licea. A third new member, Dario Andrade Mendoza, is present tonight but has not yet been sworn in.

- Approval of December Minutes and special January meeting on RTA Letter. **Motion to approve December Council and January RTA Letter Subcommittee Minutes - Marshall; Second – Ariel.**

2. Call to the audience – None

3. RTA Next Letter

Marshall summarized that at the last meeting, the Council set up a subcommittee to work on drafting a letter from the CSCC on RTA Next. The subcommittee met on January 15 and discussed developing a letter that outlines both pros and cons of RTA. Marshall took this input and drafted a letter that was shared with CSCC members last week. He will take further comment and requested revision from tonight and create an updated draft.

A number of questions were raised during the subcommittee meeting. James C. shared answers to these questions, and also shared via email to Council members, with relevant links:

- *Breakdown of how City of Tucson would be allocated potential additional revenue.*
 - RTA Next used a pessimistic revenue projection to form the basis of the program. In each program element, there is a potential additional revenue piece to account for any revenues above this projection. This is in the POPS (Policies, Objectives and Procedures). 75% will be allocated to City of Tucson, up to 55% of the total allocation. Beyond 55%, the City will get 55% of additional revenue and other jurisdictions get the remaining 45%.
- *How much could the City of Tucson collect if we went for a standalone ½ cent sales tax measure, similar to RTA Next?*
 - Example: Prop 411 was passed in 2022, and is also ½ cent. The estimate was that it would collect \$74M annually, or \$740M over 10 years.
 - Prop 411 actual revenue last year was about \$83.9M
 - In 2025 Prop 414 was another ½ cent sales tax. This projection was \$80M annually.
 - RTA Next comparison: The RTA Next plan estimates the percent share of the City of Tucson would be 52.3% of total revenues – over 20 years this would be about \$69.8M annual average. If all potential additional revenues came through, the annual amount to the City would increase to about \$83.1M
 - Caveat is that these are all projections and made using different assumptions.
- *Can the City outline the process/timeline should the City move forward with a standalone tax if RTA Next doesn't pass?*
 - This is difficult to predict. Ultimately it would be up to Mayor and Council how to proceed, and whether or not we would go for our own tax. The minimum timeline required by state statute is 90 days for public comment period before going to voters. However, in an ideal situation that special election would be called with

much more advance notice to provide opportunity for public input and possible iterative revision. Ideally it would be much longer than 90 days.

Marshall screen-shared the draft letter and led the Council through discussion:

- Marshall – didn't like that I ended up using the word "support" a few times – looking for alternative words. There were some people uneasy about this, which is why we landed on the idea of outlining pros/cons. The letter has these elements. Also note, we don't have to issue a letter at all if people aren't comfortable. These letters do legitimize our work and show that we have an understanding of the issues and are able to offer opinions to community and Mayor and Council. If the letter does go forward, the goal is to approve it in the February meeting.
- Dario – how do we define "stewardship"? (Colleen clarified that this usually means taking care of something)
 - Marshall will look into re-wording.
- Zach – if we don't want to say "support," we could maybe say "The CSCC formally wanted to put forward this analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of RTA Next so that the public can be well informed of what RTA Next will do over the next two decades." And change support language in preceding paragraphs as well.
- Cytalli – I would also be more comfortable with this language (removing support).
- Dario – what does the "shift in regional leadership" refer to?
 - Marshall – RTA replaced their Chair, and we think that the collaboration has been better.
- Dale – as a former RTA CAC member, even though I had publicly supported the plan, I would be comfortable if the comment about the support of transit states that it's better than was in the 2006 plan, but we still feel there will need to be modifications in future plans.
- Colleen asked James C to clarify the timeline and when the letter would need to be approved ahead of the vote.
 - James C – the vote for RTA Next is March 10. If there is not consensus tonight, the letter could be finalized in the February meeting.
 - Zach – although the election is March 10th, mailed ballots will probably go out in February, maybe even Feb 10th.
- Ben Buehler-Garcia (observer) – The opinion of the CSCC carries a lot of weight in this community. If RTA Next fails, there will be significant cuts to transit. If you care about transit, that should be high on your consciousness right now. The practical reality is that each individual municipality will have to go out for an additional sales tax vote. Given the mood of the voters right now, that's unlikely to happen. RTA Next is not perfect, but if you care about transit and other things that are important to this group, I would caution you to be very astute about what you do here tonight.

- James W – in terms of “meaningful public oversight”, I imagine people might just say that there are already advisory committees. I think what we mean by “meaningful” is that we can stop bad decisions from happening, like the 2014 slash of categoricals. Maybe we could reference the model in Prop 411, this is what I was thinking of for this. So not veto power over everything, but a small portion where citizens do have a voice and politicians can’t choose not to listen to them. Don’t want public opinion to be our only input.
 - Marshall – so similar to how CSCC works – with authority to approve projects.
 - Dale – a concern with this is that for it to become really meaningful you have to say who represents the citizens. In the example of the Broadway project, decisions were to be made by the CAC. If you have to define something this should probably be the CAC – they are typically built of people related to the project with interest in the project. Not all projects have CACs, but all major projects did, and they did make many decisions.
 - Marshall – are we okay to say citizens should have a stronger say?
 - Dale – leaving it open like that is probably better; too specific may not be workable.
- Dario – prioritizing transit over sprawl is definitely key. Project impact metrics related to safety are important. There are no specific metrics in this plan. We now have some of the most dangerous streets in the USA after RTA 1. For me personally, not having this in the plan makes it difficult to support, even though there is a good amount of funding. I don’t agree about the assumed threat to transit funding – this is not our fault. This is a result of decades of not having dedicated funding for transit. This is a very fear based approach.
 - Marshall – yes, the plan is very focused on road growth, and this group recognizes the importance of transit.
- Marshall – the word “support” does show up again at the end, and I can change that to focus more on advantages/disadvantages. Or I could develop two different letters, one that is supportive and another that just lays out advantages/disadvantages and we could vote in February.
- Ariel – thanks for all the work on this. When I first read it, I felt it was very even-handed, even with the word “support.” It acknowledges the issues. Removing the word support, makes it a less powerful statement. I would prefer to leave it in, because I do support it, as does my ward. We can support it and acknowledge it is imperfect.
- Dale – I will go along with this. Publicly I’ve already written letters to the editor saying I am supportive. I have no problem with the word “support.” I don’t think the word support is negative or positive one way or the other.

Discussion on whether to write a letter in support or not.

- Colleen asked if there are there any members who would not be able to support a letter that uses the word “support”?
 - James W – I couldn’t vote for a letter that uses the word “support.”

- Cytllali – I couldn't support using the word "support." This sends a message to the public that I wouldn't want.
- Zach – I would not support using the word "support," but do support a more informative letter approach.
- Marshall – I can make the adjustments suggested here tonight. Should we decide whether or not to write a letter in support or just advantages/disadvantages and then I can write that and bring it back? Or I can write both and bring back.
 - James W – writing two letters might be fine. But aside from the word "support" I'm not sure what would be different.
 - Colleen noted that three members have indicated they could not support a letter that uses the word "support." Would anyone not be able to approve a letter *without* the supportive language, but just the advantages/disadvantages? (No members).
 - Do any members have an issue with Marshall preparing only the advantages/disadvantages letter for next month? (No members)
- Josué – where will this letter go?
 - Marshall – the intention is for it to go to Mayor and Council, although it seems they may have already formed an opinion.
 - James C – the letter would be addressed to Mayor and Council, regardless of any opinions they may have formed. We would also post this on the Tucson Delivers website, which is a repository of CSCC information. Members can also distribute as they see fit to their own communities.
- Next steps: Marshall will develop an updated draft and also share with Sophia for her feedback. Then James C can send it to the Council ahead of the February meeting.

4. Prop 411 Funding Request: 6th Ave. Shared Use Path Extension - Collin Chesston, DTM

Collin shared an overview presentation. Main points are summarized here.

- The project is just north of downtown. It is very short, and we tried to move it forward with the under \$100k approval mechanism. But unfortunately not quite able to deliver for this cost.
- It is a half-block near Corbett's and Miller Surplus.
- It is important because of the connectivity – 6th Ave. protected bike lane project goes north from here, and there are new shared use paths constructed as part of Downtown Links. Also Aviation Parkway.
- How did this happen? There were a lot of moving parts with Downtown Links and at the same time the Corbett's property was being redeveloped. This project ended up getting cut from Downtown Links and Corbett's stepped up to take it on. But this ended up with some changes to the site plan and some connectivity issues.
- To address the connectivity issues, the goal is to extend the shared use path north.
- Safety issues – it is difficult for drivers to see bikes coming off this shared use path. There have been a couple of safety issues here.

- There is already a 100% design for this. The total cost is \$177-180k. This is a small investment for a big impact, and it can be bundled with larger projects.
- Equity – this is not located in an area with high concentration of mobility vulnerable folks, but it is not a residential area and it is a collector, so there is a good chance mobility vulnerable community members are moving through.

Discussion/questions

- Dario – some context around the budget would be helpful, since this is my first meeting.
 - James C – this comes from the Prop 411 safety component, over which the CSCC has approval authority. Some blanket approvals have been established for lower cost projects, but generally anything over \$100k needs to have approval from this group.
 - Patrick Hartley – there is about \$3M/yr. for this funding category. So \$30M total budget over 10 years.
- Marshall – you mentioned some alternatives. Has the City decided this, or do we?
 - Collin – the two bid options relate to technical aspects of paving. This won't change the substance of the design.

Consensus decision process

- The request is for up to \$200k to complete this project.
- Are there any members who have concerns or would not be able to support? (None)
- **Motion to approve 6th Ave. shared use path extension budget up to \$200k – Marshall; Second – Josué. All in favor; none opposed.**

5. Spot Safety Improvement Program Update *Blake Olofson, CoT Traffic Engineering*

Blake shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here.

- In August 2024, the CSCC authorized \$1.4M for FY23 – FY29 of the 10 year program, and authorized DTM to move forward with small projects under \$100k without additional approval.
- All projects have been near or below \$100k. The goal is to be nimble and be able to move quick.
- They are considering equity – hitting “high” and “moderate high” equity zones on most projects.
- 36% of the total budget has been used to date. This is about \$200k/yr.
- FY25: 5 projects completed. FY26 to-date: 5 projects
 - Mountain/Helen intersection modification, Alvernon/3rd St. Bike Boulevard, Country Club (22nd – Aviation) safety enhancements, Pueblo Gardens (33rd – 34th), Ft. Lowell (Swan-Craycroft) traffic calming, South 12th Ave GSI Islands
 - Permanent Speed Feedback Signs and Beacons installed
 - Created a policy for these signs that includes a scoring system so they are placed where most needed.

- Installed in 6 locations.
- Flashing Beacons – effective at higher traffic 4-way stops. Installed in 4 locations.

Discussion/questions

- Marshall – great to see. Like the improvement at Ft. Lowell and Craycroft. How much are the speed signs?
 - About \$4k each. We try to locate them on street light poles to keep the costs lower.
- Ariel – great to see how many projects you were able to do with the funding. Was it helpful to have the more flexible pot of funding available?
 - Can't thank CSCC enough! This makes us extremely nimble. Our operating budget is primarily maintenance. This goes a long way. To be able to do something immediate is incredible.
- Zach – thanks so much for 3rd/Alvernon bike boulevard improvement. This is a lot easier to navigate now.

6. Safety Presentation Preparation

The CSCC has previously identified the need for a presentation from the DTM Directors' office on safety.

- James C – does the group want an in-person meeting, and what topics would you like the presentation to focus on? Also note that DTM staff are currently preparing a presentation on citywide transportation safety for Mayor and Council next month.
- Members indicated interest in the session.
- Marshall – an in person meeting in March would be good. This was first raised last fall. It would be good to hear how the City is responding to this outbreak of traffic-related deaths, and how do they formulate new plans to move quickly to address issues? It seems there were some changes based on events last year.
- Dale – very interested in this presentation.
- Zach – if it exists, it would be interesting to see data on attributes of pedestrians involved in accidents (in order to understand how many may be disabled people who may take longer through crosswalks and/or not be as visible to vehicles).
- Dario – it would be good to know what are the most dangerous intersections or places for pedestrians?

In-person March meeting - either at Park Tucson or Parks and Recreation office at Reid Park.

- Dario – closer to downtown would be easier.

7. CSCC Hub

- Park Tucson – Dale Calvert

- There is a new Director at Park Tucson. The staff and Mayor and Council took parking rates downtown to a public hearing. They previously approved a rate increase that went into effect next year. There is a lot of opposition about extending this.
- Tucson Transit Advisory Committee (TTAC) - *no member*
- Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) - *James Wood*
 - Met last week. Had representatives from TPD and Sheriff's office join to discuss safety on the Loop. This has been a big concern for many members. Both said that they don't have the resources to police the Loop.
 - Some members are interested in implementing speed limit signs on the Loop. This is based on citizen complaints about e-bikes going really fast and passing people in ways that feel unsafe. This discussion will continue in the next meeting.
 - Also considering writing an RTA Next Letter (op ed, not a letter to Mayor and Council) – the primary concern is around cuts to categorical funding that could have gone to bike infrastructure. There was a presentation from PAG. CSCC had a similar presentation in December. Seems that as we get closer to March, the message is increasingly apocalyptic.
 - Zach – CODI also considered doing an op ed in the past, but City Clerk noted we couldn't do this as a BCC.
- Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) - *Zach Coble*
 - Met last week. Talked with staff from City IT. There is an April deadline for municipal compliance to make municipal websites accessible – the City is making good progress on this.
 - Also discussed priorities for next year. Discussed re-visiting sidewalk accessibility and maintenance.
- Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission (IOAC) - *no representative*

8. Wrap up, future agenda items, DTM update

DTM staff/project updates - *James Castañeda*

- Alamo Wash – first round of public outreach is complete
- Downtown Links – ribbon cutting Feb 20th (tentative)
- 22nd St. Bridge – public open house on Jan 14th; groundbreaking Feb 4th. Closure anticipated starting in March.
- Mountain Ave. bike lane – public outreach event on Feb 7th
- 1st Ave – on track with design concept report
- Bilby Rd – plans are 100% complete; construction beginning in Spring or Summer
- Limberlost - working on final design
- Fairview modernization – kicked off in Dec; public outreach to begin in late Spring
- Grant Rd 3-4: on track to complete in late 2026
- 6th Ave. protected bike lanes – construction to begin in Spring
- Roger Rd pedestrian safety – ribbon cutting just took place

Questions

- James W – does the 22nd St. Bridge closure includes the bike path underneath? (James C will follow-up)
- Ariel – can you share more on Alamo Wash?
 - Some different alternatives were proposed to public. The design team is reviewing these now to understand what is most feasible. The project team will do more public outreach soon to present these feasible options.

Meeting was adjourned by co-chairs at 7:27pm