



## Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

February 25, 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 5:35pm

#### Members Present:

Dario Andrade Mendoza  
Dale Calvert  
Marshall Davis  
Ariel Gilbert-Knight  
Cytllali Gonzalez  
Nikita Lindgren  
James Wood  
Samuel Paz (non-voting)  
Kara Spinney (non-voting)  
Josué Licea (*joined midway*)

#### Staff:

James Castañeda  
Shamara Smith  
Monica Landgrave

#### Observers:

Carissa Sipp

#### Members Absent:

Sophia Gonzalez  
Zach Coble

### Summary of actions and decisions:

- *January Meeting Minutes:* Motion to approve – Marshall; Second – James.
- *RTA Next Letter:* Motion to finalize with edits discussed this evening and send to Mayor and Council - Marshall; Second – James W.
- *Prop 407 funding request:* Motion to approve funding request of up to \$1M to complete the construction of Sahuara and Copper/Flower bike boulevards – Marshall; Second – James W.

### 2. Housekeeping

- Sophia Gonzalez, co-chair, was not present. James Wood volunteered to act as a second co-chair (with Marshall Davis).
- Carissa Sipp should be re-seated again by the March meeting.

- Approval of January Minutes - no corrections. **Motion to approve January Council Minutes - Marshall; Second – James. All in favor; none opposed.**

### 3. Call to the audience – None

### 4. RTA Next Letter - *Marshall Davis*

Marshall screen-shared the draft letter which was already circulated to members. He incorporated the edits that were suggested in the January meeting. If the letter is approved tonight it will be sent out to Mayor and Council. The group walked through the letter on-screen, making small revisions live.

- James C – reminder that the CSCC passes items through consensus, so that is how we will decide tonight.
- James W – instead of saying RTA Next “will” deliver, we could say “may” deliver as we’re not sure. In realistic budgeting bullet, can we avoid the use of the term “ensures.” In terms of local control – many of the objections to the RTA is that it doesn’t provide local control. In the current form there is no formal obligation to listen to local input.
- Nikita – we could specify that control is still not binding.
- Carissa – we may not even want to include “local control” because we don’t get local control in the RTA. That would mean that we can control the monies that go to us. In my opinion this doesn’t give us local oversight. And it doesn’t do a good job of budgeting, because it doesn’t model the use/cost of materials.
- James W – the point of this section is to acknowledge that there are some things that are better than the first RTA, even if it’s not as good as it should be. But the point is it’s better than first.
- Carissa – this should be made very clear. There were several iterations, we should clarify that we are comparing to the last 20 years.
- James W – maybe control is the wrong word. Maybe input?
- Dario – with the first RTA the cost of materials was an issue. The word “ensures” feels less correct.
- Nikita – this is more about using the lower population growth projections; so this is not specifically about the cost aspect.
- Carissa – we can’t say this means everything will be fully funded. We have to remove the mention of surplus. Realistic budgeting is a separate concept than a surplus.
  - Marshall – we’re saying there is a potential for surplus.
  - Carissa – all they did was use lower population growth. Saying there is potential for surplus makes it look like we’re predicting.
- Samuel – a key phrase here related to budgeting is that it “reduces risk.”
- James W – in this proposed RTA there is something that is written down in case there is a surplus. Tucson would get more of this surplus than with the first RTA.

- Carissa – there is some infrastructure in the plan that will go against a John Hopkins study about increased risk with road widening. Would like to site this study to help people understand why this plan doesn't fit with a complete streets narrative. Can send citation to include. Also we need to note that Tucson is now one of the least safe cities for bicycles and pedestrians. This is important to highlight.
  - Carissa will share the citation with James C to share with Marshall and others.
- Dario – perhaps we should add a bullet about the safety element. In adds for RTA Next they say that roads will be “safer.” It's important to define what this means. Agree with citing study or statistics as Carissa mentioned.
  - Marshall added this as a new bullet “Complete Streets Safety Goals” – no one shared issues or concerns with this new language.
- James C – remember that the majority of the substantive changes need to be clear and voted on tonight; very small tweaks are probably okay for after.
- Ariel – (last paragraph) if we are using a strong word like “deficiencies,” and we want this to be balanced, can we use a similarly strong word on the other side.
- Dale – the additional paragraph at the bottom does a good job of spelling out the situation. I agree 2026 is better than 2006, and neither are perfect. Related to the conversation about the collection of the sales tax, where we ended works pretty good. We will either be short or over, and it is a good idea to spell out how the over might go.
- Dario – we could introduce the complete streets policy more strongly (Marshall suggested moving this up in the list). Isn't road widening more dangerous for everyone, including cars? (Carissa – yes).

### Consensus decision process

- Anyone who cannot support the letter as it is now (excluding minor edits)? – No
- Marshall reminded the group about the different levels of consensus we will use. In order to move forward with the letter all members would need to be a 1,2, or 3:
  - 1 = full support (okay to send with the minor edits indicated tonight)
  - 2 = support, but with some reservations
  - 3 = abstain
  - 4 = cannot support
- Consensus roll call:
  - Marshall – 1
  - James W – 1
  - Ariel – 2
    - Concern is that the balanced approach can easily be cherry-picked to be seen as that the CSCC doesn't support this. I am personally supportive as is my ward, so I think we should be encouraging people to vote for it. That said, we do acknowledge there are issues, so I can see the value in the even-handed

approach and informing the public. And I do appreciate all the work that has gone into it, so I won't object to it.

- Dario – 1
- Dale – 1
  - Clarify that I am a 1 for the letter, but I don't think I'll ever be fully satisfied with the plan itself.
- Nikita – 1
- Cytllalli – 1
- This is consensus to finalize the letter, with the edits discussed this evening. **Motion to finalize and send the letter to Mayor and Council - Marshall; Second – James W.**
- James W thanked the CSCC and Marshall for getting this letter completed. Marshall thanked all for their work and thoughts. This is our most complex issue yet.

## 5. Pima County Transportation Master Plan - Samuel Paz

Samuel shared a presentation, main points are summarized here. Project website-[Movingpima.com](http://Movingpima.com)

- This is the first transportation master plan for the county, and it reflects the goals in Pima Prospers and other policies/studies.
- This will cover all modes, and look at the next 30 years.
- Project will last between 18-24 months. Currently in Phase 1 (Community engagement)
- There is a project oversight committee – 10 community members and agency partners.
- Community engagement includes 6 events (one virtual), an online survey and an interactive comment map

### *Questions/discussion*

- Cytllalli – where has the community engagement been taking place, and are there flyers or info to share?
  - Sam – this has been going on for the last two weekends. The first one was at the Vail Pride event at the Pima County Fairgrounds, and at the family day during the rodeo. The focus is on free/low-cost activities in areas where there is usually not a lot of engagement.
- Cytllalli – will community engagement done in previous plans (like Safe Streets for All) be incorporated in this plan?
  - Sam – a lot of the engagement was pulled from other plans.
- Sam screen-shared the project website, that includes surveys and interactive maps
- Cytllalli – how long will the survey be open?
  - Sam – likely until mid-summer, and the map as well
- Sam – many of us who live in the city use county roads. This survey is for anyone who uses county roads.
- Carissa – I see road widening is a priority people can choose. What is the reason for this?

- Sam – our county communities are somewhat different than city communities – longer drives, somewhat isolated. We want to hear from all users. We also have questions on transit.
- Carissa – road widening is more dangerous for drivers too. Did you consider offering an option of addressing congestion, instead of widening. Speed kills. A driver may not know that they are asking for something that is more dangerous for them.
- Sam – this is noted. We hear from county residents on a daily basis for more capacity and wider roads.
- Kara – does the interactive map distinguish county roads?
  - Sam – local government boundaries are included on the map. It doesn't indicate individual roads as being county or city.
- Marshall – how does this fit within current frameworks (e.g. RTA, if it passes)?
  - Sam – the plan is different from the RTA; it is not a funding mechanism. The intention is to set vision and priorities as a community. There is no overarching transportation document in place. When we go for funding or other resources, we don't have guidance in place as to what to pursue or not. This will help with priority setting.
- Kara – note that the project website does not appear to be registered as a government site, so it is blocked on ADOT computers.

## 6. Prop 411 Funding Request: Sahuara & Copper/Flower Bike Boulevards - *James Castañeda*

James shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here:

- Funding request is for the bicycle network enhancements portion of Prop 411.
- Project overview:
  - Two bike boulevards: Copper/Flower – 6 miles from Fairview to Swan; Sahuara – from Glenn to Golf Links (with connections to Loop and Aviation bikeway)
  - Funding is through federal RTAG grant of \$2.43M; this includes a tight federal timeline.
  - Proposed improvements: traffic calming, signage and wayfinding, enhanced street crossings (including conversion of HAWKs to BikeHAWKs).
  - The early estimates for some of the crossing work indicate potential ROW concerns that could impact the federal timeline. A planned BikeHAWK conversion has been deemed not possible due to ROW impacts.
- Safety:
  - Crashes are concentrated at major street crossings. 9 fatal injuries over the past 5 years.
  - Outside of the intersections there is not much in terms of severe injury. This emphasizes that bike boulevards, that use local streets, are often a very safe alternative for bikes.

- Overall the crash rate for bike boulevards is very small as compared to other bike facilities like bike lanes.
- Equity:
  - Copper/Flower – 42% is in moderate-high or high equity index areas
  - Sahuara – 60% is in moderate/high or high equity index areas
- Budget:
  - There is \$2.4M for design and construction. Design is underway. The constraint moving forward is construction.
  - The preliminary estimates are about \$2.5-3.2M for construction. May need about \$100k-800k to complete both bike boulevards with all improvements.
- Why now?
  - Leverage federal funds and layer these improvements with other City projects (e.g. crossing at 5<sup>th</sup> St. and Sahuara Ave). This would provide some costs savings.
  - RTAG funds are on a strict timeline. Would like to enter construction in late summer, and phase some of the components that would be paid for with Prop 411 funding to a later phase.
- *Funding request: Spend up to \$1M to complete construction of Sahuara an Copper/Flower bike boulevards, using a phased construction approach.*

#### Questions/discussion

- Marshall – for Sahuara, is there any thought of ending this at Glenn and Swan so people can get the bike path there?
  - James C - The east end point of this is at Swan/St. Carlos place. There is a neighborhood here and Crossroads Festival is across the street. Further extension east is constrained by this development.
  - Patrick – there is a similar project on Columbus now, so there would be the option to turn north here. The HAWK at Crossroads would also benefit pedestrians trying to access this shopping center.
  - Marshall – Grant/Swan is already precarious, and trying to add a HAWK here could get squirrely. Going to Glenn might be helpful.
  - James C – we did hear concerns about this crossing during community engagement. This is why we are considering if a HAWK at this east end makes sense, or if we can potentially revisit the ROW and reconfigure.
- Marshall – recommend digging tunnel under Golf Links, and not crossing here. People routinely go very fast here.
  - James C – yes, we do recognize that Golf Links is a precarious road to cross.
- James W – as BAC representative, I’ve been asked to request that bike boulevard decisions/designs come to the BAC for discussion. Could someone attend the next BAC meeting?
  - James C – we are not at final design yet, and are happy to bring something to BAC for more information.

- Dale – on 5<sup>th</sup>/Sahuara, the area west of here has serious long-term flooding issues, creating issues for bikes. The pavement here historically doesn't survive between re-paving. Have you considered taking it east of the school, instead of down 5<sup>th</sup> St?
  - James C – with bike boulevards there is not funding to work on drainage, although the issue is known. There is an existing HAWK here that would be converted, so moving this would require additional funds. We did consider this, but settled on this configuration due to budget. The approach for the crossing at Chantilly is a concrete section, in recognition of the water damage issue there. There is coordination between the two projects.
- Dale – at Broadway/Park Place mall signal – is the idea that the bike path runs along the west side of street and goes into residential streets?
  - James C - the initial plan is to move people through the residential street, circumventing the existing park on the outside of the mall. This is not yet final.
- Nikita – I use the Copper bike boulevard daily. We've been told in the past that a raised crosswalk isn't possible on larger streets, but is it possible to include this at HAWKs at smaller roads?
  - James C – the initial plan doesn't include raised crosswalks, but does include intersection enhancement at collector streets. While this doesn't include HAWKs, it does include additional safety elements. No speed tables are proposed as crosswalks.
  - Patrick –Typically this type of treatment for collector streets is determined on a case by case basis, not a hard and fast rule as it is for arterials.
- Carissa – I use the Sahuara route daily. Crossing at Wilmot/Broadway is a concern, this is one of the most dangerous crossings in Tucson. While I want the HAWK, I am concerned – is there anything additional that can be done here for safety? Cars just blow through these.
  - James C – on Broadway we would tie into the full signal here. Preliminary designs are looking at reconfiguring the intersection and time the signals for safer crossing. On Speedway, the HAWK here is addressing a known safety concern in this area. HAWKs have proven, overall, to be a safe mechanism. We haven't looked at anything different at Speedway.
  - Carissa - Broadway from Craycroft to Wilmot is very scary for pedestrians and bikes. Hope we can do something different in the future; glad we are improving Sahuara.
- Dario – is the \$900k remaining of uncommitted just for this year?
  - James C - This is just for the bike category, and for the first 7 years (ending in 2030).
  - Patrick – this is just the remaining capacity, there are ~25 projects moving with these funds. It is \$3M a year for 10 years. Most of this has already been programmed.

### *Consensus decision process*

Funding request: Spend up to \$1M to complete construction of Sahuara and Copper/Flower bike boulevards, using a phased construction approach.

- Are there any members who are not supportive? – None
- All members indicated nod for agreement.
- **Motion to approve the funding request to complete the construction of Sahuara and Copper/Flower bike boulevards – Marshall; Second – James W.**

## **7. CSCC Hub**

- Park Tucson – Dale Calvert
  - No meeting; no update
- Tucson Transit Advisory Committee (TTAC) - *no member*
- Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) - *James Wood*
  - Met last week. They couldn't decide on RTA Next, so will not do anything on this.
  - Two members recently sat and observed the bike boulevard at Speedway and Main Gate. It gets blocked up a lot of the time with vehicles stopping, dropping off. They are looking into this.
  - They are tracking SB1008 – a bill about a universal bike speed limit. BAC is very against this.
- Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) – *Zach absent*
- Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission (IOAC) - *no representative*

## **8. Wrap up, future agenda items, DTM update**

DTM staff/project updates - *James Castaneda*

- Alamo Wash project – upcoming opportunities for public input: tomorrow at Ward 6 and March 4<sup>th</sup> at Ward 2.
- Started construction for new signalized pedestrian crossing at 2<sup>nd</sup>/Euclid. Part of larger package with 16 HAWK crossings.
- Downtown Links – timeline has been pushed out; no date to announce yet.
- 22<sup>nd</sup> St. Bridge – groundbreaking on Feb 4<sup>th</sup>. Anticipate closure starting March 3<sup>rd</sup>. It will impact Aviation bikeway – still working out details; DTM will provide alternatives and wayfinding.
- 1<sup>st</sup> Ave – DTM staff are reviewing the design concept report. Have applied for an additional grant for \$25M to supplement the bridge over the Rillito.
- Bilby – still working on ROW. Hoping to start construction in summer.
- Limberlost – working on final designs.
- Fairview Ave. – public outreach not yet scheduled; hopefully in spring.
- Grant at Union Pacific Railroad approaching I-10: this will include a closure of Grant for a period of time; working on expedited schedule. Coordinating with casino.

- A number of Prop 407 bike boulevards are going into construction later this year.

*Questions/discussion*

- Nikita – we're spending about \$5M for the signalized crossing by the university at the site of that horrible tragedy. Just pointing out that this would not have prevented what happened. That whole road design is difficult.
- Nikita – RTA includes an item on modernizing intersections. Does this include license plate readers?
  - Patrick – this is for converting intersections to allow adaptive signaling, protected left at peak hours and flashing yellows. This does include camera equipment, but this is to help with signal operations and they are maintained by City of Tucson.

Next meeting topics:

- March meeting will be in-person at Parks and Recreation office. There will be a presentation from DTM Director's office to talk about safety.
- Ariel – would like another budget update, maybe closer to end of fiscal year

**Meeting was adjourned by co-chairs at 7:41pm**