



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

April 22, 2026 (5:30-7:30pm)

Zoom



Quorum was established and the meeting was called to order by co-chairs at
5:39pm

Members Present:

Dario Andrade Mendoza
Marci Caballero-Reynolds
Dale Calvert
Vanessa Cascio
Zach Coble
Marshall Davis
Ariel Gilbert-Knight
Sophia Gonzalez
Josué Licea
James Wood
Samuel Paz (non-voting)
Kara Spinney (non-voting)

Members Absent:

Nikita Lindgren
Cytllali Gonzalez
Raul Berrellez

Staff:

James Castaneda
Lydia Barker
Ben Elias
Aliz Potucek
Shamara Smith
Andrea Altamirano
Monika Landgrave

Observers:

Jonathan Crowe (Pima County DOT)
Kylie Walzak
Stacy Balstad
Suzanne Schafer
Gabriel Holguin
Laura Horley
CS
Jennifer

Facilitation/documentation:

Tahnee Robertson
Colleen Whitaker

Summary of actions and decisions:

- *March Meeting Minutes*: no corrections. Motion to approve – Marshall; second – Sophia.
- *Sidewalk spot repairs*: Motion to approve funding request - Marshall; Second - Sophia. Motion to approve framework with discussed additions/recommendations - Sophia; Second - Marshall.
- *Safe Streets Mini-grant* Motion to approve the proposed list of 8 projects - Sophia; Second - Marshall

2. Housekeeping

- Approval of March Minutes. No corrections. **Motion to approve March Minutes - Sophia; Second - Marshall. All in favor, none opposed.**
- Ben Elias introduced himself as the new staff liaison. He is a Project Manager with Planning and Programming Division and a 7th generation Tucsonan. He has been involved in advocacy in mobility space in a number of ways over the years.

- New CSCC member Caballero-Reynolds - Marci is a graduate student in Urban Planning, is part of Radical Adventure Riders (bike advocacy), and on the 1st Ave. Citizens Task Force.

3. Call to the audience - None

4. Citywide Sidewalk Repair Project - James Castañeda / Lydia Barker

James and Lydia shared a presentation. Main points are summarized here.

- Request is for \$1M to complete sidewalk repairs on arterial or collector streets across town. This is the follow-up on this item, to answer questions that CSCC members had during the February meeting.
- One question from the CSCC was what are underlying causes of sidewalk damage.
 - There are three primary causes: tree roots, heat heave, and vehicle damage (at driveways). James shared photographs of each type. Overall the city sidewalk system is very old. When there are reports of issues, a staff member goes to assess.
- Another question: Can the panels be re-used?
 - Typically not, due to compromised structure with existing panels. But they can be recycled.
- Another question: Can adjacent broken sidewalks be repaired at same time?
 - Yes, at the direction of CSCC, the City can instruct crews to repair all broken sidewalks to the next intersection, or a logical break point, to ensure connectivity. They can also give crews discretion to complete repairs within a similar location all at once, even if in a different prioritized tier.
- Another question: Can the City confirm that the locations being repaired haven't received previous repairs?
 - The City identified one potential "repeat offender" request in the downtown area due to a tree lifting the sidewalk.
- Prioritization Framework
 - Includes - Equity (35%), Safety (30%), Built environment/road design (20%), Date of complaint (10%) and Resilience (5%)
 - The city created 4 different tiers - each have about 23 requests.
- *CSCC funding request: Approval of \$1M of 411 Safety Funds from Pedestrian Safety Improvements for sidewalk spot repairs, and a framework for prioritizing spot repairs.*

Questions/discussion:

- Marshall - on the map, it looks like some that are on top of each other are ranked differently. And if there is a valid detour did this weigh in to ranking?
 - Lydia - the map makes it look like they are on top of each other, but they aren't.
 - James - alternative routing was not considered, but at the direction of CSCC we could work this in.
- Sophia - how many panels of sidewalk would be included within the priority list? In the framework do we have ridership numbers on transit routes that can be considered as part of this priority? Is it more strategic to prioritize arterials and make them continuous due to high ridership, etc.?
 - James - There are 132 requests, but we don't have a quick way of knowing how many panels this would include. At a minimum it would be 132, but could be more. We could dig into this more if wanted. We can cautiously say we can repair all 132 requests with this funding request.

- Zach - even if not all panels are on arterials, many would be, or on collector streets that are close to arterials. Creating connections from collectors to arterials is important for ADA users so they don't have to go on the street. In terms of alternate routes, a straight line is best for ADA users. If we repair these panels, how much does this enhance continuous sidewalk (e.g. what is the total number of meters or miles of continuous created)?
 - James - we don't have the number of continuous sidewalk after repairs, but we could gather this data. These damaged locations are creating a barrier for connectivity.
- Ariel - what are pros/cons of the CSCC directing the City to repair nearby issues at same time?
 - James - there would be efficiencies for mobilization. Repairing one if there is another one damaged nearby that wasn't reported doesn't get us what we want. There could be some budget constraints using this approach, however. Our goal would be to complete all 132 in list. The City could report back to CSCC at different milestones.
- Marci - is there a phased approach about where to start?
 - James - not sure we have gotten into that part of implementation too much yet. If CSCC wants a phased approach we can work within this guidance.
 - Ben - when we are in construction phase, if we are repairing a roadway we leave work to be done all at once on one side of the street. This works better for detours. There are some small things we can do in the implementation to reduce the strain on traveling public.
- Carissa - in the areas where there is damage in front of a businesses, do they own part of that sidewalk? Is there a shared responsibility?
 - James - in Chapter 25 of the City Code there is language about maintenance responsibilities - it is the responsibility of the adjacent property owner to maintain sidewalks in the ROW. So many, if not all of these locations, would constitute a Chapter 25 violation. But the impetus of this program is looking at the back log of these requests, and recognizing the impact this has on the community. Given how long it might take to implement the Chapter 25 violations, this would be a faster way to implement the repairs.
 - Ben - in one project example there were many deficient sidewalks, and many driveways that were part of this. Some of the funding came from a pedestrian safety and walkability project, with safety funding layered on top. We discovered a couple panels where the process to notify adjacent property owner had begun, but the owner was struggling financially to repair the panel. We are looking to address issues as quickly as we can.
- Sophia - how complete is the data? Kleindale is not an arterial street, although it is listed this way. It would also be good to have an overlay from SunTran that shows the routes with highest ridership. Would Council be interested in flagging a number of arterials that are the worst and should get preferential treatment to create a continuous line of sidewalk?
- Carissa - I don't want us to spend all our money on a business that can afford it, versus an individual who can't.
 - Ben - in the previous example shared, it was a property owner who lived on the street and also ran a business on the street. They were constrained due to the amount of frontage and the damage in multiple sections. Definitely understand concern of undue financial burden being paid by tax payers. When things aren't advancing through the court process, it is often an equity issue. We look at safety as a public benefit, and try to resolve the situation as soon as possible.

- Sophia - I thought we decided from our last meeting that we would prioritize arterials as major connectors for pedestrians. I'd like to know if everyone sees it that way or has other perspectives.
- Ariel - is there any way this could be perceived as giving a free pass to those property owners not doing their duty? Do we know if these have been contacted?
 - James - we don't know if these owners have been contacted or Chapter 25 initiated. We can come back with this information if CSCC would like.
 - Ariel – I see the value in addressing problems quickly, but am somewhat uncomfortable repairing things that should be the business owners responsibility.
- Zach - there was a previous effort to try and do some cost-sharing on these issues. This is a long standing problem. Roads and crosswalks are part of public infrastructure. As a sidewalk user these are just as important in terms of public infrastructure. Don't want to reward non-local businesses, but sidewalks are public infrastructure, regardless of the intent of Chapter 25.
 - James - believe the previous project mentioned is now complete and funds have been exhausted.
- Carissa - Completely agree with Zach.

Consensus Decision Process

- Sophia - there are still some questions about the framework
- Marshall - what if we approve a part of the funding now to see how it goes? E.g. \$200k and look at Tier 1 or 2?
- James W – I was ready to support last month, and am still ready to support as is. This is just a small list of the giant list of problems in our sidewalk network. I trust the algorithm and the people that came up with this list. We could go back and forth all day to get it perfect. Chapter 25 has costs associated as well that tax payers have to bare. We have a good reason to trust that this list is good enough. BAC will also want to get this passed as soon as possible to get repairs going.
- Josue - second James comments

The decision was taken in two parts:

- Part 1 – The funding request of \$1M: All members showed “thumbs up” (support) for approving the funding. **Motion to approve funding request - Marshall; Second - Sophia. All**
- Part 2 – Approval of the framework. After some discussion the group also agreed to approve the framework, with some additional guidance and a subcommittee that would work on further specific recommendations - **Motion to approve framework with discussed additions - Sophia; Second - Marshall.**
- Additional recommendations at this point:
 - include guidance that crews could also repair nearby segments when working on a segment identified through the framework.
 - Explore development of a list of top arterial streets for these treatments
 - Ben noted that the framework does not currently call out the prioritization of arterials, but of the resulting Tier 1 projects only 2 are on collectors. So the way this is applied, the resulting highest priority locations are on the arterial network. This changes further down the tiered prioritization list.
 - Lydia suggested that ridership information could be provided to CSCC to help inform this discussion.

5. Safe Streets Mini-Grant Application Review - *Andrea Altamirano*

Andrea shared a presentation, main points are summarized here:

- Program overview
 - Program is funded by Prop 411. Annually there is \$450,000 available.
 - Each can receive up to \$75,000 in funding.
 - The purpose is to develop a community led process with a focus on under-resources areas.
 - Projects are evaluated by staff and final recommendations are approved by CSCC.
 - The program is currently in Round 4. The deadline for applications each year is Dec 31.
- Evaluation Process
 - Those that are not selected remain in the queue for up to two years, and can be revised and re-submitted.
 - Projects must be on city-owner residential streets (local streets, not collector or arterials).
 - Safety and equity are weighted mostly highly. PAG information is used for safety.
 - Applications are evaluated for eligibility, and then passed to City's Safe Streets Mini Grant Review Committee for scoring.
 - The final stage of approval is CSCC review and approval.
- Implementation - coordinated with other DTM staff, 411 repaving program, etc.
- Budget report
 - In 2025: Approved - \$448k, Actual costs - \$451k
- Projects completed: 2024 - 11, 2025 - 9
- All traffic calming features that have been installed can be found on the safe streets mini-grant website.
- 2026 Budget Considerations
 - Need to add up to \$5k for vegetation in traffic circles and chicanes.
 - Have created an agreement with residents to commit to watering vegetation during the first two years. This has been working well, although some opted out to participate with other programs.
- 2026 Applications
 - 54 received. 8 were not eligible or withdrawn
 - 1 reapplication was selected after improving their proposal
- 2026 Recommendations
 - Total - 8. 100% are in high TEPI areas and aligned with criteria

Neighborhood	Ward	TEPI (equity) Score	Traffic Mitigation Features Requested	Estimated Cost	Status
*National City NW	1	High 100.00	2 Forced intersections	\$60,000	Contingent – alt funding
Bronx Park	3	High 93.27	Traffic circle + speed humps	\$75,000	Recommended
Rose	1	High 94.51	3 speed humps + 1 traffic circle	\$64,500	Recommended
Rose	1	High 97.01	Traffic circle + 2 speed humps	\$57,000	Recommended
Miracle Manor	3	High 100.00	1 speed hump	\$7,500	Recommended
National City NW	1	High 81.80	1 Traffic circle	\$42,000	Recommended
Campus Farm (Reapply)	3	High 94.51	Traffic circle + 3 speed humps	\$72,000	Recommended
Avondale	6	High 83.79	Traffic circle + 4 speed humps	\$72,000	Recommended
Sunnyside	5	High 97.40	8 speed humps	\$60,000	Alternate (same cost)
Estimated Total	\$450,000				

-
- The National City NW project is contingent, as funding may have been identified elsewhere. The alternate would be Sunnyside neighborhood - this is a one to one swap (no budget impact).
- There are two applications for Rose neighborhood and National City NW.
- Future Considerations
 - When scores are comparable, consider funding projects in different areas of the city
 - Avoid over-concentration of multiple projects in the same neighborhood when appropriate.
- Program Improvements
 - Landscaping Enhancement - want to pivot and work more with landscape architect at City to improve plant selection and design approach. Prioritize native and climate-appropriate plants

Request to CSCC: Approve recommended project list and authorize \$450k in Safe Streets Mini-Grant funding

Questions/discussion:

- Dario - where is the Campus Farm project traffic circle?
 - North Tyndall/Pastime
- Vanessa - would like to see the full list of applicants. Just thinking about how competitive this program is. How do we really invest in traffic calming that is arguable so needed?
 - Ben - a great comment and may be related to a staff update near the end of the meeting
 - Andrea - we don't have the budget for all applications submitted, but the number of applications does demonstrate the need.
- Carissa - do we have a map of where the projects have been applied over the last few years?
 - Ben - we can certainly work with our data on hand to provide maps or visual aids for the CSCC and general public
- Sophia - ready to approve these projects. Would be great next time to hear lessons learned
- Laura Holey (observer)- can we see a list of those that didn't make the cut?
 - The next three in the queue: Barrio Blue Moon, Keeling, Garden District

- Ariel - I would also like to see the full list of applications. Just as a follow up item, not affecting my support for the funding request
- Marci - It would also be good to see a map where funding hasn't been given to see gaps
- Carissa - for follow up I would like to understand more about the weighting and how effective it is

Consensus Process

- Anyone not able to support approval of the 8 projects for \$450k? (and if National City is funded, we would swap in Sunnyside) - all thumbs up. Consensus approval.
- **Motion to approve these 8 projects - Sophia; Second - Marshall**

6. CSCC Hub

- Park Tucson - *Dale Calvert*
 - No meeting since last CSCC meeting
- Tucson Transit Advisory Committee (TTAC) - *no member*
- Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) - *James Wood*
 - Safety on the Loop keeps coming up. Haven't decided on recommendations to make yet. TPD has said they don't have the capacity to police this.
 - Tracking SB1008 - have reached out to Cavanagh. It is a 15mph for cycles state-wide. BAC is against this.
- Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) - *Zach Coble*
 - Focused on drafting a memo on possible updates to single family home regulations. Also focused on engaging with proposed increased park fees.
- Independent Oversight and Accountability Commission (IOAC) - *Dale Calvert*
 - Special meeting last night regarding the RTA plan of \$140M for arterial and collector rehabilitation.
 - Adopted a list of 32 roadway segments that should be considered. The list is intentionally flexible so it can be modified if needed.
 - Adopted plan for expenditures during FY27 on 6 roadways to spend about \$28M to rehab asphalt surface. Restriping is also a potential treatment. Alvernon, Irvington, Kolb, Silverbell, Swan, Wrightstown/Harrison

7. Wrap up

DTM update - *Ben Elias*

- At the April 21st Mayor and Council Study Session, they adopted a recommendation that CSCC be one of the bodies reviewing and recommending projects for RTA Next buckets of funding.
 - \$10M - completion of RTA 1 greenways, pathways, bikeways and sidewalks
 - \$100M - safety and active transportation projects (this may increase depending on actual collected sales tax).
 - \$30M for traffic signal upgrades
- IOAC will also consider projects in other categories.

Future agenda topics:

- Josue - when new roads are being developed, could we talk about why we use the taller curbs that are hard to walk/bike over, instead of the slant curbs?

Meeting was adjourned by the co-chairs at 7:31pm