



1st Avenue Citizens' Corridor Planning Task Force

Thursday, January 22, 2026, 5:45 p.m.

Donna Liggins Recreation Center

2160 N. 6th Avenue

Tucson, AZ 85705

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Co-Chair Karl Peterson called the meeting to order at 5:52 p.m. The quorum was established through roll call.

PRESENT	ABSENT
Caroline Bartelme	Ruben Robles
Dave Boston	Maxine Dunkelman
Mindy Gutzmer	Marci Caballero-Reynolds
Kathleen (Susan) O'Brien	
Nancy Reid	
Kate Saunders	
Karl Peterson	
A.M. Rivers	
Melissa (Mimi) Noshay-Petro	

2. Approval of September 18, 2025, Meeting Minutes

Karl Peterson asked the members of the 1st Avenue Citizens' Corridor Planning Task Force (1ACCPTF) if they had an opportunity to review the minutes from the previous meeting on



September 18, 2025. All 1ACCPTF members reviewed the minutes and Mindy Gutzmer made a motion to accept, seconded by Melissa (Mimi) Noshay-Petro. All approved.

3. Call to Audience

No comments were received during the Call to the Audience.

4. Schedule Update

HDR Project Manager, Brent Kirkman, provided a schedule update to discuss where the project stands and what has been done to date. He provided a recap of the project's progress, referring to a blank map of the corridor in August 2024, and highlighted everything achieved since that time.

A verbal review of project priorities was discussed. Major scope items include:

- Safety and accessibility
- Roadway reconstruction
- Drainage improvements
- Bridge replacement

Design elements for evaluation:

- Existing conditions
- Cross-section and alignment alternatives
- Constructability and construction phasing
- Right-of-way
- Cost estimation
- Traffic design
- Floodplain and drainage
- Utilities (existing and new)
- Landscape
- Social, economic and environmental

Options were developed as a team, with input from the Citizen Task Force, and presented at the Phase II Open House in October 2025 to obtain public feedback.

The proposed corridor map was presented at that open house and is now under review by the city. Since the open house in October, the city has conducted some design reviews, but little else has occurred, which has resulted in a delay in additional meetings.

Questions from CTF Members

- Karl asked if we were on schedule?
 - Brent said yes, we are on schedule.



5. Public Outreach Update

HDR Strategic Communications Lead Kristi Ross, presented updates on public outreach, noting that a high-level summary on Phase II public outreach was previously shared with the task force and that a full summary with all comments and findings will be provided in February and posted on the project website.

In addition to the outreach recap, she provided the following outreach statistics to the task force:

- Over 40 attendees at the in-person open house
- 968 website views
- 264 online meeting portal engagements
- Portal visits averaged read times of five minutes
- 59 comments on boards, banners, roll plot maps, and online meeting portal

Kristi also presented a few highlights of the comments received during Phase II which included:

- 59 comments on boards, banners, roll plot maps, and the online meeting portal
- Most comments collected were extremely positive and supportive of the proposed improvement option
- Comments by people who visited the pop-up events were happy to hear about the improvements and agreed that safety should be the focus

Questions from CTF Members

- Kate inquired about information presented at the open house and other events that would elicit the positive responses Kristi discussed. She asked whether people were presented with specific design elements they could look at and then comment on.
 - Kristi affirmed that the public was presented with the role plot map and provided a chance to ask questions, write comments on the maps, etc.
 - Kate asked for documentation of the public comments. Kristi noted that all the comments from the public outreach will be included in the full Community Outreach Summary Report for Phase II and will be sent to task force members and posted on the project website.
 - Patrick added that the public has been engaged with the project three times (the first predated the task force). The first engagement surveyed the community to determine preference for a six-lane or four-lane alternative, with an overwhelming majority favoring the four-lane alternative. The second engagement employed the blank roll plot map and asked for feedback around challenges experienced in the corridor. The third presented the proposed improvements to ensure they align with the community's feedback.



Questions from CTF Members

- Mimi asked if the community agrees on the outlined priorities and questioned if they are similar on other roadway projects, noting safety and accessibility as the goals.
 - Brent answered that the Broadway project was very different and focused on improving traffic flow. He also noted that 1st Avenue sections also function differently.
 - Patrick added that the city has some projects on the east side, and mobility and capacity are important.
- Susan added that she felt the most recent open house was done very well, citing the interactivity, and she thanked the team for their work on it.
 - Patrick added that the addition of the online meeting portal was also a great addition and a nice way to include more input from the community.
 - Kristi added that sometimes when we try new tools like the Online Meeting portal, we don't get great input, but this tool has people engaged anywhere from five to fifteen minutes and that is great because it means people are engaged.

6. Design Concept Report (DCR) Review

HDR Project Manager Brent Kirkman provided a high-level overview of a Design Concept Report (DCR), noting that it documents the design process and includes current recommendations for corridor improvements. Upcoming priorities include examining the right-of-way process and how they are impacting property along the corridor. Examples were provided:

- At the northwest corner of 1st Avenue and Ft. Lowell Road, the new right-turn design would impact on the lighting store by taking up a significant portion of their parking area. The team is reviewing plans to address this challenge.
- The team will also be looking more into bus pullouts and bus stops to ensure they are serving transit riders and corridor users appropriately. The southbound stop at 1st Avenue and Roger Road is very close to the patios of the apartments on the bottom floor behind the stop, so additional options are being evaluated.
- Brent discussed the intersections at 1st Avenue and Roger Road and 1st Avenue and Limberlost Drive as examples of intersections that are recommended to become protected with a right turn lane or slip lane. The team wants to ensure this design is the most appropriate for everyone utilizing these intersections and the businesses located near them.

Brent added that the project is on schedule, but the goal is to be at 30 percent design by early summer. Work scheduled over the next six months also includes the following elements to work ahead of schedule:

- Bridge substructure design
- Bridge superstructure design



- Storm drain system design
- Street lighting system design
- Traffic signal design
- Property access design
- Project phasing and delivery

Questions from CTF Members

- Kate asked if the next goal is to be at 30 percent design.
 - Brent affirmed that 30 percent is the next target goal. The project is currently at 15 percent design.
 - Patrick added that the community feedback and comments from Phase II will not be included in the DCR plans. We want to be sensitive to that and recognize all the splendid work the community put into the Open House. With this DCR, we are freezing this for now and advance to the 30 percent design. During that period, we will keep the DCR as a draft document to ensure all requirements are included and that we have updated all our traffic modeling to reflect the results of changing the story.
- Karl asked if the public will be provided with additional opportunities for input.
 - Patrick said that public input is complete for right now.
- Kate asked if there will be public engagement between the 15 percent and 30 percent plans?
 - Patrick responded that there will be another round of public engagement at the 30% percent submittal, but that will be the last opportunity for a major push for public outreach. This is because the project will be moving into final design. After that there will be notifications, updates, refinements and awareness of the project provided to the community.

7. Schedule Update (Key Tasks for Next 6 Months)

Patrick discussed RTA Next. He noted that this information was covered in an earlier meeting but to recap, the project is currently at an existing funding shortfall within the confines of the existing RTA. So, this project has been included in the RTA Next plan to make the project whole. Those ballots are going out in mid-February for a March election.

Patrick stated that the team is really working to get ahead with this project, and it is moving forward as if we will obtain the RTA Next funding. If this does not pass, alternate funding will need to be secured, or the project would move forward in a very different direction and would take longer to complete.



This would create a need for a discussion on prioritizing which sections of the project are most important and how to move forward with limited funding. The team is looking into any available federal funding.

Patrick added that a Roadway Safety Assessment (RSA) will bring in outside experts to review the design and provide a peer review to ensure the team is designing as safely as possible. He has full confidence that the project team is doing that, but it is good to have another set of eyes and noted that this is an innovative project delivery approach. The RSA will look at the 15 percent, 30 percent and 60 percent plans to help the team make some adjustments to assure that pedestrian safety and bike safety is prioritized.

Patrick added that they will send the DCR to the CTF members before sending it to the public, giving them an opportunity to comment after the city reviews the document.

Patrick added that we will have dedicated public engagement to the 30 percent mark.

No action was taken.

Questions from CTF Members

- Nancy inquired as to what will happen to the project if voters turn down RTA Next.
 - Patrick replied that it will make funding for the project far more challenging and slow down the schedule quite a bit. He reiterated that this is where the phasing discussion comes in.
- Kate added that her group, Living Streets Alliance (LSA), has taken a “don’t vote yes” stance on the RTA Next plan. She stated that the group’s stance against the plan is published on their website.
- Karl asked if an assessment had been made of the current bridge structure recently and wanted to know if there were damage and a dire need to address.
- Brent answered that there was an assessment and the bridge has reached its service life. It is safe, but it is not load rated and is structurally obsolete. It cannot be widened and it would cost more to do that than to build a new bridge. In his estimation, the bridge is safe and will last for the near future. Kate added that pedestrians say the need is dire.
- Susan added that bicycle safety is not good, either.
 - Brent affirmed this and stated that if the project doesn’t obtain all the funding needed, choices on what to prioritize will become difficult. He added that RTA Next is not an additional tax but a continuation of the one the city already has now.
- Mindy asked if we had heard anything about the driveway off 1st Avenue going in and out of the farmer’s market.
 - Brent responded to let her know that a right turn only lane would be added there and that the community was incredibly supportive of the solution.
- Caroline asked if there were any negative comments.



- Patrick answered that there were quite a few comments on the online website map with negative comments about the “slip lane” or the separated right turn lanes at intersections.
- Susan asked what they don’t like about these slip lanes.
 - Patrick answered that some people do not think they are safe for pedestrians. He added that this is something the team is examining to identify the type of refinement needed to prioritize pedestrian safety through this configuration.
- Susan asked if the negative comments came from not understanding these right-turn or slip lanes or if it’s just that people do not like them.
 - Patrick believes that there are people who have experienced them and that, depending on the design, they can lead to faster speeds in right turns, making it less safe for pedestrians. He stated the lanes the lanes in question use a more compact design for an urban environment. The right turn lane will not have a dedicated lane to turn into on the roadway, so drivers must yield to traffic on the road, which will help to slow them down.
- Kate added that she has been getting questions recently regarding the slip lanes. She said that Living Streets Alliance (LSA) hosted a conversation with Tom Thibener, who used to work for the City of Tucson and now works in Calgary, where they removed all the slip lanes. She noted that she has recently received letters about the proposed slip lanes on 1st Avenue. She believes they increase pedestrian travel time because pedestrians must cross multiple lanes, which creates a long crossing, especially when there's no signal. She is going to investigate this and probably continue to raise her questions as she learns more.
- Karl asked her, “Do you mean that total distance from like, on Prince Road on the top there (pointing to the image on the screen) to the bottom?”
- Kate answered “Yes, that total distance. Even though there are these other things being thoughtfully implemented. So, I am not trying to discredit that -- like the raised crosswalk and the narrowing of the channel. But additionally, you still must cross like, five lanes.” She asked if there are any case studies that would be helpful in illustrating whether the designs proposed are enough to keep people safe, considering safety is the number one priority.
 - Patrick answered that there was an NCHRP study that came out of Toronto, and the National Cooperative Highway Research Program. It showed that the safety performance of slip lanes or channelized right-turn lanes, when well designed, is comparable to that of intersections without right turns. If you have a regular right turn, because of those additional conflict points, you do tend to see more pedestrian crashes. A lot of them happen at lower speeds, but they increase as you increase distance, exposure, and just conflict points. It is a way to mitigate the impact of widening the intersection to improve pedestrian safety when you add raised crosswalks, which adds another level of safety. You’re going to invariably slow traffic as it approaches that corner. Patrick stated that it’s one of the things we will ask the peer review team, through the RSA, to also look at and



make comments on. Patrick shared additional information on slip lane case studies in other states. He stated that these are great comments, so they will continue to evaluate these corners and make sure they're safe and they are still meeting the operational mobility needs of the corridor.

- Brent confirmed that many slip lanes are used when these types of facilities are designed as high-speed, high-volume right turns, and they are typically at places that have high right-turn volumes to allow for better movement of traffic. The turn lane on the northwest corner of 1st Avenue and Wetmore Road is similar: It's a big, sweeping, circular turn into the bus lane, which typically allows drivers to turn into their own lane. This is an old design for many vehicles to turn right without slowing down. That is not what these new proposed lanes are, and research shows that these perform better.
- Patrick added that there is an overall crash reduction associated with the provision of dedicated right turn lanes, not necessarily for pedestrians, but for all types of crashes. He suggested that members review proven safety counter measures from the Federal Highway Administration.
- At this time, a member of the public raised his hand, and Patrick deferred to the Chairman of the CTF to determine if questions from the public would be taken at this time. The chairman responded that we would keep it to the task force team first, then solicit public input. He asked if the gentleman had a question.
- The gentleman asked whether there was an appetite from businesses to give up any of their parcel.
 - Brent replied that there were a couple of business owners at the Open House event who saw their property affected, and they expressed displeasure with the situation. These concerns will be addressed within the right-of-way process to better understand the business owners' needs.
 - Kristi added that the project is still in 15 percent design, and the plot map shown here is early. She noted that things will shift as input is provided, and the team can work to mitigate some of these right-of-way issues as best as possible.
 - Brent added that early meetings with business owners can become tense, and they worry about the impact on their business. He works to stay sensitive to the impact of the situation.
- Susan asked to confirm that there are business outreach people in the corridor.
 - MainStreet Business Outreach professional Jan Waukon confirmed that their organization is in the corridor. She shared that once business owners go through the right-of-way process, solutions are often found to improve their existing situation. When solutions aren't obtainable, business owners are often compensated for. She also said that the organization's business assistance program will help owners with marketing initiatives.



- Mimi added that she knows about the process of condemnation, but if there's a dispute, they are going to litigate over the compensation. She asked, "That does not slow down the taking or the actual process of installing this new system, right?"
 - Brent answered yes. We can have our right-of-way consultant come in and talk to the CTF and answer questions later. But yes, that's correct. The idea is to come to an agreement. But if you can't, the city does have the authority to take immediate possession and proceed with the project. And then the condemnation proceedings happen separately from the project.
- Kate inquired whether the plan would be an active conversation relative to the Community Corridors Tool (CCT) that was recently passed.
 - Patrick answered yes, this is an arterial, so it's on our major streets and routes plan. All parcels will be eligible for intensification. The city has also reduced the future right-of-way setbacks on this corridor. He explained there will be some uncertainty over the next couple of years about whether they'll invest in this corridor as we finalize and refine these designs and establish the final footprint. Following that, it will provide a great investment opportunity because that width will be locked in, and with reduced setback requirements, they can now opt for that CCT incentive.
- Karl asked at what stage the setbacks are finalized for someone purchasing a property on 1st Avenue.
 - Patrick answered that typically, what happens is they will submit a design plan to the city to review, and then it will be reviewed against whatever the layout is on this corridor to establish an expected setback. If there is a transfer of ownership of a piece of property in the corridor, the team will work with the owner during the transition, so the project does not have to go back and acquire anything.
- Mindy asked if bus stops have been finalized, and do they need to be a specific distance apart?
 - Patrick responded that SunTran typically likes quarter-mile spacing for their bus stops, but they are flexible, and they try to locate them closer to primary destinations. He confirmed that the team will try to co-locate the stops with enhanced crossings within this corridor.
 - Brent added that the bus pull-outs need to be close to intersections.
- Kate asked to go back to the slip lane discussion and asked why this design of a slip lane is sufficient, and that it seems like the project is prioritizing cars over the safety of people on bikes.
 - Patrick answered that he has two preliminary thoughts on her question, the first being that if you provide a right turn lane full stop, you're going to have a conflict. A bike lane is not allowed to run to the right of a right-turn lane, so anytime you have a right-turn lane, you look at that cross happening. The alternative is no right turn. It is possible that refinements will be made to determine whether there is space to accommodate two options for bike navigation at these intersections.



More confident cyclists could continue straight as one would at an intersection, crossing the right-turn lane. The team will see if there is enough space to widen the sidewalks at the approach to those slip lanes and install a bike ramp to create a short run of an essentially shared-use path. So, the bikes could do a two-stage crossing or can cross in the crosswalks, essentially. Less confident people, or those who aren't trying to break their PR in a certain section, can use that option. It is going to be about providing options and navigating those conflicts. It's going to be a little more inconvenient if you're on a bike.

- Kate inquired as to why, if safety is the priority and space is available, can't a multi-use path with a curb be a solution for pedestrians and people on bikes?
 - Patrick replied that what she mentioned are slightly separate issues, and that the project is still going to have to accommodate different users in those conflicts at the intersection, regardless of whether the bikes are accommodated outside the curb or inside the curb. He mentions that encouraging travel in one direction or a bi-directional path with a line down the middle would help to eliminate conflict points. However, that will add additional conflict with the driveways for the multitude of businesses along the corridor. If someone is entering or exiting a driveway, they are normally looking for vehicular traffic, but not always for travel on the shared-use path, so this adds another crash conflict. Another possible solution would be to add a raised bike lane next to the sidewalk. This would eliminate some landscaping, but you would still be putting the bikes in a non-traditional location and creating driveway conflicts. The proposed plan was drafted to keep them in the street under protection in a protected bike lane.
 - Brent added that shared-use paths are typically employed in areas where there is a lot of space and added that bikes go so much faster than pedestrians, and it's good to keep them separate. He cited an example in his neighborhood, a shared multi-use path on one side of Houghton Road. He stated he experiences it as chaotic and that the cars still don't do a good job of recognizing other traffic, like pedestrians or bikes, even after 15 years of it being there.
 - Patrick added that if this area had fewer frequent entrance and exit areas for businesses, it might work, but there are driveways every 60 feet along 1st Avenue. Multi-use paths work better in a more rural environment.
 - Brent added that in this corridor, it is safer to have bikes in a protected bike lane.
- Mimi asked if the website has a roll plot map on it.
 - Brent replied that it does.

Questions from Community Members

A community member raised the point that bikes are so much faster than pedestrians, but cars are so much faster than bikes and expressed that this plan does not prioritize safety. He added that Tucson is one of the least safe cities in the country for pedestrians and bikes, and what the city is doing is clearly not working.



9. Future Agenda Items

Brent Kirkman proposed quarterly meetings moving forward, and Patrick added that for now, meetings will stay monthly on everyone's calendars.

Brent added that Carrie will be the contact to keep everyone informed. Brent then discussed the current cost estimate and presented it to the task force members. In the DCR, Patrick asked Brent to share this specifically. Brent explained the cost estimate up to this point. He stated that they are just under \$92 million for three miles of roadway, a new bridge, lighting, intersections, the whole shebang. He explained that they do carry a hefty contingency because they are early on. The contingency is an additional 30 percent to 40 percent built in based on what we know and what we don't know. This does not include the acquisitions, any final engineering or design, or potential utility relocations; this is just construction. Brent said that ADOT has a very good chart, called the Construction Cost Index (ADOT CCI). You can Google it, and they track quarterly construction costs in the industry. He noted on the construction side of things, they were seeing like 30 percent and 40 percent increases.

Patrick said he is very happy with these estimates and finds them very encouraging. He shared they are carrying about \$135 million for this project right now.

No action was taken.

Questions from CTF Members

- Nancy raised a concern regarding unhoused people moving from 1st Avenue and Grant Road further into 1st Avenue and wanted to know how to get some of the debris cleaned up from what gets left behind from campsites in the landscaping, etc.
 - Patrick encouraged her to make a report with Tucson 311 to make a non-emergency service request that will provide direct outreach to the encampment settlement and then conduct cleanups.
- Jan added that she has encountered challenges with unhoused individuals on construction projects and reiterated using 311. Nancy added that she was more specifically indicating that she experiences them "tucked into" the landscaping.
- Kate asked to know what the timeline is between 15 and 30 percent design.
 - Brent replied that the goal is sometime early summer. Kate said that means if the task force moves to quarterly meetings, they'd only be meeting once between now and then.
 - Patrick replied that they will keep it on calendars monthly and work with the rhythm of the project. If the group wants to meet more frequently and find value in that, it can be done.



- Karl suggested meetings every other month or every six weeks. Brent proposed leaving them on the calendar as is, noting that it's easier to take one off than to add one.
- Kate asked to be notified as soon as information was set for the next public engagement.
- Patrick added that this will probably be around 30 percent submittal, likely June. Karl brought the conversation back to slip lanes, asking if the decision had been finalized.
 - Patrick noted it is still up for project refinement, and the tradeoff between footprint, right-of-way impact, mobility, and safety all come into play. He stated there are many decisions still to come.
- Karl affirmed that it would be helpful to see alternatives to the slip-lane plan.
 - Brent said a lot of discussions on intersections and different alternatives have occurred. He explained that the slip lane is the larger footprint, and that was one of the reasons that they wanted to show that to begin with, because it reserves more space for design.
 - Patrick said these concepts are early on and that they are also talking with the RSA team, to refine that geometry.
 - Kate inquired where the flow requirements come from regarding negotiating the slip lanes and other elements that need to be part of the process. Patrick noted that there are a couple of things to consider: project goals and community input. Some of the goals are to minimize impact, improve safety for all users, and provide additional transportation options. He stated that they are getting back to the functionality commitments that are part of the agreement with the RTA. He said ultimately the argument they are making is that they were able to meet or exceed the operating characteristics of the corridor in 2045 with four lanes that the original ballot passed in 2006, if traffic grows. Essentially, because there was minimal traffic growth in the corridor, they are not projecting much growth.
 - Kate summarized what she heard: The RTA originally wanted to widen the street to six lanes, and the trade-off for voters getting the four-lane option through the funding mechanism was to agree to maintain or increase vehicle traffic to a certain degree. Patrick replied by letting her know that he was unsure what the final agreement was, but it would have been related to the original needs assessment.
- Karl asked how much the bridge would cost.
 - Brent believes the preliminary cost without the foundation is around \$13,000,000 but he will need to confirm. He noted that if the team can get the bridge done first, that would be an important part of a potential phasing discussion. The bridge may not need to be replaced first, but it's a big chunk of money that is being spent early on. If the decision is made to delay that spending by 3-5 years, the price will increase dramatically due to interest alone. A lot of this depends on RTA Next.
- Brent mentioned that there is a siphon to get water under 1st Avenue at the Navajo wash.
- Nancy asked where it would be drained.
 - Brent said it bubbles up on the west side of 1st Avenue, and there will be a new pipe all the way down to Wetmore Road. There is a big drain across the road on



the south side of Wetmore that the project will tap into, and then it will drain out to the river.

- Patrick added that it is all under the pavement.
- Brent said that Tucson Water has shared a big 48-inch water main that comes off Wetmore, turns north and goes across the river underground. It is a 36-inch pipe that goes across the river and serves as one of the main potable water sources for everything north of River Road. It's in good shape, but if something were to happen to it, it would be bad.
- Susan said that means you will have to raise the bridge.
 - Brent said we don't have to raise the bridge. We must put in a couple of extra girders due to the weight of the water. Hanging a water line is not a big deal and they will investigate this. Tucson Water would pay for the line.
- Nancy wants to know who to call to find out where the runoff goes from Kelso and then onto York and into the wash that crosses and floods on Glen.
 - Brent said all that water eventually heads northwest. He believes it crosses Blacklidge, goes into the road and goes up Blacklidge.
- Nancy asked to confirm that it goes on Blacklidge.
 - Brent confirmed that flow goes onto 1st Avenue and then hangs a left to go west on Blacklidge.
- Nancy clarified that she is talking about all the water that floods up in the neighborhoods first.
 - Brent said yes, it is a mess everywhere. Brent said the team has models he can share.
- Nancy said she'd love to see a map that shows where all the water courses, including underground, where all the drainages are and where they all feed into.
 - Patrick replied that she can find that information on Map Tucson. All the street washes, overland washes and underground drainage infrastructure are modeled and publicly available.
- Nancy said, "So I go to Map Tucson?"
 - Patrick said it is a learning curve and I'm happy to just walk through that with you.
- Nancy said, "Ok, good. Because I tried that one time and got lost."
 - Patrick said all the information you could ever want about infrastructure in Tucson; you can find on Map Tucson.
- Nancy wanted to know if the bad roads in Tucson fall under RTA or the City of Tucson.
 - Patrick answered that the local city streets are under the care of the City of Tucson. The overlapping half-cent sales tax in the city, called Proposition 411, is funding the re-paving of every local street in the City of Tucson, i.e., neighborhood streets. About a third of the city has been repaved already and the project will go until 2033.
- Nancy, where can she find that information?
 - Patrick said a website called Tucson Delivers contains information on all the planned improvements and a range of dates associated with them.
- Nancy added that she feels so lucky to be in the task force because she is learning a lot. Mindy asked Patrick if he knew anything about the property on 1st Avenue and Fort Lowell Road, across from Circle K, in front of the Walmart.



- Patrick replied that he is not familiar with that property, but he thinks that Walmart purchased it.
 - Brent agreed that he believes Walmart owns the land it's on.
- Nancy asked, "You mean where the old Chinese restaurant used to be?"
 - Brent said he believes that whole parcel now belongs to Walmart.
 - Patrick said that the whole area is a part of the VIVA (Violence Interruption and Vitalization Action) initiative, which is a multi-departmental initiative under the Tucson Police Department that addresses areas with disproportionate levels of gun violence and works to find solutions.
- Susan commented that it seems like there is a lot less congregation there.
 - Patrick noted that they also closed the park area near the Catholic Church near the intersection.

10. Adjournment

Karl moved to adjourn the meeting; Susan and Mimi seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.