



1st Avenue Citizens' Corridor Planning Task Force

Thursday, March 26, 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 Ruben Robles called the meeting to order at 5:50 p.m. The quorum was established through roll call.

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

2. Approval of January 22, 2026, Meeting Minutes

Ruben Robles 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 January 22, 2026. All 1ACCPTF members reviewed the minutes, and A.M. Rivers made a motion to accept, seconded by Susan O'Brien. All approved.



3. Call to Audience

No comments were received during the Call to the Audience.

4. RTA next, what it means for 1st Avenue.

City of Tucson DTM Administrator, Patrick Hartley, told the task force that because of the RTA Next election results, the 1st Avenue Improvement Project is now officially fully funded.

Right now, we have completed 15% of the design, and the Design Concept Report (DCR) is complete, and we are now advancing to 30%. We were looking at different phasing plans depending on the results of the election. Those plans included investing less where the needs were less and focusing on the most critical areas of need.

Now that we are approved for \$134 million, everything we planned for this project can happen. Next step is taking this to 30% and then creating our phasing plan which will likely be a multi-phase plan. We will bring this phasing plan back to the task force for input, but our intention now is to advance the project in a way that is most economically beneficial to the project. For example, the highest cost portions of the project, like the bridge, will probably be one phase and then the areas that have the highest cost escalations in the coming year would be beneficial to everyone involved to expediate and advance those sections. These will all be items that we will be discussing in the future but for tonight I think we can all celebrate the win.

No action was taken.

Questions from CTF Members

- Susan asked if the bridge segment will include the intersection at Wetmore and 1st Avenue, which is going to be terribly impacted starting in August?
 - Patrick answered that he thinks that will be part of the discussion as to where those endpoints are. So that's kind of our next decision point. If we decide to move that northernmost portion, kind of how much is it reasonable and beneficial to bit off at a single time as a single phase. So, we want to draw those lines where we are not going to get bogged down with utility and right of way. North of Roger Road and North of Wetmore Road look like those are good opportunities. It is probably going to not just be the bridge alone but also include approaches.
- Nancy asked if the bridge was going to be the first thing to start?
 - Patrick answered that where we are looking right now, that the bridge has the greatest opportunity to make the most sense. We want to do a full evaluation and that is going to be part of our 30% effort. So, over the next couple of months we are going to be looking into that. But in terms of how things are lining up on the project, that is the most probable starting point. But I do not want to commit anything currently until we have done our due diligence.



- Mimi asked if they have built in the cost increases into the project.
 - Patrick said that those cost escalators for cost increases are built into the administrative part of the project. And there are specific metrics that we will be using as those escalators that we will be referring to.
- Nancy asked if the various sections in this have a budget? So, the bridge is number one and then the other areas have their own amounts?
 - Patrick answered so within the preliminary submittal, we have done cost estimates for an anticipation of what that phasing might look like. That might not ultimately align with what the delivery schedule looks like. So, as we make that recommendation for that phasing plan, we will come up with an associated budget or cost estimate for that phasing project.
 - Brent added that it is one big project, one big budget and will be broken into pieces and we will refine that and kind of piecing it together. Each piece will have a budget and then it will all roll up into the whole. That is what we do when we investigate the phasing of a project. An easy example is the bridge. So, say we are going from Wetmore Road all the way up to River Road. That is a little over a mile. That is a very costly piece because of the bridge. I do not remember what the numbers are, but I will say \$40 million. So, if there is nothing in the way, we can advance that piece and do it early; it is simple economics. I mean, you can get more “bang for your buck”, whereas we delay that and push that say we push that two or three years, \$40 million at three or four percent, we typically model for escalation every year. After a few years, that \$40 million is now \$50 million, and that hits that overall budget more. We will be piecing those things together and working with the timelines that are associated with these items. We talk about this project in terms of north of Roger Road and south of Roger Road because that is where the right of way gets very wide. North of Roger Road, we have a lot of right of way and south of Roger Road, the right of way is very narrow, and we must acquire some of those pieces. That takes time. Once that is acquired, we must do relocation of utilities like power poles and that takes time as well. So, if we can do these pieces together, for example, we are doing the bridge and while we are doing the bridge we are also acquiring right of way and getting utilities relocated at the same time. Then as soon as we are done building the bridge we can go and start building the second piece of it. This is the idea behind it at an extremely elevated level. So, we will have to do utility coordination, talk to all those utilities, and see when they can get this work in, when do we have to get this done, etc. It is just a much bigger puzzle making it all work together.
- Nancy asked, “is there a possibility that when you start on the bigger items and then move down to the other areas that we are going to run out of money?”
 - Brent answered that we model all of this. We build a financial plan around all of that, and we build in cost contingencies and risks and try to allocate that.
- Nancy asked, if you run short on this project, are you going to take something from other projects?



- Brent said the idea is we do not run short. We have plenty right now in the budget.
- Patrick added that the budget they submitted to RTA Next was very conservative about this project. We have quite a bit of cushion and we also have that escalation built in if we see cost increases. The challenge with this, and getting to Brent's point, is that revenue for the last couple of years has not been trending equally with cost escalation. As the construction costs have far exceeded the inflationary impacts are on the half cent sales tax increase. So, the earlier we can build, the more beneficial it is going to be to the overall project. We will be in continual coordination and conversation with RTA because there are the overall RTA revenues and projections. So, we will also have to be attentive to cash flow. We do not want to get out in front of collections. There will be a few competing projects in this first period. So those will all be things that we will be having conversations with the RTA in consideration of this project.
- Brent added that the latest projections on construction cost from ADOT came out and the good news is that construction costs have gone down a little. We had been seeing construction costs going up 30 to 40 percent year over year since 2020 and all the COVID stuff. It now seems to have had a plateau last year. It was still escalating but it was flatter at three to five percent, which is more traditional. This is all good news.
- Susan added that the big elephant in the room is the timeframe. Start to finish, how have you parceled out these pieces and parts for it to be complete?
 - Patrick said that we are on track with our original schedule. We wanted to have the DCR completed by the end of last year, beginning of this year. That effort is made. All we are waiting to do is to publish the report. So, we are continuing to track our original schedule. So that is positive. Most of the big challenges are behind us at this point.
 - Brent added that the next milestone is the 30% which we will reach later this summer. And then from there we will move to the phasing plan. For the first phase, if it is the bridge, we can get there in 15 to 18 months or in 2028 we start bridge construction.
- Susan added that she is referring to the completion of the entire project from Grant Road to River Road. I thought we were looking at finishing in 2029.
 - Brent "oh when is the whole thing going to be done?"
 - Patrick said the challenge with completion time estimates is that we cannot estimate how long right of way acquisitions will take. The city prefers a willing seller. When we are doing real estate, we do not necessarily like to acquire through condemnation or eminent domain. So, often we can get bogged down in negotiations, so it becomes unpredictable. We are looking at 118 parcels that we will be negotiating with on this project and each one of those is going to be a discussion and negotiation. We are hopeful we get that first part moving in 2028, But it is all contingent on what happens with the right of way properties.



- Rick Ellis with RTA spoke up to say that during the discussion with the RTA board at the meeting today. They would like all the first phase projects done by the end of 2031. Rick agreed that this was a little bit of a shock, but we need to figure out how we can do this. We will try new processes and procedures, and we will go for it. There is no losing by doing this, just imagine if we can get all these projects done by 2031.
- Susan asked if they were going to fix the potholes on 1st Avenue before we start the project.
 - Patrick said if there are potholes, please submit these through the 311 website. We are not going to neglect potholes. What we're not going to do is go out and re-pave before the project begins, however, the project will replace the pavement so it will be greatly improved.

5. Public Outreach Summary and Design Concept Report (DCR) Open Discussion

City of Tucson DTM Administrator, Patrick Hartley, noted that we have provided the task force with a copy of the Public Outreach Summary for Phase II and the DCR. Patrick noted that Brent did a presentation about the DCR in our January meeting also. Patrick told the group that we are now opening it up for any comments or questions that members might have. Patrick added that we are pretty much set on this overall design, but we are open comments.

HDR Project Manager, Brent Kirkman added that we have also posted the completed Traffic Report on the project website for anyone to review. Patrick added that there is a lot of useful information in the traffic report. He said that we were able to go deeply into how the roadway is going to operate under these different configurations. So, we've documented all of that. It's available to the public. It is all the presentations that you have been seeing during this series of meetings. The report has the existing conditions, current traffic conditions, future traffic conditions, future traffic conditions under a build and a no build scenario. This means if the project is done versus if we didn't do the project. It includes the safety memo, and the peer community case studies. The purpose of this report is to document, show and defend the decision-making through this process.

Patrick added that if any questions or comments come up after reviewing the traffic report or the DCR we can discuss it in a future meeting or you can email one of the team members.

No action was taken.

6. Intersection Right-Turn Alternatives

City of Tucson DTM Administrator, Patrick Hartley started this section by saying that if you have looked through the comments we received in Phase II outreach, you will see one of the main



themes and topics was about some of our intersection design and focusing on the channelized right turn options. So, we want to address this head on and give a presentation on the rationale behind that design decision. This presentation is a deeper dive into the thinking and thought process about the alternative intersection configurations including the trade-offs and the alternatives that are being proposed. We are doing this to share with you and have on the record that we are responding to the comments that we received through this phase and do our due diligence. We want to make sure that those who did comment on these intersection configurations get the full picture of how these decisions are made.

Kittleson & Associates Principal Engineer, Felipe Ladron de Guevara, made a lengthy presentation on how the team has analyzed the intersections in the 1st Avenue corridor and their current design suggestions, including channelized right turn lanes, but not ones that were done in the past but new safer “Smart Channels”.

Here is a list of the topics that Felipe presented:

- 1) When to Implement a Right Turn Lane – the decision to implement a right turn happens when turning vehicles start affecting operations or safety at an intersection or driveway and the main factors that affect operations or safety include:
 - a. Higher right turn volume & through traffic volume
 - b. Higher operating speeds
 - c. Long queues/delay length
 - d. Higher traffic
- 2) Right-Turn Lanes for 1st Avenue
 - a. A right-turn lane warrant analysis was conducted to assess the necessity of right-turn lanes at different locations along the corridor.
 - b. Factors considered included:
 - i. Future Traffic Volumes based on 2045 estimates (Right Turn and Through Movements)
 - ii. Posted Speed
 - iii. Road Capacity
 - iv. Multimodal Operations
 - v. Crash history and near-miss assessment

Results after considering all these factors is that right-turn lanes are proposed only at select key locations along the 1st Avenue corridor.

- 3) Evaluation Criteria – Based on the City of Tucson’s Complete Streets approach and looking at 1st Avenue and Fort Lowell Road and 1st Avenue and Glenn Street intersections.
 - a. City of Tucson Guidelines for volume and turning movement threshold
 - b. Roadway Capacity
 - c. Multimodal Operations and Safety Consideration



After looking at these criteria, 1st Avenue and Fort Lowell Road should receive channelized right turn lanes on three corners of the intersection, but 1st Avenue and Glenn Street do not need any channelized right turn lanes.

Brent added that they had originally saved the space for the channelized right-turn lanes at 1st Avenue and Glenn Street but now that they don't need that extra space, it will assist with right of way needs.

4) Right Turn Lane Options

- a. Standard Right Turn Lanes
 - i. A dedicated lane for right-turns
 - ii. Separated from through lanes by pavement markings only
 - iii. Drivers must wait for a gap in both pedestrian and cross-street traffic before completing the turn
 - iv. No physical separation between the turn lane and the pedestrian crossing path
- b. Channelized Right Turn (CRT) Lanes
 - i. A dedicated lane for right-turns
 - ii. Separated from through traffic by a raised or painted refuge island
 - iii. Drivers wait for a gap in pedestrian traffic before completing the turn
 - iv. Physical separation between the turn lane and the pedestrian crossing path, creating a two-stage pedestrian crossing – pedestrians cross the turn lane first, wait on the island, then cross the remaining roadway

Both options aim to improve traffic flow; however, CRT's provide additional opportunities for multimodal safety – especially given the high near-miss analysis results – and therefore merited further evaluation.

Also, in the analysis they did on the 1st Avenue and Fort Lowell intersection there were many near misses between cars and pedestrians.

5) The Right Turn Challenge Video

This animation video demonstrates the differences that a vehicle driver looks for and sees when approaching a standard right-turn lane and then what they see when going through a channelized right-turn lane.

When a driver approaches a right-turn in a standard right-turn lane, as they approach their eyes, go to the left to look for a gap in through traffic and not look to the right for a pedestrian.

When a driver approaches a channelized right-turn lane, they look to the right as they steer into the channelized lane and see the crosswalk, therefore more likely to see a pedestrian crossing. Then after moving past the crosswalk in the channel, they will then look left for oncoming traffic before merging.



6) Additional Considerations

- a. Right turn lanes result in 14-26% reduction in total crashes. However, when turning right, drivers tend to focus on finding a gap in cross-traffic – not on pedestrians crossing directly in front of them.
- b. Felipe then presented the project goals that were created by this Citizens Task Force and the goals of the project. Number one is to Improve Safety for all users and number two is to increase transportation options, and to provide and support mobility along the corridor.
- c. We are also using the Federal Highway Administration Safe System Design Hierarchy which includes:
 - i. Tier 1: Remove Severe Conflicts
 - ii. Tier 2: Reduce Vehicle Speeds
 - iii. Tier 3: Manage Conflicts in Time
 - iv. Tier 4: Increase Attentiveness and Awareness

7) Evaluating Right Turn Lane Options: Channelized Right Turn Lane Benefits

- a. Simplifies the turning movement, allowing drivers to focus on pedestrians ahead.
 - i. One conflict at a time at crosswalks
- b. Separates right-turning vehicles from through traffic, reducing conflict points at the intersection.
- c. Accommodates larger vehicles such as trucks with a more defined turning radius.

8) Existing Channelized Right Turn Lanes in Tucson

Felipe presented two existing channelized right turn lanes in Tucson.

- a. Campbell Avenue and Grant Road
- b. 1st Avenue and Wetmore Road

Felipe asked the task force to tell him what are the biggest challenges that you see with these two existing channelized right-turn lanes.

Susan said that at the 1st Avenue and Wetmore Road right-turn channelized right turn lane, the cars turning right in that lane have to be on the look out for cars that are turning left onto Wetmore Road from 1st Avenue that might be merging over into the right-turn lane so drivers are busy watching that and they may not see any pedestrians crossing the channelized right turn lane. She added that the merge lane is not very long here either and that is an issue.

Felipe added that also due to the wider width of these channelized right turn lanes it allows vehicles to travel faster, therefore making it more dangerous for pedestrians crossing.

Susan added that there is also an in and out driveway into that shopping center located in the channelized right-turn lane entry lane and this also makes it very crazy.



Ruben added that at the 1st Avenue and Wetmore Road intersection he thinks drivers turning left from 1st Avenue onto Wetmore Road do not stay in the inside lane on Wetmore and move over into the right turn lane to turn into the shopping center driveway without looking for cars traveling through the channelized right turn lane.

Felipe said that is why we created this presentation so that we can discuss the type of channelized right turns we are proposing for the 1st Avenue corridor will not be the same as these current versions

9) Evaluating Right Turn Lane Options: Channelized Right Turn Lane Challenges and Considerations

This slide highlights the issues with the channelized right-turn lanes previously designed as we have shown in our previous slide have the following issues:

- a. Increased vehicle speeds and visibility conflicts for pedestrians and bicyclists
 - i. Usually caused by high-speed geometry and lane design
- b. Multimodal Conflicts
 - i. Varied interactions between vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists
- c. Pedestrian Crossing Concerns
 - i. Pedestrians rely on driver visibility and yielding, not traffic signals, and may be subject to longer crossing distances
- d. Inconsistent yielding behavior
 - i. Drivers may treat the turn as a free flow if not designed properly
- e. Increased pedestrian Crossing Distance and Conflict Exposure – Channelized Right Turn Lane design may increase the crossing distance, but reduce right-turn conflict exposure

12ft Channelized Right Turn Lane then crossing 5 through lanes (12ft each) and then another 12ft Channelized Right Turn Lane on the other side = 84ft crossing distance.

Standard right-turn lanes = 5 through lanes (12ft each) = 72 ft crossing distance

Felipe added that even though there might be a longer crossing distance with channelized right-turn lanes, the research shows that the pedestrian crossing across a standard right-turn lane leads to more conflict exposure.

10) Evaluating Right Turn Lane Options: Channelized Right Turn Lane Research Findings – Felipe said that a few years ago, the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) did a research study on something called the smart channelized right-turn lanes. And what they found is that the smart channelized right-turn lanes can be just as safe as a roadway with a typical right-turn lane.

Motor Vehicle Safety Performance



- a. Similar safety performance as Shared Through-Right Lane (STR)
- b. Channelized Right-Turn (CRT) is safer than Right Turn Lane (RTL)
- c. No strong evidence that CRT increases crashes

Pedestrian Safety

- d. RTL had 70 – 80% more pedestrian crashed compared to CRTs
- e. DRT & STR show similar safety performance

Patrick wanted to make sure everyone understands that this study shows that CRTs intersections have 70% to 80% fewer pedestrian crashes in comparison to RTLs. This is one of the driving forces why we are promoting using these smart CRTs on this project, especially at intersections where we saw a lot of near misses between vehicles and pedestrians. The intersections at 1st Avenue and Wetmore Road and 1st Avenue and Fort Lowell Road are two of the worst intersections for crashes in the city.

11) Case Study: Smart Right Turn at Lamar Boulevard/Parmer Lane Intersection, Austin, Texas

Felipe presented before and after photos of a CRT in Texas where they changed the design from a standard CRT to a smart CRT.

The study they did on this CRT resulted in a reduction of severe right turn crashes by 40% and in total crashes by 47%.

12) Case Study: Smart Right Turn at Northmoor Road and Knoxville Avenue, Peoria, Illinois

Felipe presented a second example of a right-turn intersection in Illinois with an old CRT and after with a smart CRT.

The results of their study after the change showed that there was a reduction in crashes by 59% and up to 70% for older drivers.

13) Channelized Right Turn Options and Configurations

Felipe presented three diagrams of how vehicles and drivers move through the Standard Right Turn, the Traditional CRT and the Smart CRT.

He then presented overhead photos of these three types of right turn lane options.

14) Comparing Channelized Right Turn Options

This table shows the comparison of the four possible right-turn lane design options and the features that they provide:



FEATURE	STANDARD RIGHT TURN	TRADITIONAL CRT	SLIP LANE	SMART CHANNEL
Refuge Island	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Vehicle Speed	Signal controlled	Varies	Higher	Lower
Conflicts Reduction	Low	Depends on design	Often weaker	Designed stronger
Focus	Car-focused	Mixed	Mobility- focused	Safety- focused
Signal Timing	Longer cycle length	Slight cycle reduction	Shorter cycle length	Slight cycle reduction

Felipe added that as you can see the smart CRT has the most features to provide a safer right turn option for some of the 1st Avenue intersections.

Patrick added that the push button for the walk signal will be located on the islands not on the curb side of the channelized right-turn lane and therefore will give pedestrians a little shorter section to cross.

15) Smart Channels: Addressing Channelized Right Turn Safety Concerns

The safety concerns are addressed in smart channels as follows:

- a. Improved vehicle speeds
 - i. Refined geometry and lane design, including tighter turning radii, slows vehicles before entering the turn
- b. Reduced Conflicts



- i. Design organizes vehicle and pedestrian paths more clearly
- c. Safer Crossing
 - i. Refuge islands and better crosswalk alignment provide protection and increased visibility
- d. Stronger yielding compliance
 - i. Marking and signage encourage drivers to yield

16) Refining Channelized Right Turn Elements with the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) 20 Flag Framework

Felipe wanted the task force to know that the team has been refining the CRT elements using the TDOT 20 Flag Framework. This method identifies intersection conditions as follows:

- Scores intersections across 20 design conditions known to increase risk for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Each condition is flagged red (high concern) or yellow (moderate concern).
- Identifies design elements affecting multimodal safety.

If an intersection is flagged red, then it means you need to go back and look at the design and how you can reduce the number of conflicts.

Key mitigations to reduce conflicts at a red flag intersection right turn are:

- Reduce vehicle speed
- Install raised crosswalk
- Implement signal or stop control
- Locate crosswalk to separate conflicts

As the design for the intersections on the project advance, this flag framework will be used to evaluate new safety enhancements and mitigate challenges.

17) Key Intersection Design Elements

Felipe presented some key design elements for making the CRT safer for pedestrians but still allows for commercial truck traffic to utilize the CRT.

A Raised Crosswalk in the CRT further slows vehicles like a speed hump and increases visibility of those crossing the CRT.

Truck Aprons allow the narrower design of the CRT to slow down passenger vehicles but can still allow larger vehicles to make the turn safely.

18) Bike Lane Departure Ramp

As we discussed earlier, how do cyclists travel via CRT safely. We are suggesting the use of a bike lane departure ramp in addition to the standard bike lane across the CRT opening, which puts a cyclist at more risk. This optional bike ramp will take a cyclist to a ramp and onto a shared-use path which allows them to follow across the CRT like a pedestrian.



19) Other Design Considerations

We need to address other design considerations in CRTs, these include:

- Right-of-way
- Drainage
- Utilities
- Accessibility
 - Pedestrian refuge areas designed with visually impaired folks in mind
 - ADA-compliant curb ramps
 - Lighting and signage

20) 15% Design Concept

Felipe presented two images of the proposed smart CRTs proposed for 1st Avenue and Prince Road and 1st Avenue and Fort Lowell Road. At Prince Road they are only proposing one smart CRT and at Fort Lowell Road they are proposing three smart CRTs. These proposed CRTs are through 15% design and along with other smart CRTs proposed on the corridor they will be updated as needed as we move forward.

Brent added that at the 15% design concept we put in these smart CRTs wherever we felt they could be used. But as we refine the design, we must consider right-of-way utilities, drainage and other factors before we finalize the design.

For example, on the northwest corner of Fort Lowell Road and 1st Avenue, putting a smart CRT there would take up a major portion of the business's parking lot so we can switch that to a standard right turn there and not affect the business. These are the kind of refinements that we need to make along the entire corridor.

The summary of this presentation was that the previous channelized right lane designs do have some negative issues, and that is why we are looking at new smart CRTS only. The evidence shows that these are a safer alternative for both bikes and pedestrians and that the project is looking at only using smart CRTs and only at intersections where it makes sense. We wanted to make sure we addressed this because of the feedback we have received in the last phase of our outreach. We will be having continued discussions on this as we move forward. No action was taken.

Questions from CTF Members

- Susan asked when the driver approaches the channelized right turn lane, are they required to stop before the crosswalk?" She added that they could just go ahead and make a right turn and not observe whether there's a pedestrian stepping out.
 - Felipe said yes, that is correct and that is what we're talking about in a few more slides. How can we make this channelized right turn lane safer. Because if we just do what has been done, it is not going to work.



- Susan added that this is the way it is currently at southbound 1st Avenue and Wetmore Road.
 - Felipe said yes, exactly like that intersection. We will be having discussions about this coming up on how we can make these channelized right-turn lanes safer.
- Caroline asked about the design of the Smart Right Turn in Austin, Texas is the main thing they changed was the old CRT was more of a swooping easy to enter right turn lane and the new smart CRT is at more of angle and not as wide forces drivers to slow down before entering.
 - Felipe said, yes, that is correct.
- Susan added that if you are pedestrian standing and waiting to cross in the new smart CRT example, you are more likely to be seen better than the old CRT version. And as you approach the smart CRT turn, you have a longer approach to merging, on the other side of the pedestrian crosswalk which is much smarter than the old CRT.
 - Brent said that the other difference between these two examples is that in the old CRT the right turn lane extended into the through traffic lanes and therefore cars didn't need to slow down or stop and the smart CRT right turn lane does not have that lane and therefore drivers have to stop before merging into through traffic.
- Susan asked if there is enough land at the 1st Avenue and Wetmore and 1st Avenue and Fort Lowell intersections to something like the sample smart CRT in Texas?
 - Felipe and Brent said that is something they must figure out with right of way.
- Mimi added that the design of smart CRT forces drivers to be more likely to be facing pedestrians instead of looking for how to merge into traffic.
- Ruben asked about the size of the islands in the smart CRTs and are they going to be a place for homeless to stand?
 - Felipe said that the islands will be relatively small, and he doesn't feel it will be a problem.
- Several task members added comments that you probably won't be able to stop homeless people from standing there with signs.
 - Patrick added that this is probably true. If the homeless are already in the area, they will probably stand on these islands as well.
- Mimi asked if in the smart CRT intersection will there be enough space for two or three cars to be in the queue going through the right turn lane?
 - Felipe said that there will be enough room for several cars to be in the queue for the smart CRT lane.
 - Brent added that we will provide enough space for traffic to queue before entering the smart CRT lane.



- Nancy added that on the current CRT at Grant Road and Campbell Avenue, she notices that not every driver going through here know that there is a lane for the right turn traffic to enter and stay on without yielding or moving over into other travel lanes so they stop in the CRT and back up traffic when they don't need to. Nancy also asked if there is a button to push on the island at Grant Road and Campbell Avenue CRT for pedestrians to use.
 - Felipe said that there is not one at this point. But this is something we need to decide on in our design of the smart CRTs on 1st Avenue.
- Caroline asked if it is going to be a Yield sign in the smart CRTs on the 1st Avenue project.
 - Felipe said we haven't made that final decision. He would like it to be a stop sign.
- Caroline agreed that a stop sign would be better, drivers tend to not stop or even yield at Yield signs.
- Caroline then asked, "what does this look like with a bike lane."
 - Felipe said, "We will have a slide later to discuss this."
- Nancy went back to her question about people stopping in the current CRT at Grant Road and Campbell Avenue instead of moving through into their own lane. She asked if a turn signal light could be added here to inform drivers to move forward if there are now pedestrians.
 - Felipe answered that typically that is done with some sort of signage. He added that the smart CRTs we do on 1st Avenue will not have a lane for the right turning cars to continue through on, they will have to look for gaps in traffic.
- Caroline asked if there is going to be additional backup at intersections that have CRTs in the corridor?
 - Felipe answered that they are analyzing this to see how they can best design things to avoid too much backup.
 - Caroline added that the alternative bike ramp for cyclists to use to get through the CRTs is a great option for them.
- Caroline added that yes there is a lot of concern about Slip Lanes, but I think there are a lot of nuances when it comes to them. Basically, the negative comments received in the last outreach were thinking of the accelerated-on ramp versus the smart CRTs. It's good to know what the differences are.
 - Patrick said yes, that is what most of the negative comments were concerning, at least to our interpretation of the comments.
- Caroline agreed with that interpretation.
 - Brent said simply put, we are not going to do what is currently at Wetmore Road and 1st Avenue.



7. Schedule Update

HDR Project Manager, Brent Kirkman presented the updated project overview timeline and right now the team is exactly where it should be with the goal of 30% design to happen this summer. Construction to begin at the end of 2028 and finish at the end of 2031.

Brent added that the RTA would like this project to be complete by the end of 2031 and they are the ones funding it, so we need to finish on time. Rick Ellis with RTA added that the project has 134 million reasons to finish on time.

Brent added that part of the phasing for the project will also be an evaluation of alternative delivery. Traditionally the city likes to design, bid, build. Other jurisdictions will do other delivery methods like design, build or get to a certain of the design and then get a contractor on board and do the design and construction at the same time. The city of Tucson doesn't normally like to do that, but he thinks that other delivery methods are fair game. There are certain things that make those alternative deliveries advantageous, or it can really hurt you if you are not ready for delivery. So, that's part of why we investigate all those options.

In the meantime, the HDR team has a lot of work too, and here is how it will happen:

During the Next Two Weeks, Team will Complete the following:

- Address City of Tucson Department of Transportation Staff Comments on the DCR
- Kittleson & Associates will complete – Street Lighting System Design and Traffic Signal Design

In Two Weeks, the team will work on:

- Responding to Public Engagement Comments
- Balancing Safety, Mobility and Right of Way Impacts
- Bus Stop Locations and Details
- Bridge Substructure Design
- Bridge Superstructure Design
- Storm Drain System Design
- Property Access Design
- **Project Phasing and Delivery**

Brent added that he bolded the "Project Phasing and Delivery" because those are the biggest decisions that need to be made.

No action was taken.

Questions from CTF Members

- Susan asked, "so we will see all of this in our next meeting"?



- Brent answered, yes, we should but it depends on when the next meeting is, but there will be a lot of progress. We will be going very fast to get to 30%.

8. Future Agenda Items

Patrick Hartley and Brent Kirkman asked the task force members if there was anything else that they would like to discuss and put on future agendas. No one had anything else to add.

No action was taken.

10. Adjournment

Ruben Robles moved to adjourn the meeting; A.M. Rivers seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.