

Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) Meeting Summary

Summary of 9 a.m., September 2, 2026, meeting

The meeting can be viewed in its entirety at: <https://www.youtube.com/live/NpZKZ-RMI2g>

Committee Members

Chris Stebe (Virtual)
University of Arizona

Davita Mueller (Virtual)
Sun Tran

Galovale Galovale (Virtual)
Town of Sahuarita

Jennifer Flood (Virtual)
Town of Marana

Jeremey Moore (Virtual)
ADOT

Jose Rodríguez (Virtual)
Town of Oro Valley

Josue Licea (Virtual)
City of South Tucson

Committee Members Cont.

Kathryn Skinner (Virtual)
Pima County DOT

Nadine Manuel (Virtual)
Tohono O’odham Nation

Natalie Shepp (Virtual)
PDEQ

Sam Credio (Virtual)
City of Tucson

Scott Robidoux (Virtual)
Tucson Airport Authority

PAG Staff Lead
Jeanette DeRenne

Ex-Officio
Jamie Brown, PAG/RTA

1. Call to Order and Introductions

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9 a.m., and introductions were made.

2. In-kind Reporting

Staff informed the participants of the in-kind form, and members were asked to confirm their estimated in-kind time for the meeting.

3. FY 2025–FY 2029 PAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #2025.100

[Video Timestamp: 4:06](#)

PAG staff provided information on draft TIP Amendment #2025.100 as provided in the meeting materials. PAG Program and Policy Manager Adam Ledford presented TIP Amendment #2025.100, which programs funding for transit services and programs included in the voter-approved RTA Next plan. Mr. Ledford explained that new ballot items such as streetcar operations and high-capacity transit improvements required new TIP IDs, and that existing services also needed new IDs due to updated ballot numbering. Members were informed that the services provided to the region had not changed due to the amendment. Mr. Ledford also described the treatment of FTA 5311 awards and MOE revenues, noting that both would be programmed in standalone TIP IDs for clarity and consistency.

Committee members asked about spreadsheet alignment, TIP ID labels, and MOE allocations. Kathryn Skinner of Pima County asked how the three paratransit and dial-a-ride service groupings differed. PAG Transportation Planning Coordinator Thomas Robertson explained that they covered RTA-operated Sun Shuttle paratransit, fixed-cost paratransit provided through MTM, and Oro Valley's service. Ms. Skinner asked whether the vendor had two contracts or one contract with separate parts. Mr. Robertson said one contract includes two parts and covers demand-response and fixed-route bus services, including fixed-route, paratransit, and Dial-a-Ride. The costs are listed separately to show how much funding goes to each service.

Members discussed the need for a working session to review cost allocations, paratransit categories, and MOE distribution. PAG leadership agreed to convene a meeting with the City of Tucson, Pima County, and other interested TPC members before September 24 to ensure shared understanding.

Action: A motion to approve TIP Amendment #2025.100 was made by Sam Credio, City of Tucson, seconded by Jose Rodríguez, Town of Oro Valley, and passed unanimously.

4. Potential FFY 2027 Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) Funding – Draft NOFA Summary

[Video Timestamp: 22:33](#)

In follow-up to the discussion at the Aug. 19, 2026, TPC meeting about potential FFY 2027 Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) funding, PAG/RTA staff asked for input on the draft Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) summary. PAG Director of Strategic Planning, Programming and Policy Jamie Brown presented a draft summary for a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for potential FFY 2027 CRP funds. He noted uncertainty regarding federal reauthorization but emphasized the need to prepare so the region could act quickly if funds become available. Mr. Brown shared projected apportionments and

explained that projects must obligate funds by May 2027. Members were informed of eligible project types, and told that all CRP-eligible projects, not only bicycle and pedestrian facilities, could be considered. Mr. Brown also clarified that projects would become federalized upon programming, adding time and cost considerations.

Committee members discussed eligibility for new versus existing projects, local match requirements, and whether RTA or HURF funds could serve as match sources. Paul Casertano, Pima County, inquired if new project eligibility would be limited to design only. Members were informed that it was not foreseen to be problematic but would be incumbent upon the member agency to confirm if they could meet those obligations.

Andy Bemis, City of Tucson, questioned if the RTA would be offering RTA funding for local match for RTA eligible projects. Mr. Bemis also inquired if there was any regional HURF capacity that could be available for a CRP eligible project that was not aligned with an RTA project. Members were informed that the RTA Board had not been officially asked to authorize the match, but there had precedent to leverage those federal dollars with minimal RTA. Mr. Brown stated that RTA match would be possible for RTA-aligned projects, but HURF match would require broader committee discussion. Members also discussed prioritizing projects previously submitted for CRP or RTAG funding but not fully funded. Mr. Brown agreed that this could be considered during evaluation.

The committee expressed a consensus to move forward with the NOFA as summarized. Mr. Brown confirmed that staff would convert the summary into a formal memo and release it promptly.

This item was for discussion and possible action.

5. Request for Future Agenda Items and Announcements

[Video Timestamp: 49:19](#)

PAG staff shared information on grant opportunities. PAG Transportation Planning Director Jeanette DeRenne announced to members that FHWA had issued a Notice of Funding Opportunity for PROTECT competitive grants, with up to \$787 million available nationwide for FY 2024–2026. Applications are due October 9.

****Pursuant to Arizona open meeting laws, the committee cannot discuss or take action today on any matters raised under this agenda item. Under this agenda item, committee members are also prohibited from returning to other agenda items which have been previously discussed and concluded earlier in this meeting*

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 a.m.