Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)
Project Prioritization Subcommittee
Thursday, February 18, 2021 5:00 p.m.
Virtual Meeting

Legal Action Report

Present: Colby Henley, Stacy Rodenberg, Ruth Reiman, Craig McCaskill, Jill Brammer, Rod Lane (non-voting), Jonathan Crowe (non-voting)

Absent: Derek Brown

In the Audience and City Staff: Tahnee Robertson, Paul Casertano, Robin Raine, Andrew Bemis, Patrick Hartley, Colleen Whitaker, Jennifer Toothaker, Erin David, Jean Crowther

1. *Call to Order/Introductions*
   A quorum was established. **Ruth Reiman called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.**

2. Ratification of Legal Action taken on Tuesday, February 09, 2021 at the Complete Streets Coordinating Council Move Tucson Project Prioritization Subcommittee

   The following is a record of the discussions that took place at the February 09 meeting. The CSCC Subcommittee move to ratify the discussion.

   2. Presentation: Prioritization Framework Erin David, Alta
      Erin gave an overview of the prioritization framework, and also referred to the Draft Prioritization Framework Memo which was shared with all members. The presentation was also provided at the full CSCC meeting on 1/27. Main points are captured here, along with questions and discussion by subcommittee members.
      Process overview
      The proposed process involves 5 main steps:
      1. Identify projects
      2. Measure the network
      3. Apply network scores to projects
      4. Calibrate projects scores
      5. Compile scores, create phasing plan
      Questions/Discussion
      ● Ruth - will every road in Tucson be scored? How does that work?
      ○ Erin - Yes. Using data that has informed the Existing Conditions Analysis and a GIS

○ Ruth - how do you get data for residential roads?

■ Erin - it's more limited, but we have some.

■ Patrick - lots of the data does come from PAG

● Colby - re: bike/ped stress scores. Seems it would weight more to arterials. But how do things like a Bike Boulevard network get picked up? Don't want to push projects onto arterials when neighborhood streets may be a better location for those.

○ Erin – Bike Boulevards (BB) will get points by having been identified as a project. We do have more comprehensive data for the BB network. The calibration approach will also get at these by

helping to find places to close gaps. Could capture this by the project being present in a plan already (as with transit)

○ Andy - we definitely want to consider this. Perhaps include a BB score? And maybe a way to add scores based on major street crossings that they intersect with

○ Colby - giving points for being low stress would also be important.

● Ruth - this is very complex. How do we convey this to the public?

○ Jean - grounding the process in Guiding Principles that have broad public input will help. All information will be shared. The need is for the public to understand at a different level, and they will also see the final product. This subcommittee is seeing a more technical detail mid-process.

○ Ruth - good that it is based on data, rather than people's choices. The calibration step will need to be well-documented so it doesn't appear that personal choices are creeping in.

○ Jean - yes we have to acknowledge the importance of the data, but also that data can't capture everything.

○ Erin - at this point we want to know if the measures we're considering make sense and if anything is missing.

● Stacy - re: discussion on traffic volumes in the Existing Conditions report (high volumes on small segments of Speedway and Grant) - do these get averaged over the entire project, or are they treated as special cases because of the higher likelihood of impacting other principles?

○ Erin - need to look into this more as we actually start scoring the roads

○ Paul - these are regional travel demand outputs, so the number you see for Speedway in that report is based on a modeled volume.

Measuring the Network

The group went through each principle and suggested measures one by one. Comments are presented with the relevant principle. Main topics

Principle: Connected

● Intention: remove physical barriers

● Measure: How many modal networks can be improved or further supported?

Questions/Discussion

● Ruth - what is "stress" in this case and how is it measured?

○ Erin - considers factors associated with exposure or perceived safety barriers (see page A5 of Existing Conditions Report)

○ Andy - it separates the road network into higher and lower stress

● Stacy - re: stress, does this look at type of bike facility? Is this based on national design standards? The specific context is important.

○ Erin - yes facility type is included. Lower stress if there is a physical separation. The methodology uses the LTS - this is becoming an industry standard.

○ Stacy - would like more specific terminology in terms of what type of facility.

○ Andy - the question of the type of bike treatment we would pick for a specific project is very important, but we're not there yet with this exercise.

● Colby - is this where we can add BBs identified through the master plan? (Erin - probably)

● Rod - motor vehicles is a missing mode. Through technology increase we will have opportunities to increase vehicle efficiency and allow for other modes to expand. Should we look at how to measure this? We want to increase efficiency for the whole system.

○ Jean - the thinking here is to address lack of connections in modal networks. Regionally significant corridors are included to get at cross-town connectivity for vehicles; beyond this we didn't see gaps in the vehicle network as they exist for bike/ped, ADA and transit.

○ Rod - how would we measure a project that addresses lack of bike/ped connectivity by implementing technological efficiencies for vehicle traffic?

○ Jean - solutions applied in project implementation is something that is considered more at the project level than at a criteria at this point. There are also system-wide categories of improvement that are programmed and funded in a different way than these site specific projects.

○ Andy - there are some measures in the "optimized" principle that include motor vehicle data.

○ Paul - was facility class considered as a supplement to regionally significant corridors? It might allow you to look at connectivity from a facility-class standpoint and possibly get at Rod's points.

● Ruth - isn't there a sidewalk network that should be included?

○ Erin - this is incorporated into pedestrian level of traffic stress

● Ruth - what is ADA inventory?

○ Patrick - this is same thing; has been collected for last few years.

○ Ruth - does it include disrepair? (yes)

Principle: Optimized

● Intention: best use of the space to serve the most people

● Measure: What opportunities are available to optimize the network so it can serve more people?

Questions/Discussion

● Ruth - how is congestion measured? For places that we expect to be congested (e.g. downtown or university), how is this taken into account when the congestion makes sense?

○ Erin - we're trying to think about acceptable congestion, and there are places that we expect to be more congested. But the places we see a lot of congestion don't always align with where we expect it. This can be addressed through solutions.

○ Patrick - we consider these things as we identify proposed projects.

● Stacy – re: implications of excess capacity - how are these places identified?

○ Erin - this measure will look at both extremes to identify where the roadway either has too much capacity, where space can be re-allocated to other uses, or where there congestion and additional capacity may be needed.

● Paul – should include signalized intersections, at a minimum, here. We see that this is localized to intersections. Volume/Capacity is a starting point, but considering intersection level will give you more information that won't show up in segment analysis.

Principle: Safe

● Measure: Does the roadway have a history of serious crashes

● Point allocation - Full points for fatal or serious injury crashes (all modes) or on the pedestrian HIN

Questions/Discussion

● Stacy - is the point assessment of safety open-ended to identify increases in crashes on a particular segment over time? Would like to see additional data whenever it becomes part of Pedestrian High Injury Network (HIN) or a fatality. How are near misses reported? Want to make sure we have a clear picture of safety and comfort. This isn't just based on when someone gets injured. We are seeing a constant escalation of crashes. Could we revisit the rating?

● Erin - for this we are using the analysis we conducted as part of Move Tucson. How to account for near misses is always a challenge - this is what stress is trying to get at (knowing that higher volumes and speeds are associated with injuries).

● Andy - think the Ped HIN is based on 10 years of data, but need to double check

● Jean - to clarify, is the goal to escalate near misses to same importance as injuries, or to elevate the whole safety issue more?

● Colby - would need to see how it plays out with the scoring

● Ruth - any reported accident should have the same value, because there are so many unreported accidents. We need to accommodate them somehow. Don't' distinguish between whether someone died or was hurt. Every accident should get a full point.

● Craig - do we assume that an area with reported accidents has more unreported accidents? Valencia/Kolb project - seems like accidents have gone up.

● Stacy - many of the accidents are happening in areas that scored low in equity analysis; these are folks that may not report an accident, or are less likely/able to go to hospital

● Patrick - we have another safety dataset we could use (PAG analysis on level of safety - it compares like segments to identify if areas perform better or worse than expected). This wouldn't focus as much on fatality and injury.

○ Stacy - very supportive of this

○ Jean - any concern that results are based off an expectation of collisions, rather than looking at collisions being preventable through design? (e.g. an approach that says it's okay to have a certain number of collisions)

○ Andy - a potential downside is that a segment with fatalities or injuries might be missed.

Principle: Resilient

● Intention: Move Tucson projects apply sustainability best practices and increase the resilience of the city's transportation infrastructure and systems, enabling Tucson to be more responsive to its natural context and to be nimble in the face of climate change.

● Measure: Can the network better support short, local trips?

Questions/Discussion

● Stacy - does Destination Density this consider specific paces (schools, etc.)

○ Erin - considers schools, shopping, parks, recreation, transit, etc.

● Ruth - want to understand what destinations are considered as high demand in the Destination analysis.

○ Jean - this is really about land use context as a whole. Even if these things don't exist now, it's intended to indicate areas where there is potential

○ Erin - this also considers how close destinations are together; can things be clustered?

● Stacy - does this include the "last mile" concept where you're connecting one mode to another? (yes)

● Paul - PAG just developed a new heat severity index that is available. It includes tree canopy data.

- Ruth - how can we incorporate climate change here?
- Jean - the Guiding Principles and intentions apply to all aspects of Move Tucson, not just prioritization criteria. We also considered this.

Principle: Equitable
- Measure: Is the network located within an equity area?
- Uses results of equity analysis
- This criteria has a proposed weighting of 1.5
- Rationale - starting point for discussion. Also don't want to identify a segment that doesn't have other potential needs associated with it.

Questions/Discussion
- Colby - curious to hear what weighting has been used by other communities. Would be good to run some at 1.5 and then at 2 to be able better assess what this weighting is doing (this may be something to share with the full CSCC as well). When we did the RTA prioritization it was helpful to look at what % of projects were within equity zones, and what % of people live in equity zones. To ensure it's not just proportional.
- Erin - the way that equity is incorporated varies. One example chose equity as a first filter (rather than a weight).
- Colby - have a report on equity weighting. It references a threshold of impact. Can share.
- Ruth - during our RTA subcommittee Lucy was looking at the money spent in equity zones and looking to see how that compares to money spent in other areas. Keep in mind this will be a way people look at this across the city. It won't be perceived as equitable if the dollars invested in non-equity zones is higher than in equity zones.
- Jean - will look into this further.

Project Calibration
Note - these items were only presented briefly, and not discussed in full. Will be addressed at next subcommittee meeting
- Calibration adjusts scores to reflect project feasibility or impact. Uses qualitative data

Principle: Equitable
- Measure: Has the project been identified as a priority through public input
- Will look at public input maps collected through Move Tucson

Question/Discussion
- Colby: re projects being identified as a priority through public input - while this is good, it doesn't seem like equity. Perhaps that fits better in optimized or authentic.
- Jean - can look at re-framing this. The thinking was that the data might not tell the full story of what a community member is experiencing or needs.

Principle: Authentic
- Measure: Have representatives of Tucson's Ward offices identified the project as a priority?
- Measure: Does the project provide opportunities for placemaking (e.g. historic status, smaller setbacks, lower Average Daily Traffic)

Principle: Connected
- Measure: Does the project close an identified network gap for any mode?

Principle: Optimized
- Measure: Is the project located on roadways with poor or failing pavement quality?
- Measure: How does the estimated cost of the project compare to the expected benefits?

3. Closing and Next steps

● In-between meetings: Alta can run network scores and have a couple of projects to look at and consider in terms of project calibration. Next subcommittee meeting – February 18th (5-7pm)
● Share any further feedback with Patrick via email
● Ruth - What gets presented to full CSCC and will they get a chance to provide input?
○ Patrick – this subcommittee will bring back a recommended framework with explanation, then there will be discussion and feedback by the full CSCC. Then this will go to M&C in (hopefully) March.
● Jonathan - is the end result a list of projects?
○ Patrick - yes, we have collected a number of potential projects (~200). Ultimately the network screening will be overlaid with the potential projects to score and prioritize.
● Ruth - will currently funded projects not be on the list?
○ Patrick - they will be in Move Tucson plan, but we won't score these through the same process to prioritize, as they are already funded.
General comments
● Jonathan - it's abstract at this point. Hard to evaluate until we see how it shakes out with some numbers.
● Stacy - appreciate having the information ahead of time to review. Appreciate all the work that goes into it. Being prepared on my part is important to me.
● Colby - working through it tonight was good. Feel like we're on the right track.
Motion: Stacy Rodenberg. Second: Craig McCaskill. All Approved

3. Approval of 02/09 Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
   The subcommittee voted to approve the 02/09 Meeting Minutes. **Motion Craig McCaskill. Second Ruth Reiman. All Approved**

4. Subcommittee Discussion - updated Move Tucson project prioritization framework.
   The subcommittee discussed the Move Tucson project prioritization framework. **No Action Taken.**

5. **Next Steps**
   The subcommittee discussed the next steps of prioritization. **No Action Taken.**

6. *Adjournment*
   The CSCC Project Prioritization Subcommittee Adjourned at 6:55 p.m.