



## Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

January 27, 2021 (5:45pm – 7:45pm)

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)



### Approved Meeting Minutes

#### 1. Call to Order/Roll Call

**A quorum was established at 6:00pm.** Tahnee Robertson called the meeting to order.

##### **Members Present:**

Colby Henley  
Derek Brown  
Jonathan Crowe  
Rod Lane  
Ruth Reiman  
Selina Barajas  
Stacy Rodenberg  
Catlow Shipek  
Lucy LiBosha  
Tarik Williams  
Jonathan Crowe  
Craig McCaskill  
Ted Bell  
Jill Brammer (*not sworn in at time of meeting*)

##### **Members Absent:**

Peter Norback  
Maira Alexander  
Paki Rico  
Dale Faulkner  
Grecia Ramirez

##### **Guests:**

Mayor Regina Romero  
Michael Ortega, City Manager  
Elaine Becherer, Mayor's Chief of Staff  
Erin David, Jean Crowther (Alta)

##### **Staff and Audience Present:**

Patrick Harley  
Jenn Toothaker  
Andy Bemis  
Diana Alcaron  
Robin Raine  
Ben Buehler-Garcia  
Scott Robidoux  
Paul Casertano  
Oscar Gandy  
Kylie Walzak  
Emily Yetman  
Angela Ward  
Davita Mueller  
*Tahnee Robertson, Colleen Whitaker (facilitators)*

#### 2. Remarks from Mayor and City Manager

*The Mayor and City Manager joined for the first part of the meeting to offer some remarks and take questions.*

##### **Mayor Romero**

- Appreciate all the work of this council. Felt it was important to address this group directly.
- Projects we select for next round of funding (through RTA) should reflect what our community deems is important.
- We are in a good place – there are conversations at the federal level about infrastructure bill; we have finalized the Move Tucson process with an amazing amount of input; the RTA next process has started. Want to ensure that CSCC are part of the conversation.

- On Nov 17, 2020 Mayor and Council (M&C) gave direction to staff to hold off on submitting the RTA Next project list which was requested of this group. M&C had several concerns – they wanted to hear about Move Tucson first, and hear from Tucsonans about priorities. The pandemic has slowed down efforts, but still felt rushing to submit a project list is not in the best interest of community. M&C wanted to understand and start with what Tucsonans had given us; not start with RTA list.
- City of Tucson residents pay 62% of the taxes, so we feel we can submit more than \$600 million in projects. We want to tell the RTA what Tucsonans want: maintenance of infrastructure, transit improvement, technology upgrades, safety improvements, and mobility options like biking and walking connections.
- M&C are still working on transportation priorities. We have opportunities for clean transportation and infrastructure funding from the federal government. Feel it is critical that the RTA Board and committee think about how we approach RTA Next in a more inclusive way. We need to ensure that the voice of Tucsonans are being heard in terms of funding. Tucson has the majority of residents in this region.
- M&C is committed to seeing the vision of Tucsonans embedded into RTA Next. Will work with Biden - Harris congressional delegation to aggressively pursue funds.
- Wanted to make it clear tonight why we put the brakes on some things the CSCC has done.

#### Michael Ortega

- Move Tucson is not just aspirational, it will set the stage for the foreseeable future. It isn't just about a document on a shelf.
- Want to identify all the funding opportunities that can move forward Move Tucson priorities. How do we have a broader conversation, not just about corridor development.
- Opportunities that will be discussed with Council soon:
  - HURF – want to dissect this and rethink how these funds are used going forward. Will pay off some debt in 2022 which will create some capacity – how do we use this?
  - General Fund – don't usually think about this for transportation infrastructure, but we now need to bring all resources to the table.
  - Federal funds
  - City of Tucson Prop 101 – potential extension of this
- Move Tucson is a great opportunity to be all-inclusive. Need to identify macro-level funding sources to move the needle. It's not an either or situation.
- CSCC has an important role in helping to frame the priorities moving forward. The entirety of M&C are very appreciative of what the CSCC is doing.

#### Questions/comments

- Ruth – The CSCC has previously expressed concern about rushing to submit an RTA list - very glad we are slowing down. However, the RTA Next process seems to be continuing on in a way that is not particularly well-defined. How do you envision Tucson working within the RTA Next process?
  - Mayor – Agree. This is the reason why we pumped the brakes on the process. We feel that the City of Tucson has to be able to participate at the decision-making table and plan together. M&C do not think it is appropriate or correct to dictate to Tucson how the process will go. In order for RTA Next to work, there needs to be a partnership. All members need to feel our voices are part of the decision-making. M&C want to learn

from the community, and align this with priorities that are submitted to the Citizens Advisory Council (CAC).

- Ruth – re: the structure of the plan, they’re sticking with what was done 15 years ago. How do you see being able to impact this?
- Mayor – This is exactly the conversation that Council is beginning. We need to advocate for Tucsonans priorities. Expansive and expansion projects were not as big of priorities in Move Tucson input as they were 15 years ago – want to have this discussion with RTA. Feedback from CSCC will be important in this.
- Michael – it’s important to think through how we take a regional approach when 60% of the priorities are different than the other 40%; we need to have a conversation. The needs of the communities are diverse – we need to talk about how we address that. The priorities of 15 years ago are not resonating today.
- Tarik: re: 60/40 split what are you referring to?
  - Ortega – this refers to the population. We have ~600,000 within the city limits out of a total of 1 million. The needs of Tucson are different than the needs of County, Marana, Oro Valley, etc.
- Tarik – appreciate M&C being here tonight. Re: welcoming of the new administration. As a commission we’re all doing the best we can to serve the community of Tucson. Doesn’t matter too much who is in the administration. Do you have a different thought process?
  - Mayor – My job as Mayor is to get the best investment for our dollars. As Mayor I sit on the RTA board to represent Tucson. M&C have discussed that we have the majority of the population in this region (about 600,000 compared to remaining 400,000). We simply want to ensure that Tucsonans are represented and that we get our fair share.
- Diana Alcaron – want to emphasize how much we do appreciate the efforts and the energy. This CSCC plays significant role. Want to be inclusive, not just focus on one piece of a transportation system. This work will be a roadmap for how we build a sustainable and smart transportation system. The CSCC is important.

### 3. Housekeeping

#### Meeting purpose - Patrick

- Review the Guiding Principles and Vision based that were updated based on your November feedback. This was shared ahead of the meeting.
- Project Prioritization – note that this will be a bit different than the RTA process. We are now building on Move Tucson process and looking at a more expansive project list. This will be the first of several meetings looking at prioritization.

#### Membership updates

- Michael Guymon is gone.
- Jill Brammer will take his place. She is here tonight, but not yet sworn in and cannot participate as a voting member. She is a native Tucsonan and business owner on 4<sup>th</sup> Ave.

#### Approval of past meeting minutes

- There were no recommended edits to the minutes.
- **Motion to approve past meeting minutes - Ruth Reiman; Second – Craig McCaskill**

#### Co-chairs

- This is the last meeting for Ruth and Craig. Will have new co-chairs starting in February.

- New co-chairs: Stacy and Colby

### 3. Move Tucson Guiding Principles and Vision - Alta

Jean shared an overview presentation on the updated principles and vision. The main points are summarized here

- At the last meeting a draft version was shared and CSCC shared input. Have made updates based on this and shared the updated version ahead of this meeting.
- Vision – provides the lens through which all future policies, programs, and projects should be developed.
- Guiding Principles – shape how Tucson works toward achieve the Vision.

#### Vision

- *Original Vision statement:* Tucson is preparing for a future in a rapidly-changing world by being innovative, creative and inclusive. By working together, we can commit ourselves to create a mobility future that works for all of us. The outcome of our work is a transportation system that supports a welcoming, livable, and sustainable city for visitors, residents and business owners.
- Feedback from CSCC for revision:
  - Not specific to transportation
  - Not specific to actions
  - Weak ties to environment/climate change and equity goals
  - Not clear who the Plan will serve
- *Updated Vision:* Tucson is preparing for a future in a rapidly changing world by making economically and environmentally resilient transportation investments. We are working together to create a mobility future that reduces barriers and enables opportunities for all of us by increasing transportation choices, improving safety and investing in the infrastructure we already have. Tucson will dramatically shift how we invest in transportation to support a thriving, inclusive, and sustainable city for Tucson residents, businesses and visitors.

#### Guiding Principles

- Retained original 6 core pillars
- Major changes: added intention statements for each principle (see memo)

#### Discussion/feedback

Members provided initial feedback through a poll question:

*Overall, how well do you feel these principles reflect what Move Tucson projects should accomplish?*



- Derek – don't see specifics related to ADA accommodations. As the CODI representative I would like to see this. Things fall through the cracks when they aren't specifically specified.
- Patrick -

- Colby – big improvement overall
- Patrick – Can take specific comments in writing to the end of the month. These will be shared more widely in the Virtual Open House. Will share link as soon as it's available.

#### 4. Move Tucson Prioritization Process

- Patrick - Recall that this is different than the RTA prioritization process. The purpose of this session is to provide an introduction and start getting everyone up to speed. Following this there will be about 2 months to finalize. The proposal is to establish a sub-committee to look at specific data, weighting, etc. and bring back recommendations to the full CSCC for the March meeting.

##### Overview presentation

*Erin presented the Prioritization Framework, which was shared ahead of the meeting (see memo). Main points are summarized here.*

- Role of prioritization
  - Evaluation of projects and network priorities
  - Intended to be repeatable
  - Reflects community values and needs
  - Converts values and need into something practical
  - Informs implementation and phasing of projects
- Proposing 5 step process:
  - Identify projects
  - Measure the network
  - Apply network scores to projects
  - Calibrate projects scores
  - Compile scores, create phasing plan

##### Discussion/Questions

- Rod – have you considered other agency's planned work? Example - One of the biggest issues I've heard is about I-10 intersections. ADOT has planned work on I-10 and there are opportunities to modify connectivity and meet goals of this committee. Don't see this coordination reflected in this framework.
  - Erin – this is meant to be part of a more high level view of where projects are pulled from.
  - Rod – there is a published design concept on ADOT website (I-10/SR210 Design Concept Study). We really need to look at this and include it in this process. Available to everyone. Encourage all to take a look.
    - Patrick – yes thanks, we've been looking at some of these already.
- Catlow – on some principles there may be multiple measures, how will this be accounted for? When we went through the RTA process there was weighting. How and when does weighting happen here?
  - Erin – re: multiple measures we're still working through the mechanics to identify relevant data points. Weighting comes in with the values assigned to each one
  - Jean – we have to focus on the best data we have to get a score. Guiding Principles are intended for all parts of Move Tucson, this is just how we use them for prioritization. But some of them may be more useful for thinking about policy or design guidance. Not everything they communicate has to be a direct line to a metric.
- Tarik – when we look at these priorities we want to try and be as all-encompassing as possible. We recently had someone discussing bike boulevards in recent PAC meeting, but they didn't talk about street lights.
- Paul – would love to follow the progress on this. PAG is struggling with how to deal with systemic projects (e.g. lighting for areas that haven't been chosen, or education programs – things that don't fit easily into a network measuring approach). We are measuring all projects with the same approach, and recognize some faults (e.g. specialty projects that aren't intended

to achieve all improvements, but are maybe focused specifically on safety). We see that these don't score well across the entire system. Just some considerations as you move forward.

## 5. Next Steps and Closing

- Patrick – please get in touch with any follow up. Is there interest in forming a subcommittee? Will likely meet two times before March. We need 3 for quorum. And non-members are able to participate
- Prioritization process subcommittee
  - no one expressed concerns with forming subcommittee
  - **Volunteers: Stacy, Colby, Ruth, Derek, Rod, Jill, Jonathan, Craig** (non-member interested in participating - Paul Casertano).
- Lucy – in the next meeting could we recap who everyone is (Members and non-members)? I'm interested in the ratio of members and non-members who are participating in the subcommittee. Want it to be equivalent to what we have in council meetings.

**The meeting was adjourned at 7:49**