



## Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

February 24, 2021 (5:45pm – 7:45pm)

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)



### Approved Minutes

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

A quorum was established at 5:53pm. Stacy Rodenberg called the meeting to order.

##### Members Present:

Colby Henley  
Derek Brown  
Jonathan Crowe  
Rod Lane  
Ruth Reiman  
Selina Barajas  
Stacy Rodenberg  
Catlow Shippek  
Tarik Williams  
Jonathan Crowe  
Jill Brammer  
Grecia Ramirez  
Katharine Len Yee Mitchell

##### Members Absent:

Lucy LiBosha  
Craig McCaskill  
Peter Norback  
Paki Rico  
Dale Faulkner

##### Guests:

Erin David, Jean Crowther (Alta)

##### Staff and Audience Present:

Patrick Harley  
Jenn Toothaker  
Andy Bemis  
Matt Kopek  
Ariel Fry  
Davita Mueller  
Robin Raine  
Ben Buehler-Garcia  
Scott Robidoux  
Felipe Ladron de Guevara  
Paul Casertano  
Oscar Gandy  
Kylie Walzak  
Evren Sonmez  
*Tahnee Robertson, Colleen Whitaker (facilitators)*

#### 2. Housekeeping

- Introduction of new member Katharine Yen Lee Mitchell (Director of Transportation).
- Approval of past meeting minutes - no corrections
  - **Motion to approve past meeting minutes – Stacy Rodenberg; Second – Colby Henley**
- Review roster
  - Patrick reviewed the current roster and noted vacancies for Ward 1, Ward 3 and the City Manager’s Office. Looking to get these filled.

#### 3. Meeting overview – Patrick Hartley

- Developing and approving a project prioritization framework is one of the primary roles of the CSCC.

- Have been working with the subcommittee to iterate on the draft prioritization framework presented at January 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. An updated draft was shared via email before this meeting, and will be discussed tonight.
- A recommendation to Mayor and Council on March 23<sup>rd</sup> is the goal. After review the framework will be applied to the project list that is being developed through Move Tucson.

#### 4. Prioritization Framework

- Subcommittee update - *Stacy and Colby*
  - The subcommittee met twice (4 hours total). Developed iterative recommendations for the City and Alta. Commented on things we weren't comfortable with and asked them to tweak. Feel very good about what is in the memo.
  - This is deep stuff and it's complex. Eager for the discussion today to see what has been developed even since our last subcommittee meeting.

*Erin David (Alta) provided an overview of the updated draft prioritization framework. Main points are summarized here, with discussion following:*

- Overview of the role of prioritization for reminder and for new members
  - 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
- Framework process (bolded are focus of work tonight and in memo under discussion):
  - Identify projects
  - **Measure the network**
  - Apply network scores to projects
  - **Calibrate project scores**
  - Compile scores, create phasing plan

#### Network screening

*For each principle, Erin shared the scoring notes and a map of how the scoring looks on the network. See memo for full detail. Changes based on CSCC and subcommittee input are noted:*

- *Optimized*
  - Capacity has been updated to remove roadways where there is only one lane in each direction of travel.
- *Safety*
  - Added criteria to capture frequency of crashes, regardless of mode or severity. Total of 20 points are now available for safety.
- *Equitable*
  - Worked the most with subcommittee on this aspect to explore different multipliers and understand impact.
  - Original suggested multiplier of 1.5 for equity was updated to 2 based on feedback from subcommittee
  - Looking at the priority score before the multiplier is added, we see distribution of high need areas across the city.

- Multiplying equity by 2 we see a change in distribution - top tier segments are located within identified equity focus areas, and second tier moves toward these areas as well. Local roadway segments move into third tier of scores.
- Multiplying equity by 3 - see more local roadways that show up as second tier priority. All top tier are within equity focus areas. Far fewer second tier roadways outside of these areas.
- Looking at the percent of roadway mileage within top 3 tiers is helpful to begin to understand the impacts.

### **Example segment**

The subcommittee asked to see some examples of how the scoring would play out on real areas (these are not projects, but segments of roads to illustrate the scoring in a real context).

#### Segment on 22nd between I-10 and Fremont

- Colby - see that this segment scores high in many of the criteria. Curious about the type of project would be selected for this? How does the type of project get considered?
  - Erin - this is about identifying opportunities. Doesn't necessarily mean it will inform the type of project. Will pull on other things, including the existing conditions assessment, to ensure we are developing projects related to need.
  - Jean - recognize the challenge of trying to connect this approach to project scores. But the projects that will ultimately be prioritized are a package of solutions suited to the need in the network. This helps us look system wide to find highest opportunities.
- Ruth - for this segment, what is the actual score?
  - Erin - this includes multiple sections, and the score varies for each.
- Ruth - after implementing a project could we re-score the network to see if there is improvement?
  - Erin - intention is that this is replicable.
  - Jean - yes, this is part of the value. Proposed projects may even change. City could re-run with updated data in 5 years and see changes.
  - Ruth - that would be a valuable way to show the benefit. This seems like a tool to help us assess.
  - Paul Casertano - want to support Ruth and Robin by clarifying that PAG is also looking at replicability of performance evaluation for before and after project implementation. Much of the data that we use for our own process, and that is used here, was chosen as best available data that can be continued into the future and support evaluation of project impacts.
- Rod - when was the data taken? Is there any correlation between this data and the Gem show? This area is particularly intense at that time of year. This is a good example of connection with other departments. E.g. the western edge is on I-10, so any solution would have to take this into account.
  - Erin - data sources are documented in the Existing Conditions Report
- Jonathan - To clarify, does the red 22nd street segment represent a composite score that totals all the metrics?
  - Erin - yes
- Selina - my only concern is the outreach component; making sure the projects are transparent and concise moving forward, especially with the equity factor.
  - Patrick - as we continue to develop projects we'll do all this outreach. It is still a long time from now.

- 
- Oscar - individual measures can be defined, and justified, but when they are incorporated into a construct like equity or Resiliency are quite complex, and subject to considerable debate about meaning and appropriateness of composite measures.

### **Example project applications**

*Erin showed how the projects scores changed based on the different equity multipliers, using projects from the RTA Next process.*

#### Example 1 - Country Club Rd (Prince to 29th)

- Catlow - different measures may pick up lack of amenities for bike/ped. For the safety measurement, would a segment score lower even if they lack an amenity? How is that being considered? Country Club doesn't have these amenities - this would get picked up in connected, but not safety. Maybe the incidents are lower because bike/ped aren't using this area.
  - Erin - we are looking at frequency of collision regardless of mode. This is why we have included a number of measures, so it can score high in some but not all.

#### Example 2 - Speedway (Euclid to Wilmot)

#### Example 3 - Bilby Rd

- Jonathan - this explanation seems to say the higher equity rating lowers the relative score because the denominator increases so much.
  - Erin - The real impact of the weights will be seen more in how the projects score relates to other project scores.

### **Calibration**

*Erin reviewed the source and scoring notes for each of the principles in calibration (see memo for full detail)*

- Colby - feels like the calibration area might be a place to more directly address climate change. Considering the Resilient measure - is there a more direct metric that would get at things like mode shift.? And do different types of projects score differently on the same area - how do we ensure we can capture mode shift and other climate change considerations?
  - Jean – the Move Tucson charge is to create a more balanced multi-modal transportation system. Operational needs are being addressed for motor vehicle travel, where there is a need. But there aren't going to be any projects that invest in infrastructure to increase vehicle traffic, or that aren't applying the idea of complete streets (that policy is informing this plan).
  - Colby - have great confidence in City staff and Alta. Feel we are on the same page and working towards a common goal. But the replicability is an issue - staff changes in the future, etc. This is the concern. How is this codified?
  - Jean - everyone involved in Move Tucson needs to develop this plan in the context of the City. The work of CSCC and the design guidance are important in this. We are very clear in this approach with the intent behind each measure. This will help codify.
- Stacy - can we reclarify how we're using the chat?
  - Tahnee - question can be asked in chat as long as facilitator reads it out. Or to say "I have a question" But not to have substantive comments.
- Catlow - struggling to understand how climate resilience is included. Do we need to add a data source to resilient, or rethink what we're using? Two ideas - PAG has a prioritization map

based on heat vulnerable populations. Pima County Regional Flood Control District has map that shows flood depth along roadways.

- Jean - had a similar discussion in the subcommittee and landed on the current approach with the idea that within a prioritization process you can't capture everything, or it gets watered down.
- Catlow - the under resourced areas experience the greatest heat and flooding.
- Rod - I understood that the intent was to manage vehicle capacity without expansion/addition of lanes (e.g. technology, signaling, etc.). Vehicles will continue to grow, and it has to be dealt with. It sounded like vehicle capacity is not going to be addressed, but it has to be addressed.
  - Jean - vehicle capacity is accounted for
- Catlow - concern about the "Authentic" calibrating step of ward support. Have seen with the GSI Fund that projects and funding tend to get distributed equally, even though the equity across wards is not equal. Don't want us to end up with an equal distribution of funding. Re: equity scoring. Wasn't aware the SC made rec of 2x

[Break]

### **Continued discussion on key elements**

Resilience metric - bringing in high heat and/or tree canopy

- Catlow - for resilience- maybe there is a better dataset that can be included? want to include other aspects related to livability and things that stress communities.
  - Patrick - we can bring in tree canopy and/or high heat datasets from PAG. This can be added. We do have heat vulnerability, but there is a very high level of overlap with equity areas.

Equity weighting

- Patrick – the current recommendation for equity weighting is 2x. This recommendation came from the City/Alta team. The subcommittee never came to recommendation, and asked City/Alta to make one. The subcommittee was clear that they did not want 1.5x (too low). City/Alta felt more comfortable with 2x, because 3x pulls everything into the equity areas, and there may be some real issues outside these areas (e.g. safety, ADA) that might get lost. This can be discussed further.
- Colby - because equity is intended to be a primary focus we want to be very clear. Can we review metric table again? Want to clarify that 33% of roads in Tucson fall within equity zones?
  - Andy - this is not % of project miles, it's % of network miles.
- Ruth - in the Existing Conditions report it says 21% of people live in the equity zones.
- Derek - have concerns with 2x. Not sure why we are applying 2x weight. Is this based on feedback from Tucsonans? Don't want to be steered toward certain goals, want to formulate our own goals.
- Stacy - we did struggle with this in subcommittee meetings and discussed at great length. It's hard to wrap your head around. When you change the weight it starts to have other effects on rankings. This was a reason why some on the subcommittee felt that having the recommendation from City/Alta was a better way to proceed, because of their expertise. Think we can be comfortable with what they have recommended to us.
- Derek - just question why we would add twice a weight to anything. Seems more convoluted that it needs to be.
- Jonathan - the subcommittee had consensus that 1.5 weighting wasn't sufficient, and that 2 or 3 was more appropriate.

- Andy - the Complete Streets policy has equity as a primary guiding principle. The results from the community survey also showed 45% of respondents saw equity is priority area.
- Katharine - appreciate Derek's comments. Have some reservations on equity measure - seems we don't have clear consensus on why going with 2.
- Colby - do agree with some equity weighting. It is a clear tenant of the Complete Streets policy. Equity zones are identified for a reason - history of underinvestment. Moving forward with status quo would be a huge lost opportunity, and not true to guiding principles of the Complete Streets policy. The subcommittee all felt 1.5 was not enough. All ranged between 2-3.
- Colby - want to ensure everyone is comfortable and understand what has been presented.
- Derek - comfortable moving forward. But do have concerns about the equity weight. But comfortable to move forward if others are.
- Catlow - a large portion of population live in midtown and to the east, which may drive why there is fewer in equity zone.
  - Andy - the 21% from existing conditions report was in the highest need (top tier). For this we are considering top 1 and 2. So this is probably more like top 40%
  - Jenn - memo from Oct 6 re: equity analysis methodology. The demographic map is in there. Andy's comment is substantiated that we are dealing with about 40% of the population in this.

Ward priority in calibration

- Patrick - don't see this as a major driver of project scoring. The network screen is major driver. We've heard that we don't want to overemphasize ward priority. The screening should drive the scoring.

**5. Recommendation**

Patrick shared a draft recommendation for the council to discuss and vote on:

*The Complete Streets Coordinating Council recommends that the updated Draft Move Tucson Project Prioritization Framework be forwarded for consideration by Mayor and Council. The memo reflects revisions that were developed in coordination with the CSCC. With the following changes:*

- *Incorporation of either high heat or tree canopy data into the calibration under optimized or resilient*

*The Prioritization Framework was approved with the following reservations noted by those who "supported with reservations": (to be added)*

**Consensus vote on recommendation**

<u>Tiered consensus vote</u>	<u>(Robert's rules equivalent)</u>
1= Support without reservations	(Yes)
2= Support with reservations	(Yes)
3= Abstain	(Abstain)
4= Do not support	(No)

Name	First round consensus vote	Final consensus vote (after additional discussion)

<b>Selina Barajas</b>	2	2
<b>Jill Brammer</b>	2	2
<b>Derek Brown</b>	4	4
<b>Colby Henley</b>	4	4
<b>Katharine Mitchell</b>	2	1
<b>Grecia Ramirez</b>	2	2
<b>Ruth Reiman</b>	1	1
<b>Stacy Rodenberg</b>	1	1
<b>Catlow Shipek</b>	2	1
<b>Tarik Williams</b>	2	1

Summary of “Support with reservations” (Level 2):

- Selina - concern is the outreach component; making sure the projects are transparent and concise moving forward; especially with the equity factor. See projects being implemented today that were voted over 20 years ago, and there is a lot of pushback on supporting these at local level. Want to ensure that as we move forward we clearly define the equity factor and what these projects entail. Don’t want this to be an issue in 20+ years.
- Jill – equity weighting: don’t know if it is fully representative or actually equitable
- Katharine – equity weighting: we don’t seem to be clear on number, but do support some weighting. Resiliency: bring the additional data sets into consideration. Safety: bring in other departments so not siloed at the point of considering actual projects.
- Grecia – equity weighting: questions remain, data not clear
- Catlow – equity weighting: still not clear. Resiliency: how to make sure heat, flooding, other issues considered
- Tarik - honestly don’t completely understand everything, but do know the subcommittee put in a lot of work and trust it.

Summary of “Do not support” (Level 4)

- Derek – equity weighting: don’t support using any weighting. Also not sure how equity and equality are relating here.
- Colby – think we need another meeting, don’t have clear and consistent understanding.

Further discussion - How to address concerns?

- Catlow - would move to “1” with additions of tree canopy.
- Derek - just don’t understand why we would weight anything. It should reflect what Tucsonans see as a concern.
  - Ruth - this is a way to compensate for historical underfunding.
- Colby read directly out of the Complete Streets Policy Section 9 Project Selection:
  - “The tool shall also incorporate criteria to ensure equitable implementation of this Policy, to help alleviate disparities by prioritizing geographic areas and communities that have had the least investment in Complete Streets infrastructure. Additionally,

the tool shall further prioritize projects with Complete Streets elements in neighborhoods where residents disproportionately rely on low-cost mobility options and shall, at a minimum, include criteria to direct investment to neighborhoods with higher concentrations of low-income individuals, people of color, and households without access to a private automobile. The tool shall also include additional equity-focused criteria to prioritize projects that directly benefit other vulnerable users of the transportation system such as children, older adults, and people with disabilities.”

- Stacy - would have been great to have more participation during the subcommittee work on this.

**Motion to approve the statement and send this recommendation to Mayor and Council – Stacy Rodenberg; Second - Jill Brammer**

**The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 by Colby**