	Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)	
	March 24, 2021 (5:45pm – 7:45pm)	
	Virtual Meeting (Zoom)	

Approved Minutes

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

A quorum was established at 5:50 pm. Stacy Rodenberg called the meeting to order.

Members Present:
Colby Henley
Derek Brown
Jonathan Crowe
Rod Lane
Ruth Reiman
Selina Barajas
Stacy Rodenberg
Catlow Shipek
Tarik Williams
Jonathan Crowe
Jill Brammer
Grecia Ramirez
Katharine Len Yee Mitchell
Craig McCaskill
Peter Norback

Members Absent:
Paki Rico

Guests:
Erin David, Jean Crowther (Alta)

Staff:
Patrick Harley
Jenn Toothaker
Andy Bemis
Diana Alcaron
Robin Raine
Scott Robidoux
Monica Landgrave-Serrank

Observers:
Antonio Ramirez
David Higuera (Sup Heinz)
Collin Chesston
Ben Buehler
Davita Mueller
Paul Casertano
Evern Sonmez
Oscar Gandy
Kylie Walzak
Barbara Brookhart
Emily Yetman
Matt Kopek

Tahnee Robertson (facilitator)

2. Housekeeping
- Approval of past meeting minutes - no corrections. Consensus approval.
  - **Motion to approve past meeting minutes – Stacy Rodenberg; Second – Colby Henley**
- Meeting overview –
  - Project prioritization framework was approved by M&C on 3/23/21.

- ○ Focus of this meeting: Update on M&C, timeline review, summary of findings from the virtual house, project development process. Project list - after this meeting there will be an opportunity to provide feedback before the next CSCC meeting.

3. Mayor and Council update - *Andy*
- City staff had one-on-one meetings with each council member and their staff to review the proposed prioritization framework; they presented at 3/23/21 M&C study session.
- Went well and got very good feedback. Not many concerns. Some questions about the project scoring.
- The prioritization framework was approved and we can move forward.

4. Move Tucson process review - *Patrick*
- Plan phases:
  - ○ Winter 2019 – Visioning, Inventory and Analysis
  - ○ Spring/Summer 2020 – Public Engagement
  - ○ Winter 2020/Spring 2021 – Guiding Principles and Recommendations (we are here)
  - ○ Spring/Summer 2021 – Implementation Plan
- Core decision points in the timeline are aligned with CSCC meetings to ensure that there are opportunities to engage and have input
- Anticipate bringing prioritized project list back to CSCC for review at April meeting
- May 18 – project list will go to M&C
- After this there will be additional virtual public engagement and development of policy recommendations.
- June/July – discussion on policy and program recommendations with CSCC
- July – review by M&C. Sub-list of RTA projects. Work on implementation and phasing plan
- August – final review of full plan by CSCC

Questions/discussion
- Ruth – the project list we will see after the meeting today will not have scores?
  - ○ Patrick - yes, these are the full list of projects before they are scored. Want to get feedback from you all if there is anything that is missing.
- Ruth – what is our role after August
  - ○ Patrick – this is a standing committee of the City. There are other major elements for this body, such as the Design Guidelines. CSCC will be part of the review process for projects.
  - ○ What about CSCC role in funding?
  - ○ Diana – once we are in implementation we will discuss funding with CSCC. Then when we get to the point of building things, this committee will be involved in design to ensure we are working with a complete street lens.

5. Move Tucson engagement update – Virtual Open House – *Erin*
- As of March 17: Over 1500 views and 90 survey participants
- Vision statement: 65% agreed/strong agreed; 16% disagreed; 19% neutral. This is similar to how the individual guiding principles were assessed.
- Emerging themes:
  - ○ Improve safety for all users, particularly vulnerable modes
  - ○ Climate change – reduce emissions, improve shade/heat resilience, and invest in existing infrastructure

- o Connect transportation to land use and economic opportunity
        - o Concern about implementation
- Takeaways
    - o General agreement with Vision and Guiding Principles
    - o Further support for the concepts developed to date

Questions/discussion
- Selina – during Covid have noticed a lot of businesses closing, and an influx of vacant spaces and changes in land use. Will that affect any of these projects?
    - o Diana – the project list to date won't be affected by this. But we will come back to CSCC to discuss the design of projects; these types of adjustments to respond to land use can be made at this point.
- Craig – were there any outlier responses on the survey?
    - o Erin – don't think so. Comments didn't show anything significantly inconsistent with anything we've heard before.

5. Initial Project List – *Erin*
Project list development – Inputs:
- Review of Existing Conditions Data
    - o Existing Network – bicycle, pedestrian, public transport and regionally significant corridors
    - o Network Performance – level of traffic stress (bike and ped), traffic capacity, frequent transit network, pavement quality
    - o Network Safety – crash history and trends, and other data such as pedestrian High Injury Network
    - o Connectivity – how all modes fit together and how easy it is to travel; identifying areas that might be disconnected.
    - o Destination Clusters – considers places you travel to/from. Want to encourage shorter, more active trips, within these clusters. New connections and enhancement of lower stress travel
- Previous Plans and Studies
    - o Reviewed many from other areas, across different modes and scales
- Public Input
    - o Multiple methods – survey, public input map. Received many comments with specific project ideas and thematic ideas. Worked to consolidate and synthesize these.
- Ward Input
    - o Meetings with ward offices. Location based suggestions as well as thematic suggestions
- RTA Next Project Development Process
    - o This was included as an existing project source to build on
- Top themes from phase 1 engagement
    - o Improved mobility options
    - o Improved safety, especially for pedestrians and bicycles
    - o Improved maintenance and investment in existing infrastructure
    - o Improved access and connections

Project list consolidation
- The goal is to solve mode specific needs. Result is multimodal network projects.

- Project Example: Drexel Road between Mission and Alvernon
  - Core components - Limited lighting, no sidewalks, opportunities for bikeways, etc.
  - Showed mapped examples of biking, pedestrian and roadway improvements that could be pursued in a project here.
- Have developed two different categories for improvements – Network Improvements and Packaged Improvements
- Network Improvements – 3 project types
  - Catalyst corridors – multimodal corridor projects, improves most modes (major roads)
  - Strategic solutions – smaller scale projects; improves some modes (major roads)
  - Local connections – complete, connected networks (local roads) – things like bicycle boulevards and greenway improvements
- Packaged improvements – these are planned improvements that are critical to the transportation system; they exist across the transport system, not necessarily on specific segments
  - Includes things like ADA projects, HAWK crossings, local street improvements, pavement improvements
- There is also a complimentary effort to identify programmatic needs to support additional investments. Programs would include – safety improvements, signal improvements, education and encouragement, transportation demand management, shared mobility services
- Alta shared the interactive map and explore the subcategories categories of Network Improvements

Next steps
- CSCC provide input on draft projects by April 5 (a map and list will be shared within two days following this meeting)

Questions/discussion
- Request to have ability to zoom in on map when it is shared.
- Ruth – do we need to know now what a focused improvement is?
  - Erin – no, at this point it is more modal specific (i.e. an opportunity to enhance bike facilities on collector roadways)
  - Ruth – but given this we wouldn't know if a project would add sidewalks or a bike lane, for example.
  - Andy – yes, we need to provide more detailed project descriptions to accompany the map. We are working on this and will share.
- Ruth – in terms of prioritization, will we have priority lists within each category, or one big list?
  - Andy – it will be one project list. In order for this to occur we need to add the scores, then do a project-by-project review to develop a conceptual cost estimate, and then applying the calibration process. This will happen over the next month.
- Ruth – what if these projects need pavement improvement?
  - Andy – that's not included in this view at this stage, although it is an important part of many projects.
- Tahnee - How people should provide feedback?
  - Jean – we will share the project list and map with some specific questions. The desire is that you will have the chance to take your time with a closer look. Feedback is requested on: how project types are presented, specific project segments, and any additional questions you have. This group is really the first sounding board.

- Colby – is this a 20 year plan?
  - Andy – yes that is the time horizon we're looking at, although we have identified more projects than could be executed in 20 years, which is why the prioritization is so important.
- Tarik – thanks for the presentation. In the PAC meetings we discuss safety – TPD gives a report on casualties at each meeting. Is this data incorporated here or could it be in the future?
  - Patrick – safety was incorporated in two different ways. For project development we looked at areas that had a disproportionate number of crashes and injuries, and also the Pedestrian Safety Action Plan (top 10% of segments with known safety issues). Also using safety in the prioritization process – about 20 points out of 50 comes from looking at the safety profile of the area.
- Ruth – will we get an excel spreadsheet with project descriptions?
  - Patrick – will depend on what we can turn around. What would be the most helpful way to receive information to you? We want to communicate broad elements, not specific design issues.
  - Ruth – knowing what is actually being proposed to be done; want description of work on the segments.
  - Patrick – would same level of info we shared for RTA projects be useful? → Yes.
- Stacy – for this exercise do you want us to limit our assessment to just the things that are identified here? Should we mention something that we think is missing?
  - Patrick – definitely please share things that you think we have missed
- Colby – how is the prioritization process updated with new data?
  - Patrick – we have not established a schedule yet. 5 years is likely a reasonable amount of time to revisit. If opportunities arise in less time we can be responsive to those
- Selina – re: lighting, will we be able to see the elements/amenities that will go into these projects?
  - Patrick – we can think of a way to do that. It's easier for catalyst corridors. Some of the strategic investments are harder to express in this way. We are looking at the best way to distill and communicate this.
- Stacy –if we have a questions about a specific project, can we ask that and get a response quickly?
  - Patrick – sure, email or call me with any questions or comments. There may also be an opportunity to have a couple groups come in (sub-quorum) and do a review of projects with me if this is desired.
  - Stacy – if we could track Q&A somewhere so others could see what has been asked (e.g. a google doc) that would be useful.
  - Diana – we have the ability to set up a chat room in Teams and add the full CSCC. Questions can be posted there and staff can answer them. Only restriction is that members can't talk with each other.
- Jonathan – is this list all potential projects, or a prioritized list?
  - Patrick – this is the full universe of projects that are not yet prioritized. We'll come back to you in April after running it through the framework we discussed last month.
- David Higuera – awesome stuff. Might be good to highlight where current bike and other infrastructure currently exist.
- Craig – do we envision meetings continuing on Zoom for the foreseeable future?
  - Diana – we are potentially looking at starting in-person meetings in June. Also discussing a hybrid option.

- Jonathan – are you asking us to submit a prioritized list?
  - Andy – no, we want to know if there are any projects missing or if anything is unclear before we proceed with prioritization.
- Ruth – can you share Erin's presentation?

6. Wrap-up and next steps
- Will share the list/map by end of the day Friday. Please provide input by end of the day April 5. Is there a preference for how this is shared (digital, static, etc.?)
  - Colby and Catlow – interactive map
  - Stacy – when you set up the chat room can you also share relevant links to things like the 407 projects?
- Roster update: Lucy Libosha has left CSCC (she will be running for council office in Ward 3), Dale Faulkner has also stepped down. If you know of anyone interested let Patrick know.
  - Selina – please send council the application

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 by Colby and Stacy