



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

July 27, 2022 (5:30pm – 7:30pm)

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)



Approved Minutes

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Quorum was established and the meeting was called to order at 5:34pm

Members Present:

Rossio Araujo
Selina Barajas
Jill Brammer
Rhonda Bodfield
Jennifer Flores
Craig McCaskill
Katharine Mitchell
Grecia Ramirez
Ruth Reiman
Liz Soltero
Miranda Schubert
Catlow Shipek
Tarik Williams
Paki Rico

Members Absent:

Jonathan Crowe

Staff:

Patrick Harley
Jenn Toothaker
Monica Landgrave-Serrano
Chris Desborough

Observers:

Ben Buehler-Garcia
Riley Merline
Tres English
Sophia Gonzalez
Sam Credio
Scott Robidoux (TAA)

Guests:

Arlie Adkins (UA)

Facilitation:

Tahnee Robertson
Colleen Whitaker

2. Housekeeping

- Approve past meeting minutes
 - No corrections were offered. **Move to approve minutes – Jill; second – Ruth.**
- Introduction of new members (not yet fully seated, but will be by next meeting)
 - Sophia Gonzales (BAC)
 - Riley Merline (TTF)
- Request for new roster with August meeting agenda

3. Induced Demand - Arlie Adkins, Professor of Urban Planning, University of Arizona

Arlie shared a presentation, the main points are summarized here.

- Transportation planning includes: supply management, demand management and land use management. All of these need to support community goals.

- Congestion is the traffic level at which you move past the point of peak efficiency. This can be caused by demand surpassing capacity, and/or mis-management, or even a one-time incident (crash).
- New or expanded roads will increase overall traffic. This is related to the concept of *Triple Convergence*:
 - More drivers will converge on a previously congested route from - different times of day, different routes, different modes.
- Options for responding to congestion with this in mind:
 - Increase capacity (more lanes, better technology)
 - Just deal with it (many cities have done this outside the US)
 - Decrease or shift demand, below some congestion threshold
- Identifying when there is congestion over certain times is where we start. Try to build solutions that are tailored to this (i.e. if there is only congestion for 55 minutes of the day then building a whole new lane is probably overkill).
- Example - 1st Ave vs. Grant Rd.
 - Although they have the same ADT, there is a 47% difference in peak hour traffic per lane.
- How would triple convergence play out on a widened 1st Ave?
 - There are a number of parallel routes with excess capacity. Traffic may return to 1st from these roads.

Questions/Discussion

- Tres (observer) - we don't have the opportunity to change the density of Tucson in any radical way in the near future. Are there other ways to impact the amount of travel, without changing density?
 - Don't think the density is static over next 30 years. This can change into the future.
- Miranda - seems these are principles are well-established, yet these ideas get politicized. Wonder to what extent our local governments are taking research into account when making decisions?
 - Depends on where you are. Some cities have even taken this concept too far. It is increasingly common for cities to consider future need/demand.
- Sophia - where can we find out about how bad congestion really is in Tucson?
 - Patrick - this analysis was one of the drivers of the Move Tucson process. We did look at potential bottlenecks. What we found was surprising - looking at an objective measure, only 9% of the network was congested during peak hours. We currently have about 160 miles of excess capacity on our network. Think a lot of this is perception, and that frustrations are stemming from hitting red lights, which is different than congestion.
- Riley - for commuters who only come in/out during peak times, their perception may make it seem like there is more congestion than there is. How do we help them understand it is only part of the time?
 - Tucson's traffic signals lead to an illusion of more congestion than we have.
- Katharine - Could you share how the impacts of a shift to work from home as a result of the pandemic in Tucson (or larger national context) have come up in conversation with this demand?
 - For over a year cities around the country experienced greatly reduced traffic. We are now returning, more or less, to pre-pandemic driving levels. Some exceptions are central business districts that aren't seeing the employment return.

- A subcommittee was created at the last meeting to draft this letter. The letter is encouraging M&C to not send the project to RTA Next, and get it moving again.
- Envisioned audiences for the letter are: M&C, RTA Board, AZ Daily Star

Rhonda reviewed the letter with screen share and the group edited together. Main points of the discussion and agreed changes are summarized here:

Group discussion on letter and distribution list

- Content suggestions:
 - Catlow - include more about the vision and where we are trying to head towards. Not just focusing on the negative. Language from the City of Tucson Complete Streets Vision document that might be incorporated. Also remove acronyms or spell out on first use.
 - Ruth - we may need to tweak a bit more for the Star to clarify things, but the content and principle would remain the same.
- Distribution/audiences:
 - Jill - could also send to Tucson Sentinel
 - Jennifer - Tucson Weekly
 - Rhonda - share with other BBCs, especially those in the CSCC Hub.
 - Craig - how does social media get included for distribution of something like this?
 - Patrick - Not sure if the City could do it. Once it's been published people could probably re-post (but not on behalf of CSCC in an official capacity).
 - Sophia - May want to wait on social media for media organizations to share it first.
 - Ruth - ask ward offices to put this in their newsletters.
 - Miranda - what about neighborhood associations in the area?

Consensus agreement on letter

- All thumbs up for full agreement of the draft (with small tweaks as noted), and distribution list
- **Ruth - move to approve the 1st Avenue letter, with small tweaks noted here, for release to M&C and others; Jill – second.**

Logistics of distribution

- The city can share with M&C, ward offices. For things going to media or RTA it needs to come from committee directly and not through department.
- Once revisions are made distribution can begin. Subcommittee will lead this.
- Not sure if signatures of co-chairs is needed
- Follow-up: Rhonda will make revisions. Ruth/Patrick will work out who/how to send to different audiences.

5. Proposed Prop 411 Safety Plan Framework - Patrick

Patrick reviewed the presentation shared in May. The framework document was also shared with members ahead of the meeting. For main points of presentation see May minutes.

Questions/discussion

- Ruth - what authority do we have to direct DTM to do things differently?
 - Patrick - the program can't go forward until CSCC approves the SSIP.
 - Ruth – after that our role is to monitor actions? → Yes.

- Ruth - can we add language that describes this better. Want it explained somewhere that we can do more than review.
- Ruth - what happens at end of 5 years?
 - Patrick - that is not yet defined and could be up for discussion. Staff is proposing a rolling 5 year SSIP. After year 1, new projects would be moved into year 5, over the full 10-year horizon.
 - Goal is to meet the distribution over the 5 years.
- Ruth - what about ward influence?
 - Patrick - we will work with the wards as we develop the SSIP
- Tarik - do we get to suggest new projects? Or are projects brought to us for review?
 - Patrick - it's more the latter, but we are happy to entertain project suggestions from the committee. Please send any thoughts you have - the City is keeping a running list.
- Grecia - is the funding distribution set already, or can we modify that?
 - Patrick - that is set; this is what voters approved.
- Grecia - hard to understand how the traffic signal upgrades works. Is this mostly to accommodate drivers? How is that specifically going to protect cyclists and pedestrians?
 - Patrick – we are working through projects specific to this right now. The signaling should make improvements for bike/ped in a number of ways. It also allows us to maximize capacity of existing network, and alleviate pressure to add lanes.
- Tarik - request that audio signals are brought into consideration.
 - Patrick - yes we can make sure to include accessible pedestrian signals.
- Catlow - How do we address critical safety needs, but also do it in ways that induce demand in alternative mobility options?
 - Patrick – None of the 411 projects are adding physical capacity to the roadways
- Riley - does all traffic calming funding come from this pool of 80% (i.e. speed humps - recently saw neighborhood near Mercado with so many)
 - Patrick – we are doing installations with Prop 407. Speed humps are standard on Bike Boulevards. Another option to fund these features is the neighborhood traffic management program.
 - Jenn - the project in the Mercado area was funded through money combined from Rio Nuevo and Tucson Water.
- Riley - would we use a similar approach with projects you are already moving forward? Can we apply this new funding to projects that are already underway or just beginning?
 - Patrick - maybe this could be added into the framework
- Rhonda - is there a set division by wards? Or is it just being driven by safety?
 - The first pass is to take the data driven approach. But do want to ensure that it is city-wide as well. Would you prefer that this is called out in this document?
 - Rhonda - would like to have the info about distribution.
- Sophia – re: p.10 on funding allotted to ward offices. Can we say that the funding doesn't need to be equally distributed among wards?
 - Patrick - this is the opportunity to discuss any improvements to this.
- Evren (observer) - you acknowledge there may need to be additional resources to help neighborhoods with less funding or who need more organization. It's not clearly stated in here. Is there any portion of Prop 411 that can be used for this? Could this be more clearly laid out in the document.
 - Patrick - Nothing has been finalized. We are working on this. The current proposal is to make DTM staff available to work with the neighborhoods to support proposal development. We may also need to identify complimentary funding sources.
- CSCC members expressed that they would like to give direction to DTM to firm up the language on support for neighborhoods and how this will be funded.
 - Tarik - possible language: identify funding for more community engagement
 - Miranda - we need additional time to consider this language. This is important and we want to be careful on what we're approving. In general I'm on board with the approach, but can we motion to continue discussion to next meeting?

- Tarik - what are timeline considerations?
 - Patrick - staff do want to be able to start identifying projects, and do need lead time for design.

Summary of suggested edits:

- Speak more broadly about the project layering approach
- Show physical distribution of projects
- Need more discussion on 10% set aside for neighborhood street funding (does this just get distributed equally to council offices; how can equitable distribution happen?)

Recommendation discussion:

- Patrick asked if the City could move forward with support for general approach, but bring back the specific elements discussed tonight. The staff need to be able to begin project identification.
- The recommendation from the Committee is to direct staff to begin identifying projects, and come back with a more developed approach to 10% set aside. The formal action will be the 5 year document.
- All members showed a “thumbs up” for this approach.
- Ruth - **Motion to approve this recommendation (that staff can begin identifying projects, and come back to CSCC with a more developed approach to 10% set aside); Jill – second.**

6. RTA Next update - Paki

- Currently in phase 3 - reviewing and reducing number of submitted projects. Aligning projects to meet CAC plan goals and balancing funding needs.
- Board met in early June and gave direction to CAC in to provide a recommended draft plan by July 1, 2021
- The CAC may consider CAC's Guiding Principles and submit outcome of discussion to the RTA Board prior to Aug 18, 2022
- TMC will meet on Aug 10, 2022
- RTA Board next meeting is Aug 25, 2022

7. Wrap up

- Share any thoughts/questions with Patrick directly about the framework. Feel free to share project ideas or priorities that you see around town!

Meeting was adjourned at 7:30pm