



## Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

April 22, 2023 (12:30pm – 3:30pm)  
In-person retreat | TEP (88 E. Broadway)



### Approved Minutes

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

Quorum was established and the meeting was called to order by co-chairs at 1:00 pm (lunch 12:30-1:00)

**Members Present:**

Rhonda Bodfield  
Jill Brammer  
Marshall Davis  
Charly Earley  
Jennifer Flores  
Sophia Gonzalez  
Craig McCaskill  
Katharine Mitchell  
Grecia Ramirez  
Ruth Reiman  
Miranda Schubert  
Tarik Williams

**Members Absent:**

Selina Barajas  
Rossio Araujo  
Jonathan Crowe  
Paki Rico  
Riley Merline  
Liz Soltero

**Staff:**

Patrick Harley  
Jenn Toothaker

**Guests:**

Evren Sonmez (Living Steets Alliance)

**Facilitation:**

Colleen Whitaker

#### 2. Housekeeping

- Patrick reviewed the agenda and materials provided to members in packets.

#### 3. Introductions and Team Building

Members introduced themselves, including sharing a transportation “artifact” (an object that says something about their interest in or connection to complete streets concepts)

#### 4. CSCC background and context

**Overview of Complete Streets Policy and CSCC origins** – *Evren Sonmez, Living Steets Alliance (LSA)*

- LSA initiated a Pedestrian Safety and Walkability program in 2009. This included walkability assessments with neighbors – they heard consistently that people needed funding for projects.
- This led to a 2015 bond for Pedestrian Safety and Comfort in Pima County. This did not pass, but it helped to initiate a lot of momentum and interest.

- Evren was in DC at national walking summits and met director of National complete Streets Coalition who were working on grant to support initiatives across the country. They were able to get funded through Voices for Healthy Kids.
- LSA began working with DTM and a small group of folks – many different interest and constituencies were involved. Worked with facilitators to develop the policy. Very interactive. This led to the Complete Streets Task Force.
- The way that the CSCC was set up all came out of this approach: facilitators, co-chairs, consensus driven (modified Robert’s rules).
- Implementation of the Complete Streets Policy – a first step was hiring Patrick, and forming the CSCC, both of which happened quickly. Another item was supposed to be an implementation plan, but this didn’t happen. Perhaps this is okay (some plans just sit on the shelf; so much of the implementation has happened anyway – Design Guidelines, Move Tucson, etc.)
- There is a lot of room for CSCC involvement in Complete Streets issues moving forward. Excited to see how all this will play out in the built environment. There were 99 fatalities last year; there is still work to do.
- Complete Streets is more about a mindset and an approach. Don’t want the term to be co-opted. Can’t just slap it on a project and say you’re done.

### *Question/Discussion*

- Rhonda - How are we doing at reaching the vision?
  - Feel very encouraged by the work of this body. There have been many positive steps. Although there is a lot still to do.
- Jennifer – the equity aspect of this work is of the most importance. Virtual participation has been hard (she has to be on the phone). Some of us work in places where there is nothing.
- Ruth – RTA Next have changed all the projects and called them capital maintenance. This is frustrating after all this work and developing a definition of a Complete Streets road. How do we make progress?
  - RTA is problematic. Would like to see the City of Tucson having more autonomy in defining the projects we want to see in our jurisdiction. The regional priorities are not very aligned. Passing a package with the same parameters as in 2006 would be a mistake, and not aligned with the Complete Streets vision that we have.
- Sophia – we need to remind ourselves where power is actually held, and encourage each other to always think about this.
  - shared decision-making and impact are important
- Charly – live one block south of Broadway. Since completion of that project everything has felt louder and more dangerous (e.g. drag racers at night). This is a “silent” city problem – cars/motorcycles taking over intersections. Is this a concern for LSA?
  - Evren – LSA shares concerns about Broadway. Widening and just adding sidewalks is problematic.
  - Patrick – yes the racing thing is a huge problem across the city and has been on the rise since the pandemic. Do see crashes/fatalities as a result of this. Part of this is enforcement, part is design. Not sure what the TPD conversation is on this.

### **Reflection: Things members are proud of that have been accomplished by the group**

Members reflected via silent writing on index cards (see list below). Some members shared ideas aloud:

- Sophia – equity; centering folks that have been traditionally excluded. Glad when we ask those questions
- Grecia – maintained a strong membership. 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> St. presentation with DTM Director – we had some really good questions. This dialogue was important.
- Ruth – Move Tucson was a lot of work. Good that people know where to go and what to look at.
- Katherine – accountability. Done good job to create systems/metrics for holding projects accountable. Op-eds. Open conversations and vocal as a group.

- Jennifer – 1<sup>st</sup> Ave work. Rhonda writing letter.

*Ideas shared in writing:*

- Maintained a strong CSCC membership
- Challenge/dialogue on the traffic study for 5th/6th Road Diet decisions
- Advocacy for 5th/6th Road Diet
- 5th/6th St
- Emphasis on equity
- Questions around equity, centering folks who've been historically excluded
- Equity-focused project prioritization for Move Tucson
- Education, advocacy and oversight
- Equity focus
- Move Tucson
- Moving Move Tucson forward
- 411 Implementation + (future) oversight
- Becoming the "oversight" body for Prop 411
- Set first year budget for 411 (SSIP Subcommittee)
- 1st year projects
- 1st Ave not widening needlessly
- 1st Ave adjustment with input; letter to express CSCC stance; RTA change of heart
- 1st Ave advocacy
- Impact on 1st Ave project
- Serving as a body that holds others accountable.
- Op-eds that have been written - greater conversation around safety, in particular fatalities.
- Definitions now "on paper" of how we see Complete Streets as a city
- Collaborative efforts (communications)
- Education around terminology (capacity building)
- Field trips
- Increased awareness and buy-in to importance of CS approach - both at the City and among residents
- Maintaining focus on complete streets - we keep it alive

### **Role of CSCC in oversight, project review and implementation**

Patrick provided a reminder of the functions and duties of the CSCC

- Actively overseeing the Complete Streets (CS) Policy implementation process
- Bring diverse community perspectives to inform implementation of CS Policy.
- Advise and make recommendations for Mayor & Council and staff on, but not limited to the following:
  - CS Policy implementation plan
  - Prioritization of transportation improvement projects
  - Allocation of transportation funding for CS improvements
  - Design of transportation projects to ensure consistency with the CS policy
  - Production and distribution of a biennial report documenting progress on CS policy
- Financial oversight of Prop 411

Miranda shared a reflection on CSCC role:

- When we read the enabling documents, we have a lot of responsibility and authority.
- We got a presentation about 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> and it was very exciting. Funding from 407 to 411 was layered. It was being called a Complete Streets project.
- But it felt like we got the presentation and then didn't hear anything for a while. Felt like we didn't hear about it next until we heard the road diet was off. Started poking around and found the city website content looked very different.

- When Sam Credio presented, we had a lot of good questions for him. Seems like the CS approach hasn't been brought in on an inter-departmental level.
- Want to unpack what happened with 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> project. How can we learn about projects before decisions are made? How do we get clarity about who is making decisions? With this it felt like nobody was on same page.
- We want to be advocates for better projects. Don't like punitive measures of accountability.

#### Group discussion:

- Marshall – is our reach limited to recently passed propositions?
  - Miranda – the documents indicate it is all projects
  - Patrick – yes, design of all projects moving forward
- Grecia – how do we get involved with the selection of the engineering team and consulting team on projects?
- Tarik – What could it look like to have members of M&C or elected officials in our meetings to understand our discussion and deliberation on projects?
- Sophia – how can we streamline the process of review?
- Rhonda – can we advocate for alternative studies on key projects?
  - Patrick – this forum could be used to recommend a more expansive analysis. There are 4-5 potential road diets imminently coming up. We are looking at lessons learned from 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup>. Could be an opportunity to take advantage of this timing to become part of this discussion.
- Jennifer – did we talk about what neighbors wanted on 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup>? People should have more voice than cars.
- Charly – at the last meeting on 36<sup>th</sup> St. it seemed like the decision was made quickly. Does this group ever say you want more time to deliberate, or does it always go so quickly?
  - Katherine – does it always have to be live? Can we do written motions?
  - Grecia – we do have a short window to gather our thoughts, even though Patrick does share stuff ahead of time. Might be useful to make decisions in the following meeting, or maybe in a subcommittee?
  - Miranda – it's not always clear when we get presentations if we are needed to approve, or just providing comments?
    - Patrick – in some cases we are just looking for review/comment (on things like design; comments would be bundled with neighborhood outreach etc.). The next level is taking an action (we want x out of this design). For Prop 411 projects you can withhold funding (“veto power”). It really is up to CSCC where you want to elevate your voice on certain projects.
- Marshall – are we allowed to table motions to bring back later? What are ways we can ask to come back at next meetings?
  - Patrick – with 411 projects you can withhold approval and take more time to discuss.
- Tarik – what would it look like to think about criteria/priorities for an area before we are in design?
  - Rhonda – we could develop a check list for presenters.
  - Patrick – we have this in the Design Guide.
  - Grecia – whose role is it to make sure they look at this before?
  - Miranda – we don't want them to talk to us until they have looked at the list!
  - Patrick – one challenge for City is that technical standards and guidelines are in conflict. This is a goal for the upcoming year. But by in large the consultants we work with are well aware of these.
  - Tarik – something more specific for each project could be useful. Highlighting certain things that are relevant for a project.
- Evren – there are two levels of involvement here. One is at the project-level (i.e. ensuring that they are following the CS approach). But there is also a more systemic level (reference CS Policy, page 12 #8 – *“Identify ways to improve other City practices to better align with the vision and intent of CS Policy and*

*changing trends in industry....”). Seems like this was under DTMs role. The fact that 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> St. opened this conversation is wonderful. It would be unfortunate if you were left in this situation for all projects. There is an opportunity for some work within DTM to update some processes to better align with the CS approach.*

- Patrick: we will be working to align city policies and producers with the CS Design Guideline. This is a big lift. Also looking to update project charters and initiation processes. Part of this would be making sure that all projects would have a touch point with CSCC at some point.
  - Jenn – we were looking to incorporate the checklist into an initial charter. Have recognized there are distinct phases in capital development processes. The checklist may be good for a certain point, but as projects come back for review what do you want to see? Some of our work internally should help with this – trying to identify when CSCC can have most influence and what the role is (this includes signage around construction). This is a great way for this group to keep holding our feet to the fire.
- Tahnee – need to find separate time to work on this project review/prioritization problem more.
  - Recommendation is that this is not a separate meeting, but part of one of the regular CSCC meetings.

## 5. Moving Forward

Members shared their thoughts on the most important needs moving forward (on sticky notes), in two categories: priorities for the CSCC itself, and broader Complete Streets (CS) needs (beyond CSCC). The ideas have been organized by theme/topic below:

### Education/awareness raising

#### *CSCC priorities:*

- Continued press release updates
- Brag broadly about what we do to raise awareness
- Monthly social media posts on DTM page (includes meeting time and agenda)

#### *Broader CS needs:*

- Public education to improve safety. Education campaign to improve rules of the road with CS safety measures.
- Promote changing transportation culture - i.e. education/outreach as well as actual project opportunities

### Advocacy

#### *CSCC priorities*

- Have more voice at all the various transportation projects meetings
- Advocacy in schools
- RTA Next advocacy
- Advocate for road diets as appropriate

#### *Broader CS needs:*

- Advocacy conversation on Complete Streets as a necessity, not a luxury
- Advocacy: engage with general public at large about CS to raise awareness on projects, needs, etc.

### Project design and review

#### *CSCC priorities:*

- Mini-grants program - get as many neighborhood projects as possible underway
- Reviewing as many of the 62 projects as possible
- Make sure CSCC is hearing about projects before they go to design
- Prioritization of Complete Streets elements (be more selective)
- Prioritize areas - this is where the CSCC can have the most influence on projects, not right before construction (not just "rubber stamping"). Let it be more of a back and forth

- Need time to review 411 projects to see if they meet CS guidelines

*Broader CS needs:*

- Improved Mission Rd - pedestrian infrastructure
- More inclusive traffic analysis
- Prescribed traffic studies that more fully consider traffic collisions and pedestrian safety
- Maps are the most important way to convey info. Sometimes what is most important is what hasn't been said. List of priorities the design was using could be useful
- Weighted community input analysis to prioritize those who suffer most/longest

Safety

*CSCC priorities:*

- Open each CSCC meeting with current stats of traffic violence/pedestrian fatalities

*Broader CS needs:*

- Demonstrated effectiveness of CS work - punitive law enforcement
- Reduce traffic violence
- Reduce traffic aggression
- Discussion on how we define "safety" in light of fatalities; maybe putting more to TPD is not helping

Equity

*CSCC priorities:*

- Partner/connect with City of Tucson's Chief Equity Officer

*Broader CS needs:*

- Transportation equity framework (y)

Multimodal approach

*CSCC priorities:*

- Elevate infrastructure for different modes of transportation via innovative ways (g)

*Broader CS needs:*

- Less implementations for car convenience
- Stop unnecessary road widenings
- Look for opportunities to reduce cars on the road
- Fare free public transit

Collaboration

*CSCC priorities:*

- Meaningful engagement with adjacent groups/departments (goal to streamline development/growth)
- Align with other related efforts

Policy/procedures

*Broader CS needs:*

- Align DTM internal practices with Complete Streets goals
- CSCC implementation steps (see CS Policy p12) - #3,6,8,9,13,14 (larger role for CSCC in 6 and 13)

CSCC meetings

- Plan Tucson transportation element at CSCC meeting
- Quick check-in before beginning meetings
- Less Zoom more in-person
- In person meetings once a quarter
- Have a seat at the table for all the different transportation meetings

- Time to process info with others

## 5. Wrap up

Members shared their feedback in a retreat evaluation form. Responses below:

CSCC- What is going well?	CSCC - Suggested improvements?	Retreat - Likes	Retreat - Improvements
Everyone is respectful of one another, accountability, role in publishing letters to editor, good questions, interesting presentations	Meeting in person, more time on agenda for items for discussion, go over checklist as a group to discuss process, CSCC to be along whole project process with multiple checkpoints (at least 2-3)	Everyone really showed up and shared honestly. Getting to know one another, Lunch!, The sticky activity	More of them!
Moving effectively through project lists, raising important issues re equity, respectful dialogue	Mostly captured in sticky notes already, more field trips	Loved the personal connection, liked crystallizing some areas of improvement	Maybe longer
Having really great project presentations for each meeting	More focused meetings, less topics per meeting. Review meeting/topics, especially those that generate larger discussion and more them for the next meeting to allow deeper, more quality discussion	Time for members to discuss committee process and our impact on policy. Allowing for greater discussion among members	More time for discussion
Well-structured and run, super appreciate receiving materials ahead of time	Would be helpful to receive presentations beforehand	Being in person	Probably longer, takes a minute to get into it
Managing time. Everyone seems comfortable sharing their ideas	meet in person	Meeting in person - nice environment. Getting to know other members	More time seems to be needed
Feel like everybody is motivated and willing to work, preparation by staff is exceptional	Time limits need to be strictly enforced. With so much happening recommend we meet more than once a month? Also maybe meetings in person can accomplish more	Great conversation about the CSCC, introductions more helpful	More time
Timeliness, Spirit of collaboration comradery. Encouragement of equity lens. Having facilitators and staff available	Slowing down for others understanding. Getting stipends for people's time (maybe meetings more accessible). Could improve diversity of council. How can we sharpen our critical analysis to be more anti-racist and less harmful in our work? How can we better learn history/content of streets we discuss?	Getting to better know each other in person is nice 1-2x a year. Hearing people's passions. Food	Continue to build on the facilitator. Stir the pot, capacity building, getting after what needs to be done. Mind-bending, switching up perspectives to expand brainstorming power.
I'm new. But from this retreat, i can see that dedication and a concerned		Meeting everyone! Intros were great, though perhaps too much time dedicated to this. And	As a visual person, having material to read beforehand, or having info linkages

approach to the future unities this group		appreciated learning how the council works, and the handouts really help	on slides (on a screen) is helpful
We always make quorum. Members are engaged and passionate in discussion. Collaboration and discussion/decision making is focused, inclusive, constructive	Less presentations, more interactive discussion. Balance time spent on specific tasks with bigger picture visioning	It was fun and i felt like i got to know my fellow CSCC members. More great relationship building and conversation - great jumping off point for upcoming year	Maybe allocate more time

**The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 by the co-chairs.**