



Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC)

Saturday, February 8, 2020 (8:00am – 2:00pm)

Park Tucson Conference Room

110 E. Pennington St., Ste. 150

Tucson, Arizona 85701

Meeting Minutes Approved 02/26/2020

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

A quorum was established. Patrick Hartley called the meeting to order at 8:05am

Members Present:

Allen Kath
Colby Henley
Derek Brown
Grecia Ramirez
Jonathan Crowe
Lucy LiBosha
Michael Guymon
Moiria Alexander
Paki Rico
Peter Norback
Rod Lane
Ruth Reiman
Selina Barajas
Stacy Rodenberg
Tarik Williams
Ted Bell

Members Absent:

Amaury Corona
Catlow Shippek
Craig McCaskill
Dale Faulkner

Staff and Audience Present:

Oscar Gandy
J.D. Garcia
Nathalia Untiveros
Davita Mueller
Jennifer Toothaker
Monica Landgrave-Serrano,
Diana Alarcon
Patrick Hartley
Tahnee Robertson, Colleen Whitaker (facilitators)

2. Approval of Minutes

- No corrections
- **Motion: Michael Guymon. Stacy Rodenberg seconded. All approved.**

3. Call to the Audience

- No audience announcements. Patrick noted that the CSCC will be discussing today how to engage with audience members at future meetings.

Patrick introduced the facilitators – Tahnee Robertson and Colleen Whitaker of Southwest Decision Resources.

4. Overview of CSCC Purpose – Presentation by Patrick Hartley

Patrick presented an overview of the CSCC purpose and key aspects of the enabling legislation, as well as an overview of Move Tucson.

Question and comments:

- Paki requested access to the presentation at Wednesday’s Move Tucson kick-off – Patrick will follow up.
- Lucy suggested we explore the upcoming Cesar Chavez event as a good outreach opportunity.
- Michael asked how Move Tucson will relate to previous and current relevant efforts (e.g. Major Streets and Routes Plan, RTA, and Plan Tucson which developed partly out of Imagine Greater Tucson).
 - Patrick noted the City is thinking about how these things are integrated. Move Tucson will be more specific on transportation than Plan Tucson. This is also an opportunity to review and revise the Major Streets and Routes Plan, which has been identified as something that needs to be addressed. For those who are less familiar, Patrick clarified that the MSR Plan is one of the documents that drives development patterns. It identifies future rights of way, and requirements for set-backs. In some cases, this is inhibiting development along our major corridors. This is why the buildings are often so far back from the street. In more compact areas there are also challenges; it is difficult to achieve more infill development with the required setbacks.
 - Jonathan noted that Pima County has a MSR Plan as well, with similar issues. This was revised as part of the Comprehensive Plan Update. The one size fits all 150’ right-of-way doesn’t make sense for many of these routes. They worked through the Planning and Zoning Commission to downsize these, and it was approved through the Board of Supervisors. They really didn’t encounter much opposition, which was somewhat surprising. Glad the city will be doing this; there are many opportunities.

5. Successful committees – small group discussions

Three small groups discussed their experiences with previous committees or other facilitated groups. They reflected on what went well, and what was not good. After discussion, one person from each group shared main points in plenary.

Flip chart notes from small group discussions:

<u>Good things</u>	<u>Bad things</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Celebrating successes• All are valued• Focus on goals and outcomes constantly• Clear timelines• Hearing different perspectives• Good documentation• Respectful disagreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No clear path• Meeting for meetings sake• Lack of democracy• One person dominates or intimidates• Quiet people not getting a voice• Disconnect with decision methods

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely sharing of materials (agenda, minutes) • Clear roles (rotating subcommittee leads) • Equity through consensus • Problem-solving outlook • Clear purpose and goal for meeting • Clear agenda • Clear path to decision and clarify options • Wrap up at the end of the meeting with key outcomes, actions, decisions, etc. • Leadership on committee (chair, vice chair) • Focused conversation, timely • Clear communication between CSCC and other groups, larger effort • Democracy/methods for increasing participation • Keeping everyone at the same level, especially if someone misses a meeting • Tiered consensus • Efficiency • When there is disagreement, all sides get heard • Divvy up the responsibilities and tasks • Path laid out • Discussions organized, everyone can participate • Lots of tools • Make sure everyone says something – meeting rules • Regular communication and involvement • Education • Chairperson who is a great facilitator • Officers can keep momentum going • Facilitator off-sets the power struggle with the officers • Communication process for members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many subcommittees. Disorganized. Too many chefs in the kitchen • No communication between meetings • Equity is hard to address • Concern is facilitator that isn't invested in the process • Chairperson only wants their ideas advanced • Titles confer authority • Process is more important than the outcomes – no action • Different perspectives not working well together • Inconsistent participation • Poorly managing on-boarding
---	--

6. Key principles for CSCC

At their tables members reviewed and discussed draft working agreements for City of Tucson BCCs. Several updated were suggested (see text below; suggested edits appear in red).

Suggested Ground Rules for BCC Meetings

The following lists of ground rules are suggested in order to facilitate and not inhibit discussion.

The list is a general guideline and is not all-inclusive.

1. Only one person speaks at a time; no one will interrupt while someone is speaking.
2. Each person expresses their own views, rather than speaking for others at the table or attributing motives to them.

- a. **Suggested Edit: Each person shall express their own views, and be clear about their constituency. Also, they will not speak for others or attribute motives to them.**
- 3. Avoid grandstanding (i.e., extended comments/speaking), so that everyone has a fair chance to speak.
 - a. **Suggested Edit: This is subjective. Consider removing.**
- 4. No personal attacks. Challenge ideas, not people.
- 5. Everybody agrees to make a strong effort to stay on track with the agenda and to move the deliberations forward.
- 6. Everybody will seek to focus on the merits of what is being said, making a good faith effort to understand the concerns of others. Questions of clarification are encouraged. Disparaging comments are discouraged.
- 7. Everybody will follow the "no surprises" rule. Concerns should be voiced when they arise, not later in the deliberations when a "surprise" objection is raised.
 - a. **Suggested Edit: The wording is confusing. Consider adding the word transparency (promote greater transparency; or transparency through the decision-making process). May also consider removing altogether.**
- 8. Each person will seek to identify options or proposals that represent shared interests, without minimizing legitimate disagreements. Each person agrees to do their best to take account of the interests of the group as a whole.
- 9. Each person reserves the right to disagree with any proposal and accepts responsibility for offering alternatives that accommodates their interests and the interests of others.
- 10. **Suggested addition: Keep voices at reasonable level; no screaming.**
- 11. **Suggested addition: The word respond is not here at all. Find a way to add.**

7. Decision-making protocols – Tahnee Robertson, Southwest Decision Resources

Tahnee presented an overview of different decision-making models and protocols, with a focus on consensus-based models and methods. It was noted that the enabling legislation requires this group to use collaborative decision-making.

Comments and questions

- Colby noted past experience with consensus – it allowed more nuance to discussion and decisions. It was good to have the different levels of agreement, and the majority/minority reports are important.
- Ruth has consensus is different from compromise
 - Tahnee responded: Compromise is often considered 50/50. Consensus is about improving the quality of the decision (it could be 70/60). In reality, in order to come to agreement, you may have to compromise to some degree, but by talking you can actually craft a better solution.
- Stacy asked how we would report this in the Legal Action Report, noting that the method for recording BCC votes has recently changed.
 - Jenn clarified that we do have to do a numbered vote. One idea is that we run through consensus until take vote. Will clarify with the Clerk's office, but a Yes/No/Abstain vote is required.
 - Tahnee suggested we might be able to record the levels of agreement and the minority opinion. Normally the term "vote" would not be used for a consensus process.

- Selina asked how having a chair would affect the consensus framework?
 - Patrick reminded the members that this is about how they want the group to function. The CSCC is committed to facilitation at this point, so we need to think about how this would work with a traditional officer approach.
 - Tahnee noted that in a consensus approach the chair wouldn't have a higher level of decision authority.
- Derek wondered if the group had made the decision to be a consensus group.
 - Patrick said the language in the enabling legislation is to use "collaborative decision-making"
 - Tahnee suggested that the group could choose which type of decision style was appropriate for different decisions. For example, some more important things will require consensus, but simple and less-important decisions could possibly be majority or supermajority.
- Michael asked Patrick for an example of a consensus decision the group might need to make.
 - This could happen while working on the project prioritization tool, for example. The council would need to decide what adjustments you'd like to see to a draft product from Alta. We could iterate on the design, and then use the thumbs consensus approach to see how many would give support to this. Or looking at a project to see if it is consistent with the process.
 - Michael noted this is really about opening up clear lines of discussion, rather than just saying yes or no. It's inviting more in-depth discussion.
- Lucy asked what the purpose of having non-voting members is, in terms of the decision-making process.
 - Patrick shared that the intent was to ensure there is regional transportation collaboration, while still allowing the voting authority to reside with residents of City of Tucson. The non-voting members have expertise and knowledge of transportation, which they can share throughout this process.
 - Tahnee proposed that the non-voting members participate in everything up to the point where there is a consensus decision to be made.
 - Roderick noted that non-voting members are stipulated in the enabling legislation.
 - Diana said there is value in having other agencies represented as well; it improves collaboration and coordination.
 - Lucy values their input, but wants to be mindful that leads of subcommittees or other things are voting members, not non-voting.

8. Discussion of CSCC Bylaws Topics

The group discussed how to approach bylaws for the following topics:

Roles

- The group reviewed a handout looking at the differences between a traditional officer approach and one that uses facilitation.
- Tahnee suggested the group could revisit how the approach is going throughout the process and make revisions as needed; not stuck with the same thing.

Subcommittees

- The bylaws require a consensus decision to create a committee. The requirement is for 3-8 members on a subcommittee.

- Tahnee proposed the development of a bylaws subcommittee to work with staff and facilitators to develop a draft of bylaws that would then be circulated with the full council for review and approval. We would start with a draft, not from scratch, so it's not as much of a time commitment.
- Paki asked what other options might be
 - Tahnee said the facilitators could work with Patrick to draft the bylaws and then send to the full council for review.
 - Peter thought this option sounded reasonable. Patrick suggested that drafting the bylaws are an opportunity for the CSCC to define your own procedures, rather than having it defined by staff.
- The council took a "thumbs" decision on creating a temporary bylaws committee (thumbs up = agree; thumbs to the side = won't block; thumbs down = do not agree)
 - All showed thumbs up, except Ted who didn't feel it was necessary, but wouldn't oppose it.
 - **The CSCC agreed to establish a bylaws subcommittee. The committee will consist of Paki Rico, Colby Henley, Stacy Rodenberg, and Ruth Reiman.**

Spokespeople

- Colby asked when spokespersons might be necessary - Updates to Mayor and Council? Media interviews?
 - Patrick said both are likely examples.
- Roderick wondered what Diana's (Director of Transportation) view is. This is a delicate issue.
 - Diana responded that part of the role of this CSCC is to advocate for things. Staff cannot advocate, they can educate. When something goes before Mayor and Council that this group has approved, it's good to have one voice. But have to be careful how things are presented – don't want to cause confusion. We may need to dive into this more deeply, but not today. Want to make sure the CSCC are comfortable in the advocacy role – some projects will be controversial.
 - Lucy asked that part of this discourse be to educate the public about our role as voting members and transportation staff.
 - Jenn confirmed that the City will not leave anyone feeling unsupported; if training is needed the department will support that.
- Tarik thought having more than one spokesperson is a good idea, because everyone has different backgrounds and expertise.
- Moira said guidance is needed on how members should respond to queries, and talk to other groups in the community, not just media.
- Diana suggested that some training would be good. City staff will look into this.

Audience participation

- Right now, the audience gets just 10 minutes at beginning of meeting. But the CSCC could allow the audience to participate more – e.g. in subcommittees, speak in meetings (give members priority first).
- Ruth would like to see the more participatory approach. It's frustrating to be quiet through entire meeting. Would like more participation.
- Stacy shared that on the Bicycle Advisory Council it's very useful to have input from public. But it can be limiting, to have only the 10 minutes at the front, and it's hard to convey to them why it's not possible to respond. It would be good to have a wider range of voices.

- Tarif felt that 10 minutes may seem like a lot of time, but if there are many people that may not be enough. Could they send concerns to an email address and we could add their topics to the agenda? Or is it possible to have a social media option?
- The group agreed they would support a more participatory option for the audience, which can be clarified in the bylaws.

Agenda development

- Tahnee clarified that facilitators do not set the agenda, they facilitate the development of the agenda with members of the group.
- Patrick emphasized that this is as an alternative model. Traditionally the chair works with city staff to develop the agenda. With a facilitator, we still want the members to be actively engaged in development of agendas.
- Selina suggested that if CSCC meetings are consistent, there could perhaps be a call for agenda topics to members beforehand, and maybe to the audience too.
- Moira said the group had previously discussed brainstorming agenda items for the next meeting at the end of every meeting.
- Lucy proposed that we create a subcommittee. It's important, and she would volunteer.
- The group discussed the possibility of forming an agenda subcommittee.
 - Patrick pointed out that if there is a subcommittee and we cannot get a quorum at the meeting, then we can't make any decisions, including finalizing an agenda.
 - If there is a subcommittee, those interested in joining are: Lucy, Grecia, Michael, Moira
 - Moira said that having more engagement and ownership over how the committee works is important. She also asked if subcommittees could be dissolved. Diana clarified the CSCC can vote to create or dissolve any subcommittee.
 - Lucy agreed that it's important for the group to have ownership. But in the future, we may decide an agenda subcommittee is not necessary.
 - Patrick will check in with the Clerk's office on whether or not virtual meetings would be possible for this subcommittee.
- Jenn asked if the full CSCC wants to be bcc'd when subcommittees are meeting? Most wanted to just get the final meeting time, not all the scheduling emails.
- Stacy reminded the group that everyone can view the Arizona Open Meeting Laws online. Also, the Ombudsman website has a lot of information on these topics.

Communication

- The facilitation team will strive to have the notes back out to the group within 1-2 weeks. The draft agenda should be shared in time to have review and send comments, be finalized and get posted.
- Moira asked if there is an online place where all documents will be posted?
 - Patrick said there is a Complete Streets webpage on the City website where we can upload everything (handouts, notes, presentations, etc.). The Clerk's office only keeps documents up for one year.
- Selina asked if other BCCs use social media.
 - Diana said they can look into this. She said that what this group is doing is very different than other BCCs - reviewing and prioritizing projects and giving staff recommendations, and then advocating for projects to move forward. It could be the way we've done things in the past isn't necessarily the way we want to move forward. Maybe it is. We don't have to decide today. She's up for re-thinking and innovation.

- Selina asked if the CSCC member names will be posted online.
 - The group informed her they already are online.
 - An audience member said that the only BCC that does have social media is the Metropolitan Education Commission because they were able to get separate funding for this.
- Paki asked about the rules for email communication between members
 - Patrick said all email communication to CSCC members from city staff will be include members as “bcc.” Fewer than a quorum can talk over email, but be wary of too many getting added to the thread.

9. Complete Streets 101 - Everen Sonmez

Evren provided an overview of complete streets key principles.

Comments and questions:

- Jonathan noted that we do want to see both bus stop benches and sidewalks set back further from the edge of the road.
- Jonathan noted that in his neighborhood after putting in traffic circles they were able to transform 4-way stops to 4-way yields. This was a neighborhood decision. It was controversial; there were different opinions. It depends on the volume and speed of traffic.
 - Ted shared that his neighborhood just converted two way stops to 4-way yields. In the example shared from Seattle, the traffic circles were on more narrow streets. In Tucson the streets are so wide that the traffic circle doesn't narrow the street sufficiently to slow traffic.
 - Diana clarified that there are differences between traffic circles and roundabouts. Many of these are on wide streets so the stop sign is necessary. This group will talk about design later and get more into these elements.
- Lucy said we need to keep equity in mind. Biking with friends on the south side, the streets don't look the same. Traffic circles don't always have planting and other elements like sidewalks.
 - Diana said in the past when traffic circles were put into neighborhoods, the neighborhoods were supposed to maintain them. With the new Green Infrastructure Fund, there will be funds to maintain many of these features, and we can start addressing these equity issues.
- Moira said her neighborhood tried to put in speed tables, but they were too expensive (\$5000 a piece). Want to make sure lower income neighborhoods can benefit from programs.
 - Diana said \$5000 is at the high end of what the contractors charge. The City has piloted doing this internally, but it means taking staff off other work.
- Diana proposed that the CSCC do a “pop-up” project in April/May.

10. Next Steps

Standing meeting dates/times

- Proposal is 4th Wednesday of the month (5:45-7:45) [5:30-5:45 arrival and networking]
 - Feb 26, March 17, April 22, May 27, June 24* (flexible due to Alta meeting – will doodle), July 22, Aug 26, Sept 23, Oct 28, Dec 2
- Roderick asked if non-voters can send delegates? Diana said yes
- Derek asked for clarification – will members be removed after missing 3 meetings or 4? Diana confirmed they will be removed after missing 3 meetings.

Agenda items for next meeting

- Design guidelines
- Bylaws
- Working agreements
- Quick build/ pop-up project
- Roles and responsibilities – for April meeting
- Communication – for April meeting

Evaluation

What went well (plus)? What could be improved (delta)?

Plus

- Good to be with smaller group and get to know people
- Loved Complete Streets 101
- Getting to know people
- Thank you for allowing participation of audience as much as we can (Oscar)

Delta

- Room is slightly small (but appreciate why it works for other reasons)
- Start time too early.
- 6 hours is a lot of time
- Could have been more concise/efficient
- Would like follow-up with our personal experience and what we would like to see (what each of us see as a Complete Street)
- More common terminology

Follow-up items

- Clarify virtual subcommittee meeting options with City Clerk (Patrick)
- Schedule bylaws subcommittee meeting: Paki, Colby, Ruth, Stacy, Tahnee/Colleen (Patrick)
- Look into sharing Move Tucson kick-off presentation (Patrick)
- Share document-posting webpage (Patrick)
- Explore training options for communicating with media (Jenn)
- Share minutes and edits to working agreements (SDR)
- Confirm Alta dates and doodle (Patrick)
- Share information on quick build project at next meeting (Patrick)
- Develop glossary of common terms (ongoing)

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50pm