

--- COMPILED PUBLIC COMMENTS ---
PROPOSED PHASE 3 BOSQUE TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS,
CAMPBELL ROAD TO MONTAÑO
Received between June 21, 2016 and August 23, 2016

From: Julio Candelaria
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2016 2:41 PM
Subject: Bosque

Any chance we can put the previous ideas on bosque renovation, park, bike, boat rental that was put to bed at previous town hall meetings out to public vote?

Confluence Park in Denver is a great model that I saw keeping the old preserved and GREAT new style community environment parks. The people in the nearby communities are only speaking for themselves and not thinking about our children or future. An effort to capture a small stretch of the bosque will still leave miles and miles and miles of untouched land for all to enjoy.

Putting a small police bike substation in the area will deter the crime they claim will ensue. Lake Carlsbad also has an area similar to Tingley and no strong police presence I saw, and it is a nice social community type venue like Denver offers and we lack.

Thank you for your time and efforts, I believe in this and would love to help if I can. I have some great ideas regarding the Tingley area and would love to share if desired. May be pie in the sky due to resistance from neighboring communities but I think it'd give our kids/youth/older people places to socialize rather than just cruise or hit the bar crawls and encourage active lifestyles.

Thank you for your efforts again!
Julio Candelaria

From: Becky Johnston
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2016 7:50 PM
Subject: Bosque hikes

Your public input and public meetings are a joke; you pay absolutely no attention to the comments, opinions, suggestions, etc. of the majority of folks at your meetings. These are just a formality that you must go through and then you go ahead and to what you want anyway. And, why do we only get notice of these "public input" hikes when there is only one left and it is only 4 days away?

Becky Johnston

From: Allison Schacht
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 1:39 PM
Subject: Input on Bosque Trail

If the trail must be continued, here is what I would like to see.

There is an existing trail north of Campbell Road that runs through the middle of the Bosque, not near the river bank. Because there is fast traffic on the multi-use trail, this is where the multi use trail should go. It could then connect with the eastern part of the existing Bosque Loop Trail at the Nature Center, and then connect to the paved part of the Aldo Leopold trail.

There are currently two areas off the western part of the Bosque Loop trail where there are benches near the river. Spurs of the multi use trail could connect to these two areas so that cyclists and people in wheelchairs etc could have access to the river.

I really appreciate the fact that part of the trail along the river was left as a pedestrian only trail in the section between I-40 and Campbell Road. This is a very peaceful place to walk. I go to the Bosque to enjoy nature and relax, and having to dodge fast moving bicycles is not relaxing. I believe it is very important to provide a foot-traffic-only alternative in the section between Campbell Road and the Nature Center because many people currently use the trails in that area for relaxation and bird watching. That way, people who wish to enjoy nature at a more relaxed pace without being run down by bicycles, or who wish to watch birds, sit and meditate etc have a place to go. If this is not provided, people will most likely go off trail. There is a trail we followed with Dr Schmader on the walk that would make an excellent path for foot traffic. It starts near the river at Campbell Road and then veers away a bit into the interior. It connects with the western portion of the Bosque Loop trail. The western portion of the Bosque Loop trail would also make a good path for foot traffic. The hawks and owls that breed in the bosque, as well as many songbirds, nest along these trails, so it would be good to leave these for slower moving traffic. The northern part of the Aldo Leopold trail does run along the western part of the Bosque, but is not as much of an issue because most of it is not right along the river bank. The bulk of the cottonwoods where nesting occurs are in the eastern part of the Bosque in that section. Dr. Schmader suggested a small portion of new trail that would bypass a narrow, very sandy and tree-lined area along the river bank just north and west of the northern end of the paved part of the Aldo Leopold trail, and this seems very practical, and would also leave another quiet spot for foot traffic.

Allison Schacht

From: John Thomas
Sent: Sunday, June 26, 2016 2:23 PM
Subject: Bosque walk on Saturday, June 25

I enjoyed the bosque walk with Bill on June 25. He did a great job and was patient and friendly with all.

There seems to be a faction of the Sierra Club which is opposed to any trail development, particularly any that would allow entrance to disabled people and facilitate their enjoyment. They feel that the bosque has been so compromised already that any change at all would be excessive.

I would suggest that the City forcefully state the purposes of the Americans with Disabilities Act and point out that the extension of the crusher fine trail is consistent with existing federal law. The ADA is the law of the land. When it has been challenged in court, PWD's almost always win. The US Supreme Court has been a vigorous defender of the rights of the disabled.

I think the Governor's Council on Disabilities could give the City guidance on appropriate implementation of ADA compliant shared use paths. The Montano end of the trail does not appear to have good access for the disabled and, while I have no advice in that matter, I can only speculate about what a vigorous interpretation of the ADA would require.

As for my tastes in the future trail, as a 70 something man who deals with a lot of arthritic pain, I would like:

Shady, meandering trails with good sight distance to minimize cyclist-pedestrians conflict. This means I would generally like the trail nearer the river. Avoid the straight path.

I talked briefly with a Sierra Club member who did not want any trail improvements. I told him I was a Sierra Club member and supported some of the Sierra Club goals but, I also believed in the goals of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Regards,
John Thomas

From: Colston Chandler
Sent: Sunday, July 10, 2016 4:30 PM
Subject: Phase 3 of Bosque Trail Construction

My comments about the proposed Phase 3 of the Bosque trail construction are appended.

The city proposes to continue its construction of a multiuse six-foot-wide crusher-fines trail, this time between Campbell and Montano. This trail would encourage and facilitate additional bicycle traffic through the heart of the portion of the Bosque that is heavily used by pedestrian visitors to the Rio Grande Nature Center. I believe this would seriously degrade the experience of nature sought by those visitors, as well as endanger their safety (especially of children).

This trail is also claimed to encourage and facilitate wheelchair users. It is a scandal that the City has so far made no serious effort, not even producing any plans, to provide easy (4% grade or less) access for wheelchair users from parking to to this trail (or, for that matter, to the previous construction phases). Such access is admittedly difficult to provide, but that difficulty is no excuse to ignore the problem completely.

The City's hike on June 18 in that area of the Bosque left me uncomfortable that the staff of the Nature Center had not been seriously consulted about what they consider the most pressing needs in that part of the Bosque. This is a serious flaw. I would much prefer that the City concentrate on upgrading the existing Bosque loop trail, the part of the River loop trail that goes to the river, and the asphalt trail (perhaps adding a spur from the end of that trail to the river). These trails are already among the most heavily used in the Bosque and are among the most in need of upgrading. At the same time, a substantial effort should be made to provide the 4%- grade access from the Nature Center to the Bosque that has been needed for so long. This last phase should become a showcase of what the City can do for wheelchair access to the Bosque—from the parking lot, over the levee, to the river. I doubt, however, the City will give up its construction of its multiuse (bicycle) trail and that it will remain difficult of access for wheelchair users. So, I offer the following comments.

Construction should not follow the existing trail north from Campbell that runs equidistant between the river and the levee. It should, rather, follow the other trail that is closer to the river (not the trail that runs along the river itself) until it intersects the Bosque loop trail. Construction should then follow the return part of the Bosque loop trail to the intersection with the River loop trail. A connection should be made to the asphalt trail, which should be repaired or replaced. From the end of the asphalt trail, a new trail should be crafted diagonally back toward the levee as the trail goes north toward Montañño.

Incorporate some restoration work along the lines suggested by Brian Hanson.

From: Allison Theoret
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 6:40 PM
Subject: Bosque development

I want to thank you for reading this letter. My family and I live in a poor part of town and we cross town every chance we get to walk in the Albuquerque Bosque. It sets our city apart from even charming Santa fe. No development should go on with out consulting the concerned citizens of the Bosque action team. Please hear the voices of the citizens. We adore This wonderful natural place. It should not be all tucked up and groomed fancy for people. It is a special gem! Let's respect it.

Allison Theoret

From: Melanie Bonds
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 1:41 PM
Subject: Bosque Trail Construction Comments

I just want to write my comments in about the construction and pavement of the Bosque Trail from Campbell Rd to Montano. I plan on attending the meeting on August 11th as well. My comments are below:

Construction in the Bosque has no benefit to the environment and to the wildlife in this area. It will actually hinder wildlife in the Bosque and also increase traffic to the Bosque. This, in turn, will cause severe damage to the habitat, as well as to flora and to fauna. The Bosque is a natural, open space for individuals to come and enjoy our natural world and feel connected. Construction will disrupt this and will hinder this beautiful ecosystem permanently in a way it may not be able to recover. I have a B.S. in environmental studies and a B.A. in economics and there seems no local economic benefit to doing this when the money could be spent on restoration projects in the Bosque and in other natural areas throughout Bernalillo County. Please do not damage this wonderful space.

All the best,
Melanie Bonds

From: Richard Barish
Sent: Thursday, July 14
Subject: Comments of Sierra Club and Bosque Action Team, Proposed Campbell to Montañño trail extension

I am writing to submit the following comments on behalf of the Sierra Club and the Bosque Action Team (BAT) related to the Administration's planned extension of its Bosque trail from Campbell Road to Montañño. Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.

We are submitting these preliminary comments at this time in order to provide input into the formulation of alternatives, because we are unsure if alternatives will be completed and prepared at the time of the July 29 Bosque Working Group meeting. The Future Bosque Work Agreement, of course, provides that the members of the Bosque Working Group "will work together to prepare alternatives." The Sierra Club and BAT accordingly offer the following input into alternatives:

1. We want to emphasize what the Sierra Club and the BAT have said many times before: the thing that what makes the Bosque a unique and valuable asset for the City is that it is a wonderful place to enjoy nature in the middle of the City. It is clear from the content of the public comments that the overwhelming majority of the public values the Bosque, and is passionate about protecting the Bosque, because of the experience of nature to be had there. It is clear from the volume of comments and the number of attendees at public meetings that it is not a small minority of people that think this way, but it is the view and wish of the overwhelming majority of the electorate who care about what happens in the Bosque. Albuquerque citizens want to preserve the Bosque as a place to enjoy nature. Any Bosque projects should prioritize restoration and protection of the environment, so that the birds and animals will be there for people to enjoy and are not chased away by poorly planned or ill-advised development. All decisions about development in the Bosque should be science-based. This approach is mandated by the governing City plan, the Bosque Action Plan, which provides, for instance, that "The Rio Grande Valley State Park shall be managed to preserve and enhance its ecological diversity" (Policy 3) and "Improvements shall be located in non-sensitive areas that are appropriate for such developments, considering ecological sensitivity as well as user satisfaction" (Policy 8).

2. The Sierra Club and the BAT urge the Administration to present alternative trail designs as it agreed to do in the Future Bosque Work Agreement of March, 2015. That Agreement provided: "Alternatives with plan details, including with respect to trail alignment, route, width, materials, and any related infrastructure (such as boardwalks, bridges, viewing platforms, and signage), will be presented. . . ." Specifically, the alternatives should include trails that are, in whole or in part, less than six feet in width and that are constructed of materials other than crusher fines. Trails constructed of stabilized native materials with varying widths, including wider areas for easy passing of wheelchairs, can both meet the Administration's access objectives and create a trail that is more in keeping with the natural character of the Bosque and the natural experience desired by visitors to the Bosque. An obvious, developed feature such as a six foot wide, uniform width, crusher fine trail will diminish the feeling that you are out in nature and is out of place in the natural setting of the Bosque. A wide trail fragments the Bosque and has adverse effects on wildlife. Design features should be incorporated that result in a trail that appears more natural and that blends in better in the Bosque surroundings.

3. A principal justification for the construction and design of the trail has been to provide access to people who are confined to wheelchairs. However, there remains limited access for wheelchairs due to the City's failure to provide good access over the levees. In the area of the current proposal, the ramp over the levee adjacent to the Nature Center remains too steep for many wheelchair users. There is no good wheelchair access to the Bosque and to the Corps of Engineers intended viewing platform at Campbell Road. The City should create handicapped-only parking spaces at the end of Campbell Road., perhaps by changing the "no parking" at the end of Campbell Road to handicapped-only parking. Access out of the Bosque at Montaña to the Paseo del Bosque trail will be challenging, but also needs to be addressed in the alternatives. Further, the City has not constructed the promised more gradual access at Central. Access is poor at I-40/Galbaldon Place, and there is no wheelchair-usable connection between the different trail segments under the I-40 bridge.

Given the importance of providing wheelchair access to the trail projects, the City should be focusing on actually constructing that access, not building more trails. At the least, the alternatives for the Phase III trail need to include plans for a gradual grade so that wheelchair users are able enter and exit the Bosque at Campbell, the Nature Center, and Montaña.

4. As Brian Hanson's studies have shown, a crusher fine trail results in a significant increase in usage of the Bosque. To the extent that the trail is bringing new people to enjoy nature in the Bosque, this is a good thing, but at the same time, as Mr. Hanson and other scientists have pointed out, this will inevitably have a detrimental impact on that nature, that is, on the birds and other wildlife that people come to enjoy. To give one obvious example, the coyotes that used to den near the where the trail was constructed in the I-40 to Campbell stretch have not been seen in recent months.

The City should engage in restoration projects to compensate for the loss of useable habitat caused by the trail expansion. Brian Hanson's idea of planting shrubs and creating brush piles to provide cover and lessen the stress on birds would be a simple and inexpensive way to mitigate impacts. Wildlife disturbance could be decreased if vegetation was strategically planted

to reduce noise and reduce wildlife sight lines near trails. From our understanding of the site characterization and restoration plan being prepared for the City by GeoSystems for the Central to Campbell Rd. stretch, this appears to be an excellent plan, and we commend the Administration for commissioning the study and for beginning its implementation. The plan is a multi-year undertaking, however, and we urge the Administration to ensure full implementation of the plan by committing to fully fund it out of the \$2.9 million 2013 appropriation. Similar restoration for the remainder of the project area would create both better habitat and a better and more attractive visitor experience of the Bosque.

5. To the extent that the Administration is going to build a developed trail, alternatives should specifically identify and avoid sensitive areas. In addition, the section of the trail from Campbell Road through the Bosque adjacent to the Nature Center is highly problematic. The Nature Center's Bosque loop trail gets a great deal of use, probably more use than any other place in the Rio Grande Valley State Park. Brian Hanson's study found usage averaging 20.4 hikers per hour, with 2 to 3 times more usage on weekends. Many of the users of the loop trail are children. Mixing bicycles in with such heavy pedestrian use would seem to be a recipe for accidents. The Nature Center, when it managed the Bosque adjacent to its grounds, prohibited bicycles on the loop trail. Further, the asphalt section of the trail is used by people who use walkers or who are elderly and need a smooth walking surface, at the same time that the straight, smooth surface will allow cyclists to travel at good rates of speed. This again would seem to be potentially dangerous to users.

The best route for this stretch would be to move the trail onto the Paseo del Bosque Trail from Campbell Road to the beginning of the asphalt trail in the Bosque or to the spur trail that connects to the north end of the asphalt trail section. This would avoid the risk of accidents. We urge the City to include this route as one of the alternatives. Alternatives routed through the Bosque in this stretch should incorporate features to try to ensure that bike traffic proceeds slowly in this section.

6. To the extent that the City presents alternatives entirely in the Bosque, we recommend the following alignments be included in the alternatives. From Campbell Road, there are three existing trails that proceed north, and we believe that the two more easterly trails are the preferable alignments. Both should be included as alternatives. We urge the City to keep in mind both the high environmental value of not disturbing the riverbank area and the value to wildlife of creating larger blocks of undisturbed vegetation and to carefully assess those factors as they apply to this stretch in ultimately deciding where the trail should be placed.

When the trail intersects the Nature Center loop trail, it should follow the return loop and proceed to the asphalt trail. Again, it is critical that the alternatives incorporate whatever means are necessary to ensure that bike traffic proceeds slowly in this trail segment. In addition, wheelchair users have stated that the asphalt trail is in need of maintenance, which should be part of the project.

The alternative should then include a trail that proceeds west on the dirt trail towards the river. As the current trail proceeds north, for the first hundred yards or so, up to about the second Aldo Leopold sign beginning "We abuse land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to

us. . . .", the trail proceeds through a mostly monotypic stand of old Russian Olive. This appears to be an area that is amenable to and that would benefit from restoration activity by the City or some other entity in the future, for instance, a bank lowering/ bank grading-type project. We accordingly urge the City to move the trail east into the Bosque for a short distance in this location so as to preserve this site for future restoration.

The alternatives should then include a trail that proceeds north on the existing Aldo Leopold Trail and exits the Bosque and connect to the Paseo del Bosque Trail at one of the two locations where the existing trail connects to the Paseo del Bosque Trail. The trail in this section does skirt denser areas of Bosque on the river side, and a good variety of Bosque birds have been observed in this area. We urge the City to have a competent biologist survey this area to assess whether there are any sensitive areas where the trail should be moved to the east.

7. The design of all of the multiuse trail alternatives should generally include features to slow down bicycle traffic in order to prevent accidents. The trail from I-40 to Campbell did a better job of incorporating curves to slow bike traffic, and this stretch should do the same, as well as incorporating other features where needed to ensure slow bike traffic.

8. Finally, the Sierra Club and the BAT must express their disappointment that the Administration has chosen to again ignore its agreement with the Bosque Working Group, the Future Bosque Work Agreement. There are no conceivable time constraints regarding this round of development, and there is no reason that the Administration could not have complied with the procedures that it agreed to follow.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We look forward to continuing to work with you on Bosque matters in the future to ensure that the Bosque is a place where all Albuquerque residents and visitors can go to enjoy the beautiful natural setting of our City.

Very truly yours,
THE SIERRA CLUB and THE BOSQUE ACTION TEAM
Richard D. Barish

From: Dianne Schlies
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 3:44 PM
Subject: Rio Grande Bosque improvement/ comment

This letter is a comment to be considered regarding Bosque Public Hikes to Extend Accessible Path. I am happy when I see people enjoying the bosque. The more the merrier. And bring the kids so they are able to discern its value and when they grow up they will be more inclined to protect it.

We who are highly mobile are not so able to get on to the banks of the river along the bosque because of the thickness of the brush there. Birds are right there along the banks, nesting, feeding their young, foraging in the brush and trees that grow there and unearthing the insects and

invertebrates in and on the supporting earth. All sorts of animals need that band of wild growth to thrive and to carry on the essential character of the bosque. Most of us who frequent the bosque understand that. To swipe a bank clean for accessibility would be destroying a long established habitat used by animals for cover and sustenance. Lengths of riverbank accessibility, as stated in the meeting on Dec. 16h of 2015 by Mary Beresford: *"I will fight tooth and nail to have the path all the way along the bank"*, sounds extreme and destructive to wildlife.

Already established perpendicular in-paths to the river could be improved instead. Please don't do more than is legally required of the ADA.

Thank you.
Dianne Schlies

From: Margie Tatro
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 3:37 PM
Subject: Inquiry about crusher fine bosque path

Greetings and congratulations on the great work on the bosque natural surface trail. We are doing some work for NM State Parks and are curious to learn more details about the material and processes that were used to lay down the trail surface. The trail seems to be wearing beautifully and we know it gets a great deal of use.

I would appreciate a name and contact information for someone we can talk with about these trail construction details.

Best Regards,
Margie Tatro

From: Peggy Norton
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 11:14 AM
Subject: Bosque Trail phase III comments

My first concern is the fact that there are two juvenile great horned owls in the northern section of the area affected by phase III. They hatched in early May, fledged in mid June, and have been hanging around the area in the bosque that is south of the dirt road leading from the bosque to the bike trail. I have seen them on the ground and on low logs. I am bringing this to your attention so that you will keep any activity in the area to a minimum in planning this project, and that you will not start construction in the area until they leave.

For specifics on the trail, I would like to see the trail at Campbell Road routed up to Paseo del Bosque and then down the paved Aldo Leopold trail. Many children, families, classrooms, students use the area of the bosque between Campbell Road and the paved trail and inviting more traffic into the area seems a recipe for accidents. I recommend doing maintenance on the paved Aldo Leopold trail because wheelchair users find it difficult to use. Also, the slope down will

need to be reduced. I think the plan should end at the end of the paved Aldo Leopold. There is no reason to develop all areas of the bosque - leave a few areas for minimal usage. Paseo del Bosque trail has wonderful views of the bosque and porcupines and raptors in the tree tops are almost at eye level. Any unused money should be spent on revegetation to shelter wildlife from the impact of increased trail usage.

Peggy Norton

From: Naomi Julian
Sent: Monday, August 01, 2016 7:00 PM
Subject: Bosque trail

Regarding the Bosque trail, my strong preference has always been to leave it alone. I feel that no action would be best! If the city is determined to build this trail, I prefer alternative #2.

Sincerely,
Naomi Julian

From: Brian Hanson
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2016 9:29 AM
Subject: My review comments on Trail between Campbell Road and Montano Bridge

See my attached concerns with a proposed new crusherfine trail. I appreciate your willingness to obtain comments from the public. I attended a hike in the area with Dr. Schmader and reviewed your proposed project including your excellent maps on your website.
Brian Hanson

This provides my comments concerning the proposed new crusherfine trail in the bosque on the east side of the Rio Grande from Campbell Road to Montano Bridge, about 2.5 miles. Albuquerque Open Space is proposing a new trail 6 feet wide with a hardened surface to be completed in the winter of 2017. I am providing comments to 3 alternative alignments and the no action alternative dated June 28, 2016. I appreciate the excellent color maps on your website.

Of the four alternatives, I prefer the no action alternative since a new crusherfine trail, 6 feet wide, would impact wildlife populations by removing their habitat, and causing disturbance. Of the three crusherfine alternatives, alternative 3 is the worst, then alternative 2 and the least damaging alternative is alternative 1. If any of the 3 alternatives are chosen, then I suggest nearby wildlife habitat be improved to offset wildlife habitat losses and wildlife disturbance.

Wildlife impacts could be reduced if:
Alternative 1.

- a. The alignment just north of Campbell Road should be adjusted to the next trail to the west. This would prevent the fragmentation of the cottonwood/grass habitat.

- b. Remove the trail alignment along the river's edge near Montano Bridge, about 1,200 feet.

Alternative 2.

- a. The alignment in the middle of the proposed trail is near the river bank which bisects wildlife habitat. Instead, use the paved trail in this section.
- b. Remove the trail alignment along the river's edge near Montano Bridge, about 1,200 feet.

Alternative 3.

- a. The river's edge alignment just north of Campbell Road should be replaced with the next trail to the east.
- b. The river's edge alignment near the middle should be abandoned and rerouted through the paved trail section.
- c. Remove the trail alignment along the river's edge near Montano Bridge, about 1,200 feet.

To offset (mitigate) wildlife impacts of a new crusherfine trail, I suggest the following wildlife habitat improvement projects.

- a. Remove the Kellner jettyjack field just south of Montano bridge along the riverbank, for approximately 3,000 feet. This will allow the natural development of shallow water habitat. Jetty jacks prevent the natural functions of a river and prevent shallow water aquatic habitat and establishment of native vegetation like willows. Do not plant vegetation, let the river create habitat.
- b. Construct 2 brushpiles in the cottonwood area just north of Campbell Road using native dead trees. Wildlife cover is limited in the bosque and brushpiles would provide valuable small mammal and herp habitat.
- c. Remove the old, decadent Russian olive trees at the river's edge just south of the "River Loop Trail" intersection with the river and revegetate with willows and shrubs. Keep these removal areas small, maybe 50 feet in diameter, and keep old vegetation for wildlife cover between cleared areas.
- d. Post 3 signs: at the southern and northern end of the new trail and at the river's edge somewhere explaining the ecology of the Rio Grande.

To protect the wildlife values of the bosque, I suggest that natural trails remain. If a crusherfine trail is contemplated, then wildlife habitat should be improved in the bosque that includes the above suggestions.

Respectfully,
Brian Hanson

From: Sam Karns
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2016 12:40 PM
Subject: bosque plan, Phase III

I hike in the bosque two or three times a week every week of the year and have been doing so for 35 years. I care about and LOVE the bosque and when I saw the trail being graded north of

Central Ave., it just sickened me. Unlike phases I and II, in phase III we citizens are being offered a real alternative. I wholeheartedly support the "no action" alternative. All the other options call for crusher fine and multiple trails through the bosque...very destructive of the natural environment and sure to increase negative human impact and decrease animal habitat.

Cordially,
Sam Karns

From: Patti Harper-Slaboszewicz
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2016 3:12 PM
Subject: Bosque Trail Phase III

Our family loves the new Bosque Phase I and II trails. For Phase III, it would be nice to work to avoid sensitive areas but the trails are great.

Patti Harper-Slaboszewicz

From: Richard Barish
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2016 3:55 PM
Subject: Alternative 4

Matt:

Yaseen, Michael Jensen, Brian, Mike Hamman (for the first hour or so of the walk), and I met on Friday to examine and discuss routes for the Phase III construction. We all agree that the route described below would be the best route if a new trail is constructed from Campbell to Montaña in the Bosque. We request that there be an alternative along the route described below. We are, of course, open to suggestions and discussion if you believe that there is something else we should consider. The BAT's other thoughts will be conveyed by a separate letter.

If the selected route north of Campbell is entirely in the Bosque, we support a modified version of the current Alternative 2. The route should be modified by using the asphalt portion of the Aldo Leopold Trail. The current route for this section, which uses the "return trail only" for a northerly Nature Center loop (the "River Loop Trail") and then proceeds on a trail not far from to the river until it connects to the Aldo Leopold trail, is problematic because it crosses the high flow minnow channel near the intake of the channel. A bridge will be required over the channel, since there will be water in the channel at times, it will be difficult to maintain a crusher-fine trail in the channel because of water, and the slope into and out of the channel may be excessive for wheelchairs. A bridge will not be required if the asphalt trail is used.

In addition, at the south end of the trail, the trail should connect from Campbell directly to the middle of the three trails proceeding north and should not go to the river at this point. This is only a few feet north of Campbell, where there is a river view. In addition, this is an environmentally sensitive portion of the trail. Side trails along existing paths to get to the river

and to provide river views could be incorporated into this route at the two locations where there are presently benches.

A trail through the Nature Center area is problematic. This is an area that gets considerable use, including by school children and families. Brian Hanson's trail use survey found that after development of earlier phases of the trail, usage increased by 3.5 times. Usage may increase more as the trail gets better known. We are informed that the asphalt trail is used by people who require a smooth walking surface, for instance, people with walkers and the elderly. Mixing greatly increased bicycle traffic with this pedestrian use creates an increased risk of accident. The route as it proceeds through the Nature Center area should require bicyclists to dismount in this section and indicate that bicycles may be ridden on the Paseo del Bosque Trail.

Other proposed trail alignments are less suitable or unsuitable due to sight distances, berms and topographic changes, habitat concerns, the number of trees that the City would have to remove, and proximity to the bank (in places, right on the bank) that would subject portions of the trail to certain flooding or wetting during high river flows. We urge the City to instead close the trails south of Montaño that are not part of the alignment proposed above and, in addition, to examine whether all or parts of the riverbank trail north of Campbell should be closed.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Very truly yours,
Richard Barish
Mike Hamman
Yasmeen Najmi
Michael Jensen
Brian Hanson

From: Dianne Schlies
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2016 6:11 AM
Subject: Please read before AUG 11

I want to weigh in before the meeting on Aug. 11. But first I want to *thank you* for taking comments and for setting the meeting. What I have to say is short.

I spend a lot of time at the RGNCSP and the areas north of it. Over the past 20 plus years I have found the bosque to be a needed respite from the traffic and noise and the hustle and bustle of city life. The increase in population has shown everywhere, but it's not as prevalent there along the river and in those woods.

Please, when implementing ADA required modifications, keep the needs in mind for *all* living beings to be immersed in peacefulness and the unique wonders of our bosque; and keep in mind the wild animals' resources for survival are right there and are irreplaceable. Please also consider the fact that there is already an asphalt trail through the bosque to tap into for those who are

physically challenged and that areas that are *densely vegetated are absolutely necessary for the survival of animals large and small.*

Thank you for your work and dedication to our city,
Dianne Schlies

From: Joani Murphy
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2016 12:46 PM
Subject: Bosque trail

Alternative 4. This alternative is a consensus route devised by members of the Bosque Action Team and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District.
As a frequent mosque user, I support Alternate 4.

Joani Murphy

From: RG Kinsey
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2016 1:26 PM
Subject: Comments: Bosque Trail

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to add my concern for further "development" of the Bosque trail system as an unnecessary disruption of the natural and delicate balance of what's left of this city/state treasure. The existing trails are adequate and currently provides a variety of quieter places along the existing undeveloped trails. There is no need whatsoever to disturb the ecosystem.

Sincerely,
RG Kinsey

From: Arlene Buchholz
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2016 8:43 PM
Subject: Bosque trails projects

Please keep the Bosque as wild as possible and still allow hiking access. There are porcupines, muskrats, beavers and many birds-black phoebe and wood ducks, herons, kingfishers, turtles and toads that make their homes there.

Thank you,
Arlene Buchholz

From: Allison Theoret
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2016 10:36 PM
Subject: The Bosque trail

The thing that what makes the Bosque the place that my family loves is that it is an unsurpassed urban space for the enjoyment of nature. Any project should not take away from the experience of nature.

The "no action" alternative is the best of the City's alternative plans. The increased usage that will result from a developed trail will have a negative effect on birds and other wildlife. The trails in the vicinity of the Nature Center get heavy use, including use by school children and families, and adding increased bicycle traffic will increase the risk of accidents.

If a trail is constructed in the bosque, the Administration should adopt BOSque action team Consensus Alternative 4. The trail would avoid the environmentally sensitive areas along the riverbank north of Campbell and would not create of a new trail near the river south of Montaña. The loop trail south of Montaña contained in Alternative 1 should be closed and revegetated.

The City should, as part of the Phase III project, design projects to compensate for the loss of good, useable habitat that will inevitably result from the construction of the trail and the increased usage that will result. The City should ensure full implementation of the GeoSystems restoration plan for the Central to Campbell stretch by committing to fully funding it out of the \$2.9 million 2013 appropriation. The City should take other steps to mitigate the environmental harm, for instance, shrub planting and the creation of brush piles, to provide shelter for birds to prevent stress and abandonment of the area as a result of the increased traffic from a developed trail.

The City should devise and consider alternative trail designs. An obvious, developed feature such as a six foot wide, uniform width, crusher fine trail diminishes the feeling that you are in a natural space and is inconsistent with the natural character of the bosque. The City should ensure good access for wheelchairs and others who are physically challenged. It should ensure good access over the levees, parking at Campbell, and acceptable passage over or around the more varied topography that exists in the Phase III stretch of the bosque.

Please hear the voices of the people who use the Bosque every week for exercise, solace, and sanity! It is beautiful when it is shared by animals and natural, not manicured.

Allison Theoret

From: Louisa Barkalow
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2016 12:06 PM
Subject: Bosque plan COMMENT

I attended last night's meeting where the various plans for the Campbell Rd to Montano section of the Bosque were discussed.

I would definitely favor leaving the Bosque untouched..No action plan..with the exception of appropriate renovation and improved access for the handicapped.

We must make choices that support a responsible presence on our part as we "visit" wild spaces. Creating crusher fine paths destroy wilderness...inadvertently interrupting animal lives we may not even know exist.

I would also favor keeping bikes out of the Bosque proper. If you can ride a bike, you can walk. As a senior with hearing issues, I am challenged by bikers coming up from behind. Besides, things with wheels do not belong in wilderness. It is a place for living creatures. Asking bikers to walk in the Bosque tells the community that the Bosque is a special place ...off limits for certain kinds of recreation. Welcoming to others.

Visiting wilderness is a privilege. Leave no trace should be our rule of thumb.

Thank you,
Louisa Barkalow

From: Teresa Storch
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2016 12:21 PM
Subject: Proposed Bosque trail from Campbell Rd to Montano Blvd

I urge you to take no action to develop trails within the Rio Grande Bosque, between Campbell Rd. and Montano Blvd. While this has been designated the "No Action Alternative" by the City, like a number of speakers at the public meeting held last night at the Duranes Community Center, I believe that the City does not in fact consider it an alternative. As the City did a half a year ago for the crusher-fine trail built between I-40 and Campbell Rd., scant regard will be given to the overwhelming citizen opposition to building more trails within the Bosque.

Whatever the City has already decided it will do, I hope that it is a plan that has the least impact on the plant and animal communities in the bosque and along the river.

Yours,
Teresa Storch

From: Jack L. Cargill
Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2016 9:09 AM
Subject: Campbell to Montano Bosque Path

I have reviewed the various proposals for a crusher fine path in the Campbell to Montano area. I walk the current trail daily and I am very familiar with the proposals. I urge you to adopt the

"no path" alternative. The Aldo Leopold Trail provides a fitting memorial to a champion of wilderness and a fine trail for nature lovers. It would be counterproductive and disrespectful to deface this area with a 6ft. wide crusher fine path. As for the other alternatives, alternative 4 would do the least damage, but would still be a disfigurement of the area.

Respectfully,
Jack L. Cargill

From: Brad Cushnyr
Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2016 5:18 PM
Subject: Bosque Multi-Use Accessible Path Project (Phase III)

I am writing to support the Bosque Multi-Use Accessible Path Project (Phase III) from Campbell Road to Montaña. I was in attendance at the recent meeting held at the Los Duranes Community Center on August 11, 2016. I am following up with this note to further explain my perspective.

My wife is disabled and has difficulty with mobility issues. We enjoy the outdoors immensely here in Albuquerque. Preserving and increasing access for the disabled to the wonders that our natural environment has to offer is very important to us. That is why we support Option 2, or Option 3 for Phase III of the Bosque Multi-Use Accessible Path Project. A combination of the two options with both central and riverside access would also be a good choice.

In any case, we strongly support the use of a Crusher Fine path that will meet ADA standards. This will allow greater access to the Bosque for our Disabled Community. We feel that it is vital that we use this opportunity to ensure that all our citizens benefit from the treasures of our riverside natural environment.

Sincerely,
Brad Cushnyr, M.D.

From: Richard Barish
Sent: Thursday, July 14
Subject: Comments of Sierra Club and Bosque Action Team, Proposed Campbell to Montaña trail extension

I am writing to submit the following comments on behalf of the Sierra Club and the Bosque Action Team (BAT) related to the Administration's planned extension of its bosque trail from Campbell Road to Montaña. Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments. These comments are in addition to and supplement the comments previously submitted by the Sierra Club and the BAT prior to the publication of the alternatives.

1. The best of the offered alternative for Phase III is the "no action" alternative. The wide trail and the increased usage that will result from a developed trail will have a negative effect on birds and other wildlife, especially in the absence of mitigation measures in this stretch.

The trails in the vicinity of the Nature Center get heavy use, including use by school children and families, and adding increased bicycle traffic will increase the risk of accidents. The City has not offered an option that circumvents the Nature Center area by using the Paseo del Bosque Trail. This is an option that makes sense in this particular location given its heavy usage. The City has also refused to consider alternative trail designs that would both provide access and blend in better with the natural surroundings of the bosque and that might be acceptable to bosque users. Bosque users want people to be able to access the bosque, but they also want to preserve the natural character of the bosque that makes it such a special place.

2. If a trail is constructed entirely in the bosque, the Alternative 4 route is the best route. Alternative 4 represents the consensus of the BAT and the MRGCD on the best route through the bosque. The Sierra Club and the BAT appreciate the City's willingness to add this as an official alternative and the promptness with which it posted Alternative 4 on the City's web site after the route was suggested to the City.

The Alternative 4 route has several advantages over other routes. First, it avoids the most environmentally sensitive areas. It avoids the area along the riverbank north of Campbell, which is mostly a grassy meadow, an important habitat that is now uncommon in the bosque. The riverbank north of Campbell is an area that gets considerable use by birds, butterflies, and other wildlife. The Sierra Club and the BAT would not object if the most easterly of the trails north of Campbell, the trail in the center of the bosque, were used, but is principally concerned that the route not be along the riverbank trail in this section. Further, in contrast to Alternatives 1 and 3, Alternative 4 does not create what would essentially be an entirely new trail along the barely visible, overgrown footpath immediately adjacent to the bank lowering project south of Montaña. The area south of Montaña is also an area that gets considerable use by birds.

Alternative 4 also does not cross the intake of the high flow minnow channel as Alternative 2. A bridge would be required over the minnow channel, since it would, at times, have water in it, it would be difficult or impossible to maintain a trail given its frequent inundation, and the slopes into and out of the minnow channel may be too steep for wheelchairs. Finally, Alternative 4 does not utilize the area north of the Nature Center bench at the river as in Alternative 3. This area is a narrow, intimate space like the area along the river south of Campbell that people were anxious to preserve in the previous phase.

3. A trail through this area requires some strategy to avoid user conflicts where it traverses the trails that get heavy use by Nature Center visitors, the Bosque Loop Trail and the asphalt portion of the Aldo Leopold Trail. The users of the Bosque Loop Trail are often school children and families, and people with mobility issues who need a regular surface in order to be able to visit the bosque use the asphalt trail. Alternative 4 has a dismount zone as was discussed by the Bosque Working Group. In conjunction with this, there should be some sort of physical barriers that require bicycle riders to dismount in this area, while at the same time permitting wheelchair passage. Bicyclists who wish to remain on their bicycles can be directed to the Paseo del Bosque Trail.

4. As noted above, trail construction is much more acceptable if it is done in conjunction with restoration so that the inevitable negative impacts of a wider trail and increased

traffic are mitigated. The BAT has not yet had the opportunity to review the draft GeoSystems plan, but everything we have been told about the plan indicates that it is precisely the kind of thing that should be done to mitigate environmental impacts. We commend this City for this kind of effort. We are, however, concerned about funding for full implementation of this plan, and we urge the City to set aside funds from the \$2.9 million 2013 appropriation to ensure full implementation of the plan over the next few years. We further urge the City to fund a similar effort for the Phase III stretch of the bosque, which includes areas that would benefit from such restoration.

In addition, in conjunction with its construction, we urge the City to close the loop at the north end of Alternative 1, south of Montañño. As noted above, the western part of this loop is nothing more than a bare, overgrown path, and this entire area appears to get significant use by birds. It would not be needed with the Alternative 4 route. We also urge the City to plant shrubs and place brush piles to provide shelter for birds in the vicinity of the trail so that, to the extent possible, the area will remain useable habitat for birds in spite of the increased human use. Finally, we urge the City to incorporate design features into the trail to make it appear as natural as possible and so that it blends in better with the bosque habit. Such features could include sinuosity, more vegetative plantings on the border of the trail, and a precise color match to the surrounding soils.

5. Finally, the City should ensure access for wheelchairs and others who are physically challenged. It should ensure good access over the levees, provide parking at Campbell, and make sure that there is acceptable passage over or around the more varied topography that exists in the Phase III stretch of the bosque.

Our bosque is a unique and wonderful resource. It is a natural space where all of the myriad bird species, the porcupines, the beautiful cottonwood trees can flourish. It is a place where Albuquerque residents and visitors can go, in the middle of the City, to get away and to immerse themselves in nature for a few minutes or a few hours and enjoy the beauty and the tranquility and the miraculous life that we find in the bosque. It is special, and it makes Albuquerque special, because it is this wonderful place where city dwellers can enjoy nature in the midst of an urban area. It will provide the most enjoyment to the most residents and visitors as a place to enjoy nature. It will make Albuquerque stand out and provide the most economic benefit to Albuquerque as a unique natural sanctuary in the middle of the City. The Sierra Club and the BAT urge that whatever is done in the bosque, the guiding light in all of decisions be to preserve and enhance nature in the bosque and help residents and visitors to enjoy that special, unique, wonderful nature that we are privileged to be custodians of here in Albuquerque.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We look forward to continuing to work with you on bosque matters in the future to ensure that the bosque is a place where all Albuquerque residents and visitors can go to enjoy the beautiful natural setting of our City.

Very truly yours,
THE SIERRA CLUB and THE BOSQUE ACTION TEAM
Richard D. Barish

From: Feliz Madrugada
Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2016 8:44 PM
Subject: Public input on bosque trail phase 3

Thank you in advance for taking the time to read the comments of the citizens of your city as well as sincerely consider our requests. As a resident very near to the bosque trails and who uses the old and new trails all the time, I hold this matter very dear to my heart. I love the fact that I can within 5 minutes walk be in some of the most remote wilderness available to Albuquerque residents, with bird watching, porcupines, coyotes (although much less since the newer trails were put in place), and much more available to view and enjoy. I was originally very resistant and hesitant to any new trail plans due to the main fact that I believed and still believe they reduce and drastically change the wildlife habitat we have along the longest stretch of cottonwood bosque in North America. However, as someone who likes to get outdoors to run, cycle, and walk regularly, I admit I also have found some benefits to the new trails. Given all this, I still highly agree with the endorsements below stated by the Sierra Club and Bosque Action Team. I strongly urge that the city listens to the public and thinks and acts with caution and research when implementing new trails in this very special location to make them as natural as possible and the least invasive as possible. The nature center area is a very delicate ecosystem that sees many visitors as it is already. Wheelchair accessibility to already available in many areas of the bosque, rightfully so. There is a balance to achieve and man must learn to live with nature, not on top of it.

Points of consideration:

The thing that what makes the Bosque the place that we all love is that it is an unsurpassed urban space for the enjoyment of nature. Any project should not diminish that experience of nature in the bosque.

> The "no action" alternative is the best of the City's alternative. The wide trail and increased usage that will result from a developed trail will have a negative effect on birds and other wildlife. The trails in the vicinity of the Nature Center get heavy use, including use by school children and families, and adding increased bicycle traffic will increase the risk of accidents. The City has refused to offer an option that circumvents the Nature Center area by using the Paseo del Bosque Trail. The City has also refused to offer acceptable, alternative trail designs that would blend in better with the natural surroundings of the Bosque.

> If a trail is constructed in the bosque, the Administration should adopt Alternative 4. The trail would avoid the environmentally sensitive areas along the riverbank north of Campbell and would not create of a new trail near the river south of Montaña. The loop south of Montaña contained in Alternative 1 should be closed and revegetated.

> The City should, as part of the Phase III project, design projects to compensate for the loss of good, useable habitat that will inevitably result from the construction of the trail and the increased usage that will result. The City should ensure full implementation of the GeoSystems restoration plan for the Central to Campbell stretch by committing to fully funding it out of the \$2.9 million 2013 appropriation. The City should take other steps to mitigate the environmental harm, for instance, shrub planting and the creation of brush piles, to provide shelter for birds to prevent stress and abandonment of the area as a result of the increased traffic from a developed trail.

- > The City should devise and consider alternative trail designs. An obvious, developed feature such as a six foot wide, uniform width, crusher fine trail diminishes the feeling that you are in a natural space and is inconsistent with the natural character of the bosque.
- > The City should ensure good access for wheelchairs and others who are physically challenged. It should ensure good access over the levees, parking at Campbell, and acceptable passage over or around the more varied topography that exists in the Phase III stretch of the bosque.

Thank you again for listening to public viewpoints, commentary and input on this matter.

Sincerely,
Feliz Madrugada

From: Renee Wolters
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 4:04 PM
Subject: Campbell Rd to Montano comments

My name is Renee Wolters and I've lived on Campbell Rd NW for 25 years. I walk in the bosque regularly for recreation, both south and north of Campbell Rd, and the bike trail as well. The RG Nature Center is a precious resource in this area, and should be left alone.

I don't understand who has jurisdiction over the bosque in this area. How does the city action supersede that of the Nature Center or the State Park jurisdiction? The Nature Center has been very protective of its space in the past.

I support the No Action Alternative, as there already exists in the Nature Center two well established wide trails, with access from the Nature Center and the bike trail. Improving access to these trails might be advisable. Otherwise, the Center is already well used and visited by many bird lovers and school groups. We don't need a through trail (i.e. highway) from the south end to the north end through the Nature Center. Leave it alone. The public that wants a highway through the bosque, can go to the paved bike trail at Campbell Rd and walk or ride up the bike trail for a mile or two.

A no action alternative could still include restoration of mini trails and riparian areas, removal of concrete and jetty jacks, and increase of accessibility at a low cost to taxpayers.

If the city refuses to even consider the No Action Alternative, as was said in the meeting Aug 11, I don't understand why it is offered as an alternative. If the city insists on a trail, my second choice would be Alternative 4 with the southern end of the trail (marked in red) replaced with the southern end of Alternative 1 (a route further from the river). If you insist on building a trail, having a section as walking only would be highly adviseable.

I find it unconscionable that the city would even consider trail alternatives 2 and 3, as they run so close to the river bank, especially option 3. This is not an ecologically sound idea. I've already seen one river trail in the Nature Center disintegrate into the river from erosion. Neither trail utilizes the existing paved trail which has a point of access to the river at the north end. Since this

is already in existence, and if the city insists on building a 6 foot wide trail, it only makes sense to utilize this existing trail. It is already ADA compliant.

Alternative 4 shows an Army Corps of Engineers viewing platform at the end of Campbell Rd. Is this part of ABQ Parks and Rec design too? The end of Campbell Rd was devastated with the installation of a 5 ft diameter waterline to the west side. The bosque never recovered in that area. There is already a 30-40 foot viewing area devoid of trees at the river's edge. If this is to be similar to the viewing platform south of central, it needs to be minimal in size. There is only street parking at the end of Campbell Rd--not a great place to bring streams of visitors to the bosque.

Respectfully submitted,
Renee Wolters

From: Deborah Gavel
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 2:57 PM
Subject: Comments for Bosque Plans for trails

There is a great diversity of opinions on how the bosque should be maintained. I am one who believes that we should be absolutely certain that we are doing no harm when we step along the river's edge.

I am an artist and nature lover, I have spent a great deal of time in the bosque during the twenty-five years of my residence in Albuquerque. Many times, I am inspired to write about the extraordinary encounters I have had with wildlife in these very areas, especially with birds. I do hope that will continue to be the case in the future.

Please keep in mind the fragile nature of this ecosystem. We really have done almost everything we can to destroy it to this point. Including the low allocation of water to the river itself.

We know everything is alive and interconnected; without the proper ratio of water to keep the river healthy what will be left to visit? Consider this partial list of ways this area has been cut up between Tingley and Alameda with human interventions:

Central Avenue Bridge
Montano Bridge
Alameda Bridge
Nature Center including bridges for walking over the ditches
Massive cement conduits all throughout this area for moving water into and through the systems of irrigation ditches
Black top bike trails
Botanical Gardens/train tracks along Tingley Road
Tingley Beach numerous man -made ponds, blinds, etc.

Numerous Trail heads in the bosque using materials like gravel, weed-cloth, liners, fencing materials, screening, stakes, signing, etc.

I-40 Overpass

Numerous Parking areas

Water treatment lines through Campbell Road

Bridge at Campbell road

Bike trails north and south along the river

Acequias and the Clear Mother Ditch

Numerous Civil Engineering Projects including miles of steel that cannot safely be removed

Other building projects that have cut up the area

Massive fires through the bosque especially the summer fire of 2003

Because there has been no natural flooding allowed for such a long period of time, the bosque is more susceptible to fire and will not be able to produce new cottonwood growth. And where there has been human attempts to replant cottonwoods, it is largely unsuccessful. That is a fact that could be reversed if we took the time to make a study of how we can bring water into the bosque again.

During the twenty-five years that I have lived near the river in the North Valley, I have witnessed many changes. What is most concerning to me is the ecological diversity that connects to this river. I believe the habitat needs to be left as free and clear of new projects as possible. The shift along the river's edge is profound in the past two decades. There are places so thick with undergrowth from invasive plants, garbage, pollution, toxic waste, etc. that we risk losing all life along this corridor.

Putting in more trails, widening trails, bringing in machinery, bringing in crusher fine, etc. only adds to the destruction of this sensitive area. Please stop the destruction and concentrate on cleanup of so many areas that are full with garbage including the river itself. There is a limit to the noise pollution and chemical pollution that this area can sustain and continue to be healthy and vital. I believe we have reached that limit when the flooding was controlled to the point where no water is allowed to flow through the river in the summer season.

There are mounds and mounds of garbage that has never been removed from the bosque just directly south of Tingley Beach. These mounds of human garbage have been left too long. There is a disregard for this waste that has been covered over with dirt and leaves, etc. We could conserve this area for future generations and concentrate on clean-up.

As long as the city is determined to continue to "develop" this precious area, we risk losing everything. There has been enough development and destruction of this habitat!

We are so fortunate to live in an area where there is a river flowing through the heart of our city. Let's keep it and its ecosystem alive. Let's vote for a gentle approach. The questions we should be asking are related to the balance of life itself. We need to put in place protections from the further destruction of this natural habitat. I believe Aldo Leopold would be shocked at what we have already allowed to happen.

Let's bring back the water levels to a place that is sustainable to the system of the bosque. Cottonwoods need the flooding in the spring in order for their seeds to develop into the beloved old friends that we all so love. We have done so much damage as to effectively destroy the future of this area from continuing to be a thriving force.

The "no action" alternative is the best of the City's alternative. The wide trail and increased usage that will result from a developed trail will have a negative effect on birds and other wildlife. The trails in the vicinity of the Nature Center get heavy use, including use by school children and families, and adding increased bicycle traffic will increase the risk of accidents. The City has refused to offer an option that circumvents the Nature Center area by using the Paseo del Bosque Trail. The City has also refused to offer acceptable, alternative trail designs that would blend in better with the natural surroundings of the Bosque.

Sincerely,
Deborah Gavel

From: Julie Kutz
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 9:44 PM
Subject: Bosque Trail, Phase III comments

Thank you for allowing comment on the third and final phase of the bosque trail building project. First, and most importantly because I know there will be construction and there is no No Action alternative, I would really emphasize that after this third phase, no more new development should be allowed in the bosque. There are too many other priorities for the bosque. There needs to be funding put into promised habitat restoration, education outreach and maintenance on the existing trail and handicap accessibility on existing infrastructure. No boat ramps, restaurants, water parks and so on should ever be built such as was planned in the beginning of this flawed project. As it is now the new trails (Phase I and II) have altered the natural feel of the bosque, from having a slightly wild feel to now being more of a city park atmosphere where pedestrians have to dodge bicyclists and walk on an artificial trail. We must stop at this Phase III or we will lose (more than we already have) the essence of the wonderful treasure that is a natural green space in the urban heart of Albuquerque. That is and has always been the purpose of managing the bosque that is part of the Aldo Leopold legacy: manage for the public enjoyment of this resource while protecting the integrity of the wild green ribbon that runs through our beautiful city.

The City has agreed to conduct restoration work south of Campbell Road. The City had a restoration plan prepared by GeoSystems for the Central to Campbell Rd. stretch. The City should ensure full implementation of the plan by committing to fully funding it out of the \$2.9 million 2013 appropriation. I urge the City to make that a priority and complete the restoration plan as soon as possible.

Lastly, as far as the alternatives go, I urge you to support Alternative 4, the alternative developed with the Bosque Action Team. Also, please construct the trail of stabilized native materials, with

varying widths of 4 to 6 feet which would still allow for wheelchair passing. Varying widths using native materials would help the trail feel more in keeping with the natural character of the Bosque as well as keep bicyclists speeds down thus making the trail safer. If bicycles are not controlled to include the dismount area through the Nature Center (as proposed in Alt 4), then it is going to be extremely dangerous and the City is just asking for an accident to happen between pedestrians and bicyclists. Alternative 4 also appears to avoid the most sensitive habitat and would utilize existing trails to the extent possible. Alternative 4 would have the least impact so I support that alternative.

Thank you,
Julie Kutz

From: Ken Marchand
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 5:14 PM
Subject: Campbell to Montano Bosque Trail Improvements

I would like to express my strong support for Alternate No. 3. I prefer this over the SWCA recommendation of Alternate No.2 for these reasons:

1. Alt No. 3 provides for a continuous improved trail for the entire distance from Campbell to Montano. This should help with reducing the number of “spur trails” that have developed so that users can complete their walk point to point.
2. Alt No. 3 provides more river views to users which really is the focus of the Bosque and something everyone wants to see and gaze upon.
3. Alt No. 3 provides the most access for ADA bound users opening up the entire length to them including more river views.

This said, Alternate No. 2 would be my second choice.

I am strongly opposed to the “No Action Alternative” as it would continue to discourage and limit use by all residents. I feel that the more people we can get visiting and enjoying the Bosque area the more they will learn to appreciate and respect our natural environment. For many underserved youth, this may be the only opportunity for them to experience and appreciate nature.

Best Regards,
Ken Marchand

From: Dewette Decker
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 6:42 PM
Subject: Requested comments Campbell to Montano Bosque Trail Improvements

I would like to express my strong support for Alternate No. 3. I prefer this over the SWCA recommendation of Alternate No.2 for these reasons:

1. Alt No. 3 provides for a continuous improved trail for the entire distance from Campbell to Montano. This should help with reducing the number of “spur trails” that have developed so that users can complete their walk point to point.
2. Alt No. 3 provides more river views to users which really is the focus of the Bosque and something everyone wants to see and gaze upon.
3. Alt No. 3 provides the most access for ADA bound users opening up the entire length to them including more river views.
4. As an activist to protect the environment, alternate No 3. reduction of spur trails will encourage more restoration of habitat, and expand the habitat for species that make they’re home in the Bosque. So, those who claim they want no change, because of environmental conservation seem to be ignorant to Alternate No.3, or they are just afraid of change(like many)... Possibly more succinct education would enlighten some.

This said, Alternate No. 2 would be my second choice.

I am strongly opposed to the “No Action Alternative” as it would continue to discourage and limit use by all residents. I believe if we are in the environment we can truly observe the health of the environment.

The “No-Action Alternative,” with haphazard, unmaintained trails, does not lend to more people accessing and accessing the health of Bosque. I feel that the more people we can get visiting and enjoying the Bosque area the more they will learn to appreciate and respect our natural environment. For many under served youth, this may be the only opportunity for them to experience and appreciate nature. If we can bring more people and activities to the Bosque, with the focus on helping the environment, the whole state economy, and our youth can benefit (I have ideas, if you are interested).

Sincere Regards,
Dewette Decker

From: Dave Bexfield
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 10:07 AM
Subject: Bosque Trail Phase 3 Input

Thanks for putting together three strong alternatives for the accessible ADA bosque trail from Campbell to Montano. As someone who cycles on the new trail regularly with a hand bike (again just the weekend I biked the entire length), I have a few comments based on personal experience that I would like you all to consider.

- 1) Avoid dead ends. My arm trike is long—more than 6 feet—and wider than a wheelchair and does not go backward easily. It takes the full width of a standard street to turn around. If a trail dead ends (as it appears it may in Alt 2), it takes a helper and patience to do a 12-point turn. Even so, I have to go off trail on both sides to execute such a tight turn.

2) Make the trail contiguous. It appears that Alt 2 is an out-and-back; the crusher-fine section of the bosque trail should be contiguous. In Phase 2, a spur off the south part of the trail currently dead ends in the sand under I-40 (in sight of the continuing trail). I hope this can be corrected or a turn around can be added.

3) Repair existing pavement if Alt 1 is chosen. There are so many bumps, it's not pleasant to bike on and would not be my choice for a wheelchair or scooter.

4) Consider a "viewing" area near the river where riders can pause off trail. Since my trike takes up a large area, I avoid stopping on the trail. It would be nice to pause, get a drink of water, take pictures, and rest somewhere in the shade with a view of the river without impeding fellow riders, walkers, and equestrians.

5) Be mindful of grades. As I'm sure you are aware, there are sections of the current trail that are too steep currently (e.g., crossing the culvert), which require a push from a helper for me to ascend. I imagine these issues will be fixed eventually (a bridge?) and I appreciate the new gentle grade at I-40 that I can climb without assistance.

In general, I do not have a strong preference to one particular alternative. I am just thankful that I have a place to cycle in the bosque among the trees, another outdoor jewel thanks to Albuquerque's Park & Rec. The new accessible bosque trail has and continues to change my life for the better. I can't begin to tell you how much it means to me. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

Dave Bexfield

From: Joan Robins
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 12:21 PM
Subject: Phase 3

No action.

From: Peggy Norton
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 2:24 PM

The North Valley Coalition supports the "no action" alternative for phase III of the Bosque Trail Extension. We think the remainder of the bosque should be free of un-natural crusher fine trails. We need to co-exist with the wildlife there and appreciate the remaining places that are quiet - save the bosque for people who want to travel at a slower and quieter pace.

Some rather mis-leading information was expressed at the public meeting. To state the environmental monitoring has not shown any negative effects from phase I and, although not yet determined, phase II ignores the fact that no mammals, reptiles, amphibians, insects, etc. are

included in the monitoring program. Why? SWCA stated in the initial environmental monitoring report that mammals were most likely to be affected by this trail. Any user of the Paseo del Bosque multi use trail can report dead toads, lizards, and snakes are frequently found on it. The Bosque Action Plan requires monitoring every 5 years of all these animals. Why has this not been done?

The statement was made that this trail is only 5 miles out of 22 miles. However, within city limits, the east side bosque stretch is only 7.5 miles. And, the 5 mile stretch of trail is the entire North Valley bosque that falls within city limits. Why is the input of the community most affected being ignored? We take issue with the thought that building a wide crusher fine trail will eliminate rogue trails. There are many rogue trails in the nature center area. These were made by people who were not content to follow the main developed trail. This will only happen again. Many people using the bosque prefer a soft dirt natural trail rather than feeling like they are walking on a sidewalk.

Rather than build more trails, improve what is already available. Repair the paved Aldo Leopold trail. Create access for the physically challenged – the slopes of trails over the levee are too steep. The only place to access the 5 mile loop trail already built is at Central and the trail is not continuous over the siphon or under I-40.

We understand there are plans being developed for restoration but no funding. Use this money for that and to shelter wild life from the impact of people using the built trails. One reason people live in the north valley is to enjoy the treasures of the bosque. People also come down here from all over the city and country because it is so special. We support keeping it that way. It is a gem to have a wild place like the bosque in the middle of a city.

Sincerely,
Peggy Norton

From: Colston Chandler
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 2:25 PM
Subject: Phase 3 of the Bosque Multiuse Trail

The city proposes to continue its construction of a multiuse six-foot-wide crusher-fines trail, this time between Campbell and Montaño. Despite the rhetoric of this city about needing the trail before closing other trails and providing an accessible trail, I am convinced the real reason behind the trail construction is to provide a trail for bicycles. Were it not for the inclusion of bicycles the trail could be constructed in a very different way that would much better preserve the sense of being in nature.

I strongly oppose, in particular, the construction of a building of such a trail through the area that for many years been heavily used by pedestrian visitors to the Rio Grande Nature Center. I believe this would seriously degrade the experience of nature sought by those visitors, as well as endanger their safety (especially of children) because of the additional bicycle traffic it would encourage. A dismount zone, such as included in Alternative 4 is not adequate.

This trail is also claimed to encourage and facilitate wheelchair users. It is a scandal that the City has so far announced no serious effort, not even producing any plans for public scrutiny, to provide easy (4% grade or less) access for wheelchair users from parking to this trail (or, for that matter, to the previous construction phases). Such access is admittedly difficult to provide, but that difficulty is no excuse to ignore the problem completely. Statements of concern, such as given by Barbara Taylor at the Los Duranes Center meeting on August 11, are insufficient.

The City's hike on June 18 in that area of the Bosque, as well as the meeting at the Los Duranes Center on August 11, showed no evidence that the staff of the Nature Center had not been seriously consulted about what they consider the most pressing needs in that part of the Bosque. I cannot support a trail through an area heavily used by patrons of the Nature Center that does not have the public input and support of the Nature Center staff.

It was clear at the Los Duranes meeting that the trails near the Nature Center are, in general, in need of serious upgrading. None of the alternatives presented at the Los Duranes meeting adequately address the needs of those trails, which have far more use than the trails built in Phases 1 and 2.

Therefore, I strongly urge the City to concentrate on the greatest need for the greatest number of users. Upgrade the existing Bosque loop trail, the part of the River loop trail that goes to the river, and the asphalt trail (perhaps adding a spur from the end of that trail to the river). Repair or replace the existing asphalt trail. These trails are already among the most heavily used in the Bosque and are among the most in need of upgrading. At the same time, a substantial effort should be made to provide the 4%-grade access from the Nature Center to the Bosque that has been needed for so long. This last phase should become a showcase of what the City can do for wheelchair access to the Bosque—from the parking lot, over the levee, to the river. Any funds left over for this Phase should be devoted to habitat restoration in the vicinity of the Bosque and RiverLoop trails. This could be done in a bird-friendly way so that the nature experience of the visitors would be made more enjoyable. Build no crusher fines trails either north or south of the area directly opposite the Nature Center.

I doubt, however, the City will give up its construction of its multiuse (bicycle) trail which will remain difficult of access for wheelchair users. So, I offer the following preferences. Construction between Cambell and the area opposite the Nature Center should follow that suggested in Alternative 1, with the proviso that it exit to the Paseo bike trail to the south of the present trails that are presently used by patrons of the Nature Center to access the Bosque. It is important to plant some shrubs near this trail that will improve the bird habitat (providing both shelter and food).

Construction from north of the Nature Center to Montaña should follow the red path of Alternative 4, providing that it be separated by a fence from the present asphalt trail. As before, it is important to plant some shrubs near this trail that will improve the bird habitat (providing both shelter and food). To repeat, whatever you do, incorporate some restoration work along the lines suggested by Brian Hanson.

From: Heather Kline
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 2:53 PM
Subject: Comments in response to city plans for bosque trail development

As a citizen of Albuquerque, I wanted to voice my opinion regarding plans for further trail development.

I encourage no further action on the City's development plan for the bosque. The bosque is a wilderness area, and while we should have responsible access to this natural resource via unobtrusive trails, the extensive crusher fine trails already constructed between Central and Montano are overly wide and damaging. To create more of these trails is dangerous to the natural habitat. If further development is deemed necessary, please consider Alternative 4 to avoid environmentally sensitive areas. In addition, all future planning should focus on the environmental impacts already incurred through this development and put appropriations towards restoration rather than destruction.

Thank you for listening to the feedback of concerned citizens.

Sincerely,
Heather Kline

From: Joan Robins
Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 11:46 AM
Subject: Phase III Bosque Trail Construction

I along with most of the audience support the no action alternative which actually supports actions to ensure good access to existing trails for people who are physically challenged. By improving parking at entrances to the bosque and making entrances for wheelchairs currently blocked off to prevent motorcycles and making bridges accessible a lot more could be accomplished than providing a 6 foot wide crusher pathway everywhere. Where the sand is too soft a narrower pathway with hardening materials could be provided. By following the crusher fine pathway throughout the bosque, the feel of the bosque--a forest--is lost and it becomes a roadway in a park.

Please let it be known how decisions are made when so many people testify against the plans and how "it was determined" that a 6 foot wide crusher trail was the way to go.

Sincerely,
Joan Robins

From: Peter Kelling
Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 1:57 PM
Subject: Phase 3 Multi-useTrail

I support the no action alternative presented at the Phase 3 August 11th public meeting. I feel that the crusher fine trail already installed from Central to Campbell is sufficient for people to enjoy a Bosque experience. Any more development would cause greater harm to an already fragile and altered ecosystem.

My second choice would be alternative #4. A section of Phase 3 runs west of the Nature Center, this area is used by the Friends of The Nature Center, the Junior Ranger Program and other educational programs offered by the Rio Grande Nature Center; a multi-use trail through this section would be disruptive to these valuable programs. Dis-mounting bicycles as shown on the composite would be imperative in this section. I also think the run of trail from Campbell to the bicycle dismount should follow the straight line (in black) older trail which is already well developed and wide enough to accommodate the new crusher fine trail. The trail proposed on the composite in this section goes through an area of dense growth and thus important habitat. One problem with all the alternatives is that wheelchair access from the Nature Center to the Bosque or the Hundred Acre Woods as it is called, is hampered by a substandard, almost unusable dirt ramp going up over the Levee Trail and down into the Bosque. This limits multi-use access, which is the stated purpose of the new trail.

Sincerely,

Peter Kelling

From: Rodema Ashby
Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 5:44 PM
Subject: Protecting the wild heart of Albuquerque

Whose heart doesn't lift on viewing the verdant ribbon of our mighty river threading through the heart of our city? Seen from atop Sandia (turtle mountain) we look west into the depths of the great green rift valley cradling the Rio Grande, one of the world's great rivers. Driving east from Mount Taylor (turquoise mountain), upon cresting 9 mile hill and suddenly seeing Albuquerque spread out before us our road rapidly descends to the great river where life flourishes thanks to the bounty of water that nourishes the Bosque and all the creatures that call it home.

To have such a rich, quiet, sacred space running through the heart of Albuquerque is a precious legacy of our past which needs protection. The people who had the foresight to create the Rio Grande park knew that wilderness needs protection from human incursion as well as thoughtful access which limits harm to the natural ecosystems. Years of human activity has introduced non-native vegetation into our forest & the Bosque needs restoration of native plant species and protection of the wild creatures that thrive on the river.

Mayor Berry's team has argued that increasing human access to the forest away from sensitive riverbank areas would help protect the forest. However the method of access stubbornly promoted is a 6 foot wide crusher fine path that divides & disrupts the sensitive ecosystems in our Bosque, scraping an ugly scar through this once peaceful oasis of wilderness flanking the majestic Rio Grande.

We've been told that the purpose of the path is to enable more citizens to enjoy the Bosque's natural beauty. However the path's straight route, unvarying 6 foot width & crunchy light surface is the antithesis of natural beauty. Natural surfaces that support wheelchair access have been rejected by the city which seems fixated on crunchy crusher fine. Suggestions of a meandering route for a path width for two people walking abreast and wheelchair width (3 feet) interspersed with wider places to pass and pull outs for resting has been rejected in favor of a wide straight path. A varying width path of natural surface appearance mimics the tracks made by the beaver, raccoons & other animals that laid down the first trails in the Bosque. A twisty trail has the added benefit of naturally slowing bicyclists.

The ill conceived straight, wide "multi-purpose" path creates a safety hazard by forcing equestrians, bicyclists, pedestrians, & those using wheelchairs & strollers onto a single multi use trail, diminishing the precious experience of nature for everyone. Crunching gravel and bicyclist warning bells increase the unnatural noise. Whizzing bicyclists create a danger for slower, less alert trail users such as myself. I'm disabled & seek the calming sounds of bird song & rustling leaves of the Bosque for the soothing feeling I gain when surrounded by creation. Many alternative suggestions have been made to the city. We need to restore & protect the wild heart of Albuquerque while improving disabled access & improving/providing natural appearing trails routed away from sensitive wildlife habits.

Some of the attempts made to give suggestions to the city have included:

- 1) review of the initial city proposal brought more than 350 of us to a meeting that the city wanted to be simply a show & tell. Through the leadership of the Sierra Club (Camilla) & many others, our requests for our voices to be heard & for us to hear others forced a change to the agenda which allowed for a town hall meeting at the ABQ museum. The city's facilitators wrote down comments from the public that night on four large poster sheets, 4 feet by 8 feet. Whatever happened to those suggestions?
- 2) the early bird count studies provided to the city showed the probable negative effect on the native wildlife of clearing swathes of Bosque areas on the native wildlife. Other studies and research & public comments have been provided by the Bosque Action Team.
- 3) members of the Bosque Action Team (BAT) headed by Richard Barish spent many, many hours reviewing proposals & negotiating with the city to support improved access to the Bosque. However the city has repeatedly violated agreed upon processes.

Some examples of the city disregarding negotiated agreements:

- 1) the stealth path bulldozing.
- 2) the city failing to start restoration work, and perhaps not even budgeting for the agreed actions.
- 3) the city failing to monitor bird counts & other base line environmental studies.
- 4) the city's repeated meeting cancellations & change of venues for public comments which has the effect of suppressing public participation.

I was disheartened at the last public comment hearing 8/11/16 listening to person after person who declared we saw the fix was in & though we preferred the natural trails now in place (alternative 1), the 6 foot wide, straight crusher fine path was the only choice that would be

accepted by the city and the least harmful route of that bad solution was alternative four. Meanwhile the city has not worked on making wheelchair accessible alterations to access the Bosque. Restoration work which should have had priority have not been implemented, nor have the monies been set aside? The legacy of a naturally beautiful, peaceful Bosque needs to be respected. Don't tear the wild heart out of Albuquerque.

From: Terri O'Hare
Sent: August 19, 2016
Subject: PhaseIII of the Bosque Trail(s)

I am giving my feedback regarding this phase of trail design and public comment in writing as I chose to not attend August 11th's public meeting. The previous meeting was too short and did not allow all of us to speak and was very contentious.

The last 1.5 years have been very interesting for me as I have dug deeper into our state's ADA/access approach for people with disabilities to equally explore beautiful, nourishing outdoor spaces. Spaces most other citizens can go to without a second thought. This year I have started to request public records from various levels of government in order to see what the truth is about our progress. I started with the City of Albuquerque and received records that showed we had no Transition Plan in place, anywhere in the city. This is illegal and I understand now, perhaps because of my attendance at a GARTC meeting in May, an RFP is now out to address this project. I also discovered at least 100 violations of ADA at Balloon Fiesta Park from 3 years ago, so there is much to be done here. I requested ADA Audits and Transition Plans from Bernalillo County. They were very organized, had a Transition Plan, but several properties that are non-compliant and currently have no ADA Coordinator in place to remedy this. I requested ADA Audits from NM State Parks because they have no State ADA Coordinator, and this fell to a safety officer with little ADA training. They have no Transition Plan and have intermittent ADA reports on all State] Parks. This morning I was up at the Valles Caldera Preserve. They have a new wheelchair accessible van for visitor tours. They did not know how to strap in wheelchair users. The city's training director and his staffer with Paratransit met me there and we showed the rangers how to operate their equipment using me as a chair user for 3 hours. It is a glorious natural space. I'll be working on them to develop a few miles of ADA trails, too. I am looking at the whole state to help to raise the level of what we offer people with mobility (and other) disabilities in the most majestic parks and outdoor programs we have.

I have two core concerns that I want to emphasize for this Phase III Trail:

- Do not move this phase's trail of ADA accessibility into the middle of this site with very few pleasing, canopy covered river views and opportunities to roll close to the river or see wildlife, butterflies and dragonflies. This was recently done in Phase II and it should not have happened. Equal access means equal. The city has a lawful obligation under ADA to not create 2 sets of access standards, one for able-bodied people who can walk old 'pedestrian' trails right along the river, and one for disabled people who must travel the

interior of the bosque using mobility equipment that does not fit or roll on existing ‘pedestrian’ beaten paths. I will paste concerning comments from the BWG minutes at the end section of this memo.

- Do not use the Rio Grande Nature Center (RGNC) as the supposed ‘accessible’ trailhead without doing the necessary and legal upgrades to meet ADA. I have ADA audits from the Division of State Parks for this facility---(a state park) dating back to 2006. There are items on the 2006 audit that are still not done, 10 years later. There are also incorrect comments from Parks & Rec staff regarding accessibility of parts of this site in the July BWG minutes. They will be provided at the end of my note. The 2008 audit of the RGNC closes with these words:

“Many areas of this park do not meet ADA guidelines, primarily because of the inappropriate walking/travel surface. ADA standards require a smooth, solid, nonslip walking surface, which the current base course does not provide. The main entrance ramp is too steep for standard but there is now access through the west door as well, so improvements are being made. Park management should consider long-term ADA accessibility plans (contact the ADA Coordinator for specific details when considering a project).”

They have no ADA Coordinator, FYI. The bold face report content was prepared by State Park’s ‘safety officer’ Alan D. Resnicke on September 25, 2008. The 2006, 2012, 2014 and 2016 reports all have ADA audit issues not completed. I do not know why there are missing ADA audits of this facility for other years. My records request only gave me what I have written. In addition, Mr. Resnicke was not a certified ADA professional capable of reviewing a facility in the same way John McGovern would be. The parking lots, parking spaces, path to the entry, all of the walking trails before the levee, the steep, paved levee path, the pitted, broken asphalt trail paving, etc all violate ADA. This park/center needs a lot of money thrown at it before it can be considered an ADA accessible ‘entry point’ for Phase III.

In addition to this, while reviewing the Bosque Working Group’s recent July 29, 2016 posted meeting minutes; there are discussions about many factors for the Phase III Trail. They include location of the main trail, the suitability of crusher fines from the RGNC, levee inclines and ADA compliance, etc. No one in that discussion uses a wheelchair, nor has a professional background in accessible construction and ADA. In essence, no one accurately noted the RGNC trails were not constructed properly and need to be completely reconstructed. From the Bosque Working Group (BWG) minutes:

CRUSHER FINE TRAIL MATERIALS

MR. SCHMADER: (non wheelchair user but closely aware of chair users needs in many outings) “...I also wanted to be sure to note in the existing conditions, that there already are crusher-fine trails in the Bosque in the nature center area, and the difference really is, how they were originally installed, and whether they have any stabilizer in the crusher fine, because back sometime ago when the crusher fine was laid down, that there's no stabilizer added to it.”

MR. JENSEN: (non wheelchair user) “But they are -- I mean, they get so much use, and they're so packed down. The last time I was out there was after there had been a fair amount of rain the previous week, and then a slight dry period, and then rain overnight the morning before I went in, and they were in great shape. There was -- I walked this whole area here. And there were two small areas of five or six feet long, and maybe a foot wide in the -- where the -- a couple of the hard-packed earth trails were cupped a little bit, but the crusher fine trails were completely dry. And that was after, you know, it had been saturated a little bit and then dried out, and they got, you know, sort of reclaimed. So I think they're in pretty good shape personally, but I mean --”

MR. BARISH: (non wheelchair user) “And my observation is the same, they are handling that very well.”

NEW TRAIL PLACEMENT

MS. NAJMI: (non wheelchair user) “And I would not want the trail to be along the river there. You could create a link down to the nature center. That's a wide trail. So that would be a good place.”

MR. JENSEN: (describing a path) “And my experience from walking in this area is that it's incredibly nice. It's almost a tunnel, a canopy. And if you -- again, if you could sign it, and just make it pedestrian only, or walk your bikes, but it's a really nice area to walk, and you get little glimpses through the trees, but it's just incredibly peaceful in there, really nice there.”

MS. NAJMI (discussing riverfront existing pathways) “And those are the ones I'd like to -- there's trails going through them now and I don't think people really need to be there.”

MR. BARISH: “...In the south part there are good river views, though, I guess that really is probably the most environmentally sensitive area as far as I can tell looking at this sketch. And I would not want the trail to be along the river there...”

MR. SCHMADER: (Trying to tell others that users of all physical abilities need equally rich experiences on the trails.) “So the real question is, how do we make sure that enough of the right -- that all of us get to go and see some of it, because ...by the time you rule out all of them for better accessibility, there's almost no places to go. I mean, I understand about habitat considerations. I'm just saying, we may be winnowing out every form of complete experience for --”

MR. JENSEN: “Isn't it just for us here?”

RGNC LEVEE PATHWAY STEEP INCLINE NOT ADA COMPLIANT

MR. JENSEN: (referring to document from Parks & Rec) “It says that access from the Nature Center from the west side of the drain bridge crossing up to Paseo is ADA compliant? It seemed pretty steep to me.”

MS. TAYLOR: (non wheelchair user) “The slope up is ADA compliant. I can give it to you in inches if you would like. We'd like to have the surface redone. The slope is okay. The surface is a little difficult. And in the process of fixing that surface we'd like to lengthen it a little and make it – so it's technically there.”

MS. TAYLOR: “But the slope has been measured and is technically compliant. We would like to improve the slope and lengthen the slope, which would reduce the –“

MR. BARISH: ”We should talk to Camilla when she gets back because we did do outings with those there. There were -- I think there were difficulties with that.”

With all due respect, there is no possible way this levee grade/slope/incline is ADA compliant. It has to be at least 3-4 times ‘steeper’ than ADA allows. I was on the outing Richard Barish speaks of above. No one using manual wheelchairs could get up the pavement without having a person behind them strenuously pushing the whole way. That is not considered ADA compliant. A real solution would cost a lot of money to re-grade a new incline and several switchbacks to the Paseo trail level.

It is obvious from the BWG meeting minutes we have a select few making decisions and driving outcomes for all of Albuquerque’s residents. If you’re not in these meetings, or in the Middle Rio Grande Sierra Club, or part of the ‘Bosque Action Team’, you do not get to influence outcomes much, learn about finer discussion points and you are not able to insert commentary about New Mexico’s largest minority, people with disabilities needing trail access. At the river. Under the “really nice area to walk...just incredibly peaceful in there, really nice there” places. This design outcome must not be relegated to the interior section with a tiny experience of the river. The best outcome is Alt. #3—and to widen the exiting paths along the riverfront and include all the ‘canopy’ and ‘really nice places’, and create experiences that are equal and accessible under the Federal law passed in 1990.

I would hope the city and staff understand this is not a ‘wish’ from people with disabilities, it is a request for the city to remember it’s legal requirement to comply and create spaces of equal ADA access. It is possible in the bosque, while it is not in many other hiking/trail areas.

Thank you,
T. O’Hare

I can provide document back up to the ‘Safety Audits’ and ‘ADA Audits’ I received for the RGNC from State Parks if needed.

From: Open Space Advisory Board
Sent: August 23, 2016

PREFERRED TRAIL ALIGNMENT FOR PHASE 3 OF THE BOSQUE TRAIL;

After some discussion by the board, a Motion was made by Michael Jensen to approve Alternative 4 for Phase 3 of the Bosque Trail. The motion was seconded by Alan Reed. A vote was taken and the motion passed on a 6 to 0 vote. Board member Janet Saiers left early and was not able to vote on this item.

Let the record show that Board member Rene Horvath stated she would like to add a comment regarding the bicyclists on the trail. She stated that something needs to be done as they are dangerous to other trail users. The Open Space Advisory Board is greatly concerned about safety of trail users and conflicts with bicyclists on the trail.