



## ***Environmental Planning Commission***

**Agenda Number: 2  
Project Number: 1008887  
Case #: 14EPC-40054  
September 4, 2014**

### ***Staff Report***

<b>Agent</b>	COA Planning Department
<b>Applicant</b>	City of Albuquerque (COA)
<b>Request</b>	<b>Adoption of the <i>Bikeways &amp; Trails Facility Plan</i>, which consolidates and replaces the <i>Trails &amp; Bikeways Facility Plan</i> and the <i>Comprehensive On-Street Bicycle Plan</i> (Rank II Facility Plan)</b>
<b>Location</b>	City-wide
<b>Zoning</b>	No zoning will be changed

#### ***Staff Recommendation***

***That a RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL of 14EPC-40054, based on the findings beginning on Page 20 and subject to the conditions of approval beginning on Page 22, be forwarded to the City Council.***

***Staff Planner  
Carrie Barkhurst, Planner***

#### ***Summary of Analysis***

The proposed *Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan* will update, consolidate, and replace two City planning documents, the *Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan*, 1993 and the *Comprehensive On-Street Bicycle Plan*, 2000. The Plan represents a continuation of previous planning and implementation work that has been ongoing since 1972.

Combining these plans into one consolidated Plan will help the City better manage the growth of the bikeway and multi-use trail system. The Plan also evaluates the proposed facilities and updates the list of future projects. The overarching purpose is to ensure a well-connected, enjoyable, and safe non-motorized transportation and recreation system throughout the metropolitan area.

The Plan includes a review of existing conditions and a needs analysis, which identified difficult or dangerous locations as well as areas with the greatest potential for improvement. The plan includes design guidelines for both on-street bicycle facilities and multi-use trails. Key recommendations address education and outreach, closing gaps in the system, maintenance, and way-finding. There is a proposed facilities map and a detailed list of projects to improve the bicycle system and individual facilities.

The recommendations in this plan will guide future local investment in the bikeways and trails system, including new facilities, facility improvements, maintenance, and education/outreach/enforcement/evaluation programs. The City will also be better able to apply for state and federal funds to implement projects identified in the plan.

Staff from the Planning, Municipal Development, and Parks & Recreation Departments collaborated on this planning effort. Bicycle and trail advisory groups were consulted and the City hosted three public open house meetings to introduce the draft Plan.

Neighborhood representatives were notified via e-mail. Notice was published in the Albuquerque Journal, the Neighborhood News, and on the Planning Department's webpage. Staff received a few informational inquiries and phone calls as of this writing, generally supportive of the Plan.

Suggested revisions are found in the proposed conditions of approval. Staff supports a recommendation of approval to be forwarded to the City Council.

City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 8/4/2014 to 8/15/2014.  
Agency comments used in the preparation of this report begin on Page 40.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### ***Request***

The request is for review and recommendation of approval to the City Council for adoption of the proposed *Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan*, which will replace the *Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan*, 1993, and the *Comprehensive On-Street Bicycle Plan*.

The *Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan* is a Rank II Plan that includes policies, programs, design standards, and recommended projects to be implemented over the next 50+ years.

The 2014 draft plan is available at:

[www.cabq.gov/planning/documents/BikewaysTrailsFacilityPlan.pdf](http://www.cabq.gov/planning/documents/BikewaysTrailsFacilityPlan.pdf) (Chapters 1-6), and  
[www.cabq.gov/planning/documents/Chapter7DesignManual.pdf](http://www.cabq.gov/planning/documents/Chapter7DesignManual.pdf) (Chapter 7)

The *Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan*, 1993 is available at:

[www.cabq.gov/planning/documents/trailbky.pdf](http://www.cabq.gov/planning/documents/trailbky.pdf)

The Albuquerque Comprehensive On-Street Bicycle Plan, 2000 is available at:

[www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/documents/ABQcomprehensiveonstreetbicycleplan.pdf](http://www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/documents/ABQcomprehensiveonstreetbicycleplan.pdf)

### ***Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) Role***

The EPC's task is to make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed *Bikeways & Trails Facilities Plan*. As the City's Land Use and Zoning Authority, the City Council will make the final decision. The EPC is a recommending body with review authority.

### ***Bikeways & Trails Planning History***

In 1972, the City began work on its bicycle network. A team effort involving an ad hoc Bikeway Advisory Committee and the Planning Department developed *The Bikeway Study*, published in March 1974. *The Bikeway Study* led to adoption of the *Bikeways Master Plan*, which established policy regarding bikeways in the Albuquerque Metropolitan Planning Area. A permanent bikeway subcommittee of the EPC was created to advise the City on implementation of the Plan, which eventually became the Greater Albuquerque Bicycling Advisory Committee (GABAC).

The *Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan* was adopted in 1993 by the City of Albuquerque and Bernalillo County to provide policies and guidelines for the design and development of multi-use trails and on-street bikeways in the metropolitan area. The Greater Albuquerque Recreational Trails Committee (GARTC) was established to help with the development of this plan. This plan established long-range policies for off-street trails and bicycle facilities within the Albuquerque Metropolitan Planning Area and was adopted by both the City and Bernalillo County. A proposed trail system that serves both recreational and commuting purposes was envisioned.

In late 1996, the Department of Municipal Development initiated the *Comprehensive On-Street Bicycle Plan*, based on a recommendation in the *Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan* to investigate on-street bikeways more closely. A steering committee was created consisting of members from bicycle advisory and advocacy groups, public agencies, and other parties. The *Comprehensive On-Street Bikeway Plan* was adopted in 2000. It includes goals and policies, funding strategies, design standards, recommended facilities, and an implementation plan. Recommended elements of both studies are currently being implemented as funding allows.

The total proposed network originally targeted for completion in 1978 has yet to be realized. With a mature system of 620 miles of facilities, the fact that some of these initially envisioned routes have not yet been completed speaks to the challenges in developing the system.

### ***The Update Process***

The process of revising the two current plans began in September 2008 when the City Council approved the Mayor's recommendation of Gannett Fleming West as engineering consultants for the "*Bikeways and Trails Master Plan Update*" (EC-08-175; Project #7612.91). The intention of the project was to combine the *Trails & Bikeways Master Plan* and the *Comprehensive On-Street Bicycle Plan* into one document. Combining these plans will help the City better manage the growth of the bikeway and multi-use trail system. Both plans also needed to be updated to address current conditions, goals, policies, issues, and future priorities. The consultant was also tasked to identify and recommend innovative treatments needed due to physical/fiscal/community constraints and the recommendation of a management system.

Beginning in July 2009, the project team began work to discuss the needed updates, issues, and revisions. A multi-agency project management team was formed to guide the direction of the Plan. The initial data collection and analysis for the plan was conducted by DMD and consultants between 2009 and 2010. They solicited input through stakeholder workshops, key person interviews, and public open house events held from May to July 2010.

In May 2011, a draft version of the *Bikeways and Trails Master Plan Update* was distributed to project management team members and submitted for EPC review. Comments provided indicated the draft Plan needed a clearer implementation approach, and additional work was needed to adequately address the trail system and recreational concerns.

The request was withdrawn, and in 2012, Parks & Recreation hired a consultant team to assess the *Master Plan Update* and provide recommendations on how to reformulate it to result in meaningful guidance for future development and maintenance of the City's trails and bikeways. Parks & Recreation took the lead to strengthen the Plan's recommendations regarding trails and the needs of recreational bicyclists and other trail users.

In late 2013, the Planning Department was asked to help directly respond to public comments collected in the earlier planning effort, and to update the vision, goals, and policies to reflect the concerns raised by the public, advisory groups, and agency interviews. A new working group was formed with members from Planning, Department of Municipal Development, and Parks & Recreation. This team worked together to assess how the City currently administers the bikeway and trail system; to develop recommendations to improve administrative coordination and maintenance practices; and to explore how the advisory groups can be most effective. This team also reviewed and updated the GIS data and proposed facilities and revised the design guidelines and standards.

A complete draft was made available for public comment in June 2014 on the project webpage and as a hard copy. Three Open House events were held in July 2014, with over 100 attendees. Many of the comments and recommendations from those meetings were incorporated into the current draft of the plan. Several that required further discussion are included in **Section IV** of this report and may be reflected in the **Recommended Conditions of Approval**.

## II. PLAN OVERVIEW — BIKEWAYS AND TRAILS FACILITY PLAN, 2014

### *Intent and Purpose of Plan*

The *Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan* (the Plan) aims to help the City better manage the growth of the bikeway and multi-use trail system. The overarching purpose is to ensure a well-connected, enjoyable, and safe non-motorized transportation and recreation system throughout the metropolitan area.

The *Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan* describes the existing system, policies, recommendations, and proposed projects. The plan will guide future investment in the bikeways & trails system, including facility improvements, new facilities, maintenance, and education/outreach programs. The plan does not allocate new funding or cause projects to be completed. It will serve as a guide for future planning efforts and funding requests to implement the recommendations.

### *Plan Area*

This Rank II Facility Plan has a City-wide scope in its recommendations. The proposed facilities only include those within the City limits. However, this Plan also recognizes that the transportation and recreation activities of area residents do not end at jurisdictional boundaries. The Plan recommends concerted coordination across the region both in the construction of bikeways and trails and the administration and management of the regional system.

### *Plan Summary*

The Plan is organized as follows:

**Chapter 1, Introduction**, provides a general orientation to the Plan, including its purpose, the benefits of investing in bikeways and trails, and an overview of the planning process.

**Chapter 2, Planning and Policy Framework**, contains the Plan's vision, goals, and policies, as well as how the plan fits into the broader Planning and policy context.

**Chapter 3, Existing Conditions & Current Issues**, provides an assessment of user needs and considerations for developing the bikeway & trail system. It also provides an overview of some of the current issues seen in the City.

**Chapter 4, Recommended Network**, recommends capital projects for new facilities and enhancements for existing facilities.

**Chapter 5, Recommended Programs**, reviews current programs and projects and recommends new efforts as resources and staff time allow.

**Chapter 6, Implementation Strategies**, details administrative processes, legislative change recommendations, maintenance and operations recommendations, and monitoring and evaluation recommendations.

**Chapter 7, Design Manual**, provides guidance and standards for the development of bikeways, trails, and related facilities such as wayfinding, end-of-trip facilities, and amenities.

The **Appendices** include a list of all the proposed facilities that are shown in the Plan maps and additional technical data that informed the Plan content and recommendations.

### III. ANALYSIS OF APPLICABLE ORDINANCES, PLANS, AND POLICIES

Policy citations are in regular text; *Staff analysis is in bold italics.*

#### A) CHARTER OF THE CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

The Citizens of Albuquerque adopted the City Charter in 1971. Applicable articles include:

##### Article I, Incorporation and Powers

“The municipal corporation now existing and known as the City of Albuquerque shall remain and continue to be a body corporate and may exercise all legislative powers and perform all functions not expressly denied by general law or charter. Unless otherwise provided in this Charter, the power of the city to legislate is permissive and not mandatory. If the city does not legislate, it may nevertheless act in the manner provided by law. The purpose of this Charter is to provide for maximum local self government. A liberal construction shall be given to the powers granted by this Charter.”

##### Article IX, Environmental Protection

“The Council (City Commission) in the interest of the public in general shall protect and preserve environmental features such as water, air and other natural endowments, ensure the proper use and development of land, and promote and maintain an aesthetic and humane urban environment. To affect these ends the Council shall take whatever action is necessary and shall enact ordinances and shall establish appropriate Commissions, Boards or Committees with jurisdiction, authority and staff sufficient to effectively administer city policy in this area.”

***Establishing and subsequently amending a Rank II Facility Plan to address the development and management of the City’s system of bikeways and trails is an exercise in local self government (City Charter, Article I). Recommendations and standards for bikeway and trail facilities, which address location, design, system connectivity, and related programs, generally express the Council’s desire to ensure the proper use and development of land, and to promote and maintain a humane urban environment (City Charter, Article IX).***

#### B) ALBUQUERQUE/BERNALILLO COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Comprehensive Plan, the Rank I planning document for the City and County, contains Goals and policies that serve as a framework for development and service provision and provide a means through which development and text amendment requests can be evaluated. Rank II plans, such as the Electric Facilities Plan, are more specific in focus yet carry out the Rank I plan’s general guidelines and policies. Rank II plans are generally not regulatory in nature.

##### Land Use (Section B).

Open Space Network: The Goal is to provide visual relief from urbanization and to offer opportunities for education, recreation, cultural activities, and conservation of natural resources by setting aside Major Public Open Space, parks, trail corridors, and open areas throughout the Comprehensive Plan area.

*The proposed Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan furthers the Open Space Network Goal by updating trail-related policy, design guidelines, and proposed trails projects. Part of the overarching vision of the plan is to provide recreation opportunities; the intent is to develop bikeways and trails for both transportation and recreation. Implementation of this Plan will provide opportunities for recreation, cultural activities, and access to natural resources across the City.*

Policy II.B.1f: A multi-purpose network of open areas and trail corridors along arroyos and appropriate ditches shall be created. Trail corridors shall be acquired, regulated, or appropriately managed to protect natural features, views, drainage and other functions or to link other areas within the Open Space network.

*Many existing and proposed trails are aligned along arroyos and acequias. By designating future trail development corridors in the Rank II Facility Plan, the City lays the ground work for acquiring or licensing right-of-way that can serve to provide public access and also protect natural features, views, and drainage features. The plan includes recommendations for coordinating with other local agencies, such as AMAFCA, MRGCD, and PNM to designate new trail corridors. Enhanced access to Major Public Open Space will be provided via proposed projects, which is closely aligned with this policy. The request furthers Policy II.B.1f.*

*The proposed Plan could be strengthened by specifically incorporating the applicable “Possible Techniques” provided in the Comprehensive Plan to better implement this policy.*

Semi-Urban Area Policy II.B.4b: Development in Semi-Urban areas shall include trail corridors, where appropriate, and shall be compatible with economic policies and historical and socio-cultural values, and shall maintain and integrate existing and new buildings and spaces of local significance into the community.

*The proposed Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan furthers Policy II.B.4b by updating two Rank II Plans that specify the location, design, and management of trail and bikeway facilities. Specifically, the development policies in Section 6.A.4 and the procedures for design development and review in Section 6.A.5 will help accomplish this policy.*

Developing and Established Urban Areas Goal: The Goal is “to create a quality urban environment, which perpetuates the tradition of identifiable, individual but integrated communities within the metropolitan area and which offers variety and maximum choice in housing, transportation, work areas, and life styles, while creating a visually pleasing built environment.”

*The proposed Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan generally contributes to creating a quality urban environment. Implementation of the Plan will help increase choices in transportation and life styles, furthering the Developing and Established Urban Areas Goal.*

Policy II.B.5g: Development shall be carefully designed to conform to topographical features and include trail corridors in the development where appropriate.

*The proposed Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan furthers Policy II.B.5g by including a section that addresses procedures for design development and review that apply to new developments and subdivisions of land. This process intends to guide future land development in un-platted parts of the city, where existing roads do not yet exist.*

Environmental Protection and Heritage Conservation (Section C)

Policy II.C.1d: Air quality shall be protected by providing a balanced circulation system that encourages mass transit use and alternative means of transportation while providing sufficient roadway capacity to meet mobility and access needs.

*The proposed Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan furthers Policy II.C.1d by setting direction for investments in multi-modal transportation infrastructure. One of the possible techniques found in the Comprehensive Plan to implement this policy is to “Encourage bicycle use for commuter and shopping trips as well as for recreation,” which is in line with the Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan’s vision.*

Community Resource Management (Section D)

Service Provision Goal: The Goal is to develop and manage use of public services/facilities in an efficient and equitable manner and in accordance with other land use planning policies.

Policy II.D.1a: Rank two facilities plans for water, sewer, transportation, and drainage shall reflect the regional nature of these systems and the need for long range analysis.

Policy II.D.1b: Capital spending priorities for the City and County shall be consistent with the land use goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

*The bikeways and trails system is a public service/facility that can be developed and managed in part through the land use planning process. The Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan provides a mechanism through which trails and bikeways facility planning can be linked to land use planning Goals and policies, which the Plan’s objectives and standards generally support. The request generally furthers the Service Provision Goal and related policies.*

Transportation and Transit Goal: The Goal is to develop corridors, both streets and adjacent land uses that provide a balanced circulation system through efficient placement of employment and services, and encouragement of bicycling, walking, and use of transit/paratransit as alternatives to automobile travel, while providing sufficient roadway capacity to meet mobility and access needs.

*The proposed Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan furthers the Transportation and Transit Goal by setting direction for investments in multi-modal transportation infrastructure and programs to encourage bicycling and walking.*

Policy II.D.4a: The following Table presents ideal policy objectives for street design, transit service, and development form consistent with Transportation Corridors and Activity Centers as shown on the Comprehensive Plan's Activity Centers and Transportation Corridors map in the Activity Centers section. Each corridor will undergo further analysis that will identify design elements, appropriate uses, transportation service, and other details of implementation.

*The table, page II-82 of the Comprehensive Plan, indicates that trails are preferred along express corridors; alternate routing for bikes, if possible, is recommended for major transit corridors; and bicycle facilities on enhanced transit and arterial streets are to be provided based on the bike plan. The proposed Plan is generally consistent with Policy II.D.4a; however, an analysis of proposed trail locations based on road type was not performed. Staff recommends this analysis be performed in the near future as a condition of future approval of the Plan.*

Policy II.D.4h: A metropolitan area-wide recreational and commuter bicycle and trail network which emphasizes connections among Activity Centers shall be constructed and promoted.

*Staff reviewed the existing and proposed bikeway and trail facilities in relation to the City's designated Activity Centers (AC). The majority of Activity Centers currently have facilities connecting to and within the Center. However, the San Mateo/Montgomery Community AC, the El Dorado Village Community AC, and the Los Altos/Market Center Community AC have few connections to and no routes within the center that are either existing or proposed. Other Activity Centers, such as the West Side CNM Community AC and the Sunport/Airport Major AC do not currently have any existing routes to access by bicycle or trail. The City should consider providing equitable access to all Activity Centers for all modes of travel as Centers develop, redevelop, or by retrofitting existing R.O.W.s to include bicycle and trail connections.*

Policy II.D.4i: Street and highway projects shall include paralleling paths and safe crossings for bicycles, pedestrians, and equestrians where appropriate.

*The proposed Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan is generally consistent Policy II.D.4i by updating bikeway and trail location recommendations, policy, design guidelines, and proposed trails projects. The Plan includes a Complete Streets Policy for bikeways and trails projects to be considered on all streets, as appropriate, throughout the street network.*

*One of the critiques of the plan is that it does not provide access along major arterial streets, which have been demonstrated to have the highest bicycle and pedestrian crash rates. The parallel routes are typically ½ a mile distant on the east side of the river and sometimes non-existent on the west side of the river.*

Policy II.D.4h: Efficient, safe access and transfer capability shall be provided between all modes of transportation.

*The City currently has excellent transfer capabilities between bicycle, train, and bus. Both the train and all City busses have capacity to hold multiple bicycles each. More challenging to implement is providing safe and convenient access to each bus stop (typically on major arterial*



*streets) and rail station (no trails or bike lanes in downtown). The Comprehensive Plan Policy II.D.4a, above, indicates that it is preferred for there to be parallel access routes on major transit corridors. The proposed Plan furthers Policy II.D.4h.*

Policy II.D.4q: Transportation investments should emphasize overall mobility needs and choice among modes in the regional and intra-city movement of people and goods.

*The proposed Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan furthers Policy II.D.4q by setting direction for investments in multi-modal transportation infrastructure and programs to enhance bicycling and walking options within the City.*

### **2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan**

A Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is adopted every five years by a Board comprised of locally elected officials from the counties and municipalities in the region, along with representatives of the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT). The MTP evaluates the current transportation system, considers probable growth scenarios with a 20-year horizon and envisions an appropriate future transportation system. Among other components, the MTP includes Long Range System Maps for Roadways and Bikeways. To guide implementation, the MTP proposes regional investments in shorter (5-year) cycles within the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP describes projects in more detail and identifies federal and other potential funding sources.

Key themes of the 2035 MTP are:

1. Expand Transit and Alternative Modes of Transportation;
2. Integrate Land Use and Transportation Planning;
3. Maximize the Efficiency of Existing Infrastructure.

A variety of important strategies are developed in the 2035 MTP. Some key steps that need to be taken are the expansion of convenient and reliable transit and alternative modes such as bicycling and walking, the coordination of land use and transportation planning, and ensuring that the existing infrastructure is fully utilized and operates as efficiently as possible.

The Long Range Bikeway System (LRBS) map in the MTP identifies the existing and planned future network of on-street facilities for cyclists and off-street multi-use trails for pedestrians, cyclists and, in some cases, equestrians.

*The proposed Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan furthers the themes of the 2035 MTP through its multi-modal vision, policies, and proposed facilities for pedestrians and cyclists throughout the City. The proposed facility map is consistent with the current LRBS map and provides updates to the LRBS map. The MRCOG 2040 MTP will be revised to reflect the new system, once adopted by the City.*

---

#### IV. DISCUSSION — BIKEWAYS AND TRAILS FACILITY PLAN, 2014

##### *Synopsis of Revisions*

The purpose of the plan is to guide public investment in bikeways & trails facilities and programs. The proposed draft Plan would result in the following notable differences between the proposed Plan and the two current adopted Plans to be superseded:

- 1) the addition of an overview of recent accomplishments;
- 2) an updated set of system goals and policies that combines and reworks many of the goals and policies from both the *Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan* and the *Comprehensive On-Street Bicycle Plan*;
- 3) an updated public engagement effort, which resulted in new priorities, programs, and proposed facilities;
- 4) the addition of several new analytic techniques used to evaluate the quality of individual bikeways and trails (the Bikeway Quality Index), areas of the city that are particularly conducive to cycling (Cycle Zone Analysis), and streets that could accommodate modifications to include bicycle facilities (StreetPlan);
- 5) an updated needs analysis and identification of current issues and challenges;
- 6) the Proposed Facilities Projects list (Tables 7 and 8; Appendix A), which includes new projects and removes completed projects, and also identifies high-priority projects;
- 7) the recommendation to consider newer programs that have been successful in other places; and
- 8) an updated implementation approach, including administrative recommendations, advisory group recommendations, policies for bikeway and trail development, legislative recommendations, and a prioritized list of implementation actions.

The content of the proposed Plan has been informed by a variety of perspectives and input from governmental agencies, bicycle and trail advocates, and members of the general public. Due to the strong public interest in this City facility, there has been an almost overwhelming amount of comments and input. **Below is a summary of the different types of comments** that have been submitted; the full text of the 1,000+ comments is provided as an attachment to this report.

- |  |                                      |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| - Planning Process                       | - Funding                            |
| - Assets/Strengths                       | - Intersection Design                |
| - Facilities – Network Connectivity/Gaps | - Aesthetic Improvements & Amenities |
| - Facilities – System Enhancements       | - Wayfinding                         |
| - Programmatic Improvements              | - Design Standards                   |
| - Administration & Agency Coordination   | - Education                          |
| - Safety                                 | - Encouragement                      |
| - Maintenance                            | - Enforcement                        |

The next section provides more detailed discussion and elaboration on several of the key comments and concerns that have arisen during the planning process. (The source is underlined.)

### *Purpose of the Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan*

Some members of the public and members of the City's two advisory groups have expressed some confusion about the purpose of the proposed *Plan* and the related planning effort (see attached comments). Comments that were submitted in response to the *Plan* state: "the plan seems so academic and antiseptic," and "pretty sterile – does not address many critical issues." Several reviewers have questioned who the plan is for and why the update was needed. Staff has heard advocates express their impression that the *Plan* seems to be a bureaucratic tool for administrators to talk to themselves, **while there is a desire for the *Plan* to speak directly to cyclists and trail enthusiasts and to recognize the reality of their experiences.** There is the fear that this *Plan* and City Staff don't understand the life-and-death experiences and feelings of vulnerability that many cyclists and pedestrians have had.

**Some feel that this planning effort has not adequately engaged active members of different user groups (cyclists, walkers/runners, skaters, equestrians) or the community at large,** which the plan intends to reach as potential bikeways and trails users. There is a perception that the academic tone of the document is a reflection of the disconnection between City administrators and the public.

**Comments received throughout the planning process have also indicated that the goal of the plan and any performance measures are not clear.** The meeting minutes from GABAC, the Greater Albuquerque Bicycle Advisory Group, indicate "there is still some question as to what the goal of the document is" and a lack of understanding of what happened since the initial effort in 2010. Later, when Staff presented draft goals to GABAC in January 2013, committee members commented that the community (advocates and facility users) should have been involved earlier in developing the vision and goals. No comments or recommendations were made at that time in relation to the proposed *Plan* goals. However, in follow-up presentations in April, members of GABAC commented that the vision and the *Plan* seem to be overly focused on recreation; members of GARTC indicated their perception that the *Plan* was too focused on bicycling in relation to the range of trail users and transportation at the expense of recreational experiences.

Planning Staff acknowledges these concerns and critiques of the *Plan*. Regarding the purpose of the plan, the Zoning Code provides: "**Facility Plans are specialized in subject matter; they normally cover only one type of natural resource utility or public facility, such as water or parks. Such plans cover the entire metropolitan area or city, or at least a major part thereof. These plans specify important development standards general site locations, and multi-year programs of facility capital improvements**" (§14-13-2-2).

This specific Facility *Plan* update was initiated in 2008 when **City leadership decided that Albuquerque should design, construct, and manage the bikeways and trails as one system.** The purpose of the plan update is to guide the City in this direction. Our investments in this infrastructure serves multiple purposes – including allowing those too young or old to drive to get around the city, providing opportunities for recreation, enhancing options for choice in

people's mode of travel, and facilitating active lifestyles. The decision to combine the two plans into one updated Facility Plan means that the various interests and needs for this system are considered in one document. It also reflects a shift in our management of the bikeways & trails to look at them as a system and to enhance interdepartmental coordination.

The Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan describes the existing system, policies, recommendations, and proposed projects. The plan will guide future investment in the bikeways & trails system, including facility improvements, new facilities (gap closures), maintenance, and education/outreach programs. **The plan does not allocate new funding or cause projects to be completed. It will serve as a guide for future planning efforts, programs, construction of facilities, and funding requests to implement the recommendations.**

In response to the critiques about tone of the document and audience it is written for, Staff aims to produce a summary document of the plan content that is tailored for general public consumption. Reviewers have recommended an executive summary similar to the one produced for the 50-Mile Activity Loop Plan that is filled with images and can capture a reader's attention. The City of Seattle produced a similar summary document for their similarly lengthy Bike Master Plan. The summary document should make clear that the City must balance its capital investments between improving the connectivity of existing facilities and making enhancements to our existing system to improve the experience of using the bikeways & trails.

### ***Bikeway & Trail Project Prioritization***

There is a strong desire to improve communication and coordination in the process of identifying projects and throughout the design development. Specifically, members of the public want to know how the City selects projects to design and build each year.

**The desire to create a transparent project prioritization process was a common comment received throughout the planning process.** In 2011 the consultant team developed a ranked project prioritization list, but they did not provide any information on how the projects were evaluated. Community comments indicated that the results were not very useful because there were several hundreds of projects that were ranked as high-priority.

In 2013, Planning Staff applied MRCOG's Project Prioritization Process to rank the proposed projects. This process is used by MRCOG for all projects that are identified in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to allocate federal funds; Planning Staff thought it would help the City identify projects that were more likely to receive federal funds. When presented to GABAC and GARTC, this approach was deemed to be too automobile-focused and it did not reflect some of the qualitative issues that the members value. DMD Staff also explained that projects are developed in a more opportunistic manner, depending on other road and re-surfacing projects that could be designed to accommodate bike facilities. Also mentioned was the fact that City Council or the Mayor's Office also sometimes fund projects by district that might not otherwise have been a priority from an overall system perspective (see page 62 of the Plan for more information on the City's current prioritization approach).

Planning Staff believes that it would be beneficial to solicit input from the Advisory Groups when developing each 2-year Decade Plan update or the MRCOG Transportation Improvement Program short-term program funding cycle.

### *Mapping and GIS data*

The City has several GIS databases that document the location and other relevant information related to bikeways & trails, including the length, who manages the facility, and the last time it was maintained. Through the course of the planning process, there have been efforts to coordinate the development and maintenance of these databases among DMD, Parks & Recreation, the Planning Department, and MRCOG.

One comment repeatedly voiced by members of the public is that the printed Bike Map doesn't match what is actually built in the city or what is mapped on the City's interactive map website. This happens because the Bike Map is just a graphic display of information, which is not based on the City's GIS databases. In 2014, DMD responded to this concern by doing a comprehensive review of all city roads and trails to verify the locations of existing facilities in both the GIS database and on the 2013 printed map. The Planning Department coordinated with these efforts to address public concerns and inaccuracies in the proposed bikeways & trails data. This is the first time in many years that this level of data verification has occurred.

City Staff have been working to coordinate the different GIS databases of information into one file that can be used by various departments. Further coordination is needed to ensure that the database stays up-to-date. **The Plan recommends continued coordination among departments to agree on the data content, format, and identifying a manager for this database.** GABAC has indicated that they would like to be involved in this process so they can provide input about what would be useful from the public's point-of-view. One example is the desire to document the width of each facility, to help identify the extent of bikeways and trails that do not meet our current standards, discussed in more detail below.

### *Assessment of the Quality of Our Existing Facilities*

One major challenge in our bikeways system that has been identified by GABAC is that there is a range in the width of marked bicycle lanes across the city.

Some of the variation results from development under previous standards. Narrow marked bicycle lanes also result from constrained ROW or existing pavement. Typically vehicular lanes are striped at 12-feet each, and the remainder is striped as a bicycle lane. GABAC has made a request for the City to **identify and inventory the extent of bicycle lanes that are deficient in marked width, according to the current DPM standards.** Planning Staff recommends that one of the outcomes of such an inventory be to reflect the locations of deficient width bicycle lanes on the printed Bike Map. Making the quality of bicycle facilities more apparent on the map will particularly benefit novice riders who are looking for comfortable routes. One suggestion is to use line width, similar to the way road maps show the differences between highways, major roads, paved roads, and unpaved roads.

Staff has observed a lack of trust that the new facilities will be designed and constructed according to AASHTO standards and best practices guidelines. There have been projects in the past year that are not ADA-compliant (although trails are exempt), and bikeways that are narrower than the standard provided in the DPM (a road resurfacing project maintained the existing 20" bike lane width). However, these projects are consistent with the DPM, AASHTO, and Title II ADA regulations which have flexibility built-in to the standards.

### ***Advisory Group Structure***

During the planning process, several advisory group members individually mentioned that the groups did not seem to be empowered to accomplish what the members believed their purpose was. Comments provided in the meetings and via email also indicate some members are uncertain about the purpose of the advisory committee and the extent of the advisory committee's authority. This general theme was also expressed during the public engagement led by the City's consultant team in 2010.

Committee members have expressed frustration with Albuquerque's two-committee structure. Some of their criticisms include: P&R doesn't attend GABAC and DMD doesn't attend GARTC. GARTC doesn't include representation of the broad cycling community and GABAC is not representative of the wide range of cyclists' types, abilities and confidence levels. Responsibilities between the Committees are unclear and they believe their comments on projects are too late in the process to be useful. Staff considers the two-committee structure duplicative (the same presentations have to go to two committees) and that the committees are very time-consuming given their departmental resources. Also, City staff reports that both committees are dissatisfied and that it is hard to fill positions, possibly for a variety of reasons. The point of contact with other agencies and jurisdictions is unclear and varied (sometimes through GABAC/DMD; sometimes through GARTC/P&R).

The ordinances that established GABAC and GARTC identify the duties, responsibilities, and powers of the groups (see the attached ordinances for further information).

#### **GABAC is empowered to:**

- advise the city on plans, projects, and programs including the TIP and CIP,
- monitor the bikeways and trails,
- recommend implementation strategies for adopted plans,
- promote bicycling and trail use for transportation and recreation,
- promote supporting facilities, and
- review and make recommendations regarding proposals for ROW acquisitions or vacations where bikeway and trail facilities are involved.

#### **GARTC is empowered to:**

- advise the city on plans, programs and standards for recreational trails,
- help develop and promote a recreational trails plan, promote multi-use of trails,
- coordinate joint use of trails by a variety of users,
- review and make recommendations concerning plans and actions which impact trails,
- cooperatively work with organized and non-organized constituent groups, and
- advise and recommend appropriate levels of trail maintenance and develop volunteer maintenance programs.

Parks & Recreation's consultant team investigated some other jurisdictions to find out how their public input and advisory groups were structured. They found that there were a variety of approaches – some similar to ours, some combined city and county geographies, some with

combined bike & recreation groups, and some communities also had a pedestrian advisory group. Several alternatives (status quo, a Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee, and a City/County or Regional combined advisory committee) were presented for feedback from GABAC and GARTC and shared at public meetings on the *Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan* in July 2014. These are some of the major themes that were voiced:

- 1) Many committee members understand the advantages of consolidating into one committee and there is general agreement the current system is not working very well. Major advantages of combining would be that there is a central place for discussing projects of common interest and limited staff resources would be used more effectively;
- 2) There is strong interest in creating a regional committee (as opposed to Albuquerque-only) since the bikeways and trail network is a regional system. This might either be City/County, or be more broadly regional, housed at MRCOG;
- 3) There are concerns that by combining all interest groups into one committee, the minority points of view will be lost;
- 4) There is a concern that recreational interests will be overwhelmed by the commuter/high-speed bicycle interests;
- 5) There is an acknowledgement that currently neither committee is truly working on pedestrian issues (e.g., sidewalks and creating a “walkable community”);
- 6) There is a widely shared interest in having meaningful staff participation from various critical agencies in addition to the regular participation of DMD, P&R, MRCOG. These agencies could include APD, NMDOT, Planning Department, Open Space Division, City Council, Risk Management, BernCo, and others.

The draft Plan makes the recommendation to continue exploring these options through the public adoption process of this plan. City Administration has an interest in combining the two groups into one Advisory Group for several reasons:

- The two groups have different perspectives on the same system. This makes it challenging to implement projects when there are different or conflicting recommendations. Having a variety of perspectives represented in one meeting could result in more meaningful discussion among members, which could provide better direction for project managers.
- The consolidation of the two advisory groups into one could also result in more regular attendance by other agencies that relate to trails and bikeways. The City has been reaching out to Bernalillo County and MRCOG to see if there would be interest in re-establishing a regional advisory group.
- The meeting topics and presentations have become largely similar for both meetings. Combining them into one would make more efficient use of limited resources and time, which could be more effectively spent addressing some of the concerns that are raised.

The Plan makes other recommendations that could be applied, independent of any structural changes to the groups. For one, the groups and new members should have an orientation session

or training to explore what their role is, and how advisory groups are most effective. Another recommendation is to have guest presenters prepare a brief that is provided to the group(s) a week in advance. The brief could include a summary of the project, the purpose of the presentation (whether it is to provide information, to solicit input on design, etc.), the project schedule, and if there is a request for a recommendation from the group. This would allow the advisory group to come prepared with questions and comments for discussion. One of the challenges of the current meeting format is that much time is spent trying to understand the project and there is little time for the group to develop recommendations or advise on the project.

GARTC voted to support the preservation of two separate groups because they felt their minority interests would be lost in the larger focus on bicycling. They cite the Bikeways & Trails Plan as an example of this happening – in general there is a focus on bicycling over any other trail user type or recreational concerns. They did propose to establish one joint meeting each month with GABAC where they could get project presentations to discuss together, then another meeting where they could address recreational concerns independently. This structure is similar to what City Staff envisioned for a combined group that had functional subcommittees to address on-street bicycling issues and recreational issues independently.

GABAC also discussed a possible restructuring of the advisory groups. Comments provided by individual members seem to indicate that the group supports a shift to a regional focus, perhaps more closely aligned with MRCOG, the regional funding agency. Members also individually indicated a preference to combine with the recreational trails advisory committee into one advisory group. However, GABAC has not adopted a committee position on this matter. They plan to discuss the Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan at their September meeting.

## ***V. AGENCY & NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS***

### ***Reviewing Agencies/Pre-Hearing Discussion***

City Departments and other agencies reviewed this application from 8/4/2014 to 8/29/2014.

Comments from departments and agencies are included in this report, beginning on page 40. Many reviewing agencies provided comments to the effect of “no comments/no objections.”

Parks & Recreation, Municipal Development, Long Range Planning, PNM, and MRCOG each provided an extensive list of comments. They include corrections and suggested changes to the draft Plan; Staff has classified the recommendations as changes to **content**, minor **clean-up**, and **formatting** recommendations. The vast majority of comments involve minor clean-up and formatting to enhance the clarity of the plan. The ones that recommend substantive changes to the current content of the plan are identified and discussed below. **There are no major changes recommended to the content, format, or recommendations.** Staff generally agrees that these recommendations should be reflected in a revised draft that goes to City Council for review and action. They are included as Recommended Conditions of Approval.



***Department of Municipal Development (DMD)***

DMD has commented that some of the design treatments recommended by the City’s consultant are not DMD-adopted practices. DMD recommends removal of references of pavement coloring in intersections to identify the bicycle lane and bike boxes as strategies for improving intersections for bicycles.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, DMD recommends removing the section that addresses “Shared Roadway Measures” for arterial roads where bike lanes are desired but not possible. The “Prototypical Multi-lane Arterial Intersection Improvements” on page 78 incorporates traffic signal bicycle detection and a color enriched bike lanes in motor vehicle and bicycle conflict areas. DMD has reviewed this design and does not support the recommendation to use these elements.

In the text related to administration and management of bikeways and trails, DMD recommends removing reference to the strategy for creating a Technical Review Committee. They believe this is largely duplicative of their current practice of going to the Advisory Committees for comment and review of construction plans. The comment indicates that there are insufficient staff resources available for a new committee. Finally, there is the recommendation to remove the maintenance action of establishing weed and vegetation control procedures. This action appears to apply primarily to trails, and conflicts with other policies desired by P&R.

There are other specific text additions, clarifications, and corrections recommended. These can be seen on page 42 of this report.

***Parks & Recreation***

Parks & Recreation provided comments that additional content related to soft surface trails and Major Public Open Space is needed in the Plan. This comment was echoed by members of the Open Space Advisory Board when staff presented this plan to that group. Planning Staff agrees that it would be appropriate for P&R to develop additional content related to this type of trail facility.

Another change requested by P&R is to clarify the trail development policies to indicate that a trail in lieu of sidewalk is only allowed in situations where the Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan proposes a trail, and also that the trail must meet the minimum design standards to be accepted by Parks & Rec before adding to the trail inventory list.

P&R also commented that the plan needs to add programs that are focused on trail issues; all programs in the plan only pertain to bicycling. They recommend addition of the Prescription Trails Program and other trails related programs.

There are other specific text additions, clarifications, and corrections recommended. These can be seen on page 45 of this report under the headings of “Parks & Recreation” and “Open Space Division.”

---

<sup>1</sup> This traffic control device is still in the study/evaluation phase. The MUTCD may issue “Interim Approval” with a written request for colored pavement in intersections as a traffic control device.

### *City Council - Jeff Speck's Recommendations*

In 2014, City Council hired Jeff Speck to perform an audit of the downtown area to provide recommendations for improving bicycle and pedestrian activity in the city core. After extensive interviews with City staff and other key stakeholders, and additional data collection and analysis, Mr. Speck provided a summary of his recommendations in a public presentation held on July 31, 2014. A draft report of these recommendations will be provided to the City at the end of August.

His recommendations pertaining to bicycle facilities were for the City to focus on creating a network of streets that accommodate bicycle travel to and within downtown. He provided proposed street sections, many of which included a bicycle lane that was sometimes buffered from vehicular traffic by a row of parked cars. His recommendations were to provide bicycle lanes or bicycle routes with sharrow markings on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Street and 8<sup>th</sup> Street. Bicycle lanes should also be provided on Marquette Ave., Tijeras Ave., Central Ave., Silver Ave., Lead Ave., and Coal Ave. These roads provide a rough grid with bicycle facilities generally on every other block. Many of the lanes can be accommodated by narrowing the travel lanes to 9' – 10'. According to AASHTO, "12-foot lanes should be used where practical on higher speed, free flowing, principal arterials," however, in urban areas, "under interrupted flow conditions operating at low speeds narrower lane widths are normally quite adequate and have some advantages."

The recommendations in the draft *Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan* are substantially similar to those proposed by Mr. Speck. One difference is that bicycle lanes are only proposed on 4<sup>th</sup> Street between Civic Plaza and Silver Ave., instead of throughout downtown, as proposed by Mr. Speck. The recent conversion of the 4<sup>th</sup> Street Mall back to a vehicular travel-way may not accommodate bicycle lanes in both directions. Further, bicycle travel across Civic Plaza is not currently allowed – it is a dismount zone. Because of these barriers, the draft Plan's proposal for bicycle lanes also on 5<sup>th</sup> Street make sense with the current developed landscape.

As this draft Plan continues through the review and adoption process, **additional revisions may be desired to comport with the recommendations of Mr. Speck.** Staff recommends that further consideration be made to proposed bicycle facilities in the downtown area once the report is finalized.

### *Long Range Planning*

Long Range Planning provided detailed comments and recommendations, including: add an enhanced executive summary, add more images, add emphasis to the crash data, refine the project prioritization approach, add enforcement and engineering program recommendations to Chapter 5, add more creative funding sources to the list of traditional funding sources, add more detail on the City's typical annual budget, summarize the implementation actions, and summarize the recommendations and conclusions.

There are some specific text additions, clarifications, and corrections recommended. These can be seen on page 40 of this report.

### *Mid-Region Council of Governments*

The Mid-Region Council of Governments also provided a detailed list of comments and recommendations. The general comments indicate that the plan supports the goals and objectives in MRCOG's 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and development of the 2040 MTP. Two general recommendations are for the plan to emphasize the need to look at best practices in other communities and to include data gathering and public involvement as a way to address gap closures, arterial retrofits, and project prioritization. The theme that these comments address is the need to be responsive to emerging trends and concerns in the community. MRCOG further comments: "It would also be beneficial if this plan provided flexibility as new ideas come forward, allowing them to be implemented if they are consistent with the plan." One example of a new idea since the Design Manual was prepared in 2010 is a protected bikeway, or cycle track. These are now commonly implemented across the country and have been to be hugely successful in getting new riders out. The Design Manual has not been updated to include this concept in our facility design range of options; the City should consider including this facility type.

There are some specific text additions, clarifications, and corrections recommended. These can be seen on page 52 of this report.

### *Neighborhood/Public*

During the planning phase, a variety of public outreach and engagement efforts were made. In 2010, the City's consultant conducted a survey focused on bicycling preferences and concerns. Over 1,200 individual responses to the survey were received; all but a small number came from unique computer IP addresses. The consultant also solicited information through stakeholder workshops and in three public open house meetings.

After the Plan was transferred to the Planning Department to compile and edit the document, there has been ongoing outreach and coordination since September 2013. The Staff Planner consistently attended the monthly GABAC and GARTC **meetings to understand current issues and concerns**. These two groups consist of appointed community members who serve as representatives for a variety of trail and cyclist types and represent the interests and needs of different parts of the city. Additionally, **presentations were given to each group to get guidance on elements of the plan**, such as the goals and policies, the project prioritization process, and the existing conditions analysis as well as to update the community on the project status. The Staff Planner also gave presentations to a number of different groups:

- GABAC & GARTC Monthly Meetings, 8/13 – present
- Healthier Weights Council 2013 Symposium, 10/16/13
- Complete Streets Leadership Team, 4/24/14 & 6/26/14
- Albuquerque Development Commission, 5/15/14
- Dan Burden Workshop, 5/16/14
- Parks & Recreation Advisory Board, 6/3/14 & 8/5/14
- Open Space Advisory Board, 8/26/14
- BikeABQ, 8/26/14

- Three public open house meetings were held in July 2014 to present the content of the proposed draft Plan. There were approximately 120 attendees.

Over the course of this project, Staff received numerous comments related to specific bikeway and trail facilities; programs; and administrative practices and policies. Staff notes that it was not uncommon to have multiple comments on the same topic, expressing opposing opinions. This was true for the use of buffered bicycle lanes, some specific trail locations, elements of trail etiquette (to announce “on your left” or not), and approaches to weed control. The project planning group incorporated many of the comments and recommendations into the draft plan; however, some need further discussion to determine how to best address.

The full list of public comments is included as an attachment to this report. This table includes over 1,000 comments that have been received by the Planning Department since the project initiation in 2010; approximately half of the comments were in response to the 2014 draft plan.

The EPC hearing for the proposed Plan was announced in the Neighborhood News and posted on the Planning Department’s web page. The staff planner sent e-mail notification on August 11, 2014 to the list of neighborhood coalition representatives. There is no known opposition to the request.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

This request is for adoption of the *Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan*. The Plan includes a review of existing conditions and a needs analysis, identifying difficult or dangerous locations as well as areas with the greatest potential for improvement. The plan includes design guidelines for both on-street bicycle facilities and multi-use trails. Key recommendations address education and outreach, closing gaps in the system, maintenance, and way-finding. There is a proposed facilities map and a detailed list of projects to improve the bicycle system and individual facilities. The EPC’s role is to make a recommendation to the City Council.

Staff from the Planning, Municipal Development, and Parks & Recreation Departments collaborated on this planning effort. Bicycle and trail advisory groups were consulted and the City hosted three public open house meetings to introduce the draft Plan.

The Office of Neighborhood Coordination (ONC) provided a list of the affected neighborhood representatives, who were notified of this request by e-mail. The proposed plan was announced in the Albuquerque Journal, the Neighborhood News, and on the Planning Department’s web page. As of this writing, Staff has received a few requests for a copy of the Plan and a couple of emails and phone calls from interested parties, generally supportive of the Plan.

Staff finds that the proposed plan generally further applicable Goals and policies, and the overarching intent of the City Charter and the Zoning Code. The suggested revisions in the conditions of approval are intended to improve clarity and respond to comments provided by agency reviewers and members of the public. These issues deserve continued focus and discussion as the plan moves forward through the adoption process, and have been addressed as recommended conditions of approval. Staff recommends to the Environmental Planning Commission that an approval recommendation be forwarded to the City Council.

***FINDINGS – 1008887 – 14EPC-40054 – September 4, 2014 – Facility Plan Adoption***

1. This is a request for adoption of the proposed Rank II *Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan*, which updates, consolidates, and replaces the *Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan*, 1993 and the *Comprehensive On-Street Bicycle Plan*, 2000. Rank II facility plans describe the existing facilities, policies, recommendations, and proposed projects.
2. The scope of the *Bikeways and Trails Facility Plan* is City-wide. It also shows trails within Bernalillo County's jurisdiction, which are not included on the list of City proposed projects.
3. The Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, the *Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan*, 1993, and the *Comprehensive On-Street Bicycle Plan*, 2000 are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.
4. The proposed *Plan* aims to ensure a well-connected, enjoyable, and safe non-motorized transportation and recreation system throughout the metropolitan area. Updating the *Plan* is a reasonable exercise in local self-government consistent with the City Charter.
5. The proposed *Plan* supports the following applicable goals and policies of the Rank I Comprehensive Plan:
  - a. The *Plan* furthers the Open Space Network Goal and Policy II.B.1f by updating trail-related policy, design guidelines, and proposed trails projects. Part of the overarching vision of the plan is to provide recreation opportunities; the plan also recommends trails along arroyos and appropriate ditches as connections between natural areas and open spaces.
  - b. The *Plan* furthers the Semi-Urban Area Policy II.B.4b through designation of trails and trail corridor development policies for semi-urban areas.
  - c. The *Plan* furthers the Developing and Established Urban Areas Goal and Policy II.B.5g because the plan will help guide development of a system that contributes to creating a quality urban environment and that will increase choices in transportation and life styles. The plan will guide development of trail corridors in appropriate locations.
  - d. The *Plan* furthers the Environmental Protection Policy II.C.1d and the Transportation and Transit Goal by setting direction for investments in multi-modal transportation infrastructure, which will help protect air quality through a balanced circulation system that supports and encourages alternative means of transportation.
  - e. The *Plan* is generally consistent with Policy II.D.4h - A metropolitan area-wide recreational and commuter bicycle and trail network which emphasizes connections

among Activity Centers shall be constructed and promoted. The proposed alignments have been evaluated to provide connection to and within most designated activity centers.

- f. The *Plan* is generally consistent with Policy II.D.4i - Street and highway projects shall include paralleling paths and safe crossings for bicycles, pedestrians, and equestrians where appropriate. The *Plan* includes a Complete Streets Policy for bikeways and trails projects to be considered on all streets, as appropriate, throughout the street network. One of the critiques of the *Plan* is that it does not recommend access along major arterial streets, which have been demonstrated to have the highest bicycle and pedestrian crash rates.
  - g. The *Plan* is generally consistent with Policy II.D.4h - Efficient, safe access and transfer capability shall be provided between all modes of transportation. The City currently has excellent transfer capabilities between bicycle, train, and bus. Both the train and all City busses have capacity to hold multiple bicycles each. The *Plan* does not specifically address how to provide safe and convenient access to each bus stop, which is typically located on a major arterial street.
  - h. The *Plan* is generally consistent with Policy II.D.4q - Transportation investments should emphasize overall mobility needs and choice among modes in the regional and intra-city movement of people and goods. The *Plan* sets direction for investments in multi-modal transportation infrastructure and programs to enhance bicycling and walking options.
- 6. The proposed *Plan* is generally consistent with the key themes of the *2035 MTP* through its multi-modal vision, policies, and proposed facilities for pedestrians and cyclists throughout the City. The proposed facility map is consistent with the current LRBS map and will provide updates to the LRBS map when it is amended for the *2040 MTP*.
  - 7. Key City departments, including Municipal Development, Parks & Recreation, and Planning, coordinated as part of this planning effort.
  - 8. There is general support among the reviewing agencies and members of the public that the City should adopt the proposed *Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan*. However, the numerous items outlined in the Recommended Conditions of Approval should be carefully considered for revision prior to City Council review and action.

***RECOMMENDATION – 1008887 – 14EPC-40054 – September 4, 2014 – Facility Plan Adoption***

***APPROVAL of 11EPC-40051, a request for a Facility Plan Text Amendment, City-wide, based on the preceding Findings.***

---

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – 1008887 – 14EPC-40054 – September 4, 2014  
– Facility Plan Adoption**

1. The following clerical changes shall be made:
  - a. All instances of inconsistent references and/or citations shall be corrected.
  - b. All figures that have poor resolution shall be replaced with higher-quality ones.
  - c. All miscellaneous formatting revisions recommended by agency reviewers shall be addressed.
  
2. Further evaluation and amendments to the proposed facilities shall consider:
  - a. Evaluating any outstanding public comments related to bikeway and trail facilities that have not yet been reflected.
  - b. Including the recommendations made in Mr. Speck’s final report that pertain to proposed bicycle facilities in the downtown area.
  - c. Evaluating the proposed facilities map to reflect DPM location recommendations, such as bike lanes on major local streets.
  - d. Identifying the extent of bicycle lanes that are deficient in marked width, according to the current DPM standards and highlight these locations of deficient on the printed Bike Map.
  - e. Analyze the proposed trail locations based on adjacent road type, to improve consistency with Policy II.D.4.a, policy objectives for street design, page II-82 of the Comprehensive Plan, which indicates that trails are preferred along express corridors; alternate routing for bikes, if possible is recommended for major transit corridors; and bicycle facilities on enhanced transit and arterial streets are to be provided based on the bike plan.
  - f. Evaluate multi-modal access to and within Activity Centers, in particular the San Mateo/Montgomery Community AC, the El Dorado Village Community AC, the Los Altos/Market Center Community AC, the West Side CNM Community AC and the Sunport/Airport Major AC, which do not have existing and/or proposed routes to access by bicycle or trail. The City should strive to provide equitable access to all Activity Centers for all modes of travel.
  
3. The following line edits suggested during the EPC review process shall be incorporated:
  - a. Including the applicable “Possible Techniques” for implementation of Policy II.B.1.f - multi-purpose network of open areas and trail corridors - provided in the Comprehensive Plan, page II-8. The implementation techniques relate to the planning and design of arroyo corridors and irrigation ditches and also include funding and safety measures.

- b. Page 117, Trail and Bikeways Count section, add: “If equestrian data is collected, the researcher should consult with equestrians for recommendations about locations, days, and times to perform user counts.”
4. The comments and recommendations made by **Municipal Development** shall be evaluated and incorporated into the draft Plan as feasible and appropriate.
    - a. **Content:** On Page 54, under “Treatments for improving intersections for bicyclists,” pavement striping for Colored Bike Lanes and Bike Boxes are not DMD-adopted practices.
    - b. **Content.** On Page 55, there is a section entitled “Arterial Shared Roadway Measures,” which should be deleted in its entirety due to it containing elements that are not supported by DMD.
    - c. **Content:** On Page 78 a “Prototypical Multi-lane Arterial Intersection Improvements” design is identified that incorporates traffic signal bicycle detection and a color enriched bike laneage in motor vehicle and bicycle conflict areas. DMD has reviewed this design and does not support the recommendation to use these elements, as shown in Figure 1.
    - d. **Content:** Page 97, Streamline Administrative Practices: Delete Strategy ii “Create a Technical Review Committee” of Policy 1, Objective c. Note: There are not sufficient staff resources available to fully staff a TRC. DMD Staff recently has adopted a practice of going to Advisory Committees for comment of draft construction plans involving bikeways and trails design.
    - e. **Content:** Page 106, Objective 4: Delete Action #2 – ~~Establish weed and vegetation control procedures to reduce the occurrence of noxious weeds (i.e., puncture vine) and plants that block sight lines or grow within two feet of bicycle facilities.~~
    - f. **Content.** Page 111, Traffic Code, Albuquerque Code of Ordinances: Delete the recommendation to add “(P) In a marked bicycle box.”
    - g. **Clean-up.** On Page 51, under “1. Existing Bikeway Evaluation,” replace the word “problem” with “challenge” in the fourth sentence.
    - h. **Clean-up.** On Page 52, under “Defining Bikeway and Trail Gaps,” replace the word “require” with “would benefit from” in the second sentence. Also, under “Spot Gaps,” change “accommodate safe and comfortable” to “accommodate comfortable.”
    - i. **Clean-up.** On Page 54, under “Arterial Bike Lane Retrofit Measures” Change the first sentence to read: “Many arterial streets in Albuquerque exhibit characteristics (e.g., high vehicle speeds and/or volumes) where the addition of dedicated bicycle lanes could enhance the riding experience.”
    - j. **Clean-up.** On Page 54, under “Treatments for retrofitting arterial streets with bike lanes,” Shoulder widening within the City is not an adopted practice for new and upgraded collector streets because these roadway sections are typically bracketed by



curb and gutter instead of shoulders. The reference to shoulder widening may apply to temporary sections, which routinely employ shoulders and not curb and gutter.

- k. **Clean-up.** On Page 56, under “Illustrated in Figure 8, alternative routing measures pose several challenges,” change the first bullet point to read “Bicyclists on major streets may ignore alternative routes if they are used to overcoming spot gaps and connection gaps. The relatively short lengths of spot and connection gaps may induce riders to remain on the thoroughfare despite the lack of bicycle accommodations, thereby causing potential issues to be created by them not following the alternative routing.”
- l. **Clean-up.** On Page 60, within Figure 9, for all “Improvement Opportunities,” remove “Arterial Shared Roadway” improvement measures.
- m. **Clean-up.** Page 105, Objective 2: Delete Measurement of Action #4.
- n. **Clean-up.** Page 105, Objective 2: Revise the text for Action #5 - Give increased priority to achieving connectivity of the bikeway network when planning and programming all roadway and bikeway improvements as appropriate.
- o. **Clean-up.** Page 105, Objective 3: Revise the text for Action #1 - Restripe ~~all~~ collector and arterial roadways (~~where practical~~ designated on the Bikeways Map and per AASHTO guidelines) to provide bike lanes, or minimum outside lane width of 14 feet.
- p. **Clean-up.** Page 105, Objective 3: Revise the text for Action #2 - Provide a striped bicycle lane or shoulder as described in chapter 23, section 5, subsection N of the City’s Development Process Manual, in conjunction with AASHTO bicycle facility design guidelines, on all new, rehabilitated or reconstructed roadways, as indicated in the Facility Plan.
- q. **Clean-up.** Page 105, Objective 3: Revise the text for Action #3 - Provide striped lanes/shoulders of at least five feet wide, from face of curb where curb and gutter exist, on all new or reconstructed bridges, underpasses, and overpasses, where not otherwise constrained or to the extent feasible.
- r. **Clean-up.** Page 105, Objective 3: Revise the text for Action #4 - 4. Selectively plan and design for bicycle travel with all intersection improvements - include 5-foot bike lanes or minimum curb lane widths of 15 feet through intersections.
- s. **Clean-up.** Page 105, Objective 3: Revise the text for Action #6 - Modify existing or install new traffic signal detection equipment (i.e., inductive loop, video detection, or pushbutton) to make all traffic signals bicyclist-responsive within need-based areas and as resources permit.
- t. **Clean-up.** Page 106, Revise the text - Objective 4: Provide a ~~High Standard~~ an elevated emphasis on Maintenance along Roadways.
- u. **Clean-up.** Page 106, Objective 4: Revise the text for Action #1 - With On-Street Bikeway and Multi-Use Trails, improve and fully fund the street maintenance and

sweeping program. Establish the highest priority for allocation of street sweeping resources to sweeping all bike lanes in response to 311 requests and at least ~~once per month~~ semi-annually and bike routes on local streets a minimum of once ~~four times~~ per year. Multi-use trail sweeping should be performed on a regular basis and as requested. Measurement: Request the annual data on frequency of scheduled sweeping for the on-street bikeway and multi-use trail network, based upon 311 calls along with the number and location of spot sweeping requests. Based upon 311 call volume establish a database to track trends and provide data that can be used refine scheduled sweeping and maintenance budget request.

- v. **Clean-up.** Page 106, Objective 4: Revise the text for Action #6 – Establish timely responsiveness to maintenance requests from citizens through the use of the City’s 311 Citizen Contact Center or website or other means for citizens to report concerns. ~~Establish an agency goal of 48 hours to address these requests.~~
- w. **Clean-up.** Page 106, Objective 4: Revise the text for Action #7 – Maintain bicycle routes and lanes ~~to high standards~~ through construction projects when feasible, referring to Chapter 6, “Temporary Traffic Control,” of the MUTCD, ~~and maximize maintaining~~ maintaining curb lane widths (i.e., provide lane widths of 14 feet or greater) through construction projects on roadways that ~~do not have bike lanes~~ would otherwise contain a bike lane or bike route. Where this is not feasible, provide appropriate bicycle friendly and reasonably direct detours and detour signing, per AASHTO and/or City standards.
- x. **Clean-up.** Page 107, Objective 6: Revise the text for Action #3 – ~~Develop and~~ Fully support a bicycle education program in Albuquerque’s elementary and secondary schools as part of current physical education requirements.
- y. **Clean-up.** Page 109, Objective 9: Revise the text for Action #1 - Maintain and update the bikeway and multi-use trail network inventory developed as part of the planning process. Maintain and update the bicycle accident database. Use the database to identify high accident locations and/or high accident severity locations to help prioritize bicycle project and program improvements. Review each bicycle collisions/accidents ~~in a timely manner to identify system deficiencies and potential improvements in order to assess site conditions to determine if the incident location could be targeted for system improvement.~~
- z. **Clean-up.** Page 110, Legislative Recommendations: Add the following text - Include an additional method for the hand signaling of a right-turn movement, add parking restriction in bicycle lanes and marked bicycle boxes, improve reporting of bicycle crashes by law enforcement, remove bicycle front fork size restriction, and consider redefining bike lane width references in the DPM when it is updated.
- aa. **Clean-up.** Page 119, Crash Data Collection & Analysis: Delete the section titled “Approach to Crash Data Collection” as it duplicates the immediately preceding text.
- bb. **Clean-up.** Page 119, Capital Implementation Program: Revise the text - ~~The City set aside is equally distributed between the on-street (2.5%) and trails (2.5%) programs.~~

---

The GO bonds are obligated in 2-year cycles, ~~generating \$600,000 for the on-street system biennially.~~

5. The comments and recommendations made by **Parks & Recreation** shall be evaluated and incorporated into the draft Plan as feasible and appropriate.
  - a. **Content.** Page 19 Section 1, Existing Bicycle and Trail Plans – Add the Major Public Open Space Facility Plan (1999) with discussion of how trails in Major Public Open Space are a major part of the overall network of trails including paved trails in Rio Grande State Park MPOS (Bosque Trail) and single tracks in Elena Gallegos Open Space. Then, in order, the Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan (1993 and revised 1996) followed by Facility Plan for Arroyos and Arroyo Corridor Plans (1986). All other City Plans and Policies go in Section 2 and Regional Plans and Policies in Section 3.
  - b. **Content.** Soft-surface trails, add a separate section in the Trails part to discuss and explain their role in the Trails network and how the appropriateness of a soft-surface trail is determined. We will add here more about the soft surface trails in Open Space and Rio Grande Valley State Park (the Bosque) and Petroglyph National Monument and other Major Public Open Spaces owned and maintained by the Open Space Division as well as MRGCD and AMAFCA facilities that are soft surface.
  - c. **Content.** Page 108, Delete first paragraph and substitute the following text: “Based on the latest population projections, the City can expect a significant increase in population, especially on the West side of Albuquerque. The recently released “Paseo del Norte High Capacity Transit Study Alternatives Analysis Report” dated August 2014 is proposing major changes in the way the residents of Albuquerque will travel around the City. A Bus Rapid Transit System such as the “Potential BRT Corridors” suggested in the Study could result in an increase in bicycle commuting as a way of supplementing a BRT mode for access to the Major Employment Centers as well as to Parks, Open Space, Trails, Libraries, Community Centers and other public facilities. Although the Bikeways and Trails Facilities Plan will precede any adoption of a BRT program for the City, the Bikeways and Trails Plan may be updated in the near future to include bicycle commuting w/BRT and recreational access as part of a Transportation System. With more research and information, the City can develop policies that require coordination between City departments to assure access to bike facilities and trails. In the meantime, City policy remains that if a trail and/or bicycle facility is shown on the Trails Plan as proposed where a property is being developed, the development will be required to construct and maintain said facility. This policy is consistent with the 1993 Trails and Bikeways Facilities Plan policies. As it is not possible to foresee the exact location of future development, new development within these developing areas shall be subject to the following requirements:”
  - d. **Content.** Page 108, Item 6 “ROW” should be spelled out. Add the following statement and making this number 7 and renumber present 7 and 8: “It is the City Parks and Recreation Department’s Policy that if the trail is identified on the

Bikeways and Trails Facilities Plan as a “proposed paved trail” it is to be developed, to city standards (as defined in chapter 7), as a trail which may be in lieu of a sidewalk. The Parks and Recreation Department must accept a trail for inclusion into the Trail System on the Trails Map. If a proposed trail is built, but not accepted by the City Parks Department due to the trail not meeting the minimum requirements as determined in the Design Manual, a trail maintenance agreement should be created to determine the owner or developer to take maintenance responsibility and should relieve the City of liability of that particular trail or trail section. If a proposed trail is not on the Plan, a sidewalk is still required per the DPM Standards for Transportation development”.

- e. **Clean-up.** Page 6, Include the Prescription Trails Program in this discussion on Public Health Benefits. This program is under-promoted and is a wonderful way for individuals to begin a walking program. The Prescription Trails program should also be included in the definitions on page 13. From the 2012 booklet, “The Prescription Trails Program provides prescriptions for walking and wheelchair rolling and a walking guide that suggests routes in our community targeting and promoting healthy lifestyles for individuals and families (& pets, too). This guide will help you find some of the park and trail walking paths in Albuquerque, Bernalillo County and the Village of Los Ranchos de Albuquerque.”
- f. **Clean-up.** Page 11 Please add MPOS Major Public Open Space to the section F. Acronyms as it appears throughout the Plan and should be referenced in the beginning.
- g. **Clean-up.** Page 13 Please add Open Space Trail and Major Public Open Space w/ definitions for each.
- h. **Clean-up.** Page 14 Please add Soft-surface Trail and its definition.
- i. **Clean-up.** Page 19 Section 1, Existing Bicycle and Trail Plans – City and Regional Plans – an organizational comment, I think that first should be the Comprehensive Plan followed by the Long Range Bikeway System Plan (2007) and the Comprehensive On Street Bicycle Plan (2000).
- j. **Clean-up.** On page 22, in the last paragraph of the DPM (2008), please add a sentence that reads “Open Space Trails Standards are also presented in Chapter 7 Design Manual.
- k. **Clean-up.** Page 32 second complete paragraph please give this paragraph a subtitle “other multi-use trails” wherein the discussion is about unpaved multi-use. In this same paragraph the term “Open Space” is used. This should say Major Public Open Space or MPOS throughout the document for consistency.
- l. **Clean-up.** Page 33 mentions “Urban Trail” and in parenthesis “wide sidewalks”. Could this also be added to the definitions section on Page 14?

- m. **Clean-up.** Page 77 shows 46 miles of unpaved trails proposed and if they are OSD trails and there are definite locations, we could add to Table 8 on page 74. The Open Space Division should be able to help define these numbers.
- n. **Clean-up.** Page 80 Section 3 regarding Bollards first bullet states “Bollards present a collision hazard...” Does the report state that or could we say instead that Bollards “may” present....? (depending on how close together they are, depending on the attention and/or skill level of the rider, depending on the condition of the bollard.....etc.)
- o. **Clean-up.** Page 81, Section 4, Could this read...Claremont Road is “an example of” a road .... it is not the only street that could be upgraded from a Bicycle Route to a Bicycle Boulevard.
- p. **Clean-up.** Page 82, D. 1. Second paragraph mentions discussion with GABAC. Clarify if there was a similar discussion with GARTC.
- q. **Clean-up.** Also Page 82, second sentence in Section D.2., should read...due to the greater impact on or to the multi-use trail system. Please add that the signage and markings also allows 311 calls to report more exact locations of trail maintenance problems.
- r. **Clean-up.** Page 87, Section 5.A.1, add: “Major Public Open Space Trails. The Open Space Division of the Parks and Recreation Department provides Environmental Education and Interpretation through a number of outdoor activities, classroom programs and community events to educate the public on the use of Major Public Open Space and Trails. Trail maps are maintained for trail users and Hikes are sponsored as well as special events to heighten awareness of the low impact recreation and the protection of the natural state of Major Public Open Space. The Open Space Division’s Trail Watch Volunteers Program is instrumental in educating the public about trail use ethics while noting maintenance needs to be corrected. In addition to hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding, the trails in the City’s Parks, Open Space and Trails system provide the opportunity to protect and preserve the natural environment for the benefit of the Albuquerque resident and visitor trail users now and in the future.”
- s. **Clean-up.** Page 87, Section 5.A.1, add: “Prescription Trails. The City’s Prescription Trail Program is intended to make information available to all residents about the importance of walking for health and how to get started in a self-directed or group program. The easy to use Guide provides information about specific parks in the Albuquerque area with maps organized alphabetically by zip codes and level of difficulty for each trail location, the length of each “loop” and what amenities are provided in each park facility. A walking log is included in the Guide so the trail user can easily document their distances walked. Information is also provided on Walking Clubs and Mall Walking for those rainy days.”
- t. **Clean-up.** Page 87, Section 5.A.1, add: “Environmental Education. The Open Space Division of the Parks and Recreation Department provides Environmental Education

and Interpretation through a number of outdoor activities, classroom programs and community events to educate the public on the use of Major Public Open Space and Trails. Trail maps are maintained for trail users and Hikes are sponsored as well as special events to heighten awareness of the low impact recreation and the protection of the natural state of Major Public Open Space. The Open Space Division's Trail Watch Volunteers Program is instrumental in educating the public about trail use ethics while noting maintenance needs to be corrected. In addition to hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding, the trails in the City's Parks, Open Space and Trails system provide the opportunity to protect and preserve the natural environment for the benefit of the Albuquerque resident and visitor trail users now and in the future."

- u. **Clean-up.** Page 98, Section 2, The Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan called for both a Trails Coordinator and a Bicycle Coordinator. The draft Plan is inconsistent about what the two positions are called and is confusing therefore even just in that first paragraph where they are called Planners in one sentence and Coordinators in another. It seems that both positions do planning and coordinating. It would be great if we had two of each!
- v. **Clean-up.** Page 120, The Impact Fees collected for Trails are not deposited into the General Fund and disbursed from there, apparently they have their own account and Trails development can be charged out of the account. I would suggest that the last sentence in that paragraph be deleted.
- w. **Clean-up.** Pages 121 – 129 suggest removing job titles in Lead Agency columns as these positions may change from time to time or be relocated to different departments. It will usually be the Department responsibility regardless of the staffing functions.
- x. **Clean-up.** Page 171, Width second bullet is 12-1 feet or greater... not clear.
- y. **Clean-up.** Page 172, Asphalt comment, please change "cheaper" to "less expensive."
- z. **Clean-up.** Page 174, second paragraph, should begin "Unpaved trails are typically..." (delete "and") Middle of the paragraph delete "still" in sentence discussing MPOS paved trails being part of the overall trail network.
- aa. **Clean-up.** Discussion on the Future GARTC/GABAC Structure – Each GARTC member gave comments and opinions on the possibility of combining GARTC/GABAC into a larger committee. Motion: Gary moved that GARTC remain a distinct committee as members are concerned that a restructuring could result in the loss of the visibility of some classes of trail users. However, GARTC would accept regular joint meetings with other pedestrian/bicycle committees such as GABAC to increase the efficiency for the City when areas of common interest arise. Second by Valerie Cole. Motion passed 5-0.
- bb. **Clean-up.** Definition of soft surface trails (add to plan definitions): A soft-surface trail is typically built with the earthen materials on hand and no fill or other material

is brought to the area of construction. Also see definitions “unpaved trail, single track trail”.

- cc. **Clean-up.** Definition of “single-track trail”: A trail where users must generally travel in single file and is named not for the physical structure of the trail but rather for the user. Single track trails are typically 18-30 inches wide. Usually and almost always a soft-surface trail or unpaved natural surface trail. These trails are typically found on Major Public Open Space lands and sometimes referred to as mountain bike or hiking trails. They disturb less ground and can be easier to maintain due to their narrow width. The narrowness of the trail tends to immerse the user closer to nature than a wider trail or dirt road.
  - dd. **Clean-up.** Page 32 of the Plan discusses Major Public Open Space trails and “other unpaved” trails. This “existing facilities” section is best suited for the information provided by the Open Space Division (in the comments section) to further the capital O and capital S in Open Space or Major Public Open Space.
  - ee. **Formatting.** The formatting of the various sections and subsections should be gone over as there are different fonts, different bolding, italicizing and subtitling that should be consistent throughout the document. Add section headers at the top or bottom of the pages. It is a large document with many sections and having the chapters identified on each page would help as one reads through the Plan.
  - ff. **Formatting.** Page 40 shows a map that is lacking a title which illustrates opportunities and constraints. The round or oval brown symbols seem to be keyed as “System Gap” but they cover or obscure the very space where the gap appears to be so it is difficult to figure out what the gap is.
  - gg. **Formatting.** Second, the maps on pages 64-71 (not numbered) show the unpaved trails in two different colors. The first map shows existing (unpaved) trails legibly, the second map does not show existing unpaved trails in the legend but they are apparent and are legible on the map. The third and fourth maps showing Current Projects and Critical Links are just not legible at all where trails should be showing, whether existing or proposed. The only Administrative Boundary that shows clearly on the third and fourth maps would be Kirtland Air Force Base. All Open Space areas are unclear as to what each is including the Bosque, Rio Grande Valley State Park. Possibly different colors can be used to make these maps more clear to the reader.
6. The comments and recommendations made by **Open Space Division** shall be evaluated and incorporated into the draft Plan as feasible and appropriate.
- a. **Content.** A possible section to add to help the reader to understand the different kinds of open space: There are two types of open space within the plan area, Major Public Open Space and “open space.” Major Public Open Space (MPOS) corresponds with the locations identified in the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, the City of Albuquerque Major Public Open Space Facility Plan (jointly adopted by

the City and County), and the Bernalillo County Parks, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan. Lower case “open space” examples include easements, privately maintained trails, recreational and educational facilities, utility facilities and corridors, water storage and drainage facilities, access easements and roadway and/or transit rights-of-way.

- b. **Content.** Also, rather than list the links to the websites with the Foothills and Rio Grande Valley State Parks maps, would it be possible to include the maps themselves in the actual plan? The unpaved trails in these areas represent extensive trail systems in the Albuquerque area that receive heavy use for recreation, commuting, etc. The most current maps can be found here:
  - <http://www.cabq.gov/parksandrecreation/recreation/documents/foothillsmmap.pdf>
  - <http://www.cabq.gov/parksandrecreation/open-space/lands/RGVSPmapsplit1x17.pdf>
- c. **Content.** Page 4: On Table 1, where does the data from for “unpaved trails” come from? Accordingly to a recent inventory done by Division staff, we manage just over 100 miles of official trails, including in City owned Major Public Open Space in Sandoval and Bernalillo Counties.
- d. **Content.** Page 6: Public Health Benefits: Add something about the Prescription Trails program if the program is still active.
- e. **Content.** Although Page 2 does briefly refer to the Major Public Open Space Facility Plan (January 1999), page 19 does not list the plan under Bicycle and Trail Plans/City and Regional Plans.
- f. **Content.** Page 20: Consider addressing plans by rank, not by type. Add the Open Space Facilities Plan and year adopted with discussion of how trails in Major Public Open Space are a major part of the overall network of trails including paved trails in MPOS (Bosque Trail) and single tracks in Elena Gallegos Open Space.
- g. **Content.** Page 72: Does the Open Space Division have a short list of projects that are currently programmed for design and/or construction? Page 77 shows 46 miles of unpaved trails proposed and if they are OSD trails and there are definite locations, we could add to Table 8 on page 74.
- h. **Content.** Page 82: The OSD has a separate protocol “wayfinding” program for the Sandia Foothills Major Public Open Space and along the Paseo del Bosque, and is working to develop wayfinding systems for trails within other Major Public Open Space areas.
- i. **Content.** Page 83: Add the Open Space Visitor Center, the Open Space Trail Watch Volunteer Program, and the Open Space Environmental Education Program to the list of Safety, Education and Encouragement Programs. Each of these programs involves an element of outdoor stewardship education, including Leave no Trace Ethics, proper use of trails in MPOS, and in some cases, trail design and management.
- j. **Content.** Page 113: Open Space supports the creation of a maintenance map which clearly defines which agency is going to be responsible for maintaining which trail.



- k. **Clean-up.** More consistency in general when referring to different kinds of open space. Sometimes Open Space is capitalized, sometimes not; sometimes it is referred to as Major Public Open Space, sometimes not; sometimes there is a reference to “open spaces” which is not clearly defined. Page 32 deals with some of these issues, but there are still a few sections where it’s confusing, such as: Page 31 under the “Trails” section, there is a reference to “open space” but no reference to Major Public Open Space.
- l. **Clean-up.** Another example on page 37, “Connection to Parks, Open Space, etc.” could be clarified which kinds of open space the plan refers to.
- m. **Clean-up.** Maps: Major Public Open Space areas are not clearly defined within the maps. Use a higher contrasting color?
- n. **Clean-up.** Page 19: MRCOG 2035 Long Range Map is very difficult to read.
- o. **Clean-up.** Page 13: Add Open Space Trail and Major Public Open Space w/ definitions
- p. **Clean-up.** Page 14: Soft Surface Trail is not defined although it is referred to under the Trail definition.
- q. **Clean-up.** Page 27: Could refer to the jointly managed City of Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Alameda/Bacheci Open Space as one property.
- r. **Clean-up.** Page 32: Second full paragraph uses term “Open Space” and should say Major Public Open Space for consistency or MPOS throughout the document for consistency.
- s. **Clean-up.** Page 116: Major Public Open Space includes Open Space Division managed arroyos so reword to make consistent.
- t. **Clean-up.** Spreadsheet uses both lead agency and position; however, an action should not necessarily be assigned to a job title. Positions may change and move from Department to Department.
- u. **Clean-up.** Page 169: Single Track, limited use for Open Space trails. Add the following: “Site specific signage will define the appropriate usage of trails in Open Space. The Open Space Division is responsible for defining appropriate uses based on topography, environmental conditions, and to avoid potential user conflicts.”
- v. **Clean-up.** Page 174: Change reference to MPOS having “hundreds of miles” of unpaved trails to “over a hundred miles” of trails.
- w. **Formatting.** Page 21: Change the Recommended Facilities section to “Major Public Open Space Arroyos” and “Major Public Open Space Links?”
- x. **Formatting.** Page 116: Trails maintenance practices section and On-Street Facilities Maintenance should be consistent, i.e., use the subsections of: Current practices, recommendations, best practices, etc.
- y. **Formatting.** Pages need to be numbered starting page 121.

7. The comments and recommendations made by **Long Range Planning** shall be evaluated and incorporated into the draft Plan as feasible and appropriate.
  - a. **Content.** Enhance the Executive Summary into a 10-12 page synopsis or ‘snapshot’ of the plan that can be used as a stand-alone handout.
  - b. **Content.** More images – strive to have at least one image per chapter. Ideally, the images would be local to Albuquerque unless otherwise stated. Charts and diagrams are good; it’s helpful to show photos of real people using our facilities. Pages 28-33, 81, and 162
  - c. **Content.** Page 41 – Bicycle / Vehicle Crash Locations – add emphasis to this section. Being under ‘Other Constraints’ makes crash locations seem less important. Understanding what contributes to crashes can lead to safety improvements, whether the cause is due to substandard design, sight distance, maintenance issues, user error or lack of education. The health, safety and well-being of Facilities users should be paramount.
  - d. **Content.** Page 62 - Project Prioritization Approach, to better explain the project selection process, refer to Table 6 for infrastructure project evaluation criteria. Reiterate in this section: The criteria includes safety, system connectivity, completeness of network, barriers and constraints, and serving non-motorized needs. Include a description of how projects are selected, including frequency of the selection process, which agencies or departments are involved and who leads/facilitates that process. For example, is there a committee that includes representatives from DMD, Parks and Recreation, Planning, etc., and how is the public involved in this process?
  - e. **Content.** Add some of the funding sources to the Funding Section in chapter 6 (MRA, Council set-aside, AMAFCA, grants, etc.).
  - f. **Content.** The Plan may benefit from a stronger connection between the first lists (Current Projects & Critical Links) in relation to the Implementation Actions chart beginning on page 120. Many of these items (Maintenance, Programs, etc.) seem separate, yet other categories (CIP/Network Improvements) seem to tie to the capital projects. Is there a way to tie them together more or explain the correlation? For example, does each capital project listed under Current Projects & Critical Links link to one or more items in the Implementation Actions chart?
  - g. **Content.** Page 73 – It is unclear why these projects are on this page (50-Mile Activity Loop, Fair Heights...) Add a brief header or sentence explaining that these are Other Current Projects.
  - h. **Content.** Page 83 – This section is more about Safety, Education and Encourage Programs. Where appropriate, add engineering and enforcement to the overall approach.
  - i. **Content.** Page 119-120 – Funding – This section mainly lists the traditional funding sources for these types of programs and projects. We need a robust set of options to

fund the many projects listed in this Plan. Add other creative funding sources to include: City Council set-aside funds, Coordination with other City Departments (Metropolitan Redevelopment Area funds), Federal/State Local Partnerships, MRCOG, Public Private Partnerships, TIF and TIDD funding, grants, Municipal Bonds, Special Improvement Districts, Public Improvement Districts, etc. (Note: see the list in the appendix of the Route 66 Action Plan).

- j. **Content.** Page 119 – Add a chart showing the City’s typical annual budget for the various activities (capital projects, maintenance, programs, etc.) and summarize the estimated costs mentioned earlier in the document along with the current time estimates for completion (in years). Might be good to use a pie chart to show an overall use of funds.
- k. **Content.** Overall – Recommendations and conclusions – there is a lot of information in this plan. Where appropriate, summarize recommendations and conclusions.
- l. **Content.** Updating the DPM standards for bicycle facilities to align with and reflect modern best practices.
- m. **Clean-up.** There are currently long lists of projects beginning on page 72. The projects in these lists are numbered and it is not clear if those numbers indicate any sort of priority. If the numbers are not used for mapping or prioritization, it might be good to remove them. If needed, please add an explanation. (List is in alphabetical order and is not prioritized.)
- n. **Clean-up.** Add an implementation strategy (Page 120 – Summary of Implementation Actions) to compile a list of top Bicycle / Vehicle accident locations city-wide to help prioritize funding and efforts.
- o. **Clean-up.** Page 129 – add a conclusion to the first section of the Plan / a transition to the Design Manual which begins on page 130.
- p. **Clean-up.** Page 235 – some information on that page is missing.
- q. **Clean-up.** Cover – add the city logo and the words ‘City of Albuquerque’
- r. **Clean-up.** Inside cover or first page – add publication information (published by: City of Albuquerque Planning Department, contact info, date)
- s. **Clean-up.** The DPM standards for bicycle facilities shall be updated to align with and reflect modern best-practices and the design standards and guidelines in Chapter 7.
- t. **Formatting.** Should the project lists be moved to the appendix, if they are expected to be updated regularly?
- u. **Formatting.** Page 120 – Summary of Implementation Actions – this section goes on for several pages. If possible, please use a larger font and add a heading to the chart. Please add a summary of each category (Administration, Maintenance, Programs, etc. to page 120). If it is not feasible to do all of the actions outlined in the chart, consider prioritizing the top actions to be done with the resources available. Also, one of the pages in the chart looks like a duplicate (in my copy).

- v. **Formatting.** Layout – To make it easier on the reader, add a header and footer to each page that indicates the title of the plan and date (footer) and the current chapter (header). Also, adding a divider page or tab to each chapter might make the Plan easier to navigate.
8. The comments and recommendations made by **MRCOG** shall be evaluated and incorporated into the draft Plan as feasible and appropriate.
    - a. **Content.** Under goals and policies and at the beginning of the plan there should be an emphasis about the need to look at best practices in other communities. Although this is mentioned much later in the plan (page 95 “Other Trends in Bicycling & Trail Planning”), it is not emphasized. For the last four years MRCOG has sponsored webinars on best practices from other communities. We have found them very helpful and are happy to continue to sponsor them. From our experiences with these webinars and other resources we recognize that City of Albuquerque has great potential to pilot, test, and implement practices and designs that have been found successful elsewhere. The beginning of the plan describes current facilities but does not include new possible facilities. We recommend including facilities that currently do not exist in Albuquerque in this section— protected bicycle lanes and cycle tracks for example. This would address the reality that bikeway, trail, and pedestrian accommodation is changing rapidly and that the City is seriously considering how these accommodations could work here.
    - b. **Content.** Further Proposed Mechanisms for Gap Closure, Priority Projects and New Design Implementation: The plan provides guidance on gap closure, arterial retrofits, project prioritization and other topics. We encourage the inclusion of data gathering and public involvement as a means to further assess these topics and refine strategies and needs.
    - c. **Content.** It would also be beneficial if this plan provided flexibility as new ideas come forward, allowing them to be implemented if they are consistent with the plan. For example, at the neighborhood level, the current Bicycle Boulevards came about from community desires. At the City Council level, the recent study of Downtown Albuquerque by Jeff Speck was just conducted. How will these ideas fit into this plan? Finally, there seem to be developing concerns of whether it is appropriate to place bicycle facilities on principal arterials for speeds above 40 miles per hour. Hopefully the goals of this plan can provide a mechanism to address emerging competing needs that are still not well understood. We would advise that there be enough flexibility in the plan to allow for new projects that are highly consistent with the plan goals that may not be explicitly listed in the current project list.
    - d. **Content.** Time Frame: Could this plan include a time frame? Bernalillo County’s Pedestrian-Bicycle Safety Action Plan states that it is a 10 year plan. This could go to support “Best Practices.” Best practices are changing fairly rapidly. Giving a time frame will encourage updating the plan to keep up with new best practices and better understanding of challenges facing the City in terms of walking and bicycling.

- e. **Content.** Economic Benefits: (P.5) Please include that people walking and bicycling spend more money locally and help to support local economy. This is the argument from the The Green Divide <http://community-wealth.org/content/green-divide>
- f. **Content.** Traffic Safety: (P.6) There is evidence that the more people walk and bicycle the safer it becomes to walk and bicycle. This is related to goals of both safety and increasing the number of users in the network. Safety in Numbers: More Walkers and Bicyclists, Safer Walking and Bicycling, PL Jacobsen, Injury Prevention, 2003;9:205-209.
- g. **Content.** This would increase the length of the glossary, but including new facilities such as protected bicycle lanes, cycle tracks, rapid flash rectangular beacons, and the hybrid beacon should also be included in the glossary. These elements are included in NACTO and the beacons are recognized proven countermeasures that improve safety. Including the TDM program, Smart Trips, would also be good.
- h. **Content.** Improve cyclist and pedestrian safety: (p.15-16) One safety topic that came up very frequently when Bernalillo County was conducting focus groups about active transportation in disadvantaged neighborhoods is safety from crime. This could fit under “d. Provide a welcoming and comfortable environment for all travelers along roadways and trails, which includes encouraging more legitimate users on these facilities to prevent crime.” Something similar is recommended to address this concern.
- i. **Content.** Increase use of the bikeway and trails networks: (p.16-17). Please explicitly state that this policy goal includes attracting new users. It takes more effort to attract new users than to encourage incidental users to walk and bicycle more frequently, but both groups would benefit from these efforts.
- j. **Content.** Policy (e) is a good place to recommend using performance measures to better understand the impact of programs and projects.
- k. **Content.** Long Range Bikeway System: There are several small errors in the paragraph on p.19. The Long Range Bikeway System (LRBS) is not a stand-alone plan. It is an element of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), which is a long-range plan looking at transportation on the 20 year horizon. Although it has 20 year time frame, the MTP is updated every four years. The LRBS is updated with the MTP. Currently the 2035 MTP is in effect and it was adopted in April 2011. It is recommended to use the year 2011 to describe the date of the LRBS.
- l. **Content.** Bear Canyon Arroyo from Juan Tabo to Tramway is another trail gap that should be included in this list.
- m. **Content.** New Programs to Expand or Initiate: Please include Smart Trips. It is a program that targets neighborhoods to encourage people to walk, bicycle and take the bus. It also involves assessment of the impact of this intervention. <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/43801>

- n. **Clean-up.** Glossary: Please include a definition of an Activity Center in the glossary. Also please include that Bicycle Boulevards are often neighborhood streets with good connectivity. Portland OR, is currently focused on building Neighborhood Greenways (their name for Bicycle Boulevards) because they attract novice riders, calm neighborhood traffic and are cheap to build. They are achieving many goals with these facilities. This is worth mentioning and relates back to looking at best practices in other areas.
  - o. **Clean-up.** Please include Traffic Demand Management (TDM) in both the glossary and acronym list. Although there might not be mention of TDM in the document, it is an important category under federal funding sources.
  - p. **Clean-up.** Streamline administrative practices... (p.18) Policy (e), please use the term “crash” instead of “accident”. The term “accident” implies that nothing could have prevented the incident. FHWA, NMDOT, and MRCOG use the term “crash” instead.
  - q. **Formatting.** Recognize and Leverage the bikeway and trail network as an integral part of economic development and quality of life in Albuquerque: (p.17-18) Policy (e) is the definition of a Complete Street. It really should be moved up the list to (a).
  - r. **Formatting.** Table 8: High Priority “Critical Links Projects”: There were several rows that seemed to be redundant.(#5 & #6 Same type, name, and endpoints, but different lengths, # 25 & # 26 Same type, name, and endpoints, but different lengths, #65 & # 66 All information is the same, # 107 & # 108 Same type, name, and endpoints, but different lengths).
9. The comments and recommendations made by **PNM** shall be evaluated and incorporated into the draft Plan as feasible and appropriate.
- a. **Clean-up.** PNM transmission rights-of-way or easements are identified as the location for several proposed bike routes or trails. As the easement holder, PNM has the legal right to use and maintain the easement including ensuring vehicular access to the lines, maintaining adequate clearances, and other safety measures. If the bike lanes and/or trails become guest uses at these locations, an encroachment agreement will be necessary. The City also needs to directly contact the underlying property owner. In addition, it will be the City of Albuquerque’s responsibility to ensure that PNM’s uses of the easement are not affected or interfered with in any way by the inclusion of the bike lane or trail. Revise the section entitled Trail Gap Closure Measures (page 58) as follows (added text is underlined, deleted text is shown as strikethrough):  
  
Utility and irrigation corridor trails typically include power line and water utility easements, as well as canals and drainage ditches. These corridors offer excellent transportation and recreation opportunities for cyclists and trail enthusiasts of all ages and skills. Some safety issues due to proximity to the irrigation ditches or power poles and transmission lines should be understood and appropriate protective

---

fencing/railing and warning signs installed and/or other safety measures as identified by the utility. A license agreement with ~~PNM~~ or MRGCD, respectively, is required for trails in ~~utility and irrigation corridors~~ and an encroachment agreement is required for trails in electric utility corridors. In addition, a landowner agreement with the underlying property owner may be required.

- b. **Content.** Four proposed bike lane and/or trail locations are identified within PNM's 115kV transmission rights-of-way and easements. The four locations are:
- Along the PNM CE 115kV transmission line from Irving Blvd. NW heading north toward McMahon Blvd. NW,
  - Along the PNM BW 115kV transmission line north of Interstate 40 east of Atrisco Vista Blvd NW,
  - Along the PNM SE 115kV transmission line/ID 46kV transmission line corridor in Tijeras Arroyo, and
  - Along the PNM RE/ER 115kV transmission line corridor on San Antonio Drive NE just west of Tramway Blvd NE.

Based on PNM's experience constructing and maintaining facilities at these locations, the terrain is difficult and is not conducive for bike trails. Coordination with PNM will be necessary as trails are developed at any of these four locations.

One additional trail proposed within PNM's transmission easement is the trail along the PNM SE 115kV transmission line east of Tramway Blvd NE south of Montgomery Blvd from PNM's Embudo Switching Station to approximately Menaul Blvd NE. A trail already exists near this location. Due to safety and security concerns, PNM cannot allow the trail to access or go through the Embudo Switching Station property. It is necessary for the Proposed and Existing Bikeways and Trails map (after page 63) to reflect this.

- c. **Content.** On the Proposed and Existing Bikeways and Trails map (after page 63), two proposed trails on the West Side (one paved, one unpaved) are located within PNM existing 345kV transmission line rights-of-way or easements. The first trail is west of the Ladera Golf Course. The second trail is north of Interstate 40 generally parallel on the north of Ladera Drive NW starting at Ouray Road NW and ending halfway between Arroyo Vista Blvd. and Atrisco Vista Blvd. The higher voltage lines such as these can potentially result in electrical nuisance shocks. Nuisance shocks may occur when a person touches an ungrounded metal object, in this case, such as bicycle handlebars. A nuisance shock does not harm the recipient but can be startling. PNM asks for these two proposed trails to be removed from the proposed bike/trail system or relocated elsewhere as PNM will not grant an encroachment easement at these two locations.
-

***K. Carrie Barkhurst  
Planner***

***Attachments***

Application Information:

Application  
Project Letter  
TIS Form

Support Information:

GABAC Ordinance, §14-13-3-6  
GARTC Ordinance, §14-13-3-8  
White Paper on Organization of Bicycle and Trails Advisory Committees  
Bicycle Friendly Community Feedback Report, Fall 2012

Neighborhood Information:

ONC Letter  
Copy of Email sent to NA Coalition Representatives  
ABQ Journal Advertisement Notice  
Metropolitan Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Letter  
Complete Streets Leadership Team Letter  
Media Stories

Full Public Comments (96 pages) at: <http://www.cabq.gov/planning/residents/sector-development-plan-updates/bikeways-trails-facility-plan/>

***Notice of Decision Distribution List:***

Scott Hale, Chair, GABAC  
Ian Maddieson, Chair, GARTC



---

## CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE AGENCY COMMENTS

### PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Zoning Enforcement - No comments received

Office of Neighborhood Coordination - No comments received

#### Long Range Planning

##### Content

1. Enhance the Executive Summary into a 10-12 page synopsis or ‘snapshot’ of the plan that can be used as a stand-alone handout.
2. More images – strive to have at least one image per chapter. Ideally, the images would be local to Albuquerque unless otherwise stated. Charts and diagrams are good; it’s helpful to show photos of real people using our facilities.
  - Pages 28-33 – add images for existing facilities section
  - Page 81 – add images showing typical Trail Amenities
  - Page 162 – add images showing ADA use of bikeways and trails
3. Page 41 – Bicycle / Vehicle Crash Locations – add emphasis to this section. Being under ‘Other Constraints’ makes crash locations seem less important. Understanding what contributes to crashes can lead to safety improvements, whether the cause is due to substandard design, sight distance, maintenance issues, user error or lack of education. The health, safety and well-being of Facilities users should be paramount.
4. Page 62 - Project Prioritization Approach, to better explain the project selection process, refer to Table 6 for infrastructure project evaluation criteria. Reiterate in this section: The criteria includes safety, system connectivity, completeness of network, barriers and constraints, and serving non-motorized needs. Include a description of how projects are selected, including frequency of the selection process, which agencies or departments are involved and who leads/facilitates that process. For example, is there a committee that includes representatives from DMD, Parks and Recreation, Planning, etc., and how is the public involved in this process?
5. There are currently long lists of projects beginning on page 72. The projects in these lists are numbered and it is not clear if those numbers indicate any sort of priority. If the numbers are not used for mapping or prioritization, it might be good to remove them. If needed, please add an explanation. (List is in alphabetical order and is not prioritized.)
6. Should the project lists be moved to the appendix, if they are expected to be updated regularly?
7. Add some of the funding sources to the Funding Section in chapter 6 (MRA, Council set-aside, AMAFCA, grants, etc.)

8. The Plan may benefit from a stronger connection between the first lists (Current Projects & Critical Links) in relation to the Implementation Actions chart beginning on page 120. Many of these items (Maintenance, Programs, etc.) seem separate, yet other categories (CIP/Network Improvements) seem to tie to the capital projects. Is there a way to tie them together more or explain the correlation? For example, does each capital project listed under Current Projects & Critical Links link to one or more items in the Implementation Actions chart?
9. Page 73 – It is unclear why these projects are on this page (50-Mile Activity Loop, Fair Heights...) Add a brief header or sentence explaining that these are Other Current Projects.
10. Page 83 – This section is more about Safety, Education and Encourage Programs. Where appropriate, add engineering and enforcement to the overall approach.
11. Page 119-120 – Funding – This section mainly lists the traditional funding sources for these types of programs and projects. We need a robust set of options to fund the many projects listed in this Plan. Add other creative funding sources to include: City Council set-aside funds, Coordination with other City Departments (Metropolitan Redevelopment Area funds), Federal/State Local Partnerships, MRCOG, Public Private Partnerships, TIFF and TIDD funding, grants, Municipal Bonds, Special Improvement Districts, Public Improvement Districts, etc. (Note: see the list in the appendix of the Route 66 Action Plan).
12. Page 119 – Add a chart showing the City’s typical annual budget for the various activities (capital projects, maintenance, programs, etc.) and summarize the estimated costs mentioned earlier in the document along with the current time estimates for completion (in years). Might be good to use a pie chart to show an overall use of funds.
13. Page 120 – Summary of Implementation Actions – this section goes on for several pages. If possible, please use a larger font and add a heading to the chart. Please add a summary of each category (Administration, Maintenance, Programs, etc. to page 120). If it is not feasible to do all of the actions outlined in the chart, consider prioritizing the top actions to be done with the resources available. Also, one of the pages in the chart looks like a duplicate (in my copy).
14. Add an implementation strategy (Page 120 – Summary of Implementation Actions) to compile a list of top Bicycle / Vehicle accident locations city-wide to help prioritize funding and efforts.
15. Page 129 – add a conclusion to the first section of the Plan / a transition to the Design Manual which begins on page 130.
16. Page 235 – some information on that page is missing.
17. Overall – Recommendations and conclusions – there is a lot of information in this plan. Where appropriate, summarize recommendations and conclusions.

**Format**

18. Cover – add the city logo and the words ‘City of Albuquerque’

19. Inside cover or first page – add publication information (published by: City of Albuquerque Planning Department, contact info, date)
20. Layout – To make it easier on the reader, add a header and footer to each page that indicates the title of the plan and date (footer) and the current chapter (header). Also, adding a divider page or tab to each chapter might make the Plan easier to navigate.

**Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency** - No comments received

**CITY ENGINEER**

**Transportation Development Services**

More time is needed to properly review the plan.

**Hydrology**

No adverse comments

**DEPARTMENT of MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Transportation Planning**

1. On Page 51, under “1. Existing Bikeway Evaluation,” replace the word “problem” with “challenge” in the fourth sentence.
2. On Page 52, under “Defining Bikeway and Trail Gaps,” replace the word “require” with “would benefit from” in the second sentence. Also, under “Spot Gaps,” change “accommodate safe and comfortable” to “accommodate comfortable.”
3. On Page 54, under “Treatments for improving intersections for bicyclists,” pavement striping for Colored Bike Lanes and Bike Boxes are not DMD-adopted practices.
4. On Page 54, under “Arterial Bike Lane Retrofit Measures”
5. Change the first sentence to read: Many arterial streets in Albuquerque exhibit characteristics (e.g., high vehicle speeds and/or volumes) where the addition of dedicated bicycle lanes could enhance the riding experience.
6. On Page 54, under “Treatments for retrofitting arterial streets with bike lanes,” Shoulder widening within the City is not an adopted practice for new and upgraded collector streets because these roadway sections are typically bracketed by curb and gutter instead of shoulders. The reference to shoulder widening may apply to temporary sections, which routinely employ shoulders and not curb and gutter.
7. On Page 55, there is a section entitle “Arterial Shared Roadway Measures,” which should be deleted in its entirety due to it containing elements that are not supported by DMD.
8. On Page 56, under “Illustrated in Figure 8, alternative routing measures pose several challenges,” change the first bullet point to read “Bicyclists on major streets may ignore alternative routes if they are used to overcoming spot gaps and connection gaps. The

relatively short lengths of spot and connection gaps may induce riders to remain on the thoroughfare despite the lack of bicycle accommodations, thereby causing potential issues to be created by them not following the alternative routing.”

9. On Page 60, within Figure 9, for all “Improvement Opportunities,” remove “Arterial Shared Roadway” improvement measures.
10. On Page 78 a “Prototypical Multi-lane Arterial Intersection Improvements” design is identified that incorporates traffic signal bicycle detection and a color enriched bike laneage in motor vehicle and bicycle conflict areas. DMD has reviewed this design and does not support the recommendation to use these elements, as shown in Figure 1.
11. Page 97, Streamline Administrative Practices: Delete Strategy ii “Create a Technical Review Committee” of Policy 1, Objective c. **Note:** There are not sufficient staff resources available to fully staff a TRC. DMD Staff recently has adopted a practice of going to Advisory Committees for comment of draft construction plans involving bikeways and trails design.
12. Page 105, Objective 2: Delete Measurement of Action #4.
13. Page 105, Objective 2: Revise the text for Action #5 - Give increased priority to achieving connectivity of the bikeway network when planning and programming all roadway and bikeway improvements as appropriate.
14. Page 105, Objective 3: Revise the text for Action #1 - Restripe ~~all~~ collector and arterial roadways (where designated on the Bikeways Map ~~practical~~ and per AASHTO guidelines) to provide bike lanes, or minimum outside lane width of 14 feet.
15. Page 105, Objective 3: Revise the text for Action #2 - Provide a striped bicycle lane or shoulder as described in chapter 23, section 5, subsection N of the City’s Development Process Manual, in conjunction with AASHTO bicycle facility design guidelines, on ~~all~~ new, rehabilitated or reconstructed roadways, as indicated in the Facility Plan.
16. Page 105, Objective 3: Revise the text for Action #3 - Provide striped lanes/shoulders of at least five feet wide, from face of curb where curb and gutter exist, on all new or reconstructed bridges, underpasses, and overpasses, where not otherwise constrained or to the extent feasible.
17. Page 105, Objective 3: Revise the text for Action #4 - 4. Selectively plan and design for bicycle travel with ~~all~~ intersection improvements - include 5-foot bike lanes or minimum curb lane widths of 15 feet through intersections.
18. Page 105, Objective 3: Revise the text for Action #6 - Modify existing or install new traffic signal detection equipment (i.e., inductive loop, video detection, or pushbutton) to make all traffic signals bicyclist-responsive within need-based areas and as resources permit.
19. Page 106, Revise the text - Objective 4: Provide a ~~High Standard~~ an elevated emphasis on Maintenance along Roadways.
20. Page 106, Objective 4: Revise the text for Action #1 - With On-Street Bikeway and Multi-Use Trails, improve and fully fund the street maintenance and sweeping program. Establish the highest priority for allocation of street sweeping resources to sweeping all bike lanes in

response to 311 requests and at least once per month semi-annually and bike routes on local streets a minimum of once ~~four times~~ per year. Multi-use trail sweeping should be performed on a regular basis and as requested. Measurement: Request the annual data on frequency of scheduled sweeping for the on-street bikeway and multi-use trail network, based upon 311 calls along with the number and location of spot sweeping requests. Based upon 311 call volume establish a database to track trends and provide data that can be used refine scheduled sweeping and maintenance budget request.

21. Page 106, Objective 4: Delete Action #2 – ~~Establish weed and vegetation control procedures to reduce the occurrence of noxious weeds (i.e., puncture vine) and plants that block sight lines or grow within two feet of bicycle facilities.~~
22. Page 106, Objective 4: Revise the text for Action #6 – Establish timely responsiveness to maintenance requests from citizens through the use of the City’s 311 Citizen Contact Center or website or other means for citizens to report concerns. ~~Establish an agency goal of 48 hours to address these requests.~~
23. Page 106, Objective 4: Revise the text for Action #7 – Maintain bicycle routes and lanes ~~to high standards~~ through construction projects when feasible, referring to Chapter 6, “Temporary Traffic Control,” of the MUTCD, ~~and maximize~~ maintaining curb lane widths (i.e., provide lane widths of 14 feet or greater) through construction projects on roadways that ~~do not have bike lanes.~~ would otherwise contain a bike lane or bike route. Where this is not feasible, provide appropriate bicycle friendly and reasonably direct detours and detour signing, per AASHTO and/or City standards.
24. Page 107, Objective 6: Revise the text for Action #3 – ~~Develop and~~ Fully support a bicycle education program in Albuquerque’s elementary and secondary schools as part of current physical education requirements.
25. Page 109, Objective 9: Revise the text for Action #1 - Maintain and update the bikeway and multi-use trail network inventory developed as part of the planning process. Maintain and update the bicycle accident database. Use the database to identify high accident locations and/or high accident severity locations to help prioritize bicycle project and program improvements. Review ~~each bicycle collisions/accidents in a timely manner to identify system deficiencies and potential improvements. in order to assess site conditions to determine if the incident location could be targeted for system improvement.~~
26. Page 110, Legislative Recommendations: Add the following text - Include an additional method for the hand signaling of a right-turn movement, add parking restriction in bicycle lanes and marked bicycle boxes, improve reporting of bicycle crashes by law enforcement, remove bicycle front fork size restriction, and consider redefining bike lane width references in the DPM when it is updated.
27. Page 111, Traffic Code, Albuquerque Code of Ordinances: Delete the recommendation to add “(P) In a marked bicycle box.”
28. Page 119, Crash Data Collection & Analysis: Delete the section titled “Approach to Crash Data Collection” as it duplicates the immediately preceding text.

29. Page 119, Capital Implementation Program: Revise the text - ~~The City set aside is equally distributed between the on-street (2.5%) and trails (2.5%) programs.~~ The GO bonds are obligated in 2-year cycles, generating \$600,000 for the on-street system biennially.
30. Page 120, Gross Receipts Tax: Revise the text - A set percentage (4%) of this revenue, ~~or \$1.65 million biennially,~~ is earmarked for trails used for both commuting and recreational travel; however, no dedicated funds were specifically identified for on-street bikeway improvements.

**Traffic Engineering Operations** - No comments received

**Street Maintenance** - No comments received

#### **WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY**

**Utility Services** - No comments received

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT**

**Air Quality Division** - No comments received

**Environmental Services Division** - No comments received

#### **PARKS AND RECREATION**

##### **Planning and Design**

1. **Formatting.** Just as a general comment, the formatting of the various sections and subsections should be gone over as there are different fonts, different bolding, italicizing and subtitling that should be consistent throughout the document. Add section headers at the top or bottom of the pages. It is a large document with many sections and having the chapters identified on each page would help as one reads through the Plan.
2. **Formatting.** Second, the maps on pages 64-71 (not numbered) show the unpaved trails in two different colors. The first map shows existing (unpaved) trails legibly, the second map does not show existing unpaved trails in the legend but they are apparent and are legible on the map. The third and fourth maps showing Current Projects and Critical Links are just not legible at all where trails should be showing, whether existing or proposed. The only Administrative Boundary that shows clearly on the third and fourth maps would be Kirtland Air Force Base. All Open Space areas are unclear as to what each is including the Bosque, Rio Grande Valley State Park. Possibly different colors can be used to make these maps more clear to the reader.
3. **Clean-up.** Page 6 Please include the Prescription Trails Program in this discussion on Public Health Benefits. This program is under-promoted and is a wonderful way for individuals to begin a walking program. The Prescription Trails program should also be included in the definitions on page 13. From the 2012 booklet, "The Prescription Trails Program provides prescriptions for walking and wheelchair rolling and a walking guide that suggests routes in

our community targeting and promoting healthy lifestyles for individuals and families (& pets, too.) This guide will help you find some of the park and trail walking paths in Albuquerque, Bernalillo County and the Village of Los Ranchos de Albuquerque.”

4. **Clean-up.** Page 11 Please add MPOS Major Public Open Space to the section F. Acronyms as it appears throughout the Plan and should be referenced in the beginning.
5. **Clean-up.** Page 13 Please add Open Space Trail and Major Public Open Space w/ definitions for each.
6. **Clean-up.** Page 14 Please add Soft-surface Trail and its definition.
7. **Clean-up.** Page 19 Section 1, Existing Bicycle and Trail Plans – City and Regional Plans – an organizational comment, I think that first should be the Comprehensive Plan followed by the Long Range Bikeway System Plan (2007) and the Comprehensive On Street Bicycle Plan (2000). Then please add the Major Public Open Space Facility Plan (1999) with discussion of how trails in Major Public Open Space are a major part of the overall network of trails including paved trails in Rio Grande State Park MPOS (Bosque Trail) and single tracks in Elena Gallegos Open Space. Then, in order, the Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan (1993 and revised 1996) followed by Facility Plan for Arroyos and Arroyo Corridor Plans (1986). All other City Plans and Policies go in Section 2 and Regional Plans and Policies in Section 3.
8. **Clean-up.** On page 22, in the last paragraph of the DPM (2008), please add a sentence that reads “Open Space Trails Standards are also presented in Chapter 7 Design Manual.
9. **Clean-up.** Page 32 second complete paragraph please give this paragraph a subtitle “other multi-use trails” wherein the discussion is about unpaved multi-use. In this same paragraph the term “Open Space” is used. This should say Major Public Open Space or MPOS throughout the document for consistency.
10. **Clean-up.** Page 33 mentions “Urban Trail” and in parenthesis “wide sidewalks”. Could this also be added to the definitions section on Page 14?
11. **Formatting.** Page 40 shows a map that is lacking a title which illustrates opportunities and constraints. The round or oval brown symbols seem to be keyed as “System Gap” but they cover or obscure the very space where the gap appears to be so it is difficult to figure out what the gap is.
12. **Clean-up.** Page 77 shows 46 miles of unpaved trails proposed and if they are OSD trails and there are definite locations, we could add to Table 8 on page 74. The Open Space Division should be able to help define these numbers.
13. **Clean-up.** Page 80 Section 3 regarding Bollards first bullet states “Bollards present a collision hazard...” Does the report state that or could we say instead that Bollards “may” present....? (depending on how close together they are, depending on the attention and/or skill level of the rider, depending on the condition of the bollard.....etc.
14. **Clean-up.** Page 81, Section 4, Could this read...Claremont Road is “an example of” a road .... it is not the only street that could be upgraded from a Bicycle Route to a Bicycle Boulevard.

15. **Clean-up.** Page 82, D. 1. Second paragraph mentions discussion with GABAC... was there also discussion with GARTC?
16. **Clean-up.** Also Page 82, second sentence in Section D.2., should read...due to the greater impact on or to the multi-use trail system. Please add that the signage and markings also allows 311 calls to report more exact locations of trail maintenance problems.
17. **Content.** Starting on page 83, Chapter 5 is all about bikes.
  - a. Page 87 at end of Chapter 5, A. 1., please add: Major Public Open Space Trails  
“The Open Space Division of the Parks and Recreation Department provides Environmental Education and Interpretation through a number of outdoor activities, classroom programs and community events to educate the public on the use of Major Public Open Space and Trails. Trail maps are maintained for trail users and Hikes are sponsored as well as special events to heighten awareness of the low impact recreation and the protection of the natural state of Major Public Open Space. The Open Space Division’s Trail Watch Volunteers Program is instrumental in educating the public about trail use ethics while noting maintenance needs to be corrected. In addition to hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding, the trails in the City’s Parks, Open Space and Trails system provide the opportunity to protect and preserve the natural environment for the benefit of the Albuquerque resident and visitor trail users now and in the future.  
  
Prescription Trails. “The City’s Prescription Trails program is intended to make information available to all residents about the importance of walking for health and how to get started in a self-directed or group program. The easy to use Guide provides information about specific parks in the Albuquerque area with maps organized alphabetically by zip codes and level of difficulty for each trail location, the length of each “loop” and what amenities are provided in each park facility. A walking log is included in the Guide so the trail user can easily document their distances walked. Information is also provided on Walking Clubs and Mall Walking for those rainy days.”
18. **Clean-up.** Page 98, Section 2, what did we agree on as far as consistent position titles? The Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan called for both a Trails Coordinator and a Bicycle Coordinator. The draft Plan is inconsistent about what the two positions are called and is confusing therefore even just in that first paragraph where they are called Planners in one sentence and Coordinators in another. It seems that both positions do planning and coordinating. It would be great if we had two of each!
19. **Content.** Page 108 discusses the “Growth Areas” and the section titled “Developer Requirements/Future Trail Segment Construction should be changes to eliminate the need for shading or texture on the Bikeways and Trails Map. Recently updated projections for growth especially on the West side of the river make clear that any currently undeveloped property may be platted and developed in the not too far off future. Therefore, any new development including infill development shall be subject to the listed requirements for trail development. Item 6 “ROW” should be spelled out.



- a. **Content.** Page 108, under “Developer Requirements/Future Trail Segment Construction” Please delete first paragraph and substitute the following text: “Based on the latest population projections, the City can expect a significant increase in population, especially on the West side of Albuquerque. The recently released “Paseo del Norte High Capacity Transit Study Alternatives Analysis Report” dated August 2014 is proposing major changes in the way the residents of Albuquerque will travel around the City. A Bus Rapid Transit System such as the “Potential BRT Corridors” suggested in the Study could result in an increase in bicycle commuting as a way of supplementing a BRT mode for access to the Major Employment Centers as well as to Parks, Open Space, Trails, Libraries, Community Centers and other public facilities Although the Bikeways and Trails Facilities Plan will precede any adoption of a BRT program for the City, the Bikeways and Trails Plan may be updated in the near future to include bicycle commuting w/BRT and recreational access as part of a Transportation System. With more research and information, the City can develop policies that require coordination between City departments to assure access to bike facilities and trails. In the meantime, City policy remains that if a trail and/or bicycle facility is shown on the Trails Plan as proposed where a property is being developed, the development will be required to construct and maintain said facility. This policy is consistent with the 1993 Trails and Bikeways Facilities Plan policies. As it is not possible to foresee the exact location of future development, new development within these developing areas shall be subject to the following requirements:
- b. **Content.** Page 108, under “Developer Requirements/Future Trail Segment Construction” add the following statement and making this number 7 and renumber present 7 and 8: “If the trail is identified on the Bikeways and Trails Facilities Plan as a proposed trail it is to be developed, to city standards, as a trail which may be in lieu of a sidewalk. City standards include a minimum 10’ width for paved trails plus clear zones on each side. (See Chapter 7 “Design Manual” for additional guidelines and standards). The Parks and Recreation Department must accept a trail for inclusion into the Trail System on the Trails Map. If a proposed trail is not on the Plan, a sidewalk is still required per the DPM Standards for Transportation development”.
20. **Clean-up.** Pages 121 – 129 suggest removing job titles in Lead Agency columns as these positions may change from time to time or be relocated to different departments. It will usually be the Department responsibility regardless of the staffing functions.
21. **Clean-up.** Page 171, Width second bullet is 12-1 feet or greater... not clear.
22. **Clean-up.** Page 172, Asphalt comment, please change “cheaper” to “less expensive.”
23. **Clean-up.** Page 174, second paragraph, should begin “Unpaved trails are typically...” (delete “and”) Middle of the paragraph delete “still” in sentence discussing MPOS paved trails being part of the overall trail network.

### **Open Space Division**

1. **Clean-up.** More consistency in general when referring to different kinds of open space. Sometimes Open Space is capitalized, sometimes not; sometimes it is referred to as Major

Public Open Space, sometimes not; sometimes there is a reference to “open spaces” which is not clearly defined. Page 32 deals with some of these issues, but there are still a few sections where it’s confusing, such as: Page 31 under the “Trails” section, there is a reference to “open space” but no reference to Major Public Open Space.

2. **Clean-up.** Another example on page 37, “Connection to Parks, Open Space, etc.” could be clarified which kinds of open space the plan refers to.
3. **Content.** A possible section to add to help the reader to understand the different kinds of open space: There are two types of open space within the plan area, Major Public Open Space and “open space.” Major Public Open Space (MPOS) corresponds with the locations identified in the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, the City of Albuquerque Major Public Open Space Facility Plan (jointly adopted by the City and County), and the Bernalillo County Parks, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan. Lower case “open space” examples include easements, privately maintained trails, recreational and educational facilities, utility facilities and corridors, water storage and drainage facilities, access easements and roadway and/or transit rights-of-way.
4. **Clean-up.** Add Major Public Open Space (MPOS) under acronyms.
5. **Clean-up.** Maps: Major Public Open Space areas are not clearly defined within the maps. Use a higher contrasting color?
6. **Content.** Also, rather than list the links to the websites with the Foothills and Rio Grande Valley State Parks maps, would it be possible to include the maps themselves in the actual plan? The unpaved trails in these areas represent extensive trail systems in the Albuquerque area that receive heavy use for recreation, commuting, etc. The most current maps can be found here:
  - <http://www.cabq.gov/parksandrecreation/recreation/documents/foothillsmap.pdf>
  - <http://www.cabq.gov/parksandrecreation/open-space/lands/RGVSPmapsplit11x17.pdf>
7. **Content.** Page 4: On Table 1, where does the data from for “unpaved trails” come from? Accordingly to a recent inventory done by Division staff, we manage just over 100 miles of official trails, including in City owned Major Public Open Space in Sandoval and Bernalillo Counties.
8. **Content.** Page 6: Public Health Benefits: Add something about the Prescription Trails program if the program is still active.
9. **Clean-up.** Page 19: MRCOG 2035 Long Range Map is very difficult to read.
10. **Clean-up.** Page 13: Add Open Space Trail and Major Public Open Space w/ definitions
11. **Clean-up.** Page 14: Soft Surface Trail is not defined although it is referred to under the Trail definition.

12. **Content.** Although Page 2 does briefly refer to the Major Public Open Space Facility Plan (January 1999), page 19 does not list the plan under Bicycle and Trail Plans/City and Regional Plans.
13. **Formatting.** Page 21: Change the Recommended Facilities section to “Major Public Open Space Arroyos” and “Major Public Open Space Links?”
14. **Content.** Page 20: Consider addressing plans by rank, not by type. Add the Open Space Facilities Plan and year adopted with discussion of how trails in Major Public Open Space are a major part of the overall network of trails including paved trails in MPOS (Bosque Trail) and single tracks in Elena Gallegos Open Space.
15. **Clean-up.** Page 27: Could refer to the jointly managed City of Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Alameda/Bacheci Open Space as one property.
16. **Clean-up.** Page 32: Second full paragraph uses term “Open Space” and should say Major Public Open Space for consistency or MPOS throughout the document for consistency.
17. **Content.** Page 72: Does the Open Space Division have a short list of projects that are currently programmed for design and/or construction? Page 77 shows 46 miles of unpaved trails proposed and if they are OSD trails and there are definite locations, we could add to Table 8 on page 74.
18. **Content.** Page 82: The OSD has a separate protocol “wayfinding” program for the Sandia Foothills Major Public Open Space and along the Paseo del Bosque, and is working to develop wayfinding systems for trails within other Major Public Open Space areas.
19. **Content.** Page 83: Add the Open Space Visitor Center, the Open Space Trail Watch Volunteer Program, and the Open Space Environmental Education Program to the list of Safety, Education and Encouragement Programs. Each of these programs involves an element of outdoor stewardship education, including Leave no Trace Ethics, proper use of trails in MPOS, and in some cases, trail design and management.
20. **Content.** Page 113: Open Space supports the creation of a maintenance map which clearly defines which agency is going to be responsible for maintaining which trail.
21. **Formatting.** Page 116: Trails maintenance practices section and On-Street Facilities Maintenance should be consistent, i.e., use the subsections of: Current practices, recommendations, best practices, etc.
22. **Clean-up.** Page 116: Major Public Open Space includes Open Space Division managed arroyos so reword to make consistent.
23. **Formatting.** Pages need to be numbered starting page 121.
24. **Clean-up.** Spreadsheet uses both lead agency and position; however, an action should not necessarily be assigned to a job title. Positions may change and move from Department to Department.
25. **Clean-up.** Page 169: Single Track, limited use for Open Space trails. Add the following: “Site specific signage will define the appropriate usage of trails in Open Space. The Open

Space Division is responsible for defining appropriate uses based on topography, environmental conditions, and to avoid potential user conflicts.”

- 26. **Clean-up.** Page 174: Change reference to MPOS having “hundreds of miles” of unpaved trails to “over a hundred miles” of trails.
- 27. **Clean-up.** Map. Need to make Plan consistent with the Bosque Action Plan, 1993. This includes a paved trail from Alameda to Paseo del Norte. Confirm west levee trail with OSD.

**City Forester** - No comments received

***POLICE DEPARTMENT/Planning***

No Crime Prevention or CPTED comments concerning the proposed Amendment Sector Development, Area, Facility or Comprehensive Plan request at this time.

***SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT***

**Refuse Division** - No comments received

***FIRE DEPARTMENT/Planning*** - No comments received

***TRANSIT DEPARTMENT***

Comments forthcoming.

<p><b><i>Project #</i></b> <b><i>1008887</i></b> 11EPC-40051 AMENDT TO SECTOR DEV, AREA, FAC, OR COMP.</p>	Adjacent and nearby routes	Citywide. Most of the Transit Corridors are on Central, Lomas, Montgomery, San Mateo and Coors.
	Adjacent bus stops	Citywide
	Site plan requirements	Central Avenue Street cross-section to address proposed BRT (Bus Rapid Ride Transit system.) in the median from Tramway to Atrisco.
	Large site TDM suggestions	Projects listed on pages 94 thru 98, of the report, should also take into account the Transit Corridors being impacted.
	Other information	None.

***COMMENTS FROM OTHER AGENCIES***

***BERNALILLO COUNTY*** - No comments received

***ALBUQUERQUE METROPOLITAN ARROYO FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORITY***

No objection to adoption of the Facility Plan. AMAFCA will coordinate with Parks and Recreation on plans and licensing for trails on AMAFCA’s rights-of-way.

***ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS***

The City of Albuquerque proposes a City-Wide amendment to the Bikeways and Trails Facility Plan. The goals of the Plan include:

1. Improve cyclist and pedestrian safety
2. Develop a continuous, interconnected and comprehensive system of bikeways and trails.
3. Enhance maintenance of all bikeways and trails, and improve maintenance strategies.
4. Increase use of bikeway and trails network.
5. Increase public awareness and education related to bikeways and trails.
6. Recognize and leverage the bikeway and trail network as an integral part of economic development and quality of life in Albuquerque.
7. Streamline administrative practices and coordination.

This Plan will have no adverse impacts to the district. APS does not oppose the proposed amendments and updates to the Plan.

## ***MID-REGION COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS***

### **GENERAL COMMENTS**

1. **Overall:** This plan supports the goals and objectives in MRCOG's 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and development of the 2040 MTP. The goals and policies in this plan will provide detail and direction that will help implement the broader MTP. This plan calls for MRCOG's participation in the areas of supporting gap closure, data collection and analysis, and participation in advisory groups. These activities are appropriate for MRCOG and as an organization we look forward to participating in this plan's implementation. Overall MRCOG supports the adoption of this plan with some minor changes and more emphasis in a couple of areas
2. **Best Practices:** Under goals and policies and at the beginning of the plan there should be an emphasis about the need to look at best practices in other communities. Although this is mentioned much later in the plan (page 95 "Other Trends in Bicycling & Trail Planning"), it is not emphasized. For the last four years MRCOG has sponsored webinars on best practices from other communities. We have found them very helpful and are happy to continue to sponsor them. From our experiences with these webinars and other resources we recognize that City of Albuquerque has great potential to pilot, test, and implement practices and designs that have been found successful elsewhere. The beginning of the plan describes current facilities but does not include new possible facilities. We recommend including facilities that currently do not exist in Albuquerque in this section— protected bicycle lanes and cycle tracks for example. This would address the reality that bikeway, trail, and pedestrian accommodation is changing rapidly and that the City is seriously considering how these accommodations could work here.
3. **Further Proposed Mechanisms for Gap Closure, Priority Projects and New Design Implementation:** The plan provides guidance on gap closure, arterial retrofits, project prioritization and other topics. We encourage the inclusion of data gathering and public involvement as a means to further assess these topics and refine strategies and needs.

It would also be beneficial if this plan provided flexibility as new ideas come forward, allowing them to be implemented if they are consistent with the plan. For example, at the neighborhood level, the current Bicycle Boulevards came about from community desires. At the City Council level, the recent study of Downtown Albuquerque by Jeff Speck was just conducted. How will these ideas fit into this plan? Finally, there seem to be developing concerns of whether it is appropriate to place bicycle facilities on principal arterials for speeds above 40 miles per hour. Hopefully the goals of this plan can provide a mechanism to address emerging competing needs that are still not well understood. We would advise that there be enough flexibility in the plan to allow for new projects that are highly consistent with the plan goals that may not be explicitly listed in the current project list.

#### **FURTHER COMMENTS**

4. **Time Frame:** Could this plan include a time frame? Bernalillo County's Pedestrian-Bicycle Safety Action Plan states that it is a 10 year plan. This could go to support "Best Practices." Best practices are changing fairly rapidly. Giving a time frame will encourage updating the plan to keep up with new best practices and better understanding of challenges facing the City in terms of walking and bicycling.
5. **Economic Benefits:** (P.5) Please include that people walking and bicycling spend more money locally and help to support local economy. This is the argument from the The Green Divide <http://community-wealth.org/content/green-divide>
6. **Traffic Safety:** (P.6) There is evidence that the more people walk and bicycle the safer it becomes to walk and bicycle. This is related to goals of both safety and increasing the number of users in the network. Safety in Numbers: More Walkers and Bicyclists, Safer Walking and Bicycling, PL Jacobsen, Injury Prevention, 2003;9:205-209.
7. **Glossary:** Please include a definition of an Activity Center in the glossary. Also please include that **Bicycle Boulevards** are often neighborhood streets with good connectivity. Portland OR, is currently focused on building **Neighborhood Greenways** (their name for Bicycle Boulevards) because they attract novice riders, calm neighborhood traffic and are cheap to build. They are achieving many goals with these facilities. This is worth mentioning and relates back to looking at best practices in other areas.
8. Please include Traffic Demand Management (TDM) in both the glossary and acronym list. Although there might not be mention of TDM in the document, it is an important category under federal funding sources.
9. This would increase the length of the glossary, but including new facilities such as protected bicycle lanes, cycle tracks, rapid flash rectangular beacons, and the hybrid beacon should also be included in the glossary. These elements are included in NACTO and the beacons are recognized proven countermeasures that improve safety. Including the TDM program, Smart Trips, would also be good.
10. **Improve cyclist and pedestrian safety:** (p.15-16) One safety topic that came up very frequently when Bernalillo County was conducting focus groups about active transportation in disadvantaged neighborhoods is safety from crime. This could fit under "d. Provide a

welcoming and comfortable environment for all travelers along roadways and trails, which includes encouraging more legitimate users on these facilities to prevent crime.” Something similar is recommended to address this concern.

11. **Increase use of the bikeway and trails networks:** (p.16-17). Please explicitly state that this policy goal includes attracting new users. It takes more effort to attract new users than to encourage incidental users to walk and bicycle more frequently, but both groups would benefit from these efforts.
12. **Recognize and Leverage the bikeway and trail network as an integral part of economic development and quality of life in Albuquerque:** (p.17-18) Policy (e) is the definition of a Complete Street. It really should be moved up the list to (a).
13. Streamline administrative practices... (p.18) Policy (e), please use the term “crash” instead of “accident”. The term “accident” implies that nothing could have prevented the incident. FHWA, NMDOT, and MRCOG use the term “crash” instead.
14. Policy (e) is a good place to recommend using performance measures to better understand the impact of programs and projects.
15. **Long Range Bikeway System:** There are several small errors in the paragraph on p.19. The Long Range Bikeway System (LRBS) is not a stand-alone plan. It is an element of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), which is a long-range plan looking at transportation on the 20 year horizon. Although it has 20 year time frame, the MTP is updated every four years. The LRBS is updated with the MTP. Currently the 2035 MTP is in effect and it was adopted in April 2011. It is recommended to use the year 2011 to describe the date of the LRBS.
16. **Table 8: High Priority “Critical Links Projects”:** There were several rows that seemed to be redundant.
  1. #5 & #6 Same type, name, and endpoints, but different lengths
  2. # 25 & # 26 Same type, name, and endpoints, but different lengths
  3. #65 & # 66 All information is the same
  4. # 107 & # 108 Same type, name, and endpoints, but different lengths
17. Bear Canyon Arroyo from Juan Tabo to Tramway is another trail gap that should be included in this list.
18. **New Programs to Expand or Initiate:** Please include Smart Trips. It is a program that targets neighborhoods to encourage people to walk, bicycle and take the bus. It also involves assessment of the impact of this intervention.  
<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/43801>

---

**MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT** - No comments received

**NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

The NMDOT requests additional time to review the submitted document since there are state routes identified within the plan. The NMDOT is concurrently establishing a technical committee on a state-wide level to evaluate state roadway facilities that impact bicycle, pedestrian and equestrian modes of transportation. The NMDOT requests that development within Albuquerque City Limits along and/or near any state route shall require additional NMDOT review.

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO**

PNM appreciates the opportunity to provide input to the City of Albuquerque on the Bikeways & Trails Facilities Plan 2014. As the City proceeds with the update of this plan, we present the following comments.

1. PNM transmission rights-of-way or easements are identified as the location for several proposed bike routes or trails. As the easement holder, PNM has the legal right to use and maintain the easement including ensuring vehicular access to the lines, maintaining adequate clearances, and other safety measures. If the bike lanes and/or trails become guest uses at these locations, an encroachment agreement will be necessary. The City also needs to directly contact the underlying property owner. In addition, it will be the City of Albuquerque's responsibility to ensure that PNM's uses of the easement are not affected or interfered with in any way by the inclusion of the bike lane or trail. Revise the section entitled Trail Gap Closure Measures (page 58) as follows (added text is underlined, deleted text is shown as strikethrough):

Utility and irrigation corridor trails typically include power line and water utility easements, as well as canals and drainage ditches. These corridors offer excellent transportation and recreation opportunities for cyclists and trail enthusiasts of all ages and skills. Some safety issues due to proximity to the irrigation ditches or power poles and transmission lines should be understood and appropriate protective fencing/railing and warning signs installed and/or other safety measures as identified by the utility. A license agreement with PNM or MRGCD, respectively, is required for trails in utility and irrigation corridors and an encroachment agreement is required for trails in electric utility corridors. In addition, a landowner agreement with the underlying property owner may be required.

2. Four proposed bike lane and/or trail locations are identified within PNM's 115kV transmission rights-of-way and easements. The four locations are:
  - Along the PNM CE 115kV transmission line from Irving Blvd. NW heading north toward McMahan Blvd. NW,
  - Along the PNM BW 115kV transmission line north of Interstate 40 east of Atrisco Vista Blvd NW,



- Along the PNM SE 115kV transmission line/ID 46kV transmission line corridor in Tijeras Arroyo, and
- Along the PNM RE/ER 115kV transmission line corridor on San Antonio Drive NE just west of Tramway Blvd NE.

Based on PNM's experience constructing and maintaining facilities at these locations, the terrain is difficult and is not conducive for bike trails. Coordination with PNM will be necessary as trails are developed at any of these four locations.

One additional trail proposed within PNM's transmission easement is the trail along the PNM SE 115kV transmission line east of Tramway Blvd NE south of Montgomery Blvd from PNM's Embudo Switching Station to approximately Menaul Blvd NE. A trail already exists near this location. Due to safety and security concerns, PNM cannot allow the trail to access or go through the Embudo Switching Station property. It is necessary for the Proposed and Existing Bikeways and Trails map (after page 63) to reflect this.

3. On the Proposed and Existing Bikeways and Trails map (after page 63), two proposed trails on the West Side (one paved, one unpaved) are located within PNM existing 345kV transmission line rights-of-way or easements. The first trail is west of the Ladera Golf Course. The second trail is north of Interstate 40 generally parallel on the north of Ladera Drive NW starting at Ouray Road NW and ending halfway between Arroyo Vista Blvd. and Atrisco Vista Blvd. The higher voltage lines such as these can potentially result in electrical nuisance shocks. Nuisance shocks may occur when a person touches an ungrounded metal object, in this case, such as bicycle handlebars. A nuisance shock does not harm the recipient but can be startling. PNM asks for these two proposed trails to be removed from the proposed bike/trail system or relocated elsewhere as PNM will not grant an encroachment easement at these two locations.