

- **Mr. Mathias called the meeting to order** (4:30 pm)
- **Mr. Mathias established the presences of a Quorum**
- **Welcome and Introductions** Mr. Mathias requested that all those in attendance at the meeting sign-in on the sign-in sheet located outside in the hall.
- **Approval of the October 14, 2013 Agenda**
The meeting agenda was approved
- **Approval of the September 9, 2013 Meeting Minutes**
Meeting Meetings were approved
- **Visitor Presentations**

Mr. Mathias stated that the visitor presentations would have to be limited to about 20 minutes per presentation in the interest of time.

Bollards.....Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB)

Mr. Steffin from PB gave a brief presentation on the scope of the Bollard Study and summarized the recommendations for the proper use of bollards on multi-use trails. Mr. Steffin cited various publications (FHWA, AASHTO, MUTCD, etc.) as resources used to establish the proper and safe use of bollards. PB looked at a handful of existing sites and bollard locations to see how they varied from the recommendations made by MUTCD, AASHTO and FHWA and how they varied from site to site.

In the field investigations, it was noted that the number of bollards, heights and placement varied in many locations with no consistency. For instance, Bear Canyon Arroyo on the west side of Jefferson, bollard placement and a lack of striping cause cyclists and trail users to not only negotiate a vertical curve but to also dodge the bollard placement and other trail users. In addition, Mr. Steffin felt that a common misconception was that painting the bollards yellow made them retroreflective but that they were, in fact, not any more visible, particularly at night.

Mr. Steffin stated that Parks and Recreation prefers to install the retractable bollard for multiple reasons that support safety. The only concern is that the bollard is silver (with a retroreflective tape strip). It is visible at night but blends in to the asphalt during the day.

Mr. Steffin summarized his recommendations for bollard placement, number and appropriate treatments surrounding the bollard. He provided a photo of his recommended “Best Practices.” and stated that there are no set standards for where to place bollards. AASHTO said that bollards should be placed only at areas where there is a history of problems with vehicular access. He would recommend that the City does not necessarily need bollards on facilities that parallel roads; rather, he feels that facilities that are not readily visible, such as the Hahn Arroyo, could benefit from the application of bollards.

Mr. Mathias asked about the background and goal of the project.

Ms. Lozoya responded by saying that the City wanted to come up with a recommendation or a standard for the use of bollards on trails. The City has heard over the last several years that there are issues, that they are obstacles and that they posed a hazard for cyclists. The City wanted to examine various locations where they were being used to determine best practices. Ms. Lozoya indicated that the City was not going to install the bollards initially unless there was a recorded issue or unauthorized use by a motor vehicle. Ms. Lozoya said that those complaints would be logged in the 311 system.

Mr. Hale wondered whether chicanes had been considered in lieu of bollards. Ms. Lozoya said that this treatment would only be identified for specific problems that have a high volume of complaints. However, the City is open to using chicanes when the treatment would prove beneficial.

Mr. Mathias indicated that GABAC is on board with having a City Wide Policy that determines when to appropriately put bollards in and how to get rid of ones that are not in compliance. Mr. Hale requested to have this added as a discussion item for the next meeting. Mr. Hale thought that the GABAC members should have a discussion because he had concerns. Ms. Lozoya felt it would only be useful if the City could have a direction provided.

Channel Road.....TYLin/COA Staff

The City Project Manager Juan Carlos Samuel provided a general overview of the Channel Road project. He provided the limits of all phases (Phase 1: Osuna to Hawkins, Phase 2: Hawkins to El Pueblo and an El Pueblo project). Mr. Samuel explained that the intent was to provide the ultimate configuration and connections of the road. He then introduced the Consultant/Engineer, Mr. Eric Froberg.

Mr. Mathias asked about the goal and background of the project and. Mr. Samuel explained that the intent of the road is to provide an additional north/south roadway system that would be a relief route for Jefferson traffic and provide connectivity for both vehicles and bicyclists. It is a new road and no connection exists now. Mr. Samuel explained the three projects that were on the exhibit (Phase 1, Phase 2 and El Pueblo) but indicated that the primary focus was going to be Phase 2 of the project.

Mr. Froberg started his presentation by explaining the map he provided. The map showed existing and proposed bike lanes, bike routes and trails. He explained that the intent of Channel Road is to be a reliever route for Jefferson but that it is also expected to be multi-modal. He said that this presentation would address Phase 2 and that a presentation would be made at a later date for El Pueblo. Mr. Froberg continued to explain the alignment and cross-section. He indicated that for the Phase 2 portion that it had 2 driving lanes and a 6' shoulder. He continued that he was only calling them shoulders until they were ultimately connected to bike lanes and had connectivity. At that point he would call them bike lanes.

Mr. Mathias expressed concern that Mr. Froberg had called them shoulders. Mr. Froberg explained that he could not call them "bike lanes" until they had connectivity and Mr. Mathias disagreed citing many locations around the City have no connectivity and are labeled "bike lanes".

Mr. Froberg explained the alignments and connections for the roads and the trails. He clarified the bicycle connectivity.

Mr. Mathias wanted confirmation that this was a 0% plan; which was confirmed. Mr. Mathias requested that each phase of the plan (30%, 60%, and 90%) be brought before the committee for review. Ms. Lozoya agreed and requested that the City be placed on the agenda for the next month before the City got too far into the 30%. Mr. Mathias agreed to add it to the agenda.

Bus Boards.....Chuck Malagodi (Parks)

Mr. Chuck Malagodi was presenting to get feedback on Bus Boards. Mr. Malagodi indicated that the number one cause of fatalities is wrong-way travel. He acknowledged that the PSAs presented at the September meeting were not well received by GABAC so he wanted to discuss the ideas of Bus Boards because he felt they would be more agreeable. He noted time constraints and indicated that the Bus Boards might be another media that the City could take advantage of to advertise (4 Rapid Rides and 4 other buses) on numerous routes. They would be in both Spanish and English. A member noted that the Spanish translation was completely wrong. There were some suggestions on how to orient the bicycle and the vehicle so that the head-on aspect was more evident.

A question was raised about the urgency and how the City is addressing the true users. It was felt that the bus board advertisements would be ineffective given the location. The question was asked as to why the City was coordinating the advertising effort because there were professionals that were better suited to provide the advertisements that address the issue.

Mr. Malagodi explained that he did have funding to spend on advertisement but he is vested in bicycle safety. He detailed the number of classes he teaches for bicycle safety and said it was an effort to get people to attend. He said he would like to get some information out there even if the City couldn't do it to the frequency desired.

Mr. Gonzalez expressed a desire to not "kick the can" down the road. He indicated that the City could study this a long time. He said he would rather see a message out there rather than having nothing. He felt that advertising on Rt. 66 would be great advertising until the City figures out how to do more effective advertising.

Mr. Mathias did not feel that the bus board sign presented would clearly get someone's attention to say "Don't go the wrong way!" A request was made to turn the bike around to show life on top and death on the bottom.

A suggestion was made to have the top part green and say "Bikes Always Go with the Flow" and the bottom part red with the bike turned around toward the car and it crossed out. The members agreed. There was a request for more information at actual bus stations as well.

Mr. Malagodi asked how he could move forward. Ms. Lozoya said that Mr. Malagodi should make the revisions and come back to the Committee. It was suggested that another option could be to form a subcommittee but that did not evolve beyond the suggestion. Mr. Malagodi said he could wait until next meeting.

- **Announcements**

Mr. Mathias wanted to share information he gathered from the Paseo/I-25 meeting. He reminded everyone that what was presented to the Committee had changed. He felt that what was presented at the final public comment meeting was that bikes should get off and behave as pedestrians across the whole project. There is one pedestrian bridge and cyclists are expected to ride across crosswalks and on pedestrian bridges. His summary is that there will not be proper facilities.

Mr. Hale brought up the potential Rail Runner station on Montañño. He requested that it be placed on the agenda. He requested that someone from the City come and discuss it.

- **Public Comment**

Julie Luna, Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG or COG), announced that the COG is getting ready to start the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and that it takes a year to put the plan together. There is a public meeting on November 7th from 5:30 to 7:30 at the MRCOG Offices on 8th and Copper. The point of the meeting is to create a long range plan. They are updating the long range bike system as one part of the MTP.

Announcement was made about the Coors Corridor Plan Public Meeting on Thursday, October 24 and they are looking for public comment. Mr. Mathias asked what the Coors Corridor meant. It was explained that it was Coors from Alameda to Central. The Sector Plan is being updated. Concern was expressed regarding Coors and Montañño and Mr. Mathias referred it to the next meeting.

Mr. John Barncastle thanked Ms. Lozoya and apologized regarding a calendar discrepancy. He, however, feels that it could be a mistake for Ms. Lozoya to not e-mail out the agenda as she had in the past. He also wanted to share that JLS Security and Investigations Company provides security for the Downs Race Track. They have agreed to pay \$50,000 to the person that they tackled that simply had a backpack on. He is hopeful to get the Downs to put up signs that say they do not want people to have backpacks on in the vicinity of the casino.

Mr. John Thomas wanted to speak briefly about the bollards. He appreciated the presentation but he felt, in terms of Albuquerque issues, that Mr. Steffin missed the point. The point of looking at bollard policy was that a lot of people were getting hurt. He pointed out that in Ohio and Pennsylvania that they seem to be actively removing them. He suggested that Bernalillo County seemed to have more bollards than the state of Ohio.

Mr. Mathias announced that everyone who attends the meeting must sign in for the record and if they would like to speak during the Public Comment period that they should place a check in the box to the left of their name.

Mr. Steve Verchinski spoke regarding the Paseo/I-25 project. He discussed the Categorical Exclusion for the project. He further remarked that ridership was down and the bicycle-involved collisions were over the national average. He stated that connectivity appeared that it would be compromised by the construction of multiple roads and that GARTC and GABAC missed the opportunity to comment. Mr. Mathias stated that if anyone else had a better idea of how to proactively have NMDOT or the City do anything that he would happily resign his position and give it to that person.

Ms. KJ Swanson identified herself as a first time attendee of the meeting. She presented a revision to a law in Maine which gives the bicyclist the ability to determine where they feel safest to ride. It particularly referenced citations for violation of the 3' passing law and prohibited right turns in front of cyclists. She suggested that the committee look up the law.

Mr. Chuck Malagodi wanted to inform GABAC that the bicycle program had some success. They are going to be able to present at Aggressive Driving School the bicycle safety education, very similar on how the present to the Defensive Driving School for the City. They are also working with the COG on a program that will offer free bus passes or rail passes and some limited taxi service for people that go through a class.

- **Staff Reports**
No staff reports were provided.
- **Discussion/Action Items**

November Meeting Date.....GABAC
Mr. Mathias noted that November 11th is a Holiday. It was decided on November 4th.

Paseo/I-25.....Michael Smelker (NMDOT)/GABAC
Mr. Mathias restated his initial statement presented in the Announcements about his displeasure with the bicycle accommodations for the Paseo/I25 project. He wanted to hear about the plan and design and how to change it.

Mr. Smelker indicated that the Committee could provide public comment but that for this project the proposed bridge location is set. The Committee was not pleased and expressed their concerns regarding the current design. They would prefer that the project not address Pedestrian and Bicyclists in the same manner. Mr. Smelker further explained that all three teams that submitted on the project had a bridge in roughly the same location as it is currently proposed. The Committee reiterated that the existing design was not acceptable because they feel it is dangerous and lacks connectivity. Mr. Mathias was concerned that cyclists were placed on sidewalks and that was a Traffic Violation in the City.

Ms. Coleman Burnett, Environmental Section of the NMDOT, wanted to share two things. The first being that best way for any agency to take into consideration the Committee's concern is for alternative solutions to be presented. She stated that to-date, they have only received some comments from the Bicycle/Pedestrian Community with Mr. Verchinski's being the most comprehensive and containing information the NMDOT could address, alternatives. She stated that the agency can respond to substantive comments or suggestions. Mr. Mathias said that they had seen previous versions of the plan that they preferred. At which point Ms. Burnett asked the Committee to gather what they liked about the other plans and submit that as potential alternatives. Her second comment related to the City Traffic Rules. She wished to clarify that the City has language that does allow cyclists to ride on the sidewalk without it being a Traffic Violation. Mr. Gonzalez stated that the traffic code states that bicyclists can ride on the sidewalk if they feel that it is unsafe to do otherwise. There was further discussion which involved the committees feeling that building bike facilities that would require a bicyclist to ride on the sidewalk is unacceptable.

The Committee again reiterated that they do not feel that the project, as it relates to cycling, is safe, efficient or what they voted on. Mr. Mathias stated he would invite Mr. Smelker back.

Bikeways and Trails Master Plan.....Carrie Barkhurst (COA)/GABAC

Ms. Barkhurst and Ms. Morris, Planners for the City, wanted to announce that the Planning Department has the Bikeways and Trails Master Plan back in their hands. The overview provided was that Planning is combining the On-Street Bicycle and Trails and Bikeways Facility Plans into one document so that they can insure that the system is well connected, enjoyable and safe. They are also focusing on the transportation, recreation and just the daily life functions that can be accomplished just by riding a bicycle. The planning process was set up into three phases. The first phase was to review, revise and consolidate the existing content of the two plans. In the second phase, the consultant, Gannett Fleming, did a lot of engineering studies. They did a gap analysis to identify where there were gaps in the system. They did an analysis of different cycle zones where it was easier and more ideal to ride. There were counts done of trail users and various other studies to guide us on how to make a better plan. The third phase is to actually combine the existing documents, policy and goals, with the engineering study. The next step is to move forward with the plan adoption starting at the end of February and with a plan to receive City Council's approval in August of 2014. The reason for the timing is so that it coincides with the COG's MTP timing. That would mean that the projects recommended by this plan would be incorporated into the Long Range Bike Maps. They would also like to streamline some of the content.

The Committee was then asked by the Planning representatives what their preferred method of engagement was. Mr. Mathias responded that he disagreed that there had never been phasing as presented. The Planning representative stated that she took the dates directly from the contract. She further asked the Committee what their comments or critiques were about the document and asked how they could all move forward in order to revise the plan into something that is going to be useful for everyone. Mr. Mathias and other members stated that he provided several comments on the original plan to Gannett Fleming. Mr. Mathias further questioned about how it was decided that plan needed further work on it. He indicated that the Committee had no knowledge of why the plan moved to Parks and Recreation or why any of the subsequent decisions occurred. He said that he didn't even know what the current document looked like. The Planning representative said that she had the current document is the same plan that was produced initially. Mr. Mathias requested that they be filled in on how things got developed to the point they are now because there has been no clarification as to why the plan needed to be redone. There is still some question as to what the goal of the document is. The Planning Department committed to returning for updates and Mr. Mathias agreed to add her to the agenda.

NMDOT Partial Paving.....NMDOT/GABAC

Mr. Mathias presented that Tramway between the Casino and the County Line is going to be paved edge to edge as it exists now. His understanding was that NMDOT District 3 had moved money around to achieve this. The concern is that paving only the road portion leaves a dangerous lip for riders between the shoulder and the driving lane. There are also concerns that some portions of the paving have broken off overtime on the shoulder and that the width is not the 10' it used to be. Paving driving lanes is not restoring the true width of the road. Mr. Mathias cited measurements and photos that he took that clearly show there isn't a 10' shoulder. Mr. Mathias would like to see a statewide policy that prohibits such paving actions. Mr. Mathias recommends

October 14, 2013

that this continue to be an agenda item until the Committee convinces someone to adopt a policy regarding partial paving.

- **Adjourn**