Greater Albuquerque Active Transportation Committee (GAATC) – AGENDA

March 14, 2022 | 4:00 – 6:00 PM

Meeting will be held virtually.
Due to current public health considerations, no in-person option will be provided this month.
Zoom meetings will be recorded and the chat will be saved for notetaking purposes.
*6 mute/unmute | *9 raise/lower hand

Zoom Meeting Info:
https://cabq.zoom.us/j/88461619655?pwd=TFZxL2pMMHpiN0pSRnYzRUVwSktyZz09

Join by Phone: +1 346 248 7799 (*6 mute/unmute | *9 raise/lower hand)

Meeting ID: 884 6161 9655
Passcode: 793780

Welcome and Introductions

[ ] Vacant NE Quadrant  [ ] Vacant SE Quadrant  [ ] Dan Jensen NW Quadrant

[ ] Nevarez Encinias SW Quadrant  [ ] Richard Meadows (chair) Pedestrians + Transit Users  [ ] Josiah Hooten Bicyclists

[ ] Vacant Individuals w/a Disability  [ ] Vacant Youth (Under 24)  [ ] Lanny Tonning Older Adults (over 60)

Approval of March Meeting Agenda

Approval of January Meeting Minutes

Public Comments (2 minute limit per audience member)

• Please email comments to Valerie Hermanson (vhermanson@cabq.gov) prior to the meeting or use the virtual raise hand feature during the meeting.

Discussion / Action Items

Presentations

• City of Albuquerque Bicycle and Trail Crossing Guide – Clare Haley, Bohannan Huston

• City of Albuquerque Bicycle and Trail Map Update – Clare Haley, Bohannan Huston

• Parks & Recreation Department Priority Projects – Whitney Phelan, City of Albuquerque Parks & Recreation Department

Next Meeting: Monday, April 11, 2022
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Next Meeting: Monday, April 11, 2022

Staff Reports

- Municipal Development (DMD)
  - Engineering
  - Vision Zero
- Council Services
- Parks and Recreation
- Planning
- ABQ RIDE
- Bernalillo County
- MRCOG
- NMDOT District 3

Public Comments (2 minute limit per audience member)

Adjourn
Committee Members Present

Richard Meadows (Chair)
Nevarez Encinias
Josiah Hooten
Dan Jensen

Committee Members Absent

Lanny Tonning

Staff Members Present

Tim Brown (DMD)
Tara Cok (MRCOG/MRMPO)
Valerie Hermanson (DMD)
Hugh Hulse (Parks and Rec)
Julie Luna (Bernalillo County)
Whitney Phelan (Parks and Rec)
Seth Tinkle (Planning)
Shanna Schultz (Council Services)
Cheryl Somerfeldt (Parks and Rec)

Visitors Present

Denise Aten (BHI)
Dianne Cress (Bike ABQ)
Theresa Dunn (BikeABQ)
Sue Gautsch (Bike ABQ / Free to Roam E-Biking)
Clare Haley (BHI)
Susan Hering (BikeABQ)
Jesus Hernandez (T4B)
Mag Kim (T4B)
Steve Pilon (Bike ABQ)
Peter Rice (Downtown ABQ News)
Omar Villezcas

Richard Meadows called the meeting to order at 4:02 PM

Approval of March Meeting Agenda

Nevarez Encinias (motion); Dan Jensen (second) – approved unanimously
Approval of January Meeting Minutes
Dan Jensen (motion); Nevarez Encinias (second) – approved unanimously

Public Comments (2-minute limit per audience member)

- Steve Pilon: At a recent meeting, City staff were speaking about making the westside more bicycle friendly. Would like the city to look at Pre World War II neighborhoods that were built at a time when car use was not the only mode of transportation. For example, Summit Park is prime for becoming more bicycle and pedestrian friendly. Has been asking the city to place rumble strips, signs, and striping to make the crossings at Girard and Marble, and Carlisle and Mackland more pedestrian friendly. Also, Councilor Benton put $90K toward an assessment of Girard from Lomas to Indian School. Would like to see a focus toward more pedestrian friendliness at a more commercial area near Indian School and Girard where there are several local businesses.
  - Richard Meadows: Is that $90K part of previous Girard Complete Streets effort from a few years ago?
  - Steve Pilon: This funding is not part of that effort and is a new initiative. It involves planting trees. Near the commercial area, neighbors feel it has the potential to be more of a magnet. This neighborhood has the potential to be a model for active transportation and I think it would be more productive to work on these neighborhoods than the ones on the west side that are probably always going to be car dependent.
  - Richard Meadows: Val to reach out to Council Services to find out more about the $90K initiative for Girard and how we can provide a response at the next meeting.
  - Dan Jensen: As NW quadrant representative for GAATC, think it’s important that we look at the whole city. The idea that the westside will always be car dependent is what will happen if we continue to follow this trend and support that idea. Thinks it’s important to look at newer developments in a holistic way - idea that the development itself might be more self-contained with residential and businesses to meet daily needs rather than standalone residential areas that are car distance away from mega centers with large parking lots. Pacific Northwest has been successful in achieving this idea such as Issaquah, WA. Need to continue the westside efforts to be more transit and pedestrian friendly. People will still drive, but all modes can coexist nicely.
  - Richard Meadows: GAATC is charged with looking at the whole city and we do not intend to neglect any particular area. If there is funding from your City Councilor to do a study, then let’s continue to talk about that opportunity.
  - Steve Pilon: Didn’t mean to disparage the westside. Just felt like neighborhoods like Summit Park are low hanging fruit to making some neighborhoods more bicycle friendly. Didn’t mean it shouldn’t be a priority, but it will be a heavier lift.

- Sue Gautsch: In late 2020, worked with State Senator Sedillo Lopez to get a bill introduced into that session that would clearly define e-bikes and give local jurisdictions a framework to work within as it comes to regulating e-bikes. Trying again for the upcoming 2023 session. Working with People for Bikes, which is a national lobbying foundation. New Mexico is one of
four states without legislation that defines an electric bike. Will likely bring forward the previous bill but with tweaks. It’s based on a model law that People for Bikes has used nationally, which has a framework outlining different classes for e-bikes, with room for modifications at the local level. Seeking support – not only at the city level but also the county level. And of course, the state level.

- Richard Meadows: Council Services was working on legislation for this recently and looking at legislation and definitions for e-bikes. Is this accurate?
- Shanna Schultz: At one point, was working with Parks and Recreation to create definitions that would go into the city’s code of ordinances – definition of e-bike, levels 1, 2, 3, and maybe put some restrictions on where they are appropriate or not. Has not heard back from Parks and Recreation Department on this, but would be happy to follow up and provide an update at next month’s meeting.
- Cheryl Somerfeldt – Whitney Phelan would be the primary point of contact. They’re had several meetings on how to define an e-bike and where they would be allowed to operate.
- Sue Gautsch: Has spoken with Whitney about this in the past and a good reminder to follow up with her.

Discussion / Action Items

- No discussion/action items

Presentations

- **City of Albuquerque Bicycle and Trail Crossing Guide** – Clare Haley, Bohannan Huston

City of Albuquerque contracted with Bohannan Huston to develop a crossing guide for bicycles and trails and also more generally for pedestrian crossings throughout the city.

The Guide is finalized and this presentation is to share information about the guide, so that it can be used in work moving forward.

The Guide takes national best practices and apply and adapt them to an Albuquerque context. Albuquerque has a lot of wide, high speed arterials that can make pedestrian crossings challenging. Part of this effort was to take the national guidance and adapt it locally to be able to address this challenge.

It also meant to be an easy to use tool to help determine appropriate crossing treatments. It also creates a consistent set of guidelines that applies throughout the city, which can also help the city to prioritize locations for crossing treatments. Lastly, it allows for some flexibility/engineering judgment.

Guide is divided into Three Sections:

1. **Crossing Design Elements** – describes potential treatments that can be applied at pedestrian or trail crossing locations. This section looks into the benefits, limitations, complementary
treatments, design considerations, and also the location/context. Organized by the least comprehensive treatments first and then goes into the more comprehensive treatments last:

- Enhanced Visibility Treatments
- Signal Treatments
- Infrastructure Treatments

2. Crossing Applications and Roadway Context – More of the meat of the report and where the tools are located to help determine if a site is appropriate/feasible for a crossing and if so, what type of design should be applied to the crossing.

- Site Selection
  i. Key Considerations come from the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Process Manual (DPM)

Flow Chart essentially takes the factors and determines if a location is a high priority, a potential location, or not a priority unless there is a warranting study as per the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

- Site Feasibility – after a site has been determined a priority for a crossing, a site feasibility flow chart is used to determine feasibility. Considers spacing from crossings, yielding, space from driveways, and sight distance.
- Crossing Design – recommends treatments based on roadway context factors. More comprehensive treatments are needed when vehicle speed increases, wider streets exist, and also higher vehicle volumes. This design guidance is adapted from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Crossing Locations and is meant to meet an Albuquerque context. Biggest change from the FHWA Guide: instead of total number of lanes and total ADT, Albuquerque’s guide considers these factors at each crossing stage. For example, if there is a median refuge island. The idea behind this modification is to encourage the use of median refuge islands and road diets because fewer lanes to cross means less of a need for a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon/HAWK, which is the most expensive crossing treatment.

3. Trail Crossing Profiles – City requested that the guidance be applied to variety of trail crossings in Albuquerque as examples. Provided example of Paseo de las Montañas Trail crossing at Juan Tabo, which has a median island refuge.

Discussion

- Dan J: Issue continues to be on the city side. This is a good guideline, but the underlying issue is when is the city going to start taking Vision Zero seriously and start reducing lanes or putting in more road diets in? East Central is a perfect example of this. Central east of Louisiana to Juan Tabo was a good candidate for a road diet, but business owners along the corridor pushed back and in turn the city decided not to implement the road diet. Then when this project was presented to GAATC, the city had already decided not to do the road diet and there was no interest in hearing feedback from the committee. The challenge will be getting the city to take this stuff seriously even though we have a lot of good ideas.
Richard Meadows: I don’t think the city said no to the road diet on Central, but I think there were other factors.

Dan Jensen: To make a point, I wrote to all the City Councilmembers, including my own, who requested my appointment, and received no response from anyone.

Susan H: Thank you for the presentation – it’s very helpful. Agree with Dan about the necessity of the city moving on this. Please define ADT again?

Clare Haley: ADT is vehicles per day. It’s the total number of vehicles that passed a certain point on an average day.

Susan H: Alarmed thinking about Albuquerque’s big, wide, and complex streets and wondered why the charts only go up to two lanes when we have so many wide roads. Noticed presentation example at Juan Tabo, which pointed to it as road with median refuge and having fewer lanes in the flow chart. Concerned because has been stranded on median with bike and it does not feel like two separate roads. Attention needs to be given to this and to a road like Juan Tabo because instead of two smaller roads, it’s like one monolithic, high speed road.

Worried about complexity of a street and thinking about adding the more expensive options like signals. Once the city invests in the renovation/repair/amelioration of a given problem, it becomes less likely that broader measures will be taken. So if we put in an expensive traffic signal at a new crossing or updating an old crossing, the city is less likely to address the root cause such as car speeding and road design. Glad to see road diet as an option.

Clare Haley: I agree – median islands don’t actually divide the road into two separate roads. The recommendations were structured around that to encourage median refuge islands to be built in the first place because they have proven safety benefits. Also, the FHWA guidance that this is based on has four or more total lanes, which is most of the roads in Albuquerque. To provide some nuance and fit Albuquerque’s context, we used median refuge islands to create crossing stages. Not necessarily to say it’s the same crossing experience as crossing two smaller roads.

Guide recommendations are intended to make those larger changes. Road diets, when appropriate, can be the best solution to improve a pedestrian crossing. It also can be a lot cheaper than installing a PHB and there are other safety benefits for all roadway users.

Another component I didn’t mention: speed can be reduced on a roadway to reduce the need for a PHBs. Of course, there are other elements that must be considered here such a speed reduction, but this would also need complementary design treatments.

Steve P: Thank you for the presentation and thinks that having these guidelines will be a big step forward. With flowchart, this would eliminate the necessity for pedestrian warrants? For high priority crossings, we don’t have to show that there are 12 students crossing the street in the heaviest hour, for example?

Clare H: Correct, the idea is to avoid having to use pedestrian warrants because as you know it’s a little silly to count pedestrians if there is no safe crossing.

Steve P: It’s the chicken and egg problem.
Clare Haley: Right. So we’re putting that at the end of the process to say, if it doesn’t meet these other criteria, then we can do a warranting study. But it is not needed if it’s located along a trail or an area with safety concerns.

Steve P: I’d like to go back to what Dan was saying about East Central between Louisiana and Wyoming. I was frustrated at that presentation too because Bohannan Huston recommended a road diet and it was never clear to me why that option was rejected. I could never get clarity on the decision making process or who had made that decision. I know the City did, but who at the City ultimately made that decision to ignore the recommendation from the consultant.

Definitely big arterials are a problem. I don’t want to inconvenience drivers because doing it antagonizes them. One thing that makes crossing those arterials so difficult is the fact that there are big convoys coming through and in between the convoys, people are pulling onto the arterial from side streets and it’s difficult to tell how fast they’re going or how quickly they’re going to accelerate. If you have a light or a PHB, they should be synchronized with the lights at either end of the segment.

That multi-use path example in the presentation – one of the inconveniences is crossing residential streets and it would be nice if these were four way stops, so if you get there first you have more confidence that at least you have the right of way. It’s not only the arterials, it’s also the residential streets and collectors. Those need to be addressed as well.

Richard M: Your study only addresses the major streets, is that correct?

Clare H: This guidance can be used on any kind of roadway context. However, this does not address four way stops at trails. There are recommendations for a lower volume lower speed street, which would be crosswalk markings and signage. In the crossing design section where the different treatments are discussed, there are a variety of treatments that would be appropriate for more residential streets.

City of Albuquerque Bicycle and Trail Map Update – Clare Haley, Bohannan Huston

The City of Albuquerque is working with Bohannan Huston to update the bike and trails map. This is the folding paper version of the map that typically gets distributed at bike shops and locations throughout the city. Last time it was updated was 2020.

Two tasks:
1. Update the map files and include any new biking infrastructure that has been built since 2020
2. Update content and information on the back of the map, which includes a lot of information about bike shops, rules of the road, and points of contact

Process to update the map:

- Outreach to planning agencies:
  - City of Albuquerque
  - MRCOG
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- Bernalillo County
- Rio Ranch

**Public Outreach**
- Survey open to public to get feedback – received almost 100 responses / very useful
- Bike ABQ
- Greater Albuquerque Recreational Trails Committee (GARTC)

- Maps to be printed in May

**Content Updates:**
- Adding section about bicycling events, Vision Zero, Complete Streets, City Trail Guides, contact info, updated photos, and condensed wording

**Content Removal:**
- Removed bike share and code of ordinances, which took up about 1/5 of back of map. Took this information and condensed into an FAQ section. Now it’s more readable.

**Map Updates: Visual Changes**

**Bike Routes**
Considering a few symbology changes and hoping to get feedback from this group. Current map has bike route symbology, with Routes on roads with 25 mph or below and Routes that are on roads that are > 26 mph. Received comments that this symbology is confusing because the symbology for routes on low speed streets is yellow with a red border, which to them, red meant danger. If Committee members have ideas on how to communicate this more clearly, please share your ideas.

**Wide Shoulder**
Added a wide should designation. Julie Luna pointed out that there were some bike lanes on the map were not legally bike lanes because they don’t have bike lane stencils or signage or pavement markings to facilitate movement through intersections. For those, we’ve added a wide shoulder designation. Doesn’t impact a lot of locations on the map, but it does impact a few of them.

**Multi-use Trail Symbology**
In the past there were two: green for standard multi-use trails and a brighter green with a white outline to designate the Bosque/Arroyo trail or those that are higher quality facilities. Survey respondents felt that these designations don’t work for all trails. For example, the Volcanes Trail is not near car traffic and it’s a nice bike ride, but is designated as this lower tier. Trying to think of a way to symbolize these multi-use trails to be more reflective of comfort levels.

One way we figured out how to do this was to add a side path symbology. For example, the Tramway Trail, which is next to a road and has more intersections with driveways and smaller intersecting streets. So this would be a little less comfortable than for example, the Diversion Channel Trail.

The version included in the meeting packet is a PDF copy. The final version will be a more stylized copy. Apologies for the previous copy sent out – some of the bike routes were hidden. Will coordinate with Val to send an updated copy where everything is visible.
• Richard M: Wasn’t sure I agree with the side path designation or terminology usage. Liked the idea of showing which multi-use trails are along a roadway facility versus those that are separated from traffic such as the Bosque Trail. The side path designation sounds like a different kind of facility, like a narrower facility, that doesn’t meet multi-use trail design. Also, some of the trails that are being called a side path don’t have driveways along them. There may be a few intersections, but they were designed to safely cross those intersections. They’re also next to roads, but there is some separation. I think more clarity on this definition. Does it have to do with separation of parallel roads or having driveway crossings?

• Mag K: Piggybacking on what Richard said in terms of better word usage. For example, T4B recently had a bike event along an arroyo and gave city bike map to youth leader who was confused by the keys and wording. A separate box on map to define/clarify the information could be helpful if there’s space.
  o Clare H: On the left side of map there are pictures of the types of bicycling facilities. I think we can make some edits to wording to make them clearer. From the survey, one person commented the bike boulevard was confusing.
  o Mag K: The wide shoulder designation for Rio Bravo feels really unsafe and feels dangerous to me. Bikes it almost every day and it’s one of the most unsafe feeling places to bike. However, it’s the only bike route. The map currently distinguishes it as that but also distinguishes it as a bike path. Clarification for things like that could be helpful. For this group, a lot of us bicycle, but for other people in the city that are new to it, they may be picking up this map and trying to figure out where they can go. We need to consider them. Thank you for the presentation.
  o Shanna S: Also had a comment on the wide shoulder designation. I’d like to hear more from the Committee, the public, or city staff about including this designation on the map when it doesn’t have any improvements on it. I think a lot of that paths listed on a map will have some kind of signage or pavement markings to let bicyclists and drivers know that there will be bicyclists on this roadway. With the wide shoulder designation, that is being made distinct because there are no markings anywhere. Is that pointing people toward an unsafe condition to ride in places where it’s not safe to bicycle? That made me a little nervous off the top of my head but would love to hear more discussion on it.
  o Clare H: That’s a great point. In previous map version, this was designated as a bike lane, which it is not. Part of that wide shoulder designation is meant to help clarify it’s not bike lane and is less comfortable than a bike lane. This would affect a few routes and all of them are really popular ride. For example, that Rio Bravo loop. The other one is on Tramway. I would like feedback on that because I think there is a balance between where people like to ride vs where infrastructure is comfortable.
  o Dan J: This wide shoulder discussion made me look at the map more closely. I’m trying to understand why Central west of 98th to 9 Mile Hill and Atrisco is shown as a bike route over 25 mph rather than a wide shoulder. Doesn’t see the difference between Atrisco Vista and Dennis Chavez and Rio Bravo. In fact, I consider them safer than riding on Central east of 98th. I’m trying to understand the distinction on that because especially eastbound on Central from 9-mile Hill down to 98th where you’re getting a lot of speed because you’re doing downhill – that shoulder is terrible to ride on. I’d much
rather ride on Atrisco Vista or Dennis Chavez than Central in that condition. Though I have to ride on both of them a lot.

- Clare H: It’s a really great point. MRCOG designates that section of Central as a wide shoulder. We decided to remove it because it does have that bike route symbology as well. We had to choose which one to symbolize. This is also a larger issue with some of these bike routes that are on high speed roads that feel unsafe to bike on. Cesar Chavez is another one that is designated as a bike route, but it doesn’t feel safe to bike on. This is a challenging aspect of the bike map.

- Sue G: My comments are pretty much the same, but I’m looking for a holistic approach. Are there any other cities that takes into mind designations by the design? For example, if it’s off-street how wide it is, etc. but clearly there are other factors that go into it as have been voiced. Is it a perceived sense of safety or lack thereof or it might be real. I agree with what everyone else says because with really wide shoulders with a lot of trash or debris drivers use this to make right turns.

Is there any sort of rating or a holistic rating of potential safety of bike paths/riding that takes all these factors into consideration? When I look at a bike map, it’s usually when I’m on my bike and I want the solution to pop out and tell me my safest route. I don’t get that from the old map. I like the idea of the side path simply because I would look at that and it would pop for me.

- Clare H: I don’t have the answer to that but it’s an interesting question. We did receive a few survey comments that said we should list the bike infrastructure in order of most comfortable to least comfortable, which could be helpful. However, there are so many factors that go into determining bicycle level of comfort and it can be subjective.

- Mag K: I think San Francisco and Minneapolis might have something similar.

- Richard M: This Committee has talked about this before. I don’t know if it’s in your scope to do that this year. This might be something that would need to be pursued in the future - it’s certainly a good thing to think about.

- Clare H: I think it’s a good thing to think about too. It will not happen for this update because we do not have time. It would be difficult to automate in GIS since it would involve manual review of data. But it is something to consider in the future.

- Sue G: Do you speak with other cities or participate in a consortium of other cities of certain sizes so you wouldn’t have to directly reach out to each city?

- Clare H: I am a member of the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (APBP), so I could reach out to them.

- Chat Dan J: ‘Comfort’ is very subjective and it also depends on experience and individual rider’s risk tolerance.

- Chat Mag K: Instead of a “safety rating,” San Francisco has recommended bike routes based on safety, ease of ride, and efficiency.

- Chat Navy E: Agreed, Dan. For many, comfort = low-traffic street, infrastructure or not.

Parks & Recreation Department Priority Projects – Whitney Phelan, City of Albuquerque Parks & Recreation Department
Staff put together a 10-year project priority list. Some projects are funded / some are in various stages of the implementation process.

- Mill Pond (design) connection in Sawmill to I-40 trail that runs to the north.
- Tom Bolack Trail Extension (construction/future) – I-40 trail extension through Tom Bolack Urban Forest. Challenges with PNM transmission lines that will take a minimum of two years to reconfigure everything. In the meantime, solar lighting will be added at the dog park and on the existing portion that connects under Louisiana.
- Alameda Drain Trail Phase 3 (construction) - Montano to where it turns off at Mathew
- Alameda Drain Trail Phase 4 (design) – connect along Mathew to Rio Grande and make a connection from the drain trail
- Ventana Ranch - Universe to Irving (Quote) – Parks and Rec completed some paved crusher fine work at the community center, which could be a good base course to potentially pave the trail in the future.
- Ventana Ranch – Rainbow - (Construction) – pave an existing gravel section to connect to existing paved sections.
- Calabacillas Arroyo Trail (Design) – trail alignment, design, community engagement, and some type of phase 1 construction to get work started in this area. Connects to CNM Westside and would cross under major roads. Hoping there is a way to do undercrossing at Coors and if so, it would end at an open space property along the bosque.
- Boca Negra Trail Extension (Needs Design/Quote) – Connectors for better access to CABQ properties
- San Antonio Arroyo (Needs Design) – runs south of Mariposa Trails. Will need to work with AMAFCA to see if trail could fit.
- Rail Spur Trail (Needs Right of Way analysis) - ready to release feasibility study. Will make available to everyone. Extend from Tiguex Park up through Sawmill. Potentially come down 1st Street or adjacent to the tracks. NMDOT asked that anything we proposed in the feasibility plan also have an on-street alternative. Several industrial businesses here that lease right of way from NMDOT. Currently, there is not enough ROW to fit trail so this piece could take a long time and need to acquire ROW. Leases go w/ property owner and not with the land, so as they change ownership, there could be opportunities to reevaluate leases.
- I-40 Trail Gap Feasibility study (Needs Design) - look at places where there are big gaps – particularly through Big I. Have not yet looked at funding, but Parks and Recreation would like to put money into this effort.
- Channel Road Trail (Needs Design) – There is a lot of development in this area such as housing.
- Balloon Fiesta to Roy / Tramway connection (Needs Design/Pueblo Permission) – Important to note portions go through the Pueblo Area. AMAFCA is leasing areas from the Pueblo. Opportunity for further coordination.
- Repave PDLM (Needs Quote) – Eastside of Lynwood Park
- Repave PDLM/Winrock (Coordinate with Developer) – additional housing going in at Winrock, so opportunities to make sure the entrance is safe/easy to access, so that folks that live/work in the area have a safe way of getting to/from the trail and businesses.
- Tijeras Arroyo (Needs Design) – Likely be unpaved multi-use trails
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- Rail Trail (Design) – pieces in construction, but still in design
- West Mesa Trails Plan (In Design) – Working with Sites Southwest – creating developing trails plan and a lot of it will be unpaved
- Crestview Bluffs/Isleta (Needs Design) – Looking at ways to connect Crestview Bluffs to Bernalillo County’s Isleta Drain Trail project and create further recreational activities
- Snow Heights Trail (Needs Study/Design) – This project came up through the Community Planning Assessments. Trail comes through center of median and there is no good way to get into the Westgate Community center or Truman Middle School. Looking at realigning and improving this trail. Evaluate how safe it is. MRCOG has mobile cameras and would like to use these cameras to better understand how people are using and moving on this trail to get to these locations.

Whitney will send a map to GAATC members to look at with all projects and fields to provide additional information. It’s helpful for administrators, workers, or if staff ever leave, there is guidance for future staff. It also helps constituents who are interested in supporting any of these projects to speak with your City Councilor or State representatives as the City goes to the State for GO Bond Funding.

- Sue G: Fantastic, thank you. Will this be viewable by everyone – to those who are not on the Committee?
  - Whitney P: Yes, I can send to the GAATC Members and then Val can send out to others on the email list. Would like to make this information an online map at some time. Also, officially purchased the Outerspatial app. As staff get access to the app, would like to speak with Julie and Richard from Bernalillo County because they received a dual license with a dashboard manager and there may be opportunities to also include Bernalillo County trails and open spaces.
  - Richard M: Maybe once projects that in design are further along, you can present them to GAATC. I know we’ve already seen the Rail Trail, but there are news ones that are in design.
  - Whitney P: Yes, we can also include GAATC with the Calabacillas Arroyo Trail. We do have some quarter cent funding available to move some projects along.
  - Dan J: Thank you, Whitney for a great presentation. Apologize but must leave the meeting a little early.

Staff Reports

- Municipal Development (DMD) (Tim B)
  No updates.

- Vision Zero (Val)
  Appointments for three vacant GAATC seats should occur soon for the NE, SE, and Youth seats. Appointments will be set for introduction at the March 21 City Council meeting, with possible appointments to be made at the April 4 City Council meeting. Unsure if the new representative’s first meeting would be the April or May meeting.
DMD’s M15 Planner position was posted and closed on March 7. Hope to fill this role soon.

GAATC worked with DMD and BHI on the Bikeway Gap Closure Evaluation. Based on the prioritized list, three projects were selected for further investigation – a consultant is putting together a scope and potential costs to implement each project:

- Claremont Ave Bike Boulevard from Richmond to Moon – nothing on the high fatal and injury network (HFIN) but crosses HFIN corridors.
- San Pedro proposed buffered bike lanes from Zuni to Menaul – Zuni to Central & Indian School to Menaul are on the HFIN. Menaul, Indian School, Lomas, Central, and Zuni are on HFIN intersections.
- Bear Canyon Bridge area – please note that there could be some right of way challenges, so improvements at this time may only include signing.

- Parks and Recreation (Whitney P)
  - Celebrate Trails Day on Saturday, April 23. Will be discussing at GARTC what staff will be planning for that day. Have about 50 yard signs and trail decals. Staff will provide updates as we get closer to that date.
  - Outerspatial mobile app is free for those excited and want to download!
  - Construction crews will be removing the epoxy on the Bear Arroyo Bridge and putting a flexible asphalt down. Will share updates on social media.

- Planning (Seth)
  - Long range team continuing to work on the Community Planning Area Assessments. Continuing efforts in the Near Heights and SW Mesa. Near Heights is a little bit farther along and completing some more targeted outreach. Since we last spoke, some initial drafts for SW Mesa have been posted online for feedback. Also, since we last spoke, the Central Albuquerque Community Planning Area Assessment has kicked off and are currently in the initial phases. Working with Sites Southwest to complete this assessment probably over the next year to produce report.
    - CPA website: https://cpa.abc-zone.com/
    - Ongoing engagement: https://cpa.abc-zone.com/going-engagement

- Bernalillo County (Julie L)
  Valerie sent out the Bernalillo County staff report with this month’s meeting agenda/minutes. Every calendar year, Bernalillo County provides a list of complete streets projects that they’re working on for the coming year. This is also posted on the Bernalillo County website. Julie’s staff report has the list of projects – both a spreadsheet list and a map. Please check it out and if you have any questions, please let Julie know.

- MRCOG/MRMO (Tara C)
  MRCOG communicating with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Focused Approach to Safety Team, which is a division that helps with bike/pedestrian safety training and technical assistance. Historically, FHWA identified focus city/states for high pedestrian/bicyclist fatalities/serious injuries. Albuquerque and New Mexico had been identified as a focus city/state, respectively and now FHWA has changed the geography. Now they’re looking at focus states and focus MPOs with bike and pedestrian safety issues. MRMO identified as a focus MPO, which means the MPO is qualified to receive technical assistance/trainings for
local planners/engineers/broader community. Once MRMPO has a better idea of what this all means, can share with this group, but they expect trainings for engineers, planners, or the broader community this spring or summer.

Public Comment:

- Steve P: Would like an update on the Montgomery overpass on I-25. It has probably been about six months since we last heard from them.
  - Richard M: Val to reach out to NMDOT to see if they are available to provide updates. They also presented on Tramway and Paseo and there might be updates on those as well.
- Sue G: Curious if the public can receive copies of the recorded meetings? And if not, would be interested if this was an opportunity in the future. Really interested in what Whitney presented, but we went through it quickly, so it would be helpful to refer back to the recording.
  - Val H: The record meetings are not currently available to the public and are used for notetaking purposes.
  - Richard M: Hoping Whitney can send us a handout or something that summarizes what was presented.
  - Whitney P: Forgot to share important update. We will be removing the epoxy on the Bear Canyon Arroyo Bridge and putting flexible asphalt down. It will be done separately from the joints and hoping to get more longevity from this while they figure out the larger design issues. Can provide updates with Val to share with the group.
  - Richard M: Thank you, Whitney. That has come up several times with this group.

Meeting adjourned at 5:58 PM

Next Meeting: April 11, 4:00pm – 6:00pm
City of Albuquerque Bicycle and Trails Crossing Guide
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March 14, 2022
Purpose

• Apply national best practices and adapt them to an Albuquerque context
• Build an easy-to-use tool to determine appropriate crossing treatments
• Create consistent guidance and prioritize locations for crossing treatments
• Allow for flexibility/engineering judgement
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Crossing Design Element Components

- Benefits
- Limitations
- Complementary Treatments
- Design Considerations
- Location/Context
Crossing Design Elements – Enhanced Visibility Treatments

- Signage
- High Visibility Crosswalks
- Advance Stop/Yield Lines
- In-Street Pedestrian Crossing Signs
- Pedestrian Scale Lighting
- Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB)
Crossing Design Elements – Signal Treatments

- Full Traffic Signal
- HAWK/PHB (Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon)
Crossing Design Elements – Infrastructure Treatments

• Raised Crosswalks
• Curb Extensions/Bulb-Outs
• Pedestrian Refuge Islands
• Grade Separated Crossings
• Road Diets

Raised Crosswalk
Grade-Separated Crossing
Refuge Island
Crossing Applications & Roadway Context

1) Site Selection: Determine if site is a desired location for a crossing

2) Site Feasibility: Determine if crossing is technically feasible at selected location

3) Crossing Design: Determine appropriate treatments and designs
Site 1: Site Selection

• Key Considerations:
  • Center or Corridor Designation
  • Spacing Between Crossings
  • Transit Stops
  • Multi-use Trails
  • Pedestrian Generators
  • Identified Safety Concerns
Step 1: Site Selection

- Transit: Is the location within 100’ of a transit station or within 400’ of a high-frequency transit stop?

  - Yes
    - Center/Corridor Designation: Downtown, Urban Center, or Main Street Corridor: Is the location ≥ 400’ from nearest crossing? Activity Center or Village Center: Is the location ≥ 600’ from nearest crossing?

  - No
    - Location: Is the location within Downtown, an Urban Center, an Activity Center, a Village Center, or Main Street Corridor?

- High-priority location for a crossing

  - Safety: Is the location within an area with identified safety concerns, as demonstrated through a Road Safety Audit, crash rates above the regional average, or the result of other studies or data collection efforts?

  - Special Generator: Does the location serve a special generator, such as a school, hospital, recreational site, event center, or major shopping/retail site?

  - Trail: Is the location located on a multi-use trail or protected bicycle facility?

- Potential location for a crossing depending on land use context and transit needs

  - Spacing: Is the location ≥ 1/4 mile from the nearest designated crossing?

- Location not a priority for a crossing unless supported by pedestrian count information or study documenting that a crossing is warranted (See MUTCD for pedestrian warranting criteria).
Step 2: Site Feasibility

START

Spacing from Crossings: Is the location >300' from an existing crossing?

Yes

Yielding: Is vehicle yielding to pedestrians desired at the location?

Spacing from Driveways: For mid-block crossings: Is location >100' from stop or yield-controlled side streets and driveways?

Sight Distance: Does the location have adequate site distance? (See sight distance chart)

No

Not feasible to add a crossing

Consider removing sight obstacles or implementing traffic calming to reduce stopping distances

Meets feasibility requirements
Step 3: Crossing Design

• More comprehensive treatments for higher volume, wider, faster streets

• Roadway context factors:
  • Posted speed limit
  • ADT per crossing stage
  • Number of lanes to cross at a time

• Adapted from FHWA’s Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Crossing Locations
Step 3: Crossing Design

• Crossing categories:
  • Crosswalk Markings and Signage
  • Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons
  • PHB/HAWK signal

• Encourages the use of refuge islands and road diets—fewer lanes to cross leads to less need for a HAWK signal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Crossing Lanes</th>
<th>Speed Limit</th>
<th>ADT Per Crossing Stage</th>
<th>Recommended Crossing Designs</th>
<th>Complementary Treatments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crosswalk Markings and Signage</td>
<td>RRFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One lane</td>
<td>≤ 30 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 40 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two lanes</td>
<td>≤ 30 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 40 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Crossing Lanes</td>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>ADT Per Crossing Stage</td>
<td>Crosswalk Markings and Signage</td>
<td>RRFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Lanes</td>
<td>≤ 30 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 40 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or More Lanes</td>
<td>≤ 30 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 40 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Crossing Lanes</td>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>ADT Per Crossing Stage</td>
<td>Crosswalk Markings and Signage</td>
<td>RRFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or More Lanes</td>
<td>≤ 30 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 40 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommended Crossing Designs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Crossing Lanes</th>
<th>Speed Limit</th>
<th>ADT Per Crossing Stage</th>
<th>Crosswalk Markings and Signage</th>
<th>RRFB</th>
<th>PHB</th>
<th>Stop or Yield Lines</th>
<th>In-Street Crossing Sign</th>
<th>Raised Crosswalk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two lanes</td>
<td>≤ 30 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 40 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Juan Tabo Blvd
Example: Juan Tabo Blvd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Paseo de las Montañas Trail @ Juan Tabo Blvd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Purpose Lanes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised Median/Refuge Island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Lanes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ADT</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT per Crossing Stage</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Juan Tabo Blvd

• Option 1: Keep the existing configuration and install a HAWK/PHB

• Option 2: Reduce the number of lanes and install an RRFB or HAWK/PHB
## Option 1: Keep the existing configuration and install a HAWK/PHB

### Number of Crossing Lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed Limit</th>
<th>ADT Per Crossing Stage</th>
<th>Crosswalk Markings and Signage</th>
<th>RRFB</th>
<th>PHB</th>
<th>Complementary Treatments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three Lanes</td>
<td>&lt;= 30 mph</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 mph</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;= 40 mph</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Option 2: Reduce the number of lanes and install an RRFB or HAWK/PHB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Crossing Lanes</th>
<th>Speed Limit</th>
<th>ADT Per Crossing Stage</th>
<th>Recommended Crossing Designs</th>
<th>Complementary Treatments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RRFB PHB</td>
<td>Stop or Yield Lines</td>
<td>In-Street Crossing Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two lanes</td>
<td>Crosswalk Markings and Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 30 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td>&lt;9,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 to 15,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

• Tool that can be applied widely across the City to create consistent pedestrian infrastructure and prioritize more comprehensive designs where they are most needed

• Provides nuance to national guidance by considering Albuquerque’s wide, multi-lane arterials
Questions?
City of Albuquerque Bicycle and Trails Map Update

GAATC
March 14, 2022
Updates

• Map files—new biking infrastructure
• Content and information on back of map
Process

• Outreach to planning agencies:
  • City of Albuquerque
  • MRCOG
  • Bernalillo County
  • Rio Rancho

• Public outreach
  • Survey
  • BikeABQ/GARTC

• Maps to be printed in May
Content Updates:
Changes and Additions

• Added section on bicycling events
• Added information on Vision Zero and Complete Streets
• Added information on City Trail Guides
• Updated contact information
• Replaced photos
• Condensed wording in several sections
Content Updates: Removed

• Removed bike share
• Removed bicycling code of ordinances
  • Replaced with FAQ section
BIKING IN ABQ: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

How do I report maintenance issues on the trails and bikeways?
Report maintenance issues by calling 311. You can also report online using the City’s Street Repair Request Form or by downloading the ABQ311 app.

Where can I legally ride a bicycle?
Bicyclists have the same rights and responsibilities as motorists and can ride on any City street except controlled-access roads (i.e. interstates) or streets with signs that prohibit bicycling. If a street includes a bike lane, bicyclists should ride in the bike lane except when turning, passing other bicyclists, or avoiding obstacles in the bike lane.

Where should I ride my bicycle if there is no bike lane or trail?
Bicyclists can ride in the vehicle travel lane if there is no bike lane. Bicyclists should ride on the right-hand side of the lane but can ride three feet from the curb or parked cars. For narrow roads, bicyclists can ride in the center of the lane but should move to the right when it is safe to do so. Motorists are required to give at least five feet of space when passing a bicyclist.

Can I ride a bike on the sidewalk?
Bicyclists can ride on the sidewalk only if there is no bike lane, trail, or wide bike lane to ride on. Bicyclists cannot ride on the sidewalk in business districts or where signs prohibit it. When riding on the sidewalk, bicyclists are subject to laws that apply to pedestrians and must always ride slowly, yield to pedestrians, and let people know when you are passing.

What side of the road should I ride on?
Bicyclists should ride in the same direction as traffic except on designated two-way bicycle facilities, such as sidewalks or multi-use trails. Bicyclists riding on the sidewalk should also ride in the same direction as traffic.

When do bicyclists have the right-of-way?
In general, the same right-of-way rules apply to bicyclists as motorists. Bicyclists also have the right-of-way when riding in a bike lane: motorists must yield to bicyclists when turning across a bike lane or parking. Bicyclists must yield the right-of-way to pedestrians when riding on or crossing sidewalks.

Where can I ride an e-bike?
In New Mexico, e-bikes are classified as bicycles and the same rights and responsibilities apply.

What equipment do I need to ride at night?
When riding at night, bicyclists are required to have a white front light and a red rear reflector. A red rear light can be used in addition to a rear reflector and can increase your visibility to motorists. Although not required by law, it is always a good idea to wear reflective and/or brightly colored gear when riding at night.

Do I need to wear a helmet?
Children under age 18 are legally required to wear a helmet. All riders should wear a helmet regardless of age because helmets can greatly reduce the risk of death or permanent injury in the event of a crash.

What bike helmet should I buy?
Look for bike helmets that have been certified by the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) and have a date of manufacture label. If possible, buy your helmet from a local bike shop so that you can be sure your helmet meets safety standards and is fitted properly. Always replace your helmet after a crash, even if there is no visible damage to the helmet.

*For more information on Albuquerque bicycling traffic ordinances, refer to Albuquerque Code of Ordinances § 8-0-3.
Map Updates

• Added new facilities:
  • Complete Streets restriping projects
  • New trails built by COA and Bernalillo County
  • MRCOG Long-Range Bikeway System Updates
  • Survey comments on missing bike facilities
Map Updates: Visual Changes

• Bike Route symbology
  • Routes 25 mph or below
  • Routes >25 mph
Map Updates: Visual Changes

- Wide Shoulders replaced some bike lanes that were not legally designated as bike lanes
Map Updates: Visual Changes

- Multi-use Trail Symbology

Multi-use Trail - A paved trail closed to automotive traffic
Bosque/Arroyo Trail - A paved trail along arroyo system closed to automotive traffic
Map Updates: Visual Changes

- Multi-use Trail Symbology
  - Showing side paths rather than arroyo trails
Feedback

- Wide shoulders designation
- Side path designation
- Bike route symbology
- Missing/incorrect bicycle facilities
- Email: chaley@bhinc.com
Bernalillo County Staff Update

Each calendar year Bernalillo County Public Works updates the annual Complete Streets list. This list provides pedestrian, bicycle and multi-use trail projects that Public Works is pursuing throughout the year. The 2022 annual list is attached.
January 12, 2022

To: Bernalillo County Commissioners
From: Brian Lopez, Director, Technical Services
Through: Elias Archuleta, Deputy County Manager, Public Works
CC: Richard Meadows, Technical Planning Manager

The Bernalillo County Board of Commissioners adopted a Complete Streets Ordinance (2015-21) in 2015. The ordinance requires all construction and maintenance projects on collector and arterial roadways - option in rural East Mountains - incorporate complete streets components. Improvements may include ADA accessible sidewalks, bike lanes, transit shelters, appropriate lane widths, traffic calming, pedestrian crossings, and landscaping. Some local streets where sidewalks are upgraded to meet ADA requirements are also included.

The ordinance also requires Public Works Division submit a memorandum each calendar year listing upcoming complete streets projects. The attached list identifies $63.7 million in currently funded projects by location, type, scope, cost, components, and phase of construction. Projects are funded by federal grants, capital outlay, CAP-COOP, and GO bonds.

Construction projects for this year include Bridge Boulevard phase 2, Young Avenue to Riverside Drain, La Vega Drive ADA sidewalks, Hardy Avenue to El Serano Court, and Frost Road Trail, Candy Court to Vallecitos Road. Newly funded projects for this calendar year include Transportation Program Fund (TPF) awards from NMDOT for design and construction of Blake Road, Isleta Drain to Isleta Boulevard, and design of Second Street NW, Alameda Boulevard to Fourth Street NW. Funding requests to the state are listed such as Fourth Street NW road diet, Ortega Road to Alameda Boulevard, and Alameda Drain Trail phase 5, and Bridge Boulevard/ Dolores Huerta pedestrian bridge across the Rio Grande. A new planning project considers a trail corridor along the Isleta Drain in the South Valley.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Termin/Location</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Est. Total Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Complete Street Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4th St NW</td>
<td>Ortega Rd to Alameda Blvd</td>
<td>Funding request</td>
<td>$ 5,755,765</td>
<td>CMAQ, GO Bonds ($838K)</td>
<td>Road diet, sidewalks, bike lanes, drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>Alameda Drain Trail NW</td>
<td>Ph. 4 El Pueblo Rd to Alameda Blvd</td>
<td>Design (2022) Construct (2024)</td>
<td>$ 1,700,000</td>
<td>TAP, GO Bonds ($227K)$</td>
<td>Multi-use trail, landscaping, GI/LID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>Alameda Drain Trail NW</td>
<td>Ph. 5 Alameda Blvd to 4th St</td>
<td>Funding request</td>
<td>$ 1,900,000</td>
<td>TAP, GO Bonds ($227K)</td>
<td>Multi-use trail, landscaping, GI/LID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>2nd St NW</td>
<td>Alameda Blvd to 4th St NW</td>
<td>Design (2023)</td>
<td>$ 1,052,000</td>
<td>TPF, GO Bonds ($552K)</td>
<td>Sidewalks, drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2nd St NW</td>
<td>Ph. 1 Osuna Rd to Paseo del Norte</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 450,000</td>
<td>GO Bonds$</td>
<td>ADA sidewalks$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bridge Blvd</td>
<td>Ph. 2 Young Ave to Riverside Drain</td>
<td>Construction (2022)</td>
<td>$ 8,600,000</td>
<td>STP, GO Bonds, CMAQ ($3.9M), Capital Outlay ($150K)</td>
<td>Bike lanes, ADA sidewalks$, landscaping, bus shelters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bridge Blvd</td>
<td>Ph. 3 Goff Blvd to Young Ave</td>
<td>Design (Construct 2024)</td>
<td>$ 3,900,000</td>
<td>TPF, GO Bonds ($248K)</td>
<td>Sidewalks, bike lanes, drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bridge Blvd</td>
<td>Ph. 4 Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>Funding request</td>
<td>$ 3,200,000</td>
<td>TAP, GO Bonds ($466K)</td>
<td>Multi-use trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>La Vega Dr</td>
<td>Hardy Ave to El Serano Ct</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>GO Bonds</td>
<td>ADA sidewalks$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Isleta Blvd</td>
<td>Ph. 1 Malpais Rd to Luchetti Rd</td>
<td>Design (Construct 2024)</td>
<td>$ 6,500,000</td>
<td>STP, Capital Outlay ($1.8M), GO Bonds ($580K)</td>
<td>Bike lanes, sidewalks, ADA bus stops$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sunset Rd SW</td>
<td>Ph. 2 Bridge to Trujillo</td>
<td>Design (2024) Construct (2025)</td>
<td>$ 1,700,000</td>
<td>STP, GO Bonds ($248K)</td>
<td>Sidewalks, bike lanes, drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sunset Rd SW</td>
<td>Ph. 3 Neetsie to Gonzales</td>
<td>Construct (2022)</td>
<td>$ 744,000</td>
<td>Capital Outlay ($500K)</td>
<td>Sidewalks, bike lanes, drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sunrise Rd SW</td>
<td>Ph. 2 Prosperity to Rio Bravo Blvd</td>
<td>Design (2022) Construct (2024)</td>
<td>$ 13,000,000</td>
<td>FLAP, GO Bonds ($6.2M)</td>
<td>Sidewalks, drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sunrise Rd SW</td>
<td>Ph. 6 Neetsie to Coors Blvd</td>
<td>Design (2024) Construct (2025)</td>
<td>$ 5,900,000</td>
<td>STP, GO Bonds ($880K)</td>
<td>Sidewalks, bike lanes, multi-use trail, Prince St crossing$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prosperity Ave, Prince St, William St SW</td>
<td>Ph. 1 Williams, Prosperity to Grape; Prosperity, NMRX to Williams</td>
<td>Construction (2023)</td>
<td>$ 3,500,000</td>
<td>Capital Outlay, GO Bonds</td>
<td>Add sidewalks, bike lanes, drainage, landscaping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blake Rd SW</td>
<td>Isleta Drain to Isleta Blvd</td>
<td>Design (2023) Construct (2024)</td>
<td>$ 4,250,000</td>
<td>TPF, GO Bonds ($212.5K)</td>
<td>Sidewalks, bike lanes, drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barcelona Rd SW</td>
<td>Ph. 2B Barcelona Cir to Isleta Drain</td>
<td>Construction TBD</td>
<td>$ 3,200,000</td>
<td>GO Bonds</td>
<td>Add sidewalks, bike lanes, drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barcelona Rd SW</td>
<td>Ph. 3 Isleta Drain to Coors Blvd</td>
<td>Construction (2023)</td>
<td>$ 4,300,000</td>
<td>GO Bonds</td>
<td>Add shoulders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Isleta Drain Trail Master Plan</td>
<td>Central Ave to I-25</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td>Capital Outlay, GO Bonds</td>
<td>Trail, drainage, GI/LID$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Browning St</td>
<td>PON to Eileen Dr</td>
<td>Construction (2023)</td>
<td>$ 2,100,000</td>
<td>GO Bonds</td>
<td>Add shoulders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paradise Hills Neighborhood</td>
<td>Ph. 3 additional streets</td>
<td>Construction (2023)</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>GO Bonds, CAP COOP</td>
<td>ADA sidewalks$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Frost Rd Trail</td>
<td>Ph. 2 Candy Ct to Vallecitos Rd</td>
<td>Construction (2022)</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>GO Bonds</td>
<td>Multi-use Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mountain Valley Rd Ph. 2</td>
<td>Berta Rd to Frost Rd</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>Add shoulders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 74,586,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funded</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 63,730,235</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding**

- GO Bonds – Roads, Sidewalks, and 5% Trails$ |
- TAP – Transportation Alternatives Program |
- CAP/ COOP/ SB – County Arterial/ Cooperative/ School Bus state funding |
- CMAQ – Congestion Management Air Quality Program |
- Capital Outlay – State funding |
- STP – Surface Transportation Program |
- TAP – Transportation Alternatives Program |
- FLAP – Federal Lands Access Program |
- ADAI – Americans with Disabilities Act Transit Plan projects; GI/LID$ - Green Stormwater/ Low Impact Development projects |
- HSIP – Highway Safety Improvement Program |
This information is for reference only. Bernalillo County assumes no liability for errors associated with the use of these data. Users are solely responsible for confirming data accuracy when necessary. Source data from Bernalillo County and the City of Albuquerque. For current information visit www.bernalillo.gov/public-works/gis.aspx.