Greater Albuquerque Bicycling Advisory Committee (GABAC) – AGENDA
8 February, 2021 | 4:00 – 6:00 PM
Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Notice: This meeting will be held electronically pursuant to Mayor Keller’s instructions that boards meet using virtual teleconferencing platforms.

Join Zoom Meeting (click on hyperlink below to open Zoom):
cabq.zoom.us/j/98213703516
Join by Phone: 669-900-6833 or 253 215 8782
Zoom meetings will be recorded and the chat will be saved for notetaking purposes.
*6 mute/unmute | *9 raise/lower hand

NOTICE TO PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES: If you have a disability and require special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Terra Reed at least 3 business days prior to the meeting at 505-924-3475 (voice), treed@cabq.gov (email), or by TTY at 1-800-659-8331

Welcome and Introductions
[ ] Rose McCamey
  NE Quadrant
[ ] Raul Chavira
  SE Quadrant
[ ] Dan Jensen
  NW Quadrant
[ ] Nevarez Encinas
  SW Quadrant
[ ] Josiah Hooten
  At Large
[ ] Robin Allen
  At Large
[ ] Lanny Tonning
  Unincorporated – East
---- Vacant
[ ] Richard Meadows
  Unincorporated – West
  EPC

Approval of February Meeting Agenda

Approval of January Meeting Minutes

General Announcements / Meeting Format

Public Comments (2 minute limit per audience member)
  • Please email comments to treed@cabq.gov prior to the meeting or use the virtual raise hand feature during the meeting.

Presentations
  • GABAC 14 Priority Projects Updates – Aaron Sussman, BHI
  • Project Prioritization Criteria – Aaron Sussman, BHI
  • GABAC to GAATC Transition Legislation – Petra Morris, Council Services

Staff Reports
  • Municipal Development (DMD)
    o Engineering
    o Vision Zero
  • Council Services
  • Parks and Recreation
  • Planning
  • Bernalillo County
  • MRCOG
  • NMDOT District 3

Discussion / Action Items
  • El Pueblo Updates
  • I-25 Trail/Gabaldon Crossing – Updates

Adjourn

Next Meeting: March 9 (Tuesday – Joint GABAC/GARTC Meeting)
Committee Members Present
Richard Meadows (Chair); Rose McCamey (Vice-chair); Raul Chavira; Dan Jensen; Nevarez Encinias; Josiah Hooten; Robin Allen; Lanny Tonning

Committee Members Absent

Staff Members Present
Terra Reed (DMD); Debbie Bauman (DMD); Petra Morris (Council Services); Whitney Phelan (Parks & Rec); Cheryl Somerfeldt (Parks & Rec); Carrie Barkhurst (Planning); Tara Cok (MRCOG); Julie Luna (Bernalillo County)

Visitors Present
Peter Rice (Downtown ABQ News); Christopher Ramirez (Together for Brothers, Transit Advisory Board); Mahdi Hussaini (Together for Brothers); Susan Gautsch; Rachel Stone (ABCWUA); Tom Matthews (ABCWUA); David Morris (ABCWUA); Aaron Sussman (BHI); Bradyn Nicholson (BHI)

Call to Order
• Richard Meadows called the meeting to order at 4:01 PM

Approval of February Meeting Agenda
• Add short presentation from ABCWUA at the beginning of presentations.
  • Ms. McCamey (motion); Ms. Allen (second) – approved unanimously

Approval of January Meeting Minutes
• Ms Allen (motion); Mr. Tonning (second) – approved unanimously

General Announcements / Meeting Format
• Virtual GABAC meetings are recorded for notetaking purposes.
• If calling in to Zoom on your phone (dialing, not app), *6 to mute/unmute and *9 to raise/lower virtual hand.

Public Comments (2 minute limit per audience member)
• Susan – working on an e-bike business and interested in e-bike regulations (Free to Roam)
• Christopher – Together for Brothers has an open application for youth biking cohort – 5 weeks virtual program. Funded by NM Outdoor Equity Fund. If applicants don’t have a bike, we will provide one.
• Nevarez (Navy) Encinias – new GABAC member. Dancer, performer, teacher (UNM, Yjastros). Gave up driving a car about 2 years ago after spending a summer in Copenhagen.
• Gunnar – I-25 Overpass becoming a major safety hazard for cyclists and walkers. Submitted multiple 311 requests, but generally getting the runaround – sent to NMDOT, but haven’t gotten any information from them.
  ○ Ms. McCamey – have been asking about this for about a year.
• Ms. Phelan (Parks & Recreation) – working on a memo regarding capacity for repairs. Recommend continuing to submit 311 requests and direct to Parks Management. Will share more information as it is available.

Presentations

North Diversion Channel Trail project (ABCWUA)

• David Morris, Public Affairs; Rachel Stone, Communications; Tom Matthews, Project Manager.
• Temporary closure on NDC for valve installation. Expect completion by early March.
• Detour in place [see attached map]. Project Manager rode the detour – not ideal but the best we could do.
• Notice was limited because funding became available unexpectedly and project was fast-tracked to be complete before the spring watering season.
• Open to suggestions on detour and suggestions about how we can better connect with bicycling community in the future.
• Ms. McCamey: where does the closure start and end?
  ○ Hard closure at bridge north of I-2h – diverted back north to Singer Blvd. From South, closure at Hahn Arroyo – detour uses Hahn Arroyo, Washington, crosses Montgomery (walk on sidewalk), Jefferson (ok except at I-25 crossing).
  ○ Can adjust north end of detour to start at Singer to avoid loop.
• Ms. McCamey: will the project definitely be done by March 8?
  ○ Can’t guarantee, but if there are no unforeseen circumstances, may be complete earlier. So far, project is on/ahead of schedule.
• Mr. Jensen: process question – when committee members have questions/issues, when/how should we bring them up? Have a question about a different ABCWUA project.
  ○ Committee members can email Ms. Reed (treed@cabq.gov) with questions/issues to add to the agenda.
  ○ Urgent ABCWUA issues can go through 842-WATR (ABCWUA isn’t part of 311 system). Questions about this or other projects can go through Ms. Reed or be sent to Rachel Stone rstone@abcwua.org.

14 Priority Gap Closure Projects (Aaron Sussman, BHI)

• BHI under contract to review GABAC’s 14 gap projects.
• Status updates for 14 projects [see attached map and table].
• Additional updates from staff:
  ○ Paseo del Norte (Calle Nortena to Rainbow Rd) – under contract with WH Pacific. It will take a while to identify available ROW and ROW needs. As that information becomes available and the project moves toward design, will update the committee.
  ○ Unser – under contract for design by Parametrix. Just got started on ROW analysis and survey. Will share updates as they are available.
  ○ Alexander Blvd – not on the list, but was identified as a project in the I-25 Accessibility study that would help address the difficult crossing of Montgomery near I-25. Strong candidate for road diet. Project is in design and fully funded for construction. NMDOT has to approve design and then the project will moving forward (approval expected by June 2021) and hope to move forward later this year.
Mr. Ramirez (guest): How are decisions made about funding projects? Why does it seem that only areas of higher income are being completed vs. projects in neighborhoods where we should be addressing equity and historical disparities?
  ○ A number of considerations, including available funding in different areas. Also note that this list of projects came from the Bikeways and Trails Facility Plan list of “critical links” (in some areas, gaps may not have been identified in areas where bikeways and trails are already few and far between) and was put together by GABAC members who may have had particular areas of focus. GABAC members are encouraged to continue to advocate for projects that may not have been identified through past efforts.

Mr. Sussman to update the map and table based on discussion (attachments)

Prioritization Criteria (Aaron Sussman, BHI)

- BHI has been asked to develop an evaluation process to help the City identify and prioritize projects [see attached presentation and memo (memo revised after meeting based on discussion)]. Once criteria have been identified, BHI will apply criteria to GABAC 14 priority gap closure projects and recommendations from the I-25 corridor study.
- Draft criteria (more detail in attached memo):
  ○ Facility improvements
  ○ Connectivity
  ○ Safety
  ○ Current level of use
  ○ Transportation equity
  ○ Land use context
  ○ Additional considerations: technical/engineering feasibility and magnitude of cost.

Discussion
  ○ Ms. Bauman (DMD staff): is available right-of-way part of the criteria?
    ▪ Apparent ROW would be part of the technical/engineering feasibility consideration.
  ○ Mr. Tonning: There are a lot of political considerations as well that influence what kinds of projects get funded and where. There are other important needs in different Council districts and bike facilities may not be a priority – not always up to the engineers.
    ▪ This tool is intended to help provide input and help advocate for the most effective bike projects when there is funding available. Also brings transparency to the process.

- BHI staff led meeting participants through an exercise on menti.com to help determine how to weight the different criteria. Participants were also given the opportunity to participate via the zoom (chat or out loud) [see attached memo with an overview of responses to the activity].
- BHI will work on finalizing the criteria and applying them to projects and present at April GABAC meeting.

GABAC – GAATC Transition (Petra Morris, Council Services)

- In November 2020, GABAC voted to incorporate active transportation into the scope of the committee. Staff sent out a draft of the legislation for Council prior to the meeting for GABAC members to review and share comments [see attached].
• Particularly want to focus today on the transition from the current committee structure to the new structure. GABAC members were asked for the feedback on the proposed roles (bicyclist, individuals with a disability, transit user, pedestrian, older adults, youth, active transportation user – unincorporated county, active transportation user – city, EPC) and what role they feel they might be able to represent.
  ○ Ms. Allen: looks good.
  ○ Mr. Meadows: GARTC has a similar structure – are they able to keep positions filled? Concern that we won't be able to fill all of the roles.
    ▪ Has generally worked for GARTC – there are some positions that aren't always filled. This structure means that the representation and ideas are diverse.
  ○ Mr. Jensen: I like the approach of representing different types of users, but we are a very large city and may lose some of our regional focus. How do we address the needs of different parts of the City? For example, pedestrian infrastructure in the NW part of the city is horrible, but that may not be the case in other parts of the city. The needs of people in different parts of the city are very different. There may be unintended consequences of trading one good (regionalism) for representing diverse types of users.
    ▪ We can wait to make a decision at a future meeting – GABAC members are encouraged to review and send comments to Ms. Morris and Ms. Reed for a decision in April.
  ○ Mr. Meadows: There is already an ADA Committee and a Transit Advisory Board – are these roles duplicative?
    ▪ Those committees don't have input on infrastructure/ROW projects, so having that representation on the committee would be different from what those committees do.

Staff Reports

• Municipal Development (DMD)
  ○ Engineering (Debbie Bauman)
    ▪ No additional updates.
  ○ Vision Zero (Terra Reed)
    ▪ Draft VZ Action Plan will go to the Administration next week.
    ▪ Scoping a project on Louisiana (Gibson to Zuni) – first quick build/interim design project. Will present to GABAC when project is a little farther along.
    ▪ Developing a VZ marketing campaign – may reach out to GABAC for input as that process moves forward.

• Council Services
• Parks and Recreation (Whitney Phelan)
  ○ Copper Trail (Eubank to Daniel Webster Park – complete and doing inspection later this week. Still working on landscape design – construction should start in March.
    ▪ People are using the new trail, but not cleaning up after dogs. Councilor looking into funding Mutt-mitt stations.
  ○ Crack seal on Paseo de la Mesa complete. Installing a 10 ft. crusher fine trail to connect Paseo de la Mesa trail to Atrisco Vista. Not sure when it will be complete, but it is forthcoming.

• Planning (Carrie Barkhurst)
No report – will present on Bikeways and Trails Facility Plan at March joint meeting.

- **Bernalillo County (Julie Luna)**
  - Provided Bernalillo County updates. Once per year, staff provides Commission with a list of upcoming complete streets list [see attached]. Mix of long-term projects, design, etc. but helpful to highlight what is coming.
  - Mr. Meadows: Highlight the Isleta Drain Trail project that County is working on an RFP for.
    - Alameda Drain Trail filled an important system gap in the North Valley – multi-agency project.
    - Similar gap in the South Valley and County is starting a process to engage with community to identify locations along the Isleta Drain (Central to I-25). Looking for opportunities to reach out and get input on the process (like the City’s Community Planning Area assessments).

- **MRCOG (Tara Cok)**
  - 2020 Bike to Work Day survey is complete and posted online. Different from past years because it was a week-long even in September.
  - Mr. Meadows: Are we planning BTWD for May?
    - Ms. Reed will follow up, but unlikely that it will be safe to do an event in May. May be able to use similar online tools as we used last year, but don’t think any efforts have been made to order swag in preparation for a May event.

- **NMDOT District 3**
  - Staff not available, but Ms. Reed checked in on projects of interest.
    - Montgomery/I-25 project – NMDOT is starting over with a new project – no information available until a contract is in place (may take a few months).
    - Tramway overpasses – no updates.
    - El Pueblo – many barriers to making progress. BNSF not open to work in the 25 ft. buffer area. NMDOT may look at trail realignment, but that is unlikely to happen in the near future. May need to focus on discouraging people from riding in this area.
      - Mr. Tonning: Los Lunas has done a good job of aligning trails and rail lines.
      - Ms. McCamey: Are there opportunities for better signage?
        - Ms. Reed: Encourage GABAC members to provide some examples of how to improve signage. City is also thinking about ways to update the interactive bike/trail map to be more responsive. Ideas about the map can be sent to Ms. Reed.
      - Mr. Jensen: Bicyclists sometimes overestimate skill level – relying on people to follow the signage and understand the need to be safe.
      - Ms. Morris: Could we use public art on the trail/roadway?
        - Wouldn’t be allowed because of the 25 ft. buffer and may be more distracting.

**Discussion / Action Items**

- Bike Boulevard speeds – there is interest in changing the speed limits on bike boulevards. That change is not imminent and GABAC will be consulted when it comes up.
- I-40/Gabaldon Crossing – met with Bernalillo County. Identified potential funding sources for longer term improvements. In the short-term, the County was going to send someone out to
clear overgrowth that was blocking signage. City Parks & Rec will be replacing signage on the trail that had been moved.

Adjourn

- *Mr. Tonning (motion) – approved unanimously.* Meeting adjourned at 5:57 PM.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 9 4:00-6:00 PM
CONSTRUCTION NOTIFICATION
North Diversion Trail Temporary Closure
Griegos CAV Rehab (2320.01104)

Work is underway to rehabilitate valves along a portion of the North Diversion Channel Trail. For the safety of pedestrians/cyclists/runners and the construction crews, a portion of the North Diversion Trail will be closed and rerouted until March 8. Please see the included detour map.

This project has a scheduled completion date of March 8, but as with all construction projects this timetable is subject to change. Any changes to this construction schedule will be communicated as soon as new information becomes available.

It is important to us to work as safely as possible for the crews and the community. Please use caution and obey all construction signage, slow down your speed, and allow for extra time to reach your destination.

Have questions and concerns? Please contact:

- Tom Matthews, Water Authority, Project Manager, 505-289-3241, tmatthews@abcwua.org
- Rachel Stone, Water Authority, Communications Specialist, 505-289-3071, rstone@abcwua.org
- Danny Montaño, New Mexico Underground Utilities, 505-401-2187 or 505-877-2300
- Emergencies and After-hours please call 505-842-WATR (9287)

(Note: All work is weather permitting and subject to change without notice)

Thank you for your patience while we improve Albuquerque’s infrastructure
## GABAC Priority Gap Closure Projects

Priority list identified in January 2019; projects originally included in Bikeways & Trails Facilities Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor / Location</th>
<th>Project Limits</th>
<th>Proposed Project Type</th>
<th>Current Facility</th>
<th>GABAC List Designation</th>
<th>BTFP No. (p. 72)</th>
<th>Status (February 2021)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blake Rd</td>
<td>Unser Blvd to Arenal Main Channel</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>No facilities</td>
<td>Highly viable</td>
<td>#91</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Blvd / Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>River to Yale Blvd</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>No facilities</td>
<td>Highly viable</td>
<td>#114</td>
<td>City to conduct feasibility study along corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave</td>
<td>Entire corridor</td>
<td>Bike lanes: west of Downtown, buffered bike lanes: East of Louisiana Blvd, west of 86th St</td>
<td>Bike lanes in some places; no facilities in other locations</td>
<td>Highly viable</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>East Central Safety Studies ongoing; bike lanes installed in some places during ART project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Ave</td>
<td>Richmond Dr to Moon St</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
<td>Highly viable</td>
<td>#12</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Ranch Rd</td>
<td>Irving Blvd to Coors Blvd</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
<td>Moderately viable</td>
<td>#7</td>
<td>Bike lanes installed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-25/Montgomery</td>
<td>Interchange/ North Diversion Channel to Renaissance</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>No facilities</td>
<td>Time sensitive</td>
<td>#72</td>
<td>NMDOT in negotiations with consultant for design - construction in 2023; Bike lanes and road diet on Alexander Blvd in 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-40 Trail</td>
<td>Gaps along trail</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>No facilities</td>
<td>Moderately viable</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving Blvd</td>
<td>Unser Blvd to Golf Course Rd</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>No facilities</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>#10-11</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble Ave</td>
<td>Texas St to Utah St</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
<td>Highly viable</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Diversion Trail</td>
<td>4th St to Balloon Fiesta Park</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>No facilities</td>
<td>Moderately viable</td>
<td>#51</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paseo del Norte</td>
<td>Rainbow Blvd to Calle Nortena</td>
<td>Buffered bike lanes</td>
<td>No facilities</td>
<td>Moderately viable</td>
<td>#25-26</td>
<td>Design work in progress, including available right-of-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Blvd</td>
<td>Central Ave to Mountain Rd</td>
<td>LRBS: TBD</td>
<td>No facilities</td>
<td>Time sensitive</td>
<td>#19</td>
<td>Design and construction to occur in 2021-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro Dr</td>
<td>Zuni Rd to Menaul Blvd</td>
<td>Buffered bike lanes</td>
<td>No facilities</td>
<td>Highly viable</td>
<td>#75</td>
<td>Road diet/Bike lanes installed between Lomas and Haines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unser Blvd</td>
<td>Paradise Blvd to Atrisco Dr</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Moderately viable</td>
<td>#38</td>
<td>Consultant under contract for design work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Bikeway Project Evaluation Process for the City of Albuquerque

Greater Albuquerque Bicycling Advisory Committee

February 8, 2021
Purpose/Benefits of Evaluation Process

• Objective, transparent tool for prioritizing bikeway projects
• Flexible process that can be applied to a variety of project types
• Support Vision Zero and other City policy objectives
• Consider project benefits alongside project cost and technical feasibility
Application of Bikeway Project Evaluation Process

• GABAC Priority Gap Closure Projects
  ▪ List of 14 projects developed January 2019
  ▪ Originally identified in the Bikeways & Trails Facilities Plan

• I-25 Bicycle Accessibility Study
  ▪ Evaluated crossings from Menaul Blvd to Tramway Blvd
  ▪ Considered feasibility of projects identified in LRBS
  ▪ Project recommendations
Evaluation Criteria

- Consider range of **project benefits**
- Mix of quantitative and qualitative criteria
- Apply weighting factors to highlight key criteria

1. Facility Improvements
2. Connectivity
3. Safety
4. Current Level of Use
5. Transportation Equity
6. Land Use Context
Criteria #1: Facility Improvements

Purpose

• Evaluate change in bicyclist user comfort level
• Contrast existing conditions against proposed improvements

Methodology

• Bicycle Level of Service Analysis:
  ▪ Projects rated on scale from A to F
  ▪ Inputs include bikeway infrastructure type and roadway conditions
Criteria #2: Connectivity

Purpose

• Highlight projects that provide connections between bicycle routes and access to key destinations

• Prioritize projects that fill in gaps in the network

Methodology

• Network improvements
  ▪ Fills a gap in the network
  ▪ New connections to existing routes
  ▪ Access underserved areas
  ▪ Improved existing route

• Access to major destinations (schools, parks, community centers, cultural sites etc.)
Criteria #3: Safety

**Purpose**
- Highlight projects that provide new or improved facilities where high crash rates are observed
- Enhanced bikeways are likely to improve safety outcomes

**Methodology**
- Project location along the High Fatal and Injury Network
- Rate of vehicle crashes along the corridor
- Rate of bicyclist-involved crashes along the corridor
Criteria #4: Current Level of Use

**Purpose**
- Consider benefits of bikeway improvements to existing users
- Ideal projects are located along facilities with low levels of user comfort and high levels of current users

**Methodology**
- Average monthly Strava users
- MRCOG bicycle counts, where available
Criteria #5: Equity

Purpose
• Providing quality transportation infrastructure for all residents improves access to jobs and services and supports healthy lifestyles
• Consider project location and characteristics of area residents

Methodology
• Vulnerable Communities metric (identified for Vision Zero efforts)
• Considerations for the project area include:
  ▪ Median household income
  ▪ Vehicle ownership rates compared to City average
Criteria #6: Land Use Context

Purpose
• Highlight projects that support development goals from the Comprehensive Plan
• Support multi-modal infrastructure in critical locations
• Create additional transportation options

Methodology
• Project located in or provides access to a designated Center
• Employment activity within 1-mile buffer of project area
Other Considerations: Technical/Engineering Feasibility

• Consider issues or obstacles that may prevent implementation
• Important to contrast feasibility against project benefits
• Projects may be high benefit, but technically challenging
• Qualitative assessment – Low, Medium, High
Other Considerations: Project Cost

• Project cost is a major consideration in project development and can be a significant constraint
• Costs can be contrasted against project benefits
• Magnitude of costs assessment – Low, Medium, High
Summary: Project Benefits vs. Other Considerations

- Provide means for decision-making based on multiple factors
- Important to recognize that projects may be pursued depending on feasibility as well as benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Overall Project Benefits</th>
<th>Project Costs</th>
<th>Technical Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weighting Exercise

- GABAC and staff input to determine which project benefits criteria should be weighted most heavily
- Adjustment factors to be applied to project scores and shared in next GABAC meeting (April 2021)
GABAC Meeting (2/8) Weighting Poll Results

Prepared by Bohannan Huston
February 10, 2021

Description

During the February 8, 2021 meeting for the Greater Albuquerque Bicycling Advisory Committee, BHI and City staff administered an interactive poll to identify the top three criteria that should be weighted most heavily in the proposed bikeway evaluation process. This memo identifies the results of the polling efforts. In total, 17 individuals participated, including eight representatives of GABAC, seven public agency staff, and two members of the general public.

Summary Takeaways

Overall, respondents overwhelmingly ranked Safety (n=14), Transportation Equity (n=13), and Connectivity (n=13) as the top three criteria that should be weighted most heavily. When separating responses by type of participant, these priorities generally remained at the top of the list. GABAC members ranked Safety as the highest priority (n=8) followed by Transportation Equity (n=6) and Connectivity (n=5). Among public agency staff, Transportation Equity and Connectivity were top of the list (n=6) followed by Safety (n=5). Two members of the public also participated in the interactive poll, with both participants indicating that Connectivity should be prioritized.

As BHI moves forward with the bikeway evaluation process, Safety, Transportation Equity, and Connectivity will receive higher priority compared to other criteria.

Overall Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Equity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Improvements</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level of Use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Context</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GABAC Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Equity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level of Use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Context</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Agency Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Equity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Improvements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Context</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level of Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Evaluation Process for Bikeway Facilities in the City of Albuquerque

Prepared by Bohannan Huston

February 9, 2021 – Revised based on input for GABAC and City staff

Purpose & Overview

This memorandum proposes a set of criteria for evaluating and prioritizing bikeway-specific projects in the City of Albuquerque. The set of evaluation criteria outlined below will be presented to the Greater Albuquerque Bicycling Advisory Committee (GABAC) for feedback. A key outcome of working with GABAC will be to identify weighting values for each criterion. Evaluation criteria include:

- Facility Improvements
- Connectivity
- Safety
- Current Level of Use
- Transportation Equity
- Land Use Context

The section below describes the purpose or rationale for each criterion and the methodology for evaluation. Evaluation criteria can be understood as assessing overall project benefits and are linked to City policies identified in the Comprehensive Plan and Vision Zero efforts. The process is intended to be flexible so that it may be applied to a range of bikeway improvement projects. It is important to note that not all projects will score high in all categories and that certain criteria may not apply to all projects. Rather, the purpose is to provide a consistent and objective data-driven process that provides information needed for selecting projects for final design and/or implementation.

The evaluation process will rely on a variety of existing datasets from the City and MRCOG, including crash data, the Vision Zero vulnerable communities metric, the Long Range Bikeway System, and the High Fatal Injury Network. Existing conditions data from the Mid-Region Council of Governments, American Community Survey, Strava, and measurements of street design elements will also be utilized to evaluate location conditions.

To complement the assessment of project benefits, this memorandum proposes that technical/engineering feasibility and magnitude of costs also be considered as part of the project evaluation process. These considerations reflect the reality that project decision-making is constrained by issues such as available-right-of-way and available funding. These assessments may
be qualitative and should be utilized for purposes of planning and decision-making. Precise cost estimates and a full assessment of engineering challenges are generally identified through a dedicated study or design phase and therefore, are not included as part of this evaluation process.

As a first step towards greater application, the evaluation criteria will be applied to a list of priority gap closure projects identified by GABAC in 2019. These projects were initially identified in the Bikeways & Trails Facilities Plan, completed in 2015. The evaluation criteria will also be applied to projects identified in the I-25 Bicycle Accessibility Study, which considered potential improvements to on-street crossings of I-25 between Menaul Blvd and Tramway Blvd, as well as new crossings of I-25 proposed in the Long Range Bikeway System. Subsequently, the evaluation criteria may be applied more broadly to projects identified in the Bikeways & Trails Facilities Plan or other priority bikeway projects lists.

**Evaluation Criteria**

**Facility Improvements**

**Definition/Purpose**
This criterion quantifies project benefits from the standpoint of change in bicycle user comfort. A bikeway project may create new facilities where none currently exist or improve/upgrade existing facilities through wider bikeways, buffers, additional signage and/or striping, and more. Existing facilities can be compared to proposed facilities, as identified in the Long Range Bikeway System (LRBS).

**Methodology**

**Description**
*Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) analysis* will be completed for existing on-street bikeways using roadway characteristics, including number of lanes, median type, average daily traffic (ADT), travel and bike lane widths, and speed limit. This same LOS assessment will be conducted for proposed bicycle facilities, where points will be awarded based on the difference between LOS for existing and proposed conditions. If no facilities are identified in the Long Range Bikeway System or specified in the proposed project description, the project will be assumed to include 5’ bike lanes. The Bicycle LOS analysis will utilize the methodology identified in the National Cooperative Highway Research Program publication *Multi-modal Level of Service Analysis for Urban Streets* (2008).

A qualitative scale can also be applied to assess the magnitude of benefits of bikeway improvements for trail projects based on the level of separation between bicyclists and motorists, use of vertical barriers, and other factors.

**Assessment**
- Bicycle LOS – existing and proposed conditions
• General bikeway improvement scale

**Connectivity**

**Definition/Purpose**
A safe and convenient bicycle network relies on connections between bicycle routes and access to key destinations. Projects that improve bicyclist circulation to the surrounding network by creating new or improving upon existing connections should be prioritized over others. In particular, there are substantial mobility benefits that result from enhancing trail connections or filling in gaps within the existing network, as these improvements increase bicycle travel efficiency. Another factor for bicycle connectivity is ensuring access to major destinations and services, such as schools, community centers, parks, and libraries. Activity centers and areas with high levels of employment are considered as part of the Land Use Context criterion.

**Methodology**

**Description**
Bikeway improvement projects will be evaluated on the type of network improvements that are facilitated as a result of the project, including whether it fills in an existing gap, extends or connects to an existing route, creates an entirely new route, or if it improves an existing bike route (such as upgrading a bike route to a bike boulevard). Access to major destinations will be assessed using a 1-mile radius around the project route. Destinations include:

- K-12 Schools – public and private
- University of New Mexico
- Central New Mexico Community College, including all branch campuses
- Vocational schools and private universities
- Community centers
- Hospitals/medical clinics
- Parks and open spaces greater than 10 acres
- Park and ride facilities
- Museums
- Libraries

**Assessment**

- Network improvements
  - Fills a gap in the network between existing facilities
  - Provides new connections to existing routes
  - Expands network to currently underserved areas
  - Improves existing route
- Access to major destinations
Safety

Definition/Purpose
Expanded bikeways is an important part of the City's commitment to Vision Zero, which sets a goal of zero fatalities and serious injuries by 2040. This criterion ensures that consideration is given to the way roadway conditions affect current users, and highlights projects that provide new or improved facilities where high crash rates are observed. Bicyclists are more vulnerable to crashes involving motor vehicles, making quality infrastructure that reduces conflicts between vehicles and bicyclists/pedestrians a priority. The inclusion of safety as an evaluation criterion is based on the general premise that enhanced bikeways are likely to improve safety outcomes and that bikeways are especially important in locations that currently have high numbers of crashes.

Methodology

Description
Safety considerations are based on crash data for the project location, including whether a bikeway project is located along the High Fatal Injury Network (HFIN). The HFIN considers locations with high numbers of severe crashes, as compared to the City overall. Additional considerations will be given to the rate of vehicle crashes and bicycle-involved crashes overall. Project locations with crash rates above the regional average will receive additional points in the evaluation process. Analysis will utilize the most recent crash data available from MRCOG.

Qualitative consideration should also be given to the roadway design characteristics. Though design issues such as poor sight distance are difficult to incorporate into a standardized evaluation process, such issues should be noted when selecting bikeway improvements. Similarly, evaluation of top contributing factors for crashes for all projects is impractical as part of the evaluation process, though sources of crashes should be considered during project design.

Assessment
- Project location along the High Fatal and Injury Network
- Rate of vehicle crashes along the corridor
- Rate of bicyclist-involved crashes along the corridor

Current Level of Use

Definition/Purpose
The current level of use provides an indication of the benefits that a bikeway improvement may provide to existing users. Ideal projects may be located along facilities with low levels of user comfort and high numbers of current users. It is important to note the limitations associated with current tools for measuring levels of use. The principal dataset available is Strava, which records trips among users of the app. There is a level of bias that should be noted when looking at Strava data since it is used more widely by more confident bicyclists. However, Strava data has been demonstrated to record a meaningful sample of total bicycle trips, and the data provides insights.
into bicycle travel patterns and the magnitude of usage among different routes. MRCOG also maintains a bicycle counts program, though the locations where data is collected are limited. Given data limitations, the current level of use should be considered in combination with other criteria that assess potential benefits to new users.

**Methodology**

**Description**

Evaluation is based on the average monthly Strava users and MRCOG bicycle counts, where available, for the project area. Citywide Strava data is available by road and trail segment. Each segment will be assigned a user level value (low, medium, or high), depending on the observed levels of use. The evaluation process will consider the average number of users across the project area, with points awarded based on the average user level value.

**Assessment**

- Strava data
- MRCOG bicycle counts program

**Transportation Equity**

**Definition/Purpose**

Equity entails providing fair and just opportunities for all. Bicycling may be the only transportation option available for some residents and providing quality transportation infrastructure for all residents is a critical means of improving access to jobs and services and supporting healthy lifestyles. This criterion will consider whether individual bikeway improvement projects provide benefits to communities that are likely to depend more on bicycling as a means of transportation.

**Methodology**

**Description**

Projects that provide infrastructure improvements in communities for which additional transportation options are particularly critical, including households below area median income or where vehicle ownership rates are below the City average. Project scoring will be based on the Vision Zero Vulnerable Communities metric, which compiles data at the census tract level and can be used to assess characteristics of the population in the project location.

**Assessment**

- Vulnerable Communities metric (identified for Vision Zero efforts)
Land Use Context

Definition/Purpose
Various City and regional policies assert that transportation infrastructure should support the surrounding land use context. Transportation investments can also influence future development patterns. By considering land use context, this criterion supports development goals from the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan (Comprehensive Plan) that call for multi-modal infrastructure in critical locations and the creation of additional transportation options.

Methodology

Description
Land use context will be evaluated based on Corridor and Center designations for the project location and the level of employment activity. The Comprehensive Plan identifies a series of designated Centers where development should be concentrated and where trips can be made easily by walking or biking. In addition, these Centers should be linked together through a range of transportation options. Projects that provide direct access to or support travel within a Center will be highlighted in the evaluation process.

In addition to land use designations, the evaluation process will consider the level of employment activity within a vicinity of the project area. Employment serves as a proxy for activity along the route and the level of bicycling trips that may be generated if infrastructure were improved. The calculation of employment levels will be based on a 1-mile buffer around the project and data from the Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics data from the US Census Bureau.

Assessment
- Corridor and Center designations from the Comprehensive Plan; project located in or provides access to a Center
- Employment activity within 1-mile buffer of project area
Other Considerations

Purpose
Two other factors – technical/engineering feasibility and magnitude of costs – can be considered alongside project benefits in the evaluation process as they directly influence project implementation. In particular, feasibility and cost may be understood as indicators of the resources required to construct a project, rather than as indicators of project merits. Ultimately, decision-making regarding project development will depend on both project benefits and available resources, which may preclude the implementation of high-priority projects. Demonstration of magnitude of costs and feasibility issues may also be used to demonstrate the need to obtain additional resources for implementation. The example table below provides an overview of how this would be incorporated into the evaluation of bikeway projects.

Example Table of Project Benefits and Other Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Project Benefits</th>
<th>Magnitude of Costs</th>
<th>Technical Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical/Engineering Feasibility

Definition/Purpose
Technical and engineering challenges are important factors in the design of bikeway facilities. An initial screening of a project location may reveal issues or obstacles that may prevent implementation, including whether a project would easily fit within the current roadway footprint, whether apparent right-of-way is available, and if technical challenges are likely to arise, such as median relocations or conflicts at intersections.

Methodology

Description
Projects may be considered to have a higher level of feasibility if desired improvements could reasonably be implemented within the existing curblines or if the roadway has been identified by
The determination of technical/engineering feasibility is a generally qualitative assessment and projects will be assigned a value of low, medium, or high.

Factors that will be evaluated to determine the technical/engineering feasibility of a bikeway project include:

- Proposed bikeway type and general roadway width requirements
- Apparent right-of-way
- Width from curb-to-curb
- Presence of medians
- Signalized intersections
- Business access and driveways
- Identified road diet candidate

**Assessment**

- Qualitative assessment of engineering feasibility
- Presence on MRCOG network of potential road diet candidates

**Magnitude of Cost**

**Definition/Purpose**
The overall purpose of identifying the relative magnitude of cost will be to provide insight into the resources required to be able to complete a bikeway project. The cost of implementing a proposed bikeway project is based on both the type of project and any technical challenges or unique improvements associated with a project location. It is also important to differentiate technical feasibility from costs. For example, some projects may be highly feasible yet expensive to implement. Other projects may be particularly costly to construct, though right-of-way or land ownership may not be issues.

**Methodology**
An assessment of low, medium, or high may be applied to projects based on engineering judgment and the general costs associated with different project types, such as bike lane or trail installation, plus additional costs related to roadway or intersection improvements. The magnitude of project costs will be determined on a per-mile basis.

---

1 Road diet candidates are based on justifications for roadway narrowing and the ability to accommodate bikeway facilities including traffic volumes, number of lanes, frequency of driveways, number of intersections, and potential conflict points.
CITY of ALBUQUERQUE
TWENTY FOURTH COUNCIL

COUNCIL BILL NO. ________________ ENACTMENT NO. ________________

SPONSORED BY:

1 ORDINANCE
2 AMENDING THE SCOPE OF THE GREATER ALBUQUERQUE BICYCLING
3 ADVISORY COMMITTEE, § 2-6-15 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, TO
4 INCLUDE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION USERS, AND AMENDING THE TITLE OF
5 THE COMMITTEE TO BE THE GREATER ALBUQUERQUE ACTIVE
6 TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.
7
8 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL, THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF
9 ALBUQUERQUE:
10
11 SECTION 1: Findings and Intent. The City Council hereby finds that:
12
13 1. WHEREAS, the Greater Albuquerque Bicycling Advisory Committee
14 (GABAC) was established by Ordinance 2-6-15 in 1994 to represent and
15 advise the City on safe bicycling facilities on behalf of the on-street
16 cycling community within the Albuquerque area; and
17
18 2. WHEREAS, the Greater Albuquerque Recreational Trails Committee
19 (GARTC) was established by Ordinance 2-6-17 in ** to represent and
20 advise the City on the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians
21 along off-street trails; and
22
23 3. WHEREAS, the Americans with Disabilities Act Advisory Council was
24 established by Ordinance 2-6-5 in ** to represent and advise the City on
25 the needs of people with disabilities; and
26
27 4. WHEREAS, the Transit Advisory Board was established by Ordinance **
28 in ** to advise the City Transit Department on the development and
29 promotion of public transit services; and
30
31 5. WHEREAS, no City board, committee, or commission explicitly
32 considers all of the non-vehicular users of on street facilities; and
6. WHEREAS, Active Transportation is defined as any self-propelled, human-powered mode of transportation, such as walking, bicycling, or using mobility devices; and

7. WHEREAS, the 2015 Bikeways and Trails Facility plan recommended restructuring of GABAC and GARTC in order to consider concerns beyond those of just the bicycling community; and

8. WHEREAS, the City’s Vision Zero initiative is a commitment to create safer streets for all, regardless of our age or ability, whether we are walking, riding a bicycle, using a mobility device, driving, or taking transit; and

9. WHEREAS, the City adopted a Complete Streets ordinance in 2015 (F/S O-14-27), and updated the ordinance in 2019 (O-19-64), recommending the formation of an active transportation advisory committee to address issues of safety, public health, the environment, and equity for pedestrians and cyclists using City streets; and

10. WHEREAS, at the October 2020 GABAC meeting, GABAC passed a resolution calling for the adoption by ordinance of a reorganization of GABAC to address not only the needs of on-street cyclists but those of pedestrians and other non-automotive road users in ways that ensure equitable and safe facilities throughout the Albuquerque area.

SECTION 2. Section §2-6-15 of ROA 1994 is hereby amended to read as follows:

“§ 2-6-15 CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE’S [GREATER ALBUQUERQUE BICYCLING ADVISORY COMMITTEE] [GREATER ALBUQUERQUE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE].

(A) Appointment.

(1) The Mayor, with the advice and consent of the Council, shall appoint nine members of an advisory committee to be known as the City of Albuquerque’s [Greater Albuquerque Bicycling Advisory Committee.] [Greater Albuquerque Active Transportation Committee. (GAATC).] The members shall be appointed by the city in the following manner:
(a) [One member to represent the city area north of I-40 and east of I-25.] [One member to represent bicyclists.]

(b) [One member to represent the city area south of I-40 and east of I-25.] [One member to represent individuals with a disability.]

(c) [One member to represent the city area north of I-40 and west of I-25.] [One member to represent transit users.]

(d) [One member to represent the city area south of I-40 and west of I-25.] [One member to represent pedestrians.]

(e) [Two at-large members.] [One member to represent older adults (over 60 years of age).]

[(f) One member to represent youth voices (under 24 years of age).] [(f)] [(g)] [One member to represent the unincorporated areas of Bernalillo County east of the Rio Grande.] [One member to represent Active Transportation users in unincorporated areas of Bernalillo County].

[(g)] [(h)] [One member to represent the unincorporated areas of Bernalillo County west of the Rio Grande.] [One member to represent Active Transportation users in the city].

[(h)] [(i)] One member to represent the city’s Environmental Planning Commission.

(2) Each member shall understand and represent the needs of [citizens] residents, particularly [bicyclists.] [Active Transportation users.] [within the geographic area which that member represents].

[(3) For the purposes of the GAATC, Active Transportation is defined as any self-propelled, human-powered mode of transportation, such as walking, bicycling, or using mobility devices.] [(3)] [(4)] In voting, in the case of a tie, a motion shall be deemed defeated.

(B) Duties, Responsibilities, Powers. The Committee shall:

(1) Advise [the city] [City departments and other governmental entities] including but not limited to its [Department of Municipal Development (DMD), Parks & Recreation,] Environmental Planning Commission [(EPC)], Bernalillo County, the Mid Region Council of Governments, [and] the New Mexico Department of Transportation, [and other governmental entities]
concerning plans, projects[,] and programs [in the greater Albuquerque area] for bikeways, [sidewalks, street crossings, and on-street multi use trails] including but not limited to the Transportation Improvement Program and the Capital Improvements Program; [and]

[(2) Advise the City on Vision Zero and Complete Streets projects and programs to support equitable, safe, and accessible active transportation options; and ]

[(2)] [(3)] Monitor all [on-street pedestrian and] bicycling facilities and recommended implementation strategies for adopted plans for bikeways [sidewalks, street crossings, and on-street multi use trails]; [and]

[(3)] [(4)] Promote bicycling [and other methods of Active Transportation] in [Bernalillo County] [the greater Albuquerque area] for both transportation and recreation; [and]

[(4)] [(5)] Promote [bicycling-safety-and-safety-education] [safety and safety education for all Active Transportation modes]; [and]

[(5)] [(6)] Promote bicycling [and other methods of Active Transportation] support facilities in [Bernalillo County] [the greater Albuquerque area] ;[;]

[(6)] Review and make recommendations to the EPC, the County Planning Commission, or the Planning staff regarding proposals for right-of-way acquisitions or vacations which involve areas designated for bicycle use on adopted plans;]

(7) Except where modified by this section, the provisions §§ 2-6-1-1 et seq. apply to all duties, powers, and procedures of the Committee.

(C) Ratification of Prior Actions and Continuation of Terms of Board Members.

(1) The actions of the Committee established by the previous ordinance are hereby ratified, and the Committee members appointed pursuant to the previous ordinance shall continue to serve until their successors are appointed and confirmed pursuant to §§ 2-6-1-1 et seq. Any current Committee member eligible for re-appointment under the previous constitution of the Committee may be appointed to the like position constituted under this ordinance; the first of such appointments shall count as a second term for such existing Committee member.
(2) The terms of the Committee members shall be for three years except that for the first term after the enactment of this ordinance, the terms shall expire as follows:

(a) [Committee member representing the city area north of I-40 and east of I-25, the term expires April 1, 2009;] [Committee member representing bicyclists, the term expires April 1, **;]
(b) [Committee member representing the city area south of I-40 and east of I-25, the term expires April 1, 2008;] [Committee member representing individuals with a disability, the term expires April 1, **;]
(c) [Committee member representing the city area north of I-40 and west of I-25, the term expires April 1, 2008;] [Committee member representing transit users, the term expires April 1, **;]
(d) [Committee member representing the city area south of I-40 and west of I-25, the term expires April 1, 2009;] [Committee member representing pedestrians, the term expires April 1, **;]
(e) Committee [at-large member, Position 1,] [member representing older adults,] the term expires April 1, [2009] [****;]
(f) Committee [at-large member, Position 2,] [member representing youth voices,] the term expires April 1, [2010] [****;]
(g) [Committee member representing the unincorporated areas of Bernalillo County east of the Rio Grande, the term expires April 1, 2010;] [Committee member representing Active Transportation users in unincorporated areas of Bernalillo County, the term expires April 1, **;]
(h) [Committee member representing the unincorporated areas of Bernalillo County west of the Rio Grande, the term expires April 1, 2011;] [Committee member representing Active Transportation users in the city, the term expires April 1, **;]
(i) Representative of the city’s Environmental Planning Commission, the term expires April 1, [2011] [****].

SECTION 3. COMPILATION. Section 2 of this Ordinance shall be incorporated in and made part of the Revised Ordinances of Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1994.
SECTION 4. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance shall take effect five (5) days after publication by title and general summary.
Bernalillo County GABAC Staff Report
February 8, 2021

Bernalillo County Staff Update

Bernalillo County’s Complete Streets Ordinance requires that a list of Complete Streets projects be provided annually to the Bernalillo County Commission. It is a list of projects anticipated for the coming year. Often project are multi-year endeavors planning, design and construction, so they remain on the annual list for several years.

Attached is the 2021 list of Bernalillo County Complete Streets Projects. Projects that were on the list in 2020 and that are no longer on this list are the following:

- Alameda Drain Trail from Osuna to El Pueblo (Phase 3 - Completed)
- Bridge Blvd from Coors Blvd along Tower Rd to west of Goff Rd (Phase 1 – under construction)
- Sunport Blvd & Woodward Rd (Under construction)
- El Camino Real NHT Study (Planning Study nearing completion)
- Blake Rd SW Isleta Drain to Isleta Blvd (Design - Completed)
- International District Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon at near Texas St (Going to bid)
- Paradise Hills Neighborhood Sidewalk ADA Compliance – Project being completed in phases
- Frost Rd Trail from Candy Ct. to Vallecitos Rd (upcoming construction)

One new project that is worth noting is the Isleta Drain Master Plan. Currently there are no long distance, regional multi-use trails in the South Valley west of the Rio Grande River. The Isleta Drain Trail is envisioned to be the first for this area in Bernalillo County.
January 6, 2021

To: Bernalillo County Commissioners

From: Brian Lopez, P.E., Interim Director, Technical Services Department

Through: Elias Archuleta, P.E., Deputy County Manager for Public Works

Cc: Richard Meadows, Technical Planning Manager

Re: 2021 Complete Streets Annual List of Projects

The Bernalillo County Board of Commissioners adopted a Complete Streets Ordinance (No. 2015-21) in June of 2015. The ordinance requires that all construction and maintenance projects on collector and arterial roadways - optional in the rural East Mountains - be designed to incorporate complete streets components. Improvements may include 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 the Public Works Division submit a memorandum each calendar year listing upcoming complete streets projects. The attached list identifies $61 million in current projects by location, type, scope, cost, funding, components (with modifications if necessary), and scheduled phase of construction. Projects are funded by federal grants, capital outlay, CAP-COOP grants, and GO bonds.

Several projects on the list last year are under construction or about to start construction including Sunport Boulevard extension, Woodward Road reconstruction, and Bridge Boulevard reconstruction phase 1.

Ladera Drive, its half section now under construction, is new on the list and will serve the new Amazon Fulfillment Center in Upper Petroglyphs development. Other roadways to go to construction this coming year include Sunset Road phase 3, 2nd Street NW, Prosperity Avenue and Prince Street, Paradise Hills ADA sidewalks phase 3, and additional Mountain Valley Road improvements.

Some projects aren't scheduled for construction for the next few years but are funded and included as informational on the list as upcoming projects. These include Rio Bravo/ 2nd Street intersection improvements and widening to South Diversion Channel, Isleta Boulevard reconstruction, Bridge Boulevard reconstruction phase 2 and 3, Sunset Road reconstruction phase 2, and Alameda Drain Trail phase 4.
## CY 2021 Complete Streets Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Termini/ Location</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Est. Total Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Complete Street Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 ($277K)²</td>
<td>Multi-use trail, landscaping, GI/LID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>Atrisco Vista Extension</td>
<td>Double Eagle to PDN</td>
<td>Ph. 1 Design/ ROW</td>
<td>$1,073,000</td>
<td>Capital Outlay, GO Bonds</td>
<td>Bike lanes, MU trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ladera Dr</td>
<td>Comfort Wy to Atrisco Vista Blvd</td>
<td>Construction of north half</td>
<td>$6,900,000</td>
<td>GO Bonds</td>
<td>Sidewalks, bikelanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2nd St NW</td>
<td>City limits to Alameda Blvd</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>GO Bonds¹</td>
<td>ADA sidewalks¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</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 ($3.9 M), Capital Outlay ($150K)</td>
<td>Bike lanes, ADA sidewalks¹, landscaping, bus shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Isleta Blvd</td>
<td>I-25 to Raymac Rd</td>
<td>Design (Construct 2023)</td>
<td>$5,825,000</td>
<td>STP, Capital Outlay</td>
<td>Bike lanes, sidewalks, ADA bus stops¹</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</td>
<td>Sidewalks, bike lanes, drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd St SW</td>
<td>Ph. 2 Prosperity to Rio Bravo Blvd</td>
<td>Design (2022) Construct (2024)</td>
<td>$7,600,000</td>
<td>FLAP, GO Bonds</td>
<td>Sidewalks, drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prosperity Ave, Prince St, William St SW</td>
<td>NMRX to Broadway; Prosperity to Rio Bravo; Prosperity to Grape Ave</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Capital Outlay, GO Bonds</td>
<td>Add sidewalks, bike lanes, drainage, landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd St SW/Rio Bravo Blvd</td>
<td>Intersection reconstruction &amp; approaches to S. Diversion Channel</td>
<td>Construction (2022)</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>STP, GO Bonds</td>
<td>Sidewalks, bike lanes, multi-use trail, Prince St crossing¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barcelona Rd SW</td>
<td>Ph. 28 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Camino del Valle</td>
<td>Isleta Blvd to Pajarito Lateral</td>
<td>Design/ Construction</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>GO bonds²</td>
<td>Add sidewalk north side</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Browning St</td>
<td>PDN to Elena Dr</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>GO Bonds</td>
<td>Add shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paradise Hills Neighborhood</td>
<td>Ph. 3 additional streets</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>GO Bonds², CAP COOP</td>
<td>ADA Sidewalks²</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>GO Bonds, CAP COOP</td>
<td>Add shoulders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $61,238,000

GO Bonds – Roads, sidewalks, and 5% Trails²
CAP/COOP/SB – County Arterial/Cooperative/School Bus state funding
Capital Outlay – State funding
GI/LID – Green Infrastructure/Low Impact Development Project
ADA¹ – Americans with Disabilities Act Transition Plan projects

TAP – Transportation Alternatives Program
CMAQ – Congestion Management Air Quality Program
STP – Surface Transportation Program
FLAP – Federal Lands Access Program
HSIP – Highway Safety Improvement Program