Greater Albuquerque Bicycling Advisory Committee (GABAC) – AGENDA
10 May, 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
Meeting ID: 982 1370 3516
Passcode: 294947
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

[ ] Vacant
   NE Quadrant
[ ] Raul Chavira
   SE Quadrant
[ ] Dan Jensen
   NW Quadrant
[ ] Nevarez Encinias
   SW Quadrant
[ ] Josiah Hooten
   At Large
[ ] Robin Allen
   At Large
[ ] Lanny Tonning
   Unincorporated – East
[ ] Vacant
   Unincorporated – West
[ ] Richard Meadows
   EPC

Approval of May Meeting Agenda

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
- East Central Safety Analysis Studies (Aaron Sussman, BHI)
- Project Prioritization Criteria (Aaron Sussman, BHI)
- Bike to Work/Wherever Day (Aaron Sussman, BHI)
- GABAC to GARTC Transition (Petra Morris, Council Services)

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

Discussion / Action Items
- Gabaldon Crossing

Public Comments (2 minute limit per audience member)

Adjourn

Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 8, 2021 (GABAC/GARTC)
Committee Members Present
Richard Meadows (Chair); Dan Jensen; Nevarez Encinias, Robin Allen

Committee Members Absent
Raul Chavira; Josiah Hooten; Lanny Tonning

Staff Members Present
Terra Reed (DMD), Tim Brown (DMD), Christina Sandoval (Parks & Recreation), Cheryl Somerfeldt (Parks & Recreation), Whitney Phelan (Parks & Recreation), Hugh Hulse (Parks & Recreation – Esperanza), Ciaran Lithgow (MRA), Julie Luna (Bernalillo County), Tara Cok (MRCOG)

Visitors Present
Aaron Sussman (BHI), Kurt Thorson (BHI), Bradyn Nicholson (BHI), Clare Haley (BHI), John Fleck, Scot Key, Diane Gutterud, Maggie, Maggie Ramirez, Steve Pilon, Francisco Soto

Richard Meadows began the meeting at 4:03 PM. At this time, there was not a quorum. Ms. Allen joined the meeting about halfway through, making a quorum.

Approval of May Meeting Agenda
- There was no quorum at to approve the meeting agenda.

Approval of April Meeting Minutes
- There was no quorum at the April meeting – notes were sent out to the committee and will be posted online.

General Announcements / Meeting Format
- Zoom meetings will be recorded and the chat will be saved for notetaking purposes.
  - *6 mute/unmute | *9 raise/lower hand

Public Comments (2 minute limit per audience member)
- None.

Presentations
East Central Studies (Aaron Sussman, BHI)
- Overview of safety studies conducted in 2020 for Central Ave. from Louisiana to Juan Tabo. [See presentation slides attached].
  - 2 separate studies – one for City of Albuquerque (Louisiana to Eubank) and one for Bernalillo County (Eubank to Juan Tabo).
- Discussion:
Mr. Jensen: Need better education for the public about the benefits reducing lanes to address the perception that more lanes is better? Common problem. Interesting that businesses reported that speeding was a problem, but did not support reduction in lanes, which slows traffic. How do we change that perception?

Mr. Key: The HAWK signals sound like they are shorter term than a road diet. Will left turns be limited at the HAWK signals given the offsets of the roads?

- Mr. Sussman: Conchas will not include a median at this time – will monitor conditions over time. San Pablo (just east of the street) will include a median.
- Mr. Key: Concerned about compliance, especially in these areas outside of the ART corridor. Would like to see efforts to both study compliance and enforce the use of and behaviors around HAWKs. If using automated enforcement, doing so at HAWKs would be a good idea.
  - Mr. Brown: Compliance for both pedestrians and drivers has and will be a challenge. Mixed experience with compliance at HAWK signals.
  - Ms. Reed: Opportunity around education – both around HAWK signals and around road diets/lane reductions. Don’t currently have any studies planned to look at compliance on these projects, but we can look into opportunities.

Mr. Key: Urge committee to be supportive of safety measures for all users, not just bicycles.

Mr. Pilon: Drivers speed up significantly east of Louisiana. Just narrowing the lanes is not adequate in terms of safety. Was on-street parking offered as a benefit to businesses that were against removing a lane? Could there be a temporary pilot of a road diet to show that it could work and include studies to understand the impact? HAWK signals often confuse drivers – full pedestrian actuated signal would be better.

- Mr. Sussman: Street parking may not meet the guidance in the DPM – may not be appropriate given speeds. Auto-oriented businesses and existing parking lots also may not make that a feasible option. Need for a larger, structural solution for the corridor. In the interim, identified list of solutions that might improve the situation that can be done in the very near term.
- Mr. Meadows: Trial/pilot projects have been recommended in the past.

Mr. Jensen: Why is it so hard to change a 6-lane road that is underused and make it 4 lanes instead of 6?

- Ms. Reed: Need for political will and champions for the projects.
- Mr. Brown: Many people (business owners and road users) have a visceral response to proposals to take away space from cars. Successful projects (not in ABQ) that I have done only happened because there was a champion who was willing to take the heat from those who were against the project. Once we did those projects, we were able to show the impacts. Don’t have the same amount of examples for Albuquerque. Need to be able to convince people/find champions to convince elected decision makers.
  - Need to build examples and the studies to show the impact.

Mr. Pilon (question asked in chat): If Councilor Davis were to champion the road diet, how would that happen and who should he work with in DMD?
Mr. Brown: The use of federal funding in the area between Louisiana and Eubank, which needs to be spent relatively quickly, makes it challenging to change the designs that were chosen in this area at this point – there has already been a process working with Council to identify the proposed designs based on the study that BHI completed and considering public input through that study. That is partly why we are considering the road diet farther east where federal funds aren’t being used. Unfortunately, when federally funded projects are completed, we risk losing federal funding if we make changes before they reach the end of their life, which means we probably won’t be able to pursue the road diet farther west for about 5 years.

Mr. Jensen moved that the City should consider a road diet for this portion of Central Ave. east of Louisiana Blvd. Ms. Allen seconded. Approved unanimously.

Ms. Reed: As part of the City’s Annual Street Maintenance program, DMD is looking at reducing lanes along Central east of Juan Tabo to 2 lanes in each direction (keeping the existing median and left turn lanes). Hope to use this as a test case to extend that configuration west along Central in the future. We are also looking at some opportunities to do more study of road diet projects that have been completed in the past to show the impacts.

Project Prioritization Evaluation (Aaron Sussman, BHI)

- Overview of the work in progress to finalize evaluation methodology and apply to proposed projects. Planning to be able to come back to GABAC in July with evaluation of project lists and with the scoring. [See presentation slides attached].
  - Mr. Soto: Many crashes and lots of drag racing activity along Lead and Coal near Stanford. Tree foliage blocks some of the speed limit signs. Cleanup crews are not doing a good job of clearing crash debris. Don’t know if there have been fatalities, but I have been documenting crashes.
  - Ms. Reed: If the committee is interested, Tim Brown can provide an overview of the studies and efforts that have been done along Lead and Coal already at the July meeting.
  - Mr. Key: What is the best way for the public to provide input on this process?
    - Email Richard Meadows (chair) and Terra Reed with comments. Attend meetings and provide comment.
  - Mr. Key: In terms of equity, it isn’t just within areas, but
  - Mr. Pilon: How do we get segments included in this list? The connection from the bike path from North Diversion Channel Trail to Carlisle Blvd – goes under Carlisle and you can get onto northbound Carlisle, but not southbound. That should be considered as a connection.
    - Mr. Meadows: If that is a gap identified in the Bikeways and Trails Facility Plan, would be easier to consider in the short term. If not, would need to be added when that plan is updated.

Bike to Wherever Day (Aaron Sussman, BHI)
Greater Albuquerque Bicycling Advisory Committee (GABAC) – MINUTES
10 May, 2021 | 4:00 – 6:00 PM
Virtual Meeting via Zoom

- Friday, May 21, 2021 – Mostly virtual participation. Information about the event and to commit to ride/sign up for activities: https://bikethruburque.com/.
- Working with MRCOG to include the annual survey that is usually provided.
- Reducing number of giveaway items, but will have a raffle with gift cards, t-shirts, etc.

GABAC/GARTC Transition (Terra Reed, DMD)

- Since last fall, GABAC has been working with staff and Council to develop an update to its ordinance that would broaden the scope to include all active transportation options – not just bikes. Draft ordinance [see attached Ordinance] is ready; need GABAC members to vote to approve the Ordinance going to City Council, including an alternative for proposed roles, and identify roles in the new structure for each existing GABAC member.
  - Alternative 4 [see attached list of alternatives] was the prevailing choice at the last meeting. Committee members may make additional changes/recommendations and/or vote on the alternative as is.
    - Mr. Jensen: Like Alternative 4. Ok with NW, bicyclist, or older adult.
    - Mr. Encinias: sent preferences via email. Ms. Allen and Mr. Meadows will send preferences via email.
  - Ms. Allen made a motion to support Alternative 4 for the composition of the new Greater Albuquerque Active Transportation Committee (GAATC). Mr. Jensen seconded. Approved unanimously.
  - Mr. Jensen made a motion to recommend the proposed Ordinance as provided by Council Staff, incorporating the roles in Alternative 4, to City Council for approval. Mr. Encinias seconded. Approved unanimously.

Staff Reports

- Municipal Development (DMD)
  - Engineering
    - Not in attendance.
  - Vision Zero (Terra Reed)
    - Vision Zero Action Plan will be announced at Bike to Wherever Day – details will be shared with committee members once they are determined.
    - If there is interest from GABAC and GARTC, can make a presentation on the Vision Zero Action Plan at the June joint meeting.
- Council Services
  - Not in attendance.
- Parks and Recreation (Christina Sandoval)
  - No updates at this time.
- Planning
  - Not in attendance.
- Bernalillo County
  - No updates at this time.
- MRCOG
  - No updates at this time.
• NMDOT District
  o Not in attendance.

Discussion / Action Items
• Gabaldon raised crosswalk is still being planned. No updates.
• County has submitted an application for a Road Safety Assessment on Coors between Gun Club and Rio Bravo – joint effort between City, County, and NMDOT.

Public Comments (2 minute limit per audience member)
• None.

Meeting adjourned at 5:59 PM

Next Meeting: TUESDAY, June 8, 2021 – 4pm - 6pm (Joint GABAC/GARTC meeting)
TWO COMPLEMENTARY STUDIES

- City Council Services: Louisiana Blvd to Eubank Blvd (summer/fall 2020)

- Bernalillo County Public Works: Eubank Blvd to Juan Tabo Blvd (fall/winter 2020-21)
STUDY COMPONENTS

- Existing conditions analysis
- Stakeholder outreach (Bernalillo County study)
  - Businesses between Eubank Blvd and Juan Tabo Blvd
  - Community organizations/clinics
- Recommendations
EXISTING CONDITIONS
EXISTING CONDITIONS – GENERAL ROADWAY CHARACTERISTICS

- Six general purpose lanes (plus median/center turn lane)
- High speeds along corridor, delay at intersections
- Auto-oriented land uses
- High level of transit usage (ART Green Line and Route 66)
- Among highest pedestrian fatality rates in the region (per High Fatality and Injury Network)
TRAFFIC VOLUME

- Daily traffic volume (2018)
  - Louisiana-Pennsylvania: 31,000
  - Pennsylvania-Zuni: 27,000
  - Zuni-Eubank: 28,000
  - Eubank-Juan Tabo: 23,000-28,000
- All of corridor at 60% of capacity or below in peak periods
- Identified by MRCOG as a candidate for a road diet (six lane road with less than 35,000 cars per day)
EXISTING DESIGNATIONS; PREVIOUS PLANS AND STUDIES

- Comprehensive Plan
  - International Market Activity Center
  - Major Transit Corridor / Premium Transit Corridor

- Regional Transportation Safety Action Plan

- Long Range Bikeway System
  - East Central Ave identified for future bike lanes
  - Considered a major gap by GABAC

- Metropolitan Redevelopment Areas
  - Near Heights – includes Central Ave from Louisiana Blvd to Wyoming Blvd
    - Pedestrian improvements, particularly around Central Ave and Tramway Blvd
    - Streetscape improvements; pedestrian-friendly retail
  - East Gateway – Wyoming Blvd to Tramway Blvd
    - Streetscape improvements
    - Improved lighting
**EXISTING CONDITIONS – DEMOGRAPHICS**

**Conditions along East Central Ave compared to City average**

- Significantly higher rates of transit usage
- Lower rates of vehicle ownership
- Higher rates of poverty
- Higher rates of non-white residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Transportation to Work</th>
<th>City of Albuquerque</th>
<th>Louisiana to Eubank</th>
<th>Eubank to Wyoming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drove Alone</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpooling</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at Home</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total crash rates above regional average
- Pedestrian-involved crashes occur at more than twice the regional average
- Pedestrian-involved crashes occur across the corridor, higher numbers between Louisiana Blvd and Wyoming Blvd
- Greatest number of crashes take place at signalized intersections
- Many severe crashes occur at unsignalized intersections where speeds are generally higher
CRASH ANALYSIS

- Disproportionate number of crashes at night
- Higher share of crashes involving drugs/alcohol than the City overall
- Top contributing factors overall:
  - Driver inattention
  - Failure to yield
  - Driver error

- Infrequent pedestrian crossings may create an incentive for people to cross at uncontrolled or unmarked locations
- High number of crashes are ascribed to “pedestrian error”
  → May be a result of individuals crossing in locations where no safe options to do so are provided
Current signal spacing ≈ 0.5 miles apart
Exception: Zuni Rd between Wyoming Blvd and Moon St

East Central Ave is designated a Major Transit Corridor in the Comprehensive Plan

DPM guidance
- Signalized crossings every ¼-mile
- Designated crossings every 660’
- Within 400’ of transit stops

However, unsignalized crossings are not appropriate along Central Ave due to the traffic volume, vehicle speeds, and number of driving lanes
EXISTING CONDITIONS – PEDESTRIAN CONDITIONS

- Uneven surfaces, obstructions; ADA compliance issues
- Frequent driveways; many are fenced off
- No separation from outside vehicle lane
- Short stretches with landscape buffers and wide sidewalks
- Overall low pedestrian LOS
EXISTING CONDITIONS –
DRIVEWAYS AND SITE ACCESS ISSUES

- High number of driveways, particularly west of Eubank Blvd
- Some driveways would not meet DPM criteria if constructed today
- Some sight distance issues identified
- Curb return radii are appropriately sized
EXISTING CONDITIONS – LIGHTING

- Lighting meets City minimum standards
- Illumination is designed for roadways rather than pedestrians
Phone surveys with 10 businesses; attempts made to reach all 32 businesses along corridor

Business owners agreed (or strongly agreed) that safety challenges are present along the corridor

Businesses along East Central Ave are auto-oriented

Only strategy deemed to be better than neutral is “pedestrian-scale lighting”

Strong opposition to fewer driving lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Benefit Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian-scale lighting</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent crosswalks</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk buffer</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More visible crosswalks</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian refuge in the median</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaped medians</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider Sidewalks</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer driving lanes</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High presence of homeless population: Presence of people experiencing homelessness has increased over time; a barrier to walking or transit usage

Concerns regarding personal safety: Incidents of theft and public intoxication are threats to businesses (and patrons) and obstacles to walking

High vehicle speeds: Perception that high vehicle speeds make it less likely motorists will stop at their businesses; excessive speeding poses risks for pedestrians

Incidences of jaywalking: Jaywalking is pervasive, but business owners were generally pessimistic that additional crosswalks would be beneficial; several business owners expressed that increased enforcement is necessary

Poor sidewalk conditions: Uneven surfaces with frequent obstacles affect wheelchair users and prevent pedestrians from walking side-by-side
STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH

- Interviews with staff from community organizations and medical clinics
  - East Central Ministries
  - God’s Warehouse
  - Street Safe NM
  - Southeast Heights Clinic
  - UNM Young Children’s Hospital

- Social and behavioral issues are very real
- Increasing level of pedestrian activity along corridor over time; high level of walking trips and transit usage
- Sidewalk conditions consistently identified as poor:
  - Uneven surfaces
  - Presence of obstructions
  - Sidewalks immediately adjacent to traffic
**STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH**

- **Landscape buffers**: The proximity of sidewalks to motor vehicles could be addressed through landscape buffers; mitigate issue of individuals stepping or falling into the street.

- **Improve sidewalks**: Desire for wider pedestrian ways with level surfaces.

- **Raised medians**: Would allow for pedestrians to cross the street in two stages; provide additional green space and aesthetic improvements.

- **Lighting**: Address both personal safety and pedestrian safety.

- **Additional crosswalks**: General agreement that more crosswalks are needed, including to better access public transit, though some were skeptical that they would be utilized.

- **Other**: Some individuals proposed bike lanes; general desire for reduced speeds.
NEAR-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CITY STUDY: LOUISIANA BLVD TO EUBANK BLVD

- Re-striping to create narrower travel lanes and provide *striped buffer*
- Create modest level of separation between pedestrians and motorists
- Adequate paved area exists for some portions of the corridor (i.e. Wyoming to Eubank); space is limited for other areas (i.e. Louisiana to Wyoming)
- Re-striping plan is in development
- Also recommended for east of Eubank Blvd as interim treatment (not currently part of the scope for the re-striping plan)
NEAR-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS: PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

- Additional pedestrian crossings warranted to meet the guidance from the DPM

- **Louisiana Blvd to Eubank Blvd**: HAWK signals are *in design* or *under construction*
  - Texas St (Tiny Home Village)
  - San Pablo St (at International District Library)
  - Conchas St (west of Eubank Blvd)

- **Eubank Blvd to Juan Tabo Blvd**
  - Additional crossings are recommended; few obvious pedestrian generators along corridor
  - Candidates for crossings based on spacing and proximity to transit stops: Britt St, Dorothy St
**NEAR-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS**

- **Pedestrian-scale lighting**
  - Concept designs and evaluation of right-of-way needs *in progress* from Louisiana Blvd to Eubank Blvd
  - Identified as need by business owners and stakeholders

- **Sidewalk improvements**
  - Improvements desire for whole corridor: Louisiana Blvd to Juan Tabo Blvd
  - Close driveways and create level surfaces
  - Remove obstructions

- **Intersection controls**
  - Consider leading pedestrian interval or eliminate right-turn on red at intersections of Central Ave with Louisiana Blvd, Eubank Blvd, and Juan Tabo Blvd
MEDIUM TO LONG-TERM RECOMMENDATION: ROAD DIET

- **Road Diet through Re-striping:**
  - Remove general purpose travel lane in each direction through re-striping
  - Create striped buffer and/or install bike lanes

- **Roadway Reconfiguration:**
  - Permanently remove travel lanes
  - Opportunity to reconstruct sidewalks, address uneven surfaces and obstructions
  - Options could include bike lanes

- **Challenges:**
  - Frequent driveways, access to businesses and side streets
  - Creating a consistent vision for entire East Central Ave corridor (Louisiana Blvd to Tramway Blvd)
Update on the Bikeway Project Evaluation Process for the City of Albuquerque

Greater Albuquerque Bicycling Advisory Committee

May 10, 2021
Project Scope/Purpose

• Create flexible and objective evaluation process that can be applied to a variety of project types
• Evaluate project benefits and technical feasibility of proposed bikeway projects
• Apply evaluation process to recommendations from the I-25 Bicycle Accessibility Study and GABAC Priority Gap Closure list.
Progress to Date

• Last Meeting (February)
  ▪ Introduced concept of evaluation criteria
  ▪ Weighting exercise

• Today
  ▪ Review criteria and definitions
  ▪ Proposed methodology

• Next Meeting (likely in July)
  ▪ Project rankings
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
Application of Bikeway Project Evaluation Process

I-25 Bicycle Accessibility Study
• Evaluated crossings from Menaul Blvd to Tramway Blvd
• Considered feasibility of projects identified in the Long Range Bikeway Systems
• Initial project recommendations
Evaluation Criteria

• Consider overall 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
General Methodology/Status Updates

1. Project benefits
   - Finalizing evaluation methodology
   - Assessments for more than three dozen projects

2. Technical feasibility – underway

3. Magnitude of costs – underway
### Results from GABAC Weighting Exercise

- GABAC and staff provided input on **project benefits** criteria that should be weighted most heavily
- Adjustment factors to be applied to project scores

<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>
## Point Distribution by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Initial Points</th>
<th>Adjustment Factor</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>Points Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Equity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Improvements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level of Use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Context</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Safety**: 4 points with an adjustment factor of 2, maximum score of 8, and points share of 21.1%.
- **Transportation Equity**: 4 points with an adjustment factor of 2, maximum score of 8, and points share of 21.1%.
- **Connectivity**: 4 points with an adjustment factor of 2, maximum score of 8, and points share of 21.1%.
- **Facility Improvements**: 4 points with an adjustment factor of 1.5, maximum score of 6, and points share of 15.8%.
- **Current Level of Use**: 4 points with an adjustment factor of 1, maximum score of 4, and points share of 10.5%.
- **Land Use Context**: 4 points with an adjustment factor of 1, maximum score of 4, and points share of 10.5%.

The pie chart visualizes the distribution of points across different categories, with each category receiving a percentage of the total points.
Criteria #1: Facility Improvements

Methodology

• Points awarded based on the difference between existing and proposed facility

• Evaluate new facilities AND change in bicycle LOS (contrast existing versus proposed)
## Criteria #2: Connectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Scoring Considerations (Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network Improvements</strong></td>
<td>• Fills in a gap in the network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New connections to existing routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access underserved areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved existing route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Key Destinations</strong></td>
<td>• Direct access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project within proximity of key destination(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key destinations:
- Schools (public and private)
- Universities (UNM, CNM, private)
- Community Centers
- Medical Facilities
- Parks / Open Space
- Museums
- Libraries
- National Historic Districts
- Main Streets
## Criteria #3: Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Scoring Considerations (Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **High Fatality Injury Network**   | • Project location along the High Fatal and Injury Network  
• Number of points depends on level of severity                                              |
| **Bicyclist-Involved Crashes**     | • Total number of crashes  
• Fatal crashes                                                                                   |

*Note: Apply default point values for trail projects*
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

• Apply adjustment factors to Strava data to allow for comparison with MRCOG data

• Default point values for new trails
Criteria #5: Equity

Methodology

• Based on Vulnerable Communities metric (identified for Vision Zero efforts)

• Calculate the average score across project area
## Criteria #6: Land Use Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Scoring Considerations (Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Comprehensive Plan Center Designation** | • Direct access to a Center  
                                           • Within a proximity of a Center |
| **Activity Density**             | • Housing plus employment density within a radius of the project area |
Next Steps

Technical/Engineering Feasibility

- Consider issues or obstacles that may prevent implementation
- Project may be high benefit, but technically challenging
- Qualitative assessment – Low, Medium, High

Magnitude of Costs

- Consideration in project development and can be a significant constraint
- Projects may be high benefit, but high cost
- Qualitative assessment – Low, Medium, High

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

• Debbie Bauman – dbauman@cabq.gov
• Terra Reed – treed@cabq.gov
• Aaron Sussman – asussman@bhinc.com
• Bradyn Nicholson – bnicholson@bhinc.com
CITY of ALBUQUERQUE
TWENTY FOURTH COUNCIL

COUNCIL BILL NO. _______________ ENACTMENT NO. _______________

SPONSORED BY:

ORDINANCE

AMENDING THE SCOPE OF THE GREATER ALBUQUERQUE BICYCLING

ADVISORY COMMITTEE, § 2-6-15 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, TO

INCLUDE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION USERS, AND AMENDING THE TITLE OF

THE COMMITTEE TO BE THE GREATER ALBUQUERQUE ACTIVE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL, THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF

ALBUQUERQUE:

SECTION 1: Findings and Intent. The City Council hereby finds that:

1. WHEREAS, the Greater Albuquerque Bicycling Advisory Committee
   (GABAC) was established by Ordinance 2-6-15 in 1974 to represent and
   advise the City on safe bicycling facilities on behalf of the on-street
   cycling community within the Albuquerque area; and

2. WHEREAS, the Greater Albuquerque Recreational Trails Committee
   (GARTC) was established by Ordinance 2-6-17 in 1974 to represent and
   advise the City on the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians
   along off-street trails; and

3. WHEREAS, the Americans with Disabilities Act Advisory Council was
   established by Ordinance 2-6-5 in 2015 to represent and advise the City
   on the needs of people with disabilities; and

4. WHEREAS, the Transit Advisory Board was established by Resolution
   2-7-1 in 1993 to advise the City Transit Department on the development
   and promotion of public transit services; and

5. WHEREAS, no City board, committee, or commission explicitly
   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, with one of the members also representing the Environmental Planning Commission:"
(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).
(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].
(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].
(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.

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 [the City Departments of Municipal Development (DMD) and Parks & Recreation,] the 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 modes 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 [facilities and amenities for] bicycling [and other modes
of Active Transportation] [support facilities] in [Bernalillo County] [the
greater Albuquerque area]; [and]
[(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.
Alternative 1:

a. Bicyclists
b. Disability Community
c. Transit Users
d. Pedestrians
e. Older Adults
f. Youth
g. Unincorporated County Active Transportation*
h. City Active Transportation*
i. EPC**

*Active transportation may include one or more modes

**For the other alternatives, we are planning to address a role for EPC through the ordinance in order for an EPC member to take on an appropriate role within the committee

Alternative 2:

a. NW Active Transportation*
b. NE Active Transportation*
c. SW Active Transportation*
d. SE Active Transportation*
e. Pedestrians
f. Bicyclists
g. Transit Users
h. Disability Community/Older Adults
i. Youth

* Active transportation may include one or more modes; Areas may include incorporated or unincorporated county

Alternative 3:

a. West Side Active Transportation*
b. East Side Active Transportation*
c. Unincorporated County Active Transportation*
d. Pedestrians
e. Bicyclists
f. Transit Users
g. Disability Community
h. Older Adults
i. Youth

* Active transportation may include one or more modes

Alternative 4:

j. NW Active Transportation*
k. NE Active Transportation*
l. SW Active Transportation*
m. SE Active Transportation*
n. Bicyclists
o. Pedestrians/Transit Users**
p. Disability Community
q. Older Adults
r. Youth

* Active transportation may include one or more modes; Areas may include incorporated or unincorporated county

**Similar to alternative 2 in conflating 2 different positions, but may be a closer fit with more appropriate overlap in terms of needs/concerns. Open to additional input on the organization of the roles.