

From: [Mohr, Thomas](#)
To: [Craig Weinhold](#)
Cc: [Petykowski, Christopher](#); [Zwieg, Andrew](#); [Collins, Lukas M](#); [Jaeckels, Nicholas](#); [Canton, Aaron](#); [Engineer](#)
Subject: RE: Midvale survey confusion "buffered"
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 8:42:41 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Yes, I was just thinking the same thing today about getting RRFB activation data. We'll look into it. Would be interesting.

From: Craig Weinhold <cweinhold@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 5:19 PM
To: Mohr, Thomas <TMohr@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Petykowski, Christopher <CPetykowski@cityofmadison.com>; Zwieg, Andrew <AZwieg@cityofmadison.com>; Collins, Lukas M <LCollins@cityofmadison.com>; Jaeckels, Nicholas <NJaeckels@cityofmadison.com>; Canton, Aaron <ACanton@cityofmadison.com>; Engineer <engineer@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Re: Midvale survey confusion "buffered"

Hi Tom,

It took me a moment to grasp the concept --- RRFB's are OK on wide streets so long as they don't activate very often. So Henry Mall would, in fact, be a terrible place for one. That seems counter-intuitive, but also kind of makes sense.

My impression has always been that 6-lane RRFB's are daring pedestrians to cross. I imagine the users of these crossings to be few and far between, with most timid pedestrians going far out of their way to avoid these crossings. If you have counts, it'd be interesting to see how many times different RRFB's are activated around the city. That'd be a nice bit of data to present to the T.C. some day.

I look forward to seeing Blackhawk Ave first hand. I cross there regularly!

Thanks,

-Craig

On Wed, Aug 20, 2025 at 1:53 PM Mohr, Thomas <TMohr@cityofmadison.com> wrote:

Hi Craig,

Thanks for this feedback! I think you raise excellent points in support of Option 1. Of course, there are differing perspectives, and the survey is intended to measure the level of support for the various options. It's important to note that **the survey is informational only** and while it may influence the members of the Transportation Commission, it will not automatically determine the decision.

Regarding the future RRFB at Blackhawk, we did consider the high volume on University Avenue when choosing this location. We investigated the crash history of other high volume RRFB locations. Our overall experience has been that RRFB's tend to work well in locations that have high volume of traffic on the street if the volume of pedestrians crossing is low and the RRFB activation is infrequent. We consider this location to fall under that category. Here is crash data we pulled this past February for our similar, existing RRFB locations (only crashes involving pedestrians after the RRFB was installed are included):

- Northport Dr at Northside Town Center (between Sherman Ave and Dryden Dr) (installed on 9/26/19)
 - Ped injury 11/11/19
 - Pedestrian injury 12/24/23
- Packers Ave at Schlimgen Ave (installed 9/25/17)
 - Rear-end for ped in crosswalk 9/13/18—Property Damage Only (PDO)
 - Rear-end for unknown reason 12/6/18—Possible Injury
 - Rear-end for ped in crosswalk 12/10/19--PDO
 - Rear-end for ped in crosswalk 1/16/20--PDO
 - Rear-end for ped in crosswalk 8/4/23--PDO
 - 1 fatality on 12/16/23 unknown (crash report says ped was lying in street prior to being struck)
- E Washington Ave at Blount (installed 10/23/19)
 - Ped possible injury on 12/21/19
 - Rear-end for ped in crosswalk 3/17/22--PDO
 - Rear-end for unknown reason on 8/30/22
 - Pedestrian struck but no injury on 1/30/24
 - Rear-end for ped in crosswalk 10/19/24--PDO
- E Washington Ave at 2nd Street (installed 8/11/20)
 - No crashes following installation of RRFB

Northport Dr at Goodland Dr (installed 6/12/24)

- No crashes following installation of RRFB
- Williamson St at Livingston (installed 11/5/18)
 - Rear-end for ped in crosswalk with RRFB activated on 1/17/19
 - Possible related rear end for unknown reason on 8/17/21
- Williamson St at Dickinson
 - Rear-end for ped in crosswalk with RRFB activated on 2/28/20
 - Rear-end for possible ped in crosswalk 2/28/24

For RRFBs at locations with three lanes in each direction, we currently have:

- Packers Ave at Schlimgen Ave
- E Washington Ave at Kedzie St
- E Washington Ave at Second St
- E Washington Ave at Schmedeman Ave
- *E Washington Ave at Melvin Ct (this one was replaced with a full signal for BRT)*

Our experience has been that the combination of high-volume, multi-lane streets with many RRFB activations (especially with bikes present) is the dangerous situation. Infrequent RRFB activation tends to be the safer locations for the RRFB users, although it may increase low severity rear-end crashes.

We can consider University Ave/Franklin.

Thanks,
Tom

From: Craig Weinhold <cweinhold@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 11:30 AM

To: Mohr, Thomas <TMohr@cityofmadison.com>

Cc: Petykowski, Christopher <CPetykowski@cityofmadison.com>; Zwieg, Andrew <AZwieg@cityofmadison.com>; Collins, Lukas M <LCollins@cityofmadison.com>; Jaeckels, Nicholas <NJaeckels@cityofmadison.com>; Canton, Aaron <ACanton@cityofmadison.com>; Engineer <engineer@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: Re: Midvale survey confusion "buffered"

I'm nervous about the Midvale survey, which got a boost today in the [Cap Times](#). The survey is a choice among false equivalents; it has one option to normalize bicycling on Midvale and two options to kick them off while pretending to do them a favor. The Owen improvement should be part of Mineral Point Rd resurfacing and the Segoe improvements is a great SS4A idea, but neither of them should have any bearing on Midvale bike lanes.

There is no question that Midvale is a major bike route. It's chock full of shopping, banks, schools, and the library. It is the shortest connection between two of our busiest bike paths and the Regent/Kendall bike boulevard. Below is an infographic I built from Strava data showing the number of unique individuals biking north-south across Regent St on Midvale is higher than Segoe, and more than double Owen. Of University Avenue crossings, Midvale is by far the most popular. Imagine what those numbers would look like if Midvale had an actual bike facility!

Separately, while I applaud the attention to the Blackhawk Ave crossing, I find the idea of an RRFB there insane. 50k+ AADT ! Six lanes ! Our four-lane RRFBs already have problems with "one car stops; the other doesn't" behavior; imagine that with six lanes! Cities like Boulder and Portland who have done the better studies of RRFB don't use them for more than 3000 cars/hour (approx 30k AADT). E.g., <https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Programs/ResearchDocuments/SPR814Final.pdf>

I have a hard time imagining a 6-lane RRFB working out well, even with median islands. I think Blackhawk needs a full-blown stoplight with left/U-turn phases, especially with the forthcoming Meadow Lane development.

If Madison is serious about putting RRFB's on 6-lane roads, I suggest you:

- Study the Packers / Schlimgen crossing, the only other 6-lane RRFB I'm aware of. Go have traffic engineers do crossings and measure driver compliance at different times of the day. Gather data from pedestrians in the area. What are their experiences? Do they feel safe using it?
- install an RRFB at the University Avenue crossing by Henry Mall on campus and study how it ends up working. That crossing has enough pedestrians to keep the RRFB activity high, socializing drivers to its meaning and expectations.
- Consider putting one at University & Franklin St. That intersection lost its crosswalk during the recent U Ave reconstruction, but now there are apartments and businesses on both sides, as well as a north-side sidewalk and bike path. If Franklin had an RRFB, crosswalk markings, and signage, Blackhawk's future RRFB might not seem such an oddball.

Thanks,

-Craig

On Tue, Aug 5, 2025 at 9:15 AM Mohr, Thomas <TMohr@cityofmadison.com> wrote:

Hi Craig,

Thanks for letting us know. We'll remove "buffered" to clear that up, and add a note on the plan sheet that it is paint.

Tom

From: Petykowski, Christopher <CPetykowski@cityofmadison.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 8:39 AM

To: Zwieg, Andrew <AZwieg@cityofmadison.com>; Mohr, Thomas <TMohr@cityofmadison.com>; Collins, Lukas M <LCollins@cityofmadison.com>; Jaeckels, Nicholas <NJaeckels@cityofmadison.com>

Cc: Craig Weinhold <cweinhold@gmail.com>; Canton, Aaron <ACanton@cityofmadison.com>; Engineer <engineer@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: FW: Midvale survey confusion "buffered"

Thanks Craig, Andy/Tom, see below....

Chris Petykowski, P.E.

Assistant City Engineer

City of Madison

608-267-8678

From: Engineer <engineer@cityofmadison.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 8:36 AM
To: Canton, Aaron <ACanton@cityofmadison.com>; Petykowski, Christopher <CPetykowski@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: FW: Midvale survey confusion "buffered"

FYI

From: Craig Weinhold <cweinhold@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 3, 2025 11:59 PM
To: Engineer <engineer@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Midvale survey confusion "buffered"

You don't often get email from cweinhold@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

FYI - I'm following the Midvale resurfacing survey on social media, and a number of people are confused about what "buffered bike lanes" mean. They read option 1 and think of N. Segoe's protected lanes!

Craig