

From: [Valerie Johnson](#)
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Cc: [Chih Chen](#); [Vidaver, Regina](#); [Tishler, Bill](#)
Subject: Follow-up on Midvale Blvd. Project: Contradictions in Rationale
Date: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 4:20:13 PM

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

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

To the Members of the Transportation Commission,

I am writing to follow-up regarding the rationale used to approve Option 1 for the Midvale Boulevard project. I must formally express my concern that the arguments used to dismiss the community-preferred alternatives were based on a series of contradictions.

The arguments against Options 2 and 3, which were overwhelmingly supported by the community, do not withstand scrutiny when examined against the facts.

- **Policy Alignment:** The claim that Options 2 and 3 did not align with policies such as Green Streets Madison, Vision Zero, or the modal hierarchy is inconsistent with the project's own design. As the City Engineering team confirmed, all three options were developed to align with these policies. The dismissal of Option 3 based on this reasoning is, therefore, a contradiction of the stated project goals.
- **Insufficient Connections:** Commissioner Webber's focus on the supposed insufficiency of the connections at Segoe Road and the new rapid flashing beacon (RFB) at Blackhawk is a critique of infrastructure previously approved by this very Commission. It is inconsistent for the Commission to now deem its own past work inadequate and use it as a reason to dismiss a more sensible project. These projects should be viewed as an existing asset for Option 3, not a liability.
- **Disregarding Existing Infrastructure:** The argument that these same crossings "do not easily connect to the Shorewood bike path or shopping area at Rosa place" is a direct contradiction of the work that this commission approved. It is deeply disappointing that a body tasked with ensuring a comprehensive and safe transportation network would deem its own past work a "con" to dismiss a more sensible project.

Option 1 does not genuinely address the core safety issues on Midvale Boulevard. The plan simply paints a bike lane that would only serve the most advanced and confident cyclists. The correct solution, as supported overwhelmingly by the public, is Option 3. It provides a safe, low-stress route for cyclists of all ages and abilities now, while allowing for a more comprehensive and genuinely safe reconstruction of Midvale Blvd. in the future.

The decision to move forward with a plan that so flagrantly ignores public input- the voices of nearly 2,400 survey respondents- and the representatives who were elected to serve them is disrespectful and erodes public trust in our city's governance.

Respectfully,

Valerie Johnson & Chih Chen
valeriesuejohnson@uwalumni.com

cc: Alder Vidaver
cc: Alder Tishler

Nothing will work unless you do. ~Maya Angelou

On Wed, Sep 10, 2025 at 1:08 PM Valerie Johnson <valeriesuejohnson@uwalumni.com> wrote:

Dear Members of the Transportation Commission,

Thank you for your time and consideration. I am writing to provide my detailed comments regarding the proposed Midvale Blvd. project on today's agenda, item #3.

We are residents of Midvale Blvd. and we strongly urge you to reject Option 1 and instead approve Option 3.

Opposition to Option 1 is based on the following critical issues:

- **Significant Hardship for Residents:** Midvale Blvd. residents, particularly the elderly and families with small children like us, rely on street parking for guests, family gatherings, and services. The removal of this parking creates an unreasonable hardship, forcing people to walk significant distances to the nearest available space. This also leads to increased safety concerns due to poorly lit streets and longer walks at night.
- **Safety Compromise, Not Improvement:** The Option 1 plan places a bike lane on Midvale, a designated emergency route with high traffic volumes and high rates of speed. I bike regularly with my two young kids and I never choose to bike on Midvale due to its inherent dangers. Option 1 is not an "all ages and abilities" solution; it is a compromise on safety that benefits only the most confident of cyclists.

Strong Support for Option 3 is based on its clear, all-encompassing benefits:

- **A True "Win-Win" Solution:** Option 3 is the most sensible and balanced compromise presented. It is a win-win that provides a safe and effective route for cyclists while preserving essential street parking for Midvale residents.
- **A Safer, All-Abilities Bike Route:** Option 3 wisely routes bikes to a dedicated Bike Boulevard on Owen Drive and Segoe Road. These streets are far more suitable for cyclists of all ages and abilities, unlike the high-traffic corridor of Midvale. This also takes advantage of the city's recent investment in a curb-protected bike lane on Segoe Road, creating a more cohesive and logical bike network.
- **Most Cost-Effective and Forward-Thinking:** Option 3 is noted as the less expensive option for now. It provides an immediate and effective solution while still allowing for a comprehensive Midvale Blvd. redesign in the future during a full reconstruction project. This approach is fiscally responsible and ensures a more complete solution in the long run.

We implore the commission to consider the long-term impacts on our community. Option 1 is a flawed plan that removes parking, creating significant hardship for our most vulnerable residents, and fails to genuinely improve safety for all users. Option 3, on the other hand, is a safe, sensible, and cost-effective compromise that works for everyone.

Please approve Option 3.

Sincerely,

Valerie Johnson & Chih Chen

37 S Midvale Blvd.

cc: Alderperson Vidaver

Valerie Johnson

valeriesuejohnson@uwalumni.com

Nothing will work unless you do. ~Maya Angelou

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Valerie Johnson** <valeriesuejohnson@uwalumni.com>

Date: Wed, Aug 6, 2025 at 1:30 PM

Subject: Follow-up: Midvale Blvd. Project Options & Support for Option 3

To: Jaeckels, Nicholas <njaeckels@cityofmadison.com>

Cc: Vidaver, Regina <District5@cityofmadison.com>, Chih Chen <chih.chen@gmail.com>

Dear City Engineering Team,

Thank you for presenting the updated project options for Midvale Blvd., including the Bike Boulevard alternatives on Meadow Drive (Option 2) and Owen Drive (Option 3). We also appreciate the inclusion of key pedestrian improvements across all proposed plans, which will undoubtedly contribute to a safer Midvale Blvd. for everyone.

We, as Midvale Blvd. residents, strongly support **Option 3: Bike Boulevard on Owen Drive**. This option stands out as the most thoughtful and comprehensive solution for several crucial reasons:

- It supports an 'all ages & abilities' bike route, which is incredibly important for our community. Many residents with young children like us hope to utilize this safer route when our kids start at Midvale Elementary this Fall.
- The extension of the Bike Boulevard on Owen Drive South of Midvale is a significant benefit.
- It addresses and improves the intersection of Mineral Point Road and Owen Drive, which has been a problematic area for some time.
- Crucially, Option 3 retains essential street parking for Midvale Blvd. residents, mitigating the significant hardship that Option 1 would impose on our families and visitors.
- Furthermore, as noted in your documents, Option 3, is a less expensive immediate solution that allows for a comprehensive Midvale Blvd redesign during a future reconstruction project.

We have a few clarifying questions regarding the updated plans and the process moving forward:

- Is the full resurfacing of Midvale Blvd. still part of this project's scope, or is resurfacing now limited only to specific areas?
- Will the results from the project questionnaire, which closes on September 2nd at 2 PM, be shared publicly? If so, when and where can we expect to access them?
- Will there be another public information meeting held prior to the Transportation Commission meeting on September 10th?
- Will all three options (Option 1, Option 2, and Option 3) be presented to the Transportation Commission for their consideration on September 10th?

Thank you again for your responsiveness in providing these alternatives. We look forward to your answers to our questions and to seeing Option 3 advanced as the preferred solution.

Sincerely,

Valerie Johnson & Chih Chen

37 S Midvale Blvd.

cc: Alderperson Vidaver

Valerie Johnson

valeriesuejohnson@uwalumni.com

Nothing will work unless you do. ~Maya Angelou

Jaeckels, Nicholas

Aug 12, 2025, 10:38 AM

to Regina, me, Chih



Hi Valerie,

Thanks for sharing your detailed thoughts on the project. Here are answers to your questions:

- Is the full resurfacing of Midvale Blvd. still part of this project's scope, or is resurfacing now limited only to specific areas?

- The full stretch of Midvale from Mineral Pt Rd to University Ave will be resurfaced regardless of the option the project moves forward with.
- Will the results from the project questionnaire, which closes on September 2nd at 2 PM, be shared publicly? If so, when and where can we expect to access them?
 - The project team will share summarized results at the Transportation Commission meeting.
- Will there be another public information meeting held prior to the Transportation Commission meeting on September 10th?
 - There is no plan for another public information meeting. In addition to presenting the project at the Transportation Commission, the project will go before the Board of Public Works and Common Council for approval. All three of these meetings are opportunities for the public to attend, register support/opposition, and register to speak. Dates for Board of Public Works and Common Council meetings will be posted to the project page when available.
- Will all three options (Option 1, Option 2, and Option 3) be presented to the Transportation Commission for their consideration on September 10th?
 - Yes, all three options will be presented to the Transportation Commission.

Let me know if you have any other questions,

Nick Jaeckels, P.E.

City of Madison Engineering Division

210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Room 115

Madison, WI 53703

njaeckels@cityofmadison.com

(608) 261-9177