

From: [Larry Sipovic](#)
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Cc: [Conklin, Nikki](#); [Mayor](#)
Subject: Legistar File # 79278 Complete Green Streets Project Checklist Review and Feedback
Date: Wednesday, August 9, 2023 11:03:02 AM

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

Dear Transportation Commission Members:

I am writing as a resident of the Tamarack Trails/Sauk Creek/Walnut Grove area ("Neighborhoods") to give feedback on the above-referenced file number. I am wondering about the checklist that is being discussed and if it is done before a project is considered or afterwards?

The Neighborhood is concerned about the Sauk Creek Greenway ("Bike Path") that was shown in the Complete Green Streets Policy Guide ("CGSG") approved on January 3, 2023 and the West Area Plan rolled out in February 2023, and what type of checklist was developed before including the Bike Path in these documents.

Overall, the Bike Path is opposed for a number of reasons:

1. Non-Public Participation

First and foremost, the Neighborhoods were not notified in the mail (which is in the checklist) that the Bike Path was included in the CGSG.

The CGSG was also not mentioned in the City's Sauk Creek Greenway project communication page. The last update on the Bike Path was from 2018 when it was unveiled to the Neighborhoods in 2018 when the City held its first Sauk Creek Greenway engagement meeting.

Likewise, the Neighborhoods were never notified in the mail that a Bike Path was being considered in the 2000 Bike Transportation Plan and 2015 Bike Transportation Plan.

City had its first West Area Plan public meeting on February 6, 2023 with the Bike Path shown in the presentation and asking for feedback; however, the CGSG approval was one month before this public meeting. Why would a project be in a major guide before the city seeks input from the public?

These actions go against the RESJI standards.

2. Unnecessary Bike Path

The **2000 Bike Transportation Plan** classified the bike path in the Sauk Creek Greenway not a priority since there are suitable on-road routes nearby.

Westfield Road, which is 1000 feet east of the proposed path, is classified as a “Primary” bike lane per the updated 2015 Bike Transportation Plan, and High Point Road a “Secondary” bike route. Westfield Road is a safe biking route especially now given the speed bumps that were recently added.

Per Figure 4-16 of the 2015 Bike Transportation Plan, the planners said there is NOT a bike network gap between the Primary and Secondary bike networks in our neighborhood, which means the path is not necessary from their criteria. The checklist is missing the network gap analysis.

3. Environmental Impact

There are seven (7) designated wetland areas in the Sauk Creek Greenway that would be impacted by a bike path. Per the 2015 Bike Plan, an **environmental analysis** should be done for new shared-use paths that go through wetlands, and the City could minimize the impact to the wetlands by utilizing existing pathways (Westfield and High Point). There is not an environmental analysis criteria in the checklist.

Maintaining and growing the City’s Tree Canopy is a City priority per the CGSG. The Sauk Creek Greenway is a dense 26 acre woods that would be significantly impacted by a Bike Path. The City is also not following its **Fostering Sustainability** Street Values in the CGSG=By adding a 5000+ foot Bike Path that would have an impervious surfaces.

4. Not Respectful of Stakeholders

Petitions against this Bike Path were submitted to the Common Council on November 15, 2022 attached to file #73264, which was before the CGSG passed on January 3, 2023. These petitions were totally ignored and the Neighborhoods opinions once again were excluded from this process.

Likewise, the impact of the Bike Path on the homeowners affected by this decision is not being considered at all or in your checklist. You need to consider this project through their lens instead of trying to check the boxes.

In summary, a number of City Values are not being upheld with this Bike Path and we ask that the CGSG be amended to exclude the Bike Path given the above stated reasons, as well as the City’s imploding debt.

Thank you.

Larry Sipovic
LVSipovic@gmail.com
608 770-0150

