

From: [Harald Kliems](#)
To: [Larson, Aidan](#); [Ann Kovich](#)
Subject: Comments for today's meeting
Date: Wednesday, December 14, 2022 4:15:39 PM

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

Hi Ann and Aidan:

It appears I have lost my voice and therefore won't be able to participate in the meeting tonight.

Would you mind sharing the following comments with the other commissioners and staff on item 9 (Complete Green Streets):

I am very excited to see the Complete Green Streets policy coming close to being adopted and I am generally very supportive. A few questions and concerns:

- Designing All Ages and Abilities Bikeways (page 25): **This is my greatest concern with the document and I would not vote in favor if this is not changed.** The FHWA guide ignores the number of travel lanes as well as curbside activity, and it is much coarser in recommending facilities and other measures to create true low-stress facilities. Madison is a NACTO member city and must use the NACTO Urban Design Guide (which is referenced on page 65). <https://nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide/designing-ages-abilities-new/choosing-ages-abilities-bicycle-facility/>
- Modal hierarchy (page 7 in the report): It seems one level of the hierarchy has been eliminated and parking is now on the same level as driving, freight etc. I wonder why this was changed, and I am opposed to this change. I'd be curious to hear staff talk about this and what this would mean in a practical example. Where do we anticipate making tradeoffs between a lane of parking and a general travel lane and treat those as equally important? Especially since parking is in the flex zone and would therefore in theory compete with other flex zone uses and not the travelway.
- All Ages and Abilities Bike Network: I know TPPB has discussed this in depth and I like some of the changes in language there. Having to rely on the 2015 MPO plan is not great (and you can see this immediately on the map included on page 24): The network shown is still disjointed and it often excludes those streets with the highest density of residents and destinations, which also are often part of the high injury network).
- Intersection design: I recognize that is probably considered out of scope of the manual, but I would like to point out that most crashes happen at intersections, and this is even more true for crashes involving vulnerable road users. Most of the example cross-sections shown in the report show intersections, but they don't show intersection treatments that would improve safety, such as protected intersections.

Thanks,
Harald.