

Johnson, Johanna

From: Nicholas Davies <nbdavies@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 12:50 PM
To: Board of Public Works; Traffic
Subject: Fire lane-width street designs should include bike lane options (87320)

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

Dear Board of Public Works,

Your agenda this week includes updates to the Complete Green Streets guide, including street design options to accommodate minimum widths required for Fire Department access.

I'm concerned that none of these options include an on-street bike facility, and appear to prioritize parking over biking, in contradiction with Madison's adopted modal hierarchy. This is particularly baffling because while a bike lane can comprise part of the fire lane, an occupied parking lane functionally cannot.

While it's true that streets with very low traffic can also be naturally low-stress for cyclists, even without a dedicated facility, some of the design options could become high-stress as traffic increases. For example, a street that has 13 ft travel lanes in each direction (Option 2) can end up having a lot of vehicle traffic, a lot of speeding, and can become inhospitable to non-car users.

I encourage you to show options in this guide that include on-street biking facilities as one of the components that make up the required width. These could be just painted bike lanes, but even better would be a bidirectional bike lane with a mountable barrier.

This is becoming a standard design in Paris, where bike facilities have been retrofitted very quickly and effectively.

Here's an example, on Rue de Turbigo ([source](#))



The protective element would certainly provide haptic feedback to a driver crossing it unintentionally, but it would pose no barrier to fire access.

Note also how the bike lane helps "daylight" the intersection, keeping it free of visual blockers.

Here's an example of a mountable barrier protecting a one-way bike facility on Rue de Chateaudun ([source](#)):



This part of the Complete Green Streets guide is intended to answer the question:
"How do we make our streets >20-26 ft wide without opening the door to reckless driving?"

It's really not a hard question if you just allocate some of that road width to other modes. Bike lanes can be a crucial component in solving this problem, because they can be part of the 20-26 ft required width, without being part of the street per se, as motorists experience it. It'd be a mistake not to include this solution in the guide.

Separated bus-only lanes can also be part of the mix. This could be a good fit if the street in question is on an existing route, or would provide a time-saving cut-through for a transit route, or if a development on the street in question is adding enough rider capacity to motivate a new stop.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St

Johnson, Johanna

From: SANDRA E WARD <sward@wisc.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2025 8:56 AM
To: Board of Public Works
Cc: Grace Hasler; Ledell Zellers; Pete Ostlind
Subject: Section 6.4. Of Complete Green Streets (CGS), item 87320 on 2/26 agenda

You don't often get email from sward@wisc.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hello members of the Board of Public Works,

Having advocated for an update to CGS that would enable Madison to achieve the benefits of increasing our canopy tree cover, I am exceedingly pleased by proposed section 6.4. Thank you to all who worked on this important project.

I do, however, take issue with one phrase that is now included in 6.4 which was not present in earlier drafts. That phrase occurs in the second bullet point, "...while balancing the other street priorities". Why point out this need for balance in section 6.4? All of CGS is implicitly a balancing of priorities, yet that phrase now appears only in section 6.4. The phrase seems specifically positioned to weaken the chance that canopy trees will be given their appropriate weight in the balance. The entire document addresses the need for careful consideration of the multiple needs/priorities in any decision about street design and construction.

Please remove this phrase from section 6.4.

Thank you,

Sandra Ward

333 W Mifflin St, Unit 6010

Madison, WI 53703

Johnson, Johanna

From: Grace Hasler <gracehasler@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2025 10:43 AM
To: Board of Public Works
Cc: SANDRA E WARD; Ledell Zellers; Pete Ostlind
Subject: Re: Section 6.4. Of Complete Green Streets (CGS), item 87320 on 2/26 agenda

I agree with the request Sandy makes. And thank you for this important step forward in how we consider city streets. Sandy and I co chair a CNI District (TCCP) committee focused on preservation and planting canopy trees on the Isthmus in particular. She and I are very familiar with Complete Green Streets as well as the Urban Forestry Task Force report and the new Sustainability Plan. These documents head us in the right direction relative to the past. There are barriers to a healthy tree canopy that should be reconsidered, particularly as our climate warms; our streets have historically been designed for the automobile and this document gives us a very different future if we implement it. The reconstruction of W Wilson with bike paths, underground wires and a new variety of canopy trees is a hopeful precedent. Please review the changes to the document and consider whether or not it promotes the goal of a healthy urban tree canopy. thank, you Grace Hasler

On Wed, Feb 26, 2025 at 9:34 AM Board of Public Works <boardofpublicworks@cityofmadison.com> wrote:

Sandra,

Thank you for your email. It has been forwarded to Board of Public Works members.

Johanna Johnson

City Engineering Division

210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Room 115

Madison, WI 53703

(608) 264-9274