

From: [Nicholas Davies](#)
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: Midvale Blvd (89848) video tour
Date: Sunday, September 7, 2025 12:06:00 PM

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

Dear Transportation Commission,

At past meetings on this topic, I've tried to describe the experience of biking on Midvale. To try to convey this better, I recorded the experience on video:

<https://youtu.be/mZPkXAJe5aM>

In this 10 minute video, I bike Midvale from Mineral Point Rd to University Ave, and I also visit a couple intersections involved in options 2 & 3.

For me, it boils down to this:

"Options" that leave sections of Midvale unimproved for cycling safety will not address the cycling safety problems on Midvale. Attempting to exile cyclists from a road because making it safe is "hard" is no solution.

People will still end up biking on Midvale. Maybe they didn't check a low-stress route finder before leaving home. Maybe they choose to travel the direct route, since they deserve to, and distance matters much more for cyclists and pedestrians.

("But Segoe..." Segoe is a diagonal, going in a different direction. If the existence of Midvale makes Segoe redundant, then we should be able to just close Midvale to through traffic. If anyone can afford to take the longer route, it's drivers. An extra half mile only adds 1 minute to their trip, and no additional exertion. And yet inconveniencing drivers in the slightest is never an option in the survey.)

Option 3 would attempt to divert bike traffic to Owen Dr. Except when Owen Dr reaches Mineral Point Rd, it's not at a signalized intersection. Mineral Point is currently 2 lanes each way; there's already an RRFB to cross. This is a decidedly less safe way to cross Mineral Point Rd than the light at Midvale, and it's unclear to me how that could possibly change. A redundant second RRFB to cross the same 4 lanes of traffic?

Option 2 has the same problem, but worse, attempting to divert bike traffic onto Meadow Lane, which meets University at an unsignalized intersection. Crossing University at Meadow Lane would involve crossing:

- * 3 eastbound lanes
- * 1 concrete median
- * 2 westbound turn lanes
- * 1 more concrete median
- * 3 westbound lanes

This is a level of Frogger that even I, a hard-boiled cyclist from the chaotic streets of DC, feel unprepared for.

I don't see a solution for University & Meadow. Given this location's propensity to flood, I don't think a tunnel would work. A bike/ped overpass? We are looking at a project in the millions now.

Options 2 and 3 may also include adding a stripe to Midvale to demarcate the travel lane from the parking lane. But cyclists would still be expected to cycle intermittently in and out of the parking lane, repeatedly encountering hazardous merging situations, or a tight squeeze between traveling vehicles and parked vehicles.

Without option 1's curb alignment changes, there just is not space for all that; some might see the curb alignment changes as too modest, but in my experience they are necessary.

I hope you'll have an opportunity to check out current conditions on Midvale ahead of Wednesday's meeting, whether it's through my footage or otherwise. I hope to be at the meeting in firm support of option 1.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St