

From: [Ann Kovich](#)
To: [Larson, Aidan](#)
Cc: [Mohr, Thomas](#); [Tao, Yang](#); [Spieler, Christof T](#); [Petykowski, Christopher](#)
Subject: Fwd: Traffic Engineering's Midvale survey run amuck
Date: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 2:09:24 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)
[image.png](#)
[image.png](#)
[Midvale survey confusion buffered.eml.msg](#)

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

Hi, Aidan. I do not believe you were included on this email regarding Midvale Blvd. Please forward this to all TC members, and save it in Legistar for the 9/10 TC. I am copying other City staff to make sure they have seen this email as well.

Thanks,
Ann

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

From: **Craig Weinhold** <cweinhold@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 14, 2025 at 11:08 PM
Subject: Traffic Engineering's Midvale survey run amuck
To: <district16@cityofmadison.com>, district5@cityofmadison.com
<district5@cityofmadison.com>, district11@cityofmadison.com
<district11@cityofmadison.com>, <district15@cityofmadison.com>,
<annelizabethkovich@gmail.com>

Hello Alders Vidaver, Tischler, Martina-Rutherford, and O'Brien, and T.C. Chair Kovich, (cc'd Tom Mohr)

The Midvale survey from Traffic Engineering was sloppy and unprofessional to the point of either leading the outcome or attempting to sabotage option #1. I encourage you to take Traffic Engineering to task to do better in the future. I saw a similar survey for Williamson St just went up that also has questionable design.

The Midvale survey had several major flaws:

1. The "options" were not remotely equivalent.
2. The options were presented as if they were mutually-exclusive. The T.C. had to work hard to get Engineering to acknowledge that the option #3 safety improvements at Owen and Segoe would likely happen regardless of the Midvale resurfacing.
3. Option #3 was worded to appeal to *everyone*: bike supporters, bike haters, Segoe-protected-lane-haters, parking defenders, car-lovers, Owen-improvers, Segoe-improvers, etc.
4. The first option was widely misunderstood as replicating what was done on N. Segoe. This was clear from survey comments and social media (see examples at bottom).

Some friends and I have been categorizing the option 3 survey responses (here's [the raw data](#)). We're about half-way through the 740 responses. So far,

- 20% negatively referred to the reconfigurations of N. Segoe or Whitney Way, changes due to BRT, and/or believed that option #1 was proposing lane reductions on Midvale Blvd.
- 36% seem openly hostile towards bicycling and bike lanes of any type
- 17% are sympathetic to bicycle safety
- 18% mention street parking
- 14% say they are bicyclists
- 12% were poignant comments - comments that I believe are worth everyone's time to read. (for instance, one recurring theme was to increase the short left-turn signals for NB Midvale drivers turning left onto Mineral Point Rd, Tokay, and Odana -- feedback that Ald Tishler should be aware of)
- 15% mentioned the actual option #3 Mineral Point Rd crossing improvements at Segoe and/or Owen.

This last point is key. ***Only 15% actually commented on option #3!*** The other 85% were just choosing it because they didn't want bike lanes for any reason. Half of the responders were angry and venting. That's a lot of noise. The survey was pretty much all noise, with little to no constructive guidance to help policy-makers find a compromise. I'm glad the Transportation Commission saw through. Of the three options, option #1 was the only one that a mature, responsible T.C. could choose.

It's sad because there were compromises available. E.g., one would have bike lanes north of Regent St, but keep the status quo (aka on-street parking) south of Regent St. A variation would have bike lanes south of Regent, but only in the southbound direction (uphill, where bicyclists are more in need of a dedicated lane). Either of these would be a setback for the bike network and bicyclist safety but, given that they've been the status quo for 40+ years, that a full reconstruction is coming in 10-15 years, and that the main danger area is north of Regent St, then I think they're compromises that reasonable people on both sides might agree to.

Best regards,

-Craig Weinhold

Survey comments

- *Stop crippling automobile travel in what is already a difficult area of the city to traverse.*
- *I'm unclear on why there is a need to replicate the work done on Segoe just one block away on Midvale*
- *Option 1 seems a lot like what has been done to Segoe Blvd just south of University, and that is an extremely confusing street to navigate now*
- *The Segoe redo is a disaster for driving and there are virtually no bikes that use it.*
- *Please minimize concrete separation between car travel lanes and bike lane.*
- *Listen, you pencil-necked bureaucrats, you're at it again, aren't you?*
- *Segoe Rd is not a great design. ... Traffic flow is awful on Segoe Rd. Midvale Boulevard is always backed up, I feel like your design will only cause problems*
- *I hate what you already did to segoe road. ... Please don't destroy midvale blvd.*

- *I am displeased with the Segoe redesign and avoid it whenever possible. Please don't do the same thing to Midvale.*

Public comments

From: [Charles Wolter](#)
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: Midvale Proposals
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 2:18:45 PM

You don't often get email from c.r.wolter@sbcglobal.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

NO to all THREE options propped!

There are three main North South through ways in that part of West Madison: Whitney Way, Segoe, and Midvale.

Bike lanes exist on Whitney Way, and very generous (and minimally used) bike lanes exist on Segoe.

Traffic lanes were already reduced on Whitney Way for the large bus lane, which is obviously not utilized near capacity.

Restricting traffic on Midvale to one lane will only further congest this area for a very few beneficiaries.

[This letter to the editor](#)

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Madison can't afford more overbuilt bicycle lanes | Jerry Darda

Aug 17, 2025 1

When you drive on Segoe Road between University Avenue and Regent Street on Madison's West Side, the experience parallels that of a demolition derby.

Driving lanes and parking spaces have been eliminated with fancy curbing for rarely used bike lanes. In addition, the median has not been mowed so that an effort to turn left into the Hilldale shopping center is impaired by out-of-control growth totally inhibiting the view of northbound drivers. In addition, this expensive curbing used to identify bike lanes is an impediment to snowplows.

I drive this stretch about four times per week, and I have yet to see one biker in these expensive bike lanes. Now the bike lobby is trying to get the city to do the same destructive design on Midvale Boulevard at a time when the city's population is increasing and car lanes should be a priority. Midvale Boulevard needs zero changes except surface maintenance on occasion.

Social media exchanges like this one



Craig Weinhold 5w · Sunset Village

The City is only proposing bike lanes -- simple stripes of paint. They are not proposing anything fancier like the protected lanes you see on N. Segoe. The City does plan to modify some curbs, but that is to accommodate street parking in the northbound direction. (that is the major cost of the project).



Bonnie Roe 5w · Midvale Heights

Craig then why are buffered bike lanes an option on the survey?



Craig Weinhold 5w · Sunset Village



Bonnie "Buffered" means there is a small painted buffer between the car and bike lane, like on S. Segoe (south of Regent St)

I fear the City didn't explain that well in the survey, but it's more clear in the supporting docs.



Bonnie Roe 5w · Midvale Heights

Craig oh good to know! I'm thinking no way could they put a protective/curbed lane in along Midvale, as it's an emergency route, right?

--

Ann E. Kovich

Email: annelizabethkovich@gmail.com

Mobile: 608-886-2556

Information contained in this email message is confidential and intended for use by the addressee only. Any other use of the information in this email is prohibited.