

From: [Nicholas Davies](#)
To: [All Alders](#)
Subject: Support 82916 (190 recommendations)
Date: Sunday, May 5, 2024 2:37:02 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from nbdavies@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear alders,

I support most of the recommendations in item 82916:

Discourage collector/distributor lanes

These lanes are just an excuse to further expand a 6-8 lane stretch of the interstate to an atrocious 12 lanes(!). There is no justification for that. It will increase costs to the public, consume more land, and exacerbate the existing problems posed by the interstate:

- * Incentivizing VMT and suburban sprawl in a time of climate crisis
- * Noise, water, light, and air pollution, which all worsen with vehicle volumes/speeds
- * Making more land uninhabitable / unusable / un-taxable
- * Making the barrier between neighborhoods (and ecosystems) that much more burdensome to cross by any mode

Discouraging expansion of the interstate's footprint along its entire length, or at least along the stretch within city limits, is the most important piece of this resolution.

Opposing nonsense spaghetti at 90 & 151

Option 5a/6 is a mess, and would consume more land. However, I'm also skeptical of the bike/ped way shown in 1c.

In my past conversations with WisDOT, they have claimed to be unable to build multi-modal highways. Yet when they want to sugar-coat this for us, they include this bike/ped connection as a selling point. In places like West Towne, the bike/ped path ends up being outside the highway right-of-way, and entirely a city expense. Additional land for it becomes very hard to acquire, without being able to use eminent domain.

So we need to get solid commitments that if 1c is chosen, the bike/ped component is actually happening as part of the project, within 151's existing footprint, and at a cost-share similar to the car-supportive elements of the project. Without that, 1c isn't acceptable either.

Other elements I'm not so sure about...

Adding interchanges

I'm not convinced that adding interchanges at Milwaukee St and Hoepker Rd will have a positive impact overall. The Hoepker Rd interchange would only benefit/incentivize motor vehicle travel. The Milwaukee St interchange, if it does actually connect to Co Rd T, could be a multi-modal connection, although the highway interchange isn't a necessary component of that: Milwaukee St could connect with T without an interchange at 94, and be safer for all users. The interchange itself only benefits/incentivizes motor vehicles. Plus some funding would likely have to come from the city budget.

Keeping the High Crossing interchange

The High Crossing exit is also redundant with the E Wash / 151 exit, and WisDOT should

consider eliminating it, to simplify vehicle movements and reduce costs. That would also make High Crossing a safer connection across the interstate for all modes.

Expanding to the "Modernization Hybrid"

We never should have let WisDOT add flex lanes to the Beltline. They only increase speeding and lead to accidents. Now WisDOT wants to do the same thing? I would be more supportive of the "Modernization of Existing Lanes" alternative.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St