

Pien, Janet

From: John and April Hoffman [cvlrts@charter.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 8:29 PM
To: publicworks
Cc: Fernandez, Anthony; Pien, Janet; Engineer; Dryer, David; Trowbridge, David
Subject: Lighting on Southwest Bike Path

As residents who live adjacent to the Southwest Bike Path path and use it daily for commuting, we oppose lighting the path for the following reasons: 1. Lighting will encourage crime, which so far has not been a problem. We have always felt 100% safe with the path dark at night. We fear that lighting will allow trouble makers to hide in shadows while assessing the vulnerability of path users and to light up back yards to show what might be worth stealing. 2. Destroying natural areas with development such as lighting is no longer considered desirable 'progress". Lighting will negatively affect wildlife and peoples' enjoyment of nature. 3. Lighting is too costly. If so many residents oppose the lights, why are some alders pushing to spend 200,000.00+ for them? Does the city suddenly have surplus money for a controversial project? Surely council members could find a more worthy project than lighting this short stretch of path. We have been told that money for lighting has NOT already been allocated, so why would the council fund them during tight budget times? 4. Why does a statewide lobby the Bicycle Federation carry more clout with certain alders than the voters who elected them? Again, who is really benefitting from this unpopular use of taxpayers' money? 5. Why must we fund something that benefits out of towners who merely want to commute faster through our neighborhoods? 6. Spending for lights that are inappropriate and will actually increase problems for night bikers is such a no brainer we can't comprehend any council member voting for them 7. When the city replaced the rail road tracks with the bike path, officials assured neighbors that the path would NOT be lit while proceeding to lay the ground work to install lights. This chicanery should be reason enough to table the project. Why this sudden push for a project that is so unpopular? Who benefits from this folly? The city should at least wait to install lights until the majority of neighbors see a need for them. Finally, the concerns of residents' who live adjacent to the path should of course be considered first, certainly before bikers who live outside city limits, but council members should know that these residents are not the only citizens who oppose lighting the Southwest Bike Path. Thank you for reading this. CONTACT Contact Council 2011-2013 Common Council Members Contact Information As residents who live adjacent to the Southwest Bike Path path and use it daily for commuting, we oppose lighting the path for the following reasons: 1. Lighting will encourage crime, which so far has not been a problem. We have always felt 100% safe with the path dark at night. We fear that lighting will allow trouble makers to hide in shadows while assessing the vulnerability of path users and to light up back yards to show what might be worth stealing. 2. Destroying natural areas with development such as lighting is no longer considered desirable 'progress". Lighting will negatively affect wildlife and peoples' enjoyment of nature. 3. Lighting is too costly. If so many residents oppose the lights, why are some alders pushing to spend 200,000.00+ for them? Does the city suddenly have surplus money for a controversial project? Surely council members could find a more worthy project than lighting this short stretch of path. We have been told that money for lighting has NOT already been allocated, so why would the council fund them during tight budget times? 4. Why does a statewide lobby the Bicycle Federation carry more clout with certain alders than the voters who elected them? Again, who is really benefitting from this unpopular use of taxpayers' money? 5. Why must we fund something that benefits out of towners who merely want to commute faster through our neighborhoods? 6. Spending for lights that are inappropriate and will actually increase problems for night bikers is such a no brainer we can't comprehend any council member voting for them 7. When the city replaced the rail road tracks with the bike path, officials assured neighbors that the path would NOT be lit while proceeding to lay the ground work to install lights. This chicanery should be reason enough to table the project. Why this sudden push for a project that is so unpopular? Who benefits from this folly? The city should at least wait to install lights until the majority of

neighbors see a need for them. Finally, the concerns of residents' who live adjacent to the path should of course be considered first, certainly before bikers who live outside city limits, but council members should know that these residents are not the only citizens who oppose lighting the Southwest Bike Path. Thank you for reading this. CONTACT Contact Council 2011-2013 Common Council Members Contact Information ALDER LOOK-UP Alder By Address Alder By Map Stay Informed Get email updates Subscribe to RSS Find on Facebook Follow on Twitter Watch on YouTube Common Council Office: 210 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, Room 417, Madison, WI 53703 Phone: 608 266-4071 | WI Relay Service | Fax: 608 267-8669