

August 29, 2017

Mr. Shaw,

We do plan on implementing this trial traffic diverter. We will collect hourly speed and volume data before and during the test throughout the area. There is no specific level of increased or decreased traffic that would make the test unacceptable. Rather, we will use the data along with feedback from residents in the neighborhood to reach a decision as to whether the traffic diverter is successful or not.

We understand there will be a lot of feedback and opinions from the residents around this area. Because of that, we will set up a city webpage dedicated to collecting comments from the neighborhood. We are still in the process of having our IT department set this up. When it is ready, we will mail informational postcards to residents and set up the test. We expect this to be in late September or October.

Let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,

Tom Mohr, P.E.

Traffic Engineering

City of Madison

(608) 267-8725

**From:** Bob Shaw [mailto:[robert.e.shaw@gmail.com](mailto:robert.e.shaw@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Friday, August 25, 2017 7:14 AM

**To:** Mohr, Thomas

**Cc:** Tyler Lark

**Subject:** East Mifflin Bicycle Boulevard

Hello Mr. Mohr,

I understand that TE is going to do a three month trial traffic diversion at the intersection of East Mifflin and North Blair streets. I have several questions to ask you regarding that trial.

I live on the 900 block of East Dayton street. The steering committee had proposed diversion also at the intersection of East Dayton and North Blair streets but TE rejected that proposal saying that there is low traffic there already - see <http://www.tenneylapham.org/web-data/steering/embbfeatures0817.pdf>.

But obviously if traffic is diverted off of E. Mifflin, that traffic will be going someplace else. And so the big unknown at this point is how much of an impact will the diversion have on the adjacent residential streets. I assume TE will be doing traffic surveys on the adjacent blocks to gauge the effect of the diversion.

Will TE be doing traffic surveys on all of the affected blocks before, during, and after the trial? If so, what streets and what blocks will TE be conducting the survey on? What level of increase (10%, 20%, other?) would TE consider to be unacceptable on the adjacent streets? What kind of outreach will TE have to notify the neighborhood about the trial diversion? What are the dates that the diversion will occur?

Thank you in advance for your reply.

Bob Shaw

July 8, 2017

Hi Patty,

I have reviewed the materials and would like to be involved in the next meeting. Is anything scheduled?

Some of my questions/comments are:

1.) Why was the traffic survey done in late winter? The bike boulevard is primarily utilized by bike traffic in the summer, and therefore we should know what the summer traffic counts are not what the winter traffic counts are. There are many things that occur downtown in the summer that draw greater numbers of drivers as well as a greater tendency for people to be out and about during the nice weather.

2.) I question the stop sign that was just installed at Livingston. I cross Mifflin St. at that very intersection every morning and have first hand experience with the traffic. The main problem that makes it difficult to cross at this time is the temporary existence of the machinery being utilized to construct the condos between Livingston and Patterson. The need for a stop sign at the intersection seems questionable. My observation is that anyone who is traveling quickly along Mifflin, jams on their brakes at the new stop sign and then guns their car to get moving again down the street. If anything, it may have made the intersection more dangerous for a pedestrian who is depending upon the traffic to be carefully slowing down.

3.) The Blount and Mifflin intersection has the most confusing and unhelpful traffic signal in town. My dog and I were almost run over there a couple of weeks ago by a driver who was traveling east on Mifflin as I was crossing Blount as they attempted to turn south onto Blount and failed to notice that I was in the crosswalk just a few feet away. This incident was so severe that a bike rider a block away asked if I was ok.

4.) Why can't the speed limit be reduced on Mifflin in order to improve safety and discourage speeding?

5.) I don't think that traffic islands are a particularly good idea. The one on Franklin and Mifflin causes more harm than good in that drivers are confused and often utilize it inappropriately. In addition, it squeezes the street into too narrow of a corridor.

6.) The lack of signage along E. Mifflin is a huge problem and one that seems could be corrected easily. The pavement paint showing the bike path wears out quickly and the signs along the edge of the street disappear when the trees leaf out which is when the street is used most frequently by bikers, skate boarders, motorized wheelchairs, and other non-vehicular traffic.

I could go on, but I would rather participate at the next meeting, if possible. As a former biker, I can relate to the biking needs, such as as few stop signs as possible. I currently walk along E. Mifflin each morning, which gives me that perspective, plus, as a driver on the street, I

understand their needs. I feel that I can contribute on all three fronts in a very specific and personal way.

Thanks.  
Barb Wilson

P.S. Just as I am concluding this email, a car accelerated past our condo at 623 E. Mifflin St. in a "pedal to the floor" scenario that my husband estimated was at least 40 MPH.

---

On Fri, Jun 16, 2017 at 10:30 AM, Grant Foster <[grantxyz@gmail.com](mailto:grantxyz@gmail.com)> wrote:  
Also, for anyone interested, [this video](#) about the Idaho Stop does a good job of explaining the physics of why stopping is such a big deal for bicycle travel. Anyone who spends a lot of time on a bike will already understand this through experience, but it can be helpful for those that don't have that experiential knowledge.

Our success in reducing the negative impact of car travel in this neighborhood and in the city at large is directly linked to our ability to promote alternative ways of moving ourselves about. We need to make driving cars less convenient and simultaneously make travel by foot, by bike, and by mass transit more comfortable and convenient.

On Fri, Jun 16, 2017 at 10:19 AM Grant Foster <[grantxyz@gmail.com](mailto:grantxyz@gmail.com)> wrote:  
Good morning, all.

I'm sorry I missed the meeting last night; somehow it never made it on to my calendar. Unfortunately, I also have a conflict with the 6/28 date (it's the first night of the [Places for Bikes conference](#) here in town). Is there any way to get a look at the map that you all worked on? I'd love to get a sense of what recommendations are coming from TE and what the group has come up with.

I also wanted to call out the surprise installation of the new stop signs on Mifflin at Livingston. I had a chance to share some initial thoughts about this with Ledell, but am very concerned about the negative impact that new stop has for the quality of the bike boulevard. Generally, bike boulevards are defined as streets that have interventions to minimize motor vehicle traffic volume and speed and to prioritize bike travel right of way with limited stops. This bike boulevard already has stops at Dickinson, Baldwin, Ingersoll, Paterson, and Blair. All except for Dickinson are designated as through streets and, unfortunately, require stops for Mifflin Street bike traffic. I'd be interested in looking at Dickinson to see if there's an opportunity to reprioritize those intersections (at Mifflin and at Dayton). I'd also like to get a better and more detailed understanding of the reason behind the 4-way stop installation and the alternatives available. I think review of this intersection needs to be on the table for reconsideration.

Here's some general information on bike boulevards from  
NACTO: <https://nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide/bicycle-boulevards/> with

specific recommendations on prioritizing bike travel here: <https://nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide/bicycle-boulevards/minor-street-crossing/>

*"At intersections with local streets and minor collectors, bicycle boulevards should have right-of-way priority and reduce or minimize delay by limiting the number of stop signs along the route. Stretches of at least a half mile or more of continuous travel without stop sign control are desirable."*

It's certainly possible that a 4-way stop may be what's needed for this intersection, but I'm concerned that the negative impact to the functionality of the bike boulevard may not have been appropriately weighed. It seems surprising that pedestrians would have more difficulty crossing Mifflin Street at Livingston than Johnson Street at Livingston (or any other intersection where motor vehicle through traffic is prioritized). I think we need more detailed information and there needs to be an opportunity for public review and comment. Once we better understand the specific issue or issues that Traffic Engineering is hoping to solve with the installation of this additional stop, we'll be in a better position to consider all alternatives and to understand how the design and treatment of this intersection plays into the broader plans that this group hopes to put forward.

I appreciate everyone's efforts on this and look forward to reconnecting soon.

Grant