I have reviewed the 199 public comments submitted on the Green Bay Street bike lane, and I strongly disagree with how city staff characterized them in the report which the Board of Public Works used to make its decision blocking the project in April. I have read and coded each comment as follows:

49 "Pro bike lane": supported the bike lane
38 "Parking": expressed concerns about parking loss
37 "Busy": said that Green Bay Street is busy, and often some combination of 'this will make traffic worse'/'bikes shouldn't be on busy streets'
13 "Uninformed": made statements that were based on either factually incorrect or insufficient information, such as saying this bike lane would be bad because it would interfere with student parking at Central; there's little to no chance that a bike lane would be built between 14th and Losey for a long time, because it was just refurbished.
70 "Hater": people who just oppose bike lanes in general. They had valuable and insightful contributions like "NO MORE BIKE LANES!" and "Are you guys actually serious? When have you ever seen someone using the bike lanes? We have a huge parking problem and you want to make it worse. Honestly go f**k yourself.".
23 "Other": Either something completely off the wall, or just a question, or some information that was actually helpful and informative, such as details about the operation of the loading bay.
(this adds up to more than 199 because some mentioned multiple types of concerns, such as haters who also complained about parking loss)

Redfield as an option was mentioned in 13 comments, all but one coded as "Busy".

The haters should be ignored. The creation of a bicycle transportation network is established City policy, by the Green Complete Streets ordinance and the 2024 Bicycle Master Plan, which were both ratified by the City Council.

The sheer volume of comments which were opposed to bike lanes in principle was not conveyed in the Staff Memorandum that summarized public feedback for easy consumption by busy City Council members. Instead, they were summarized as follows:

"Notable comments from the online survey for those not in favor of bicycle infrastructure noted concern bike lanes would cause traffic issues, suggestions for creating bike routes on less traveled streets and corridors, and concern with removal of parking."

Busy, Redfield, and Parking. Haters, despite being the largest category of antis, were not mentioned in the summary.

This, and other summaries provided by staff, failed to present the true picture of opinions, and could have very plausibly shifted Public Works' perception of the opposition to make it seem more reasonable than it actually was.

***

The haters do have a minor point that few people are using the current bike lanes, but this is because the bike network is currently incomplete, we still heavily subsidize and build for cars without providing sufficient non-car transportation options, and we don't have a single functional protected bike lane anywhere in the city. I don't consider paint-on "bike lanes" to be bike lanes. People don't use them, because they're still right next to traffic with zero protection. People don't use painted-on "bike lanes"

and they certainly don't want to be in the lane with cars, so if we want to make it viable to get around without a car, protected lanes are necessary. This is why we have to stop surrendering and start building infrastructure that's actually good and that people will want to use.

If we remove the comments coded "hater" from the survey, the number of people who oppose this bike lane drops to only slightly more than the number of people who support it. Issues about parking, Green Bay being busy, and people who are straight up misinformed are easily resolved.

People who expressed concerns about loss of parking are largely overruled by the Green Complete Streets ordinance, which is chapter 40 section 14 of the La Crosse Municipal Ordinances. Which means it's law. Which means city staff should follow it. Specifically, part (d)(2)e. states "Loss of on-street parking shall not be considered a singular criterion for exclusion of a Green Complete Street Project". This was put into the city ordinances specifically for this kind of situation. The fact of the matter is that there's only so much room in the right-of-way, and the default is that streets have parking, so if we let parking loss shut down a bike lane, we will literally never have bike lanes. That said, only one option would have removed parking entirely from both sides, and it was the second-least-popular one.

Also, each additional bicyclist means one fewer person taking up a parking spot. So if you want to make it easier for you, personally, to park, then you should enthusiastically support decent bike infrastructure, and a better bus system and so forth. If you want to make it hard to park, take away all options except driving.

As for the concern about Green Bay being too busy- this makes no sense. The protected bike lane would be separated from car/truck traffic. Cars and bikes would almost never interact.

***

The suggestion to put a "greenway" on Redfield is absurd. King and 17th streets are sometimes cited as "greenways". They're not. We have a bad habit in this town of mislabeling things to make them sound better than they actually are. A greenway means something exclusively for bicycles and pedestrians. See the Minneapolis Greenway. Is the idea to remove all cars from Redfield? I somehow doubt it. The word for a street that cars can drive on isn't "greenway"- it's "street".

The reason to put a bike lane on Green Bay is that it has stop lights at South Ave, West Ave, and Losey Blvd, so cyclists can actually get across these streets without having to play Frogger. Redfield has no stop lights. Adding RRFBs to West Ave and Losey would likely cost tens if not hundreds of thousands of dollars. Redfield has no connection to South Ave. The whole point of the 2024 Bicycle Master Plan was to create a bicycle network that would be safe and convenient, so people would actually be able to use it. Redfield can never be either of those.

If there are people who would prefer Redfield because it's quieter and has more trees and so forth, they can already do that today, right now. But people don't. Because it's not a serious transportation route. Minor tweaks are not going to change that.

Public Works made the wrong choice in April and the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee made the wrong choice on Tuesday, and I believe that the way the survey was presented by staff played a significant part in this.

Kevin Hundt, June 11th, 2026

Addendum July 2nd, 2026:

On April 29th, I asked Council President and Board of Public Works member Dickinson why Public Works voted the way it did, as the video was apparently not recorded, and this was her response:

“Spending money on streets that have already been repaired is not a good use of funds. The board felt the surveys of those living or working on the street did not want the change. Several surveyed suggested Redfield as an alternative.”

I also recently asked Mayor Washington-Spivey his reasoning, and he stated that the Board felt that rebuilding Green Bay Street for a bike lane would be a waste of money as it was just rebuilt last year. When I told him that Bike-Ped had supported a protected lane from South Avenue to 14th Street and was discussing compromise infrastructure design, he expressed that he had not been made aware of that.

These responses point to a severe miscommunication between Public Works and BPAC. We would be wrong to make this decision based on the result of this miscommunication and misrepresentation. We should stick to the original, superior, Green Bay Street route, based on starting with South Avenue to 14th and gradually expanding to 16th, East Avenue, and eventually Losey, and urge Public Works to reconsider.

Kevin Hundt