

From: [Nicholas Davies](#)
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Cc: [Martinez-Rutherford, Dina Nina](#); [Zwieg, Andrew](#)
Subject: Require Complete Green Streets-consistent options for Regent St (92139)
Date: Sunday, March 1, 2026 12:40:37 PM

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

Dear Transportation Commission,

At the Jan 26 meeting, as it became clear that the "preferred" alternative includes no dedicated bike facility, I asked: will the travel lanes include sharrows?

The response was: no, because the speed and volume of the travel lanes are too high.

Cyclists will be expected to bike in the travel lanes, but these travel lanes are too dangerous to even mark them with sharrows.

Your last meeting included a discussion of Vision Zero in the context of Sasha Rosen's death. We're not trending towards zero, and that's partly because street reconstructions like this one are ignoring Vision Zero.

This "preferred" alternative also doesn't comply with the Complete Green Streets guide. For a Community Main Street, it says:

"Bike lanes should be included and may require consideration of parking options on side streets or in structured parking."

In contrast, the "preferred" alternative prioritizes parking, to the complete exclusion of biking. It doesn't have to be this way. For instance, Option 2 shown on Jan 26, which included a sidewalk-level path, was objectively the best option presented:

* The path would offer an alternative route for emergency vehicles if the travel lanes are congested. No other options presented include this feature. Option 2 is the best option for emergency response.

* The sidewalk-level path would of course be open to pedestrians as well, and it would do the most to narrow the crossings of Regent Street, as CGS also recommends. Option 2 is the best option for pedestrians.

* In Option 2, buses would stop in a travel lane. Staff called this a downside, but this is specifically what the Complete Green Streets guide recommends:
"Designs will prioritize in-lane stops that do not require buses to merge back into traffic."
Thus Option 2 is the best option for transit as well.

However, Option 2 is not the only possibility for Regent Street that would be consistent with Complete Green Streets. Given the 25 mph speed limit and the nearby path, simple painted bike lanes could be sufficient. These would give vehicles another 5 feet to pull over on either side in an emergency situation, enhancing emergency response.

This is all based on a fallacy that, because there's a path somewhere nearby, this street doesn't need a bike facility at all. That is 180° backwards. The area around a path is the best place to extend the bike network.

If the Commission truly believes that, though--that it's okay to entirely exclude bikes from streets that are near enough to a path--then that should be a written policy. Otherwise, if CGS says verbatim that there should be a bike facility on this type of street, but we're just gonna decide otherwise on a case-by-case vibes basis, then we don't actually have a policy at all.

It's a real shame that at your meeting this week, we will be evaluating a "preferred" alternative (selected before the public got to see any designs) that does not meet the Complete Green Streets standard, when instead we could have been comparing and contrasting one or more *legitimate* options, and could've had a better discussion as a result.

If it were actually used, the Complete Green Streets guide could be such a time-saver as well, allowing staff to build upon all the work that's already gone into it, rather than reinventing the wheel with every project. Staff could save themselves a whole lot of effort if they stopped working on non-compliant designs in the first place. I thought we went over this already, with Pflaum Rd.

I urge you to direct staff to come back with legitimate options.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St