

From: [Alicia Lyu](#)
To: [Guequierre, John](#); [Board of Public Works](#)
Cc: [kliems@gmail.com](#); [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: Regent street reconstruction (BPW 4/22, Legistar 92491): procedural and policy failures
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 3:06:33 PM

You don't often get email from alicia.w.lyu@icloud.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hello Alder Guequierre and Board of Public Works,

I hope this email finds you well. I am writing to bring to your attention a critical agenda item in this week's Board of Public Works (BPW) meeting regarding the **Regent Street reconstruction**. While I personally wish to see the addition of bike lanes, I am focusing my request on the **procedural failures** in this process; it is because of these failures that the BPW should consider referring the item back to the Transportation Commission (TC).

My concerns regarding the integrity of the process are as follows:

- **The TC deliberation was based on incomplete information.** The TC reached a 5-5 tie, broken only by the Chair, despite the item being a consent agenda item at first. Much of the information that influenced the commissioners emerged only because public registrants brought it to their attention, leaving the committee insufficient time to deliberate on these critical details before a vote.
- **Staff limited the decision-making scope by providing only one viable option.** Although staff evaluated several designs, they dismissed all alternatives to the current plan based on "technical viability." This forced the TC to accept a single predetermined outcome, effectively allowing staff—rather than the appointed committee—to dictate the design of Regent Street.
- **Technical constraints were misrepresented to the committee.** During the meeting, it was revealed that the "technical difficulties" of adding bike lanes vanish if parking is restricted to one side of the street. Staff admitted they did not draft such a design not because of technical viability but to prioritize parking, as shown in this exchange:

Harald Kliems: *Did you draft up a design that had on-street parking on one side and how does that allow you to do in terms of bike facilities?*

Tom Mohr: *Yeah, we didn't draw up just one side because the delivery [issue].*

- **Policy-level prioritization was executed by staff without committee direction.** It became clear only 20 minutes before the vote that the omission of bike facilities was a choice to prioritize parking. Per the Complete Green Streets (CGS) guide and public surveys for Regent Street, parking is the lowest priority for this corridor, and **the decision to override these established priorities belongs to the Committee, not city staff.**

This represents a fundamental procedural failure because staff misrepresented the technical viability of alternatives. By presenting only one "viable" design, the TC and, now, the BPW

have been denied a meaningful opportunity to make a policy decision.

Being a D19 resident, I've always appreciated and trusted the work of Alder Guequierre, no matter whether the issue directly pertains to D19. I plead you to raise a motion to **refer this issue back to the TC** and allow for a proper deliberation with multiple design options at hand.

Sincerely,

Alicia Lyu

District 19