

Name: [Alissa Lynn](#)  
To: [Council](#)  
Subject: [Complete Green Street Feasibility and Technical Constraints in Regent Street Planning \(19000\)](#)  
Date: [Wednesday, April 23, 2025 11:28:24 AM](#)  
Attachments: [Screenshot of Council Meeting Presentation](#)

You do not have permission to view this calendar item. [View this item in my calendar.](#)

[View this item in my calendar.](#)

Dear Transportation Commission,

I am writing to formally express grave concerns regarding the staff's handling of the Regent Street design process. It has become apparent that the alternatives presented by Tom Meier do not represent an impartial range of options, but rather a narrow selection that covers an auto-centric outcome. By failing to provide the Commission with a viable alternative that adheres to both the technical requirements of this specific project and Complete Green Street guidelines, staff has effectively steered the decision-making process toward a predetermined conclusion, no matter whether this is their intention. Due to this procedural failure, I urge the commission to move for reconsideration in your next meeting.

The attached multi-modal configuration is not only possible but, unlike multi-modal designs presented by staff, it is also technically sound:

- Pedestrian infrastructure is preserved by maintaining 11-foot sidewalks on both sides of the street.
- Emergency vehicle access is ensured by maintaining a minimum width of 28 feet throughout the stretch.
- Curbside utility is preserved through the inclusion of on-street parking and dedicated bus loading areas.
- Intersection functionality is maintained by incorporating the necessary left-turn lanes.
- Pedestrian experience is promoted by allocating sufficient space for trees.

To be clear, the problem is not that the Commission did not choose a multi-modal design, but that staff did not present the Commission with a viable multi-modal design at all and misrepresented its technical viability.

The existence of this viable design suggests that the constraints presented to the Commission were not absolute technical limitations, but rather choices made to prioritize vehicular throughput and storage over established city safety goals, effectively in violation of the impartiality required of civil servants. It suggests that the Commission was denied the opportunity to evaluate a COG-compliant design. I ask that a member of the prevailing side (esp. Alder Alderson) move for reconsideration so that the Commission may deliberate on a complete and accurate range of design alternatives.

Sincerely,  
Alissa Lynn  
District VP

