
From: Alicia Lyu <alicia.w.lyu@icloud.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 11:20 PM

To: Transportation Commission <TransportationCommis@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: Concerns Regarding Staff Neutrality and Technical Constraints in Regent Street Planning (#92491)

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.

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 Mohr **do not represent an impartial range of options, but rather a narrow selection that ensures 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 guidance, **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 prioritized 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 prioritized 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-model 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 CGS-compliant design. I ask that a member of the prevailing side (esp., Alder Ochowicz) move for reconsideration so that the Commission may deliberate on a complete and accurate range of design alternatives.

Sincerely,
Alicia Lyu
District 19