

From: [Kaleb Haugen](#)
To: [council](#)
Cc: [All Alders](#); [Madison, Sabrina](#)
Subject: Legistar 92491 - Refer back to Transportation commission
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 1:13:11 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from kaleb@haugenh.us. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Alders,

I urge you to refer the Regent Street reconstruction project (Legistar 92491) back to the Transportation Commission before advancing it to the Board of Public Works. I'm a long-time Madison resident with broad experience in urban transportation and public safety in addition to my preference for bike commuting, writing because I'm deeply concerned with the Regent St. redesign's failure to attempt alignment with Madison's Complete Green Streets, Vision Zero, and All Ages & Abilities policies.

Requested action:

1. Refer the project back to the Transportation Commission rather than advancing it on for Board of Public Works review; and
2. Direct City Engineering to either:
 - Submit revised designs that fully comply with Complete Green Streets (including appropriate bike facilities and pedestrian-prioritized public realm), or
 - Resubmit the current designs to the Transportation Commission with detailed, itemized, formal requests for variances for each non-compliant element, including detailed written justification and evidence supporting each variance.

Reasons for referral:

- **Noncompliance with Complete Green Streets:** The presented geometry does not meet Madison's Complete Green Streets standards, and no formal exception or variance has been recorded in Legistar to justify that noncompliance. TC should have the opportunity to address these gaps or explicitly consider variances with full documentation.
- **False choice of options:** City Engineering presented only non-compliant design options, forcing a choice among alternatives that all fail to meet the policy. TC needs compliant alternatives or a clear, transparent variance request with written justification.
- **Excessive lane widths and safety concerns:** The design includes vehicular lane widths wider than those on interstate highways, a decision at odds with established traffic calming and safety best practices—particularly alarming given recent fatal vehicle violence on S. Park St. Wider lanes encourage higher speeds and reduce safety for people walking and biking.
- **Omission of bike facilities:** The current cross-section effectively excludes bike lanes while allocating very wide vehicular lanes. Complete Green Streets guidance calls for inclusion of bike facilities and consideration of alternate parking solutions when needed.

With hundreds or thousands of new residents planned along Regent, omitting bike infrastructure will have long-term negative consequences for safe active transportation.

- **Pedestrian space sacrificed for parking:** The current design preserves a large amount of on-street parking at the expense of sidewalk and public realm space, contrary to engagement results that prioritized pedestrian space and contrary to the project's stated goals.
- **Prioritization of vehicle convenience over other users:** The plan centres motor vehicle throughput (in part to accommodate an unnecessarily large clear width allegedly requested by Fire but not documented in the Legistar in a transparent way) rather than balancing the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders, businesses, and residents in this heavily walked and transit-served corridor.

A street reconstruction is the one regular opportunity to correct past design mistakes. Please ensure Regent Street's redesign reflects the city's policies and the community's priorities—safe, equitable, modal-inclusive, and people-centered streets rather than an institutional preference for oversized vehicle geometry.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kaleb Haugen
District 17

From: [Craig Weinhold](#)
To: [All Alders](#)
Subject: Referral: agenda #102 (Regent St geometry) should go back to T.C., not to B.P.W.
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 8:20:34 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from cweinhold@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

The Regent Street Geometry ([Legistar 92491](#)) should be referred back to Transportation Commission because it is missing the **Complete Green Streets CHECKLIST** that *"should accompany project documentation through the approval process."* ([Complete Green Streets guide](#), page 68). Here is an example Checklist from the Sheboygan & Segoe project: [DRAFT CGS Sheboygan Segoe CGS Project Checklist 07262023.pdf](#)

The Regent St project deviates from Complete Green Streets in many ways, but only a few have been addressed by City Engineering orally and in their documentation. The CGS Checklist is needed to fully appreciate how far the project deviates from Complete Green Streets.

Best,
Craig Weinhold