

From: jsgriswold
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: Public Comment 3/4/26
Date: Wednesday, March 4, 2026 3:49:14 PM

You don't often get email from jsgriswold@protonmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hi,

This email is for a public comment on Agenda Item 3 (92139), "Public Works Transportation Projects - Regent St.", at the 3/4/26 Transportation Commission meeting.

Thank you to the Commission for the work you're doing to improve our city.

As a Madison resident, I appreciate your care on the Regent Street reconstruction project to improve the area for safety and multiple modes of transportation. I understand that there are many diverse needs of residents, and that accommodating all of them can be a challenge. Additionally, I recognize your efforts to comply with Madison's Complete Green Streets guide (CGS) for building our streets in a way that reflects our community values - namely, prioritizing people over the speed and convenience, supporting safe communities, and promoting short trips through biking, walking, and transit.

While I commend many of the thoughtful improvements in the current proposed street design (as outlined on page 14 of today's slides) such as wider sidewalks, reduced/narrower lanes, and a push toward the CGS Community Main Street layout, I have questions about the bicycle recommendations and would like to hear more about the thinking behind them.

Why does the proposed design prioritize parking and business loading space over bicycle lanes?

On slide 40, the Major Concerns with a dedicated bike lane option are emergency vehicles, bus stops at intersections, and severely limiting parking/loading zones for businesses. I would like to see more explanation about these.

CGS notes that "emergency services are not included on the hierarchy because they will be accommodated at all levels". Could you clarify how including bicycle infrastructure will impact emergency services?

CGS does point to transit modes as higher priority than bicycle modes, but that does not explain why parking was chosen in the proposed design over bicycle infrastructure. Parking is specifically at the very bottom of the modal hierarchy. Slide 39 seems to imply that adding 10' of bike lanes will come at the cost of expanding sidewalks, even though the parking takes 16' of the street. Instead of the creating bicycle connections to the existing Southwest Commuter Path (Slide 42), why isn't the parking put on those side streets? CGS specifically outlines (p.44 of the CGS Guide) that for a Community Main Street "bike lanes should be included and may require consideration of parking options on side streets or in structured parking". Further, "loading zones, if needed, should be provided around the corner on intersecting minor streets". Slide 71 says that CGS calls out higher priority for parking because there are no backlots, current parking is highly used, and that business owners request to maintain current parking levels. Could you clarify how these reasons fit with CGS design?

I believe reducing car-centric infrastructure in our main streets has the biggest impact on safety

and creating a strong sense of place. And, that increasing the ease for residents to walk, bike, and bus to various locations actually increases their patronage at local businesses. Personally, I spend much more time and money with my friends and family in areas that have the least cars.

As I wrote above I know there are many ideas and needs in the design of Regent Street, so I look forward to seeing the many improvements in the future!

Thank you for your hard work.

--

Jamie Griswold (he/him/his)
jsgriswold@protonmail.com