

Speed Limit Review
Engagement Supplemental Information



Speed Limit Review

Engagement Supplemental Information
May 28, 2021



1 Background

This report provides additional information on the public engagement conducted for the Residential Speed Limit Review, including:

- Summary of comments received;
- Data cleaning of open link survey responses;
- Marketing summary; and
- Data limitations.

2 Summary of Comments Received

Respondents to the open link survey were able to provide a comment. These comments were analyzed to determine common themes. Below are the most common themes and sub-themes from these comments.

Administration also received 263 emails from the public. There was also a total of 84 comments on the City's project engage page (including City staff comments). The common themes from these other sources of input closely reflect the comments received in the survey.

Below is a summary of the most common themes and sub-themes received.

Does not support lower speed limits on residential streets

- Most were not in support of reviewing residential speed limits
- Doesn't think accidents on residential streets are an issue
- Waste of taxpayer money (i.e., the review, the cost of signage changes)
- Should not be a priority
- Will not fix speeding, distracted driving
- Argue that many accidents are caused by poor practices by pedestrians / cyclists rather than vehicle speed
- Negative impacts to reduced speed
 - Worse traffic flow
 - Frustration with lower speed
 - Too much attention on the speedometer rather than surroundings
 - Confusion / frustration with multiple speed limit changes
- Money grab through tickets
- Feel the change would not be adequately enforced

Frustration with the review process

- Survey questions and information provided by the City were biased towards reducing speeds
 - No option for increasing speeds
 - Limited options provided for school zone days/times
- City should have provided recent local collision data
- Review should have been initiated based on factual evidence, not perceptions of speed or input from interest groups
- Feel that City Council has already decided and public input will be ignored

Other options to consider

- Add traffic controls and calming measures where needed (e.g., seniors zones)
- Use fencing and other measures to direct pedestrians at parks and schools
- Enforce existing rules / hold offenders accountable
- Support addressing speed in neighbourhoods / spots where it's a proven issue rather than a City-wide blanket approach
- Education on traffic safety (drivers, cyclists, children)

Supportive of the review

- Those who indicated support for reductions on residential streets were more supportive of reductions on local streets compared to collectors or arterials
- There was more support for 40km/h as some feel 30km/h is excessively slow
- Safety considerations and concerns with vehicle speed were most often provided as the reason for supporting the review
- Speed limit reductions would not be widely supported in Saskatoon because of its "car culture"

Speed zones

- Support for school zones in general, even among many who are against considerations of speed reductions on residential streets
- Many support removal of speed zones next to high schools
- Not enough options were provided for times/days in the survey (e.g., options such as "only when children are present" or "other options for end times")
- Support for speed zones next to playgrounds, especially close to the roadway
- Many suggested traffic controls (e.g., flashing crosswalk signs) in areas with high numbers of seniors rather than speed reductions
- Some support school / playground zones year-round
- Traffic safety is also the responsibility of parents, teachers, and children

3 Data Cleaning – Open Link Survey

The City's open link survey allowed for multiple responses to be received from the same IP address. This setting was selected to ensure those who have limited or no access to their own device would still be able to participate in the survey at locations such as libraries, schools, or work places. This also enabled multiple respondents from the same household.

To mitigate the impact of any attempts at skewing the results by individuals who would fill out the survey multiple times, the results were sorted by IP address and reviewed if there were 10 or more responses from an IP address. In total, the responses from 52 IP addresses were reviewed using the following considerations:

- Were the responses submitted in quick succession beyond what one could expect from multiple users?
- Were there comments provided that repeated the same points using the same phrases / wording?
- Were the same options selected for each closed-ended opinion question?

If it was clearly evident using these considerations that the responses from an IP address with 10 or more responses were submitted by the same individual, all but the first response provided was omitted from the analysis. In cases where it was not clearly evident, all responses were included in the analysis.

In total, 731 responses from 35 different IP addresses were removed from the analysis. However, the difference in results for each question were negligible whether these responses were included in the analysis or not and, therefore, their removal had no impact on how the results were interpreted.

4 Marketing

To encourage a broad representation of Saskatoon residents, we used a variety of communications tools to promote the online survey to people digitally through social media and offline using printed inserts mailed with utility bills through April, posters at Leisure Centres and Saskatoon Public Libraries, and radio ads (2 weeks in mid March). The paid 6-week social media campaign reached beyond the City's followers across Facebook, Twitter and Instagram with 231,000 impressions.

The response was tremendous with an unprecedented participation of approximately 15,000 entries.

To ensure a balanced cross-section of residents were included in the public engagement, we hired a third-party firm to reach participants. The third-party firm offered both telephone and online as an option. They contacted a total of 1,234 participants and received 61 telephone responses and 353 online responses for a total of 414 responses.

Participants represented people from ages 18-84 from many different neighbourhoods who drive, walk, jog, and/or bike in all seasons.

5 Data Limitations

- Due to COVID-19, we were not able to conduct any in-person engagement. Online engagement is less inclusive as some residents may have limited to no Internet access. To mitigate this issue:
 - a third-party firm was hired to conduct the survey with a telephone option;
 - the survey allowed for multiple responses per IP address so the survey could be completed at public libraries, schools, work places, and other locations in which a person might have better access to the Internet;
 - the survey was promoted in a number of different ways other than digital promotions, including posters, utility bill inserts, and radio ads; and
 - the survey was open for responses for approximately two months.
- The question "Which speed limit being considered would you prefer for each type of residential street?" included the options 30km/h, 40km/h, 50km/h, and Unsure. However, some arterial streets with residential frontages currently have speed limits higher than 50km/h. Those responses received that prefer 50km/h will be interpreted as indicating "status quo" or "no change," which is supported by the comments received.

- Several comments received included “write-in” preferences for speed zone days/times for schools/playgrounds that were not included as options in the question.