## Janzen, Heather

**Subject:** FW: Email - Communication - Jason Hanson - Neighbourhood Bikeways 30km-h Speed Limit Policy - CK 6320-0 x 6000-5

From: Web NoReply < web-noreply@Saskatoon.ca>

**Sent:** Friday, December 15, 2023 11:54 AM **To:** City Council < <u>City.Council@Saskatoon.ca</u>>

Subject: Email - Communication - James Dobson - Neighbourhood Bikeways 30km-h Speed Limit Policy - CK 6320-0 x

6000-5

--- Replies to this email will go to

Submitted on Friday, December 15, 2023 - 11:54

Submitted by user:

Submitted values are:

I have read and understand the above statements.: Yes

I do not want my comments placed on a public agenda. They will be shared with members of Council through their online repository.: No

I only want my comments shared with the Mayor or my Ward Councillor.: No

Date: Friday, December 15, 2023

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council

Pronouns: He/him/his

First Name: Jason

Last Name: Hanson

**Phone Number:** 

Email:

Address: Avenue H South

**Neighbourhood:** King George

City: Saskatoon

Province: Saskatchewan

Postal Code:

What do you wish to do ?: Request to Speak

If speaking will you be attending in person or remotely: In person

What meeting do you wish to speak/submit comments ? (if known):: CITY COUNCIL AGENDA – REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING – Wednesday, 20 December 2023

What agenda item do you wish to comment on ?: 9.2.2 Neighbourhood Bikeways 30km/hr Speed Limit Policy

## Comments:

I was in these chambers for the Standing Policy Committee on Transportation on December 5th and heard the concerns of some north end business owners regarding the Connect Ave. C proposal. They told the committee they were worried about project costs (higher taxes), lost parking spaces, and the safety of cyclists and pedestrians in, as they described, a particularly dangerous section of the city. As a taxpayer, motorist, and cyclist, I thought "these are legit concerns". Who doesn't want to be careful with their money? Who doesn't want safety? Who doesn't love "rock star parking"?

I was also here on June 28th, when Tod Fox told council about what it was like to kiss his wife Natasha goodbye in the morning of May 24th without realizing it would be for the last time. I heard 17 year old Lucy Stobbe and her classmates talk about how they often feared for their lives as they rode their bikes to school, either due to motorist ignorance or outright aggressiveness. I heard Saskatoon Cycles speak in solidarity with them to loudly call for increased cycling safety, now.

On paper, all of these perspectives should be entirely compatible. We can surely all agree that the safety of pedestrians and cyclists is of paramount importance, given their inherent vulnerability while using streets that they have every legal right to be riding on! We can surely all agree that no one wants to waste money.

And yet, here we are, again, writing and speaking to the councilors of the City of Saskatoon to approve infrastructure that would increase safety because this concept is "controversial".

Where is the disconnect here?

From my perspective, there can be only two reasons to reject projects designed for improving safety outcomes for active transportation users:

There is an ideological opposition to safety itself, which seems too unlikely to seriously contemplate, or No one wants to spend any money on "these kinds" of projects.

If we can agree that we all genuinely care about the safety of cyclists and pedestrians, then we can remove ideology as a factor.

And... if we're left with money as the primary determinant, then the questions become more fundamental: "What do we actually value in our community? In what do we want to invest our precious tax dollars? What makes a city a great place to live?"

I can't speak for those who oppose these particular projects, but \*1\* want to live in a community where:

- People feel safer riding a bike, walking, or rolling in any neighborhood they need to go
- All neighborhoods are accessible to people regardless of their mode of travel
- We don't write off inclusion and safety because "it costs too much"
- The long term value of smart infrastructure is recognized over the short term costs
- Citizens and government work together in good faith to figure out solutions to complicated problems
- People don't recoil at the idea of increases in taxes, but instead work to understand what their investment in the community actually means

Perhaps these are lofty dreams, but it can happen. The proposals in front of council today are, in my opinion, both well thought out and practical steps to increase safety and access for active transportation users. They help build a baseline network of corridors AND lower risk along those corridors. They both would contribute to Saskatoon's greatness.

I ask that council approve both items.

Thank you.

Will you be submitting a video to be vetted prior to council meeting?: No