
From: Web NoReply
Sent: Sunday, February 4, 2024 4:39 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Email - Communication - Janet McVittie - Saskatoon Freeway Planning Study – Phase 2 Endorsement Request - CK 6003-1
Attachments: 7.2.2 Saskatoon Freeway _0.docx

--- Replies to this email will go to [REDACTED] ---

Submitted on Sunday, February 4, 2024 - 16:38

Submitted by user: [REDACTED]

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: Sunday, February 04, 2024

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council

First Name: Janet

Last Name: McVittie

Email: [REDACTED]

I live outside of Saskatoon: No

Saskatoon Address and Ward:

Address: [REDACTED] Cavers Street S7K [REDACTED]

Ward: Ward 1

Name of the organization or agency you are representing (if applicable): myself

What do you wish to do ?: Submit Comments

What meeting do you wish to speak/submit comments ? (if known):: Feb 5 Standing Policy Committee on Transportation

What agenda item do you wish to comment on ?: 7.2.2 Saskatoon Freeway

Comments:

I urge council not to endorse the recommendation. The Transportation committee is, unfortunately, thinking only of

roads and individual cars. There is more involved, including public transit, human and ecosystem health, financial costs, lost tourist opportunities, and the very future of the planet.

Attachments:

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

I am writing about the initiative the council has before it to widen and to increase the speed on the Saskatoon Freeway. I urge council to vote for Option 1: Do not endorse the study.

1. The city has a plan for **Bus Rapid Transit**. When the city increases the ease by which people can use their individual cars, the city pushes people away from public transit and into their cars. I will not enumerate the toxic effects of cars on the environment (even electric cars), but I will say that the more people use cars, the less they use their bodies, and therefore, the less **healthy (both physically and emotionally)** they are.

2. When people first started arguing for the protection of the ecologically and rare sample of native prairie, the **Northeast swale**, they were told that the Saskatoon Freeway was a long way in the future and not to worry about it, and there would be consultation about it if the project were to go ahead. Then, about 15 years ago, the plans for the freeway moved ahead.

3. Consultation involved inviting people to choose where the bridge should go – 50 meters north or 50 meters south of the proposed route. **That is not consultation!** Apparently, if a person wants a say in urban development, they have to be arguing as soon as a plan is proposed and put onto a 25 year plan. I was at a meeting where the city proposed a major change, and I was told that, since this was 25 years in the future, I was not to worry, and it might never happen. They refused to listen to my concerns. And, so again: **That is not consultation!**

4. The city agreed to some of the modifications to the freeway, so as to mitigate the damage the freeway was doing. The city agreed to: McOrmond Drive would be built to look as if it were in a residential neighbourhood, encouraging people to drive slowly; there would be speed limits of 60 k/hr through the Swale to protect wildlife. **Both these mitigations have been reversed**, even with the evidence from dead mammal bodies in the higher speed zone. Again – so much for consultation.

5. **Saskatoon could be a leader in environmental protection and design**, and would actually 6. **save money** through having ecosystem services provided by natural features. As well, being green, and adding in leadership, 7. **tourists and new residents** will be attracted to the city. People already come to Saskatoon because it is “green” (and sometimes white, but not this year). Saskatoon is hoping to have an 7. **urban national park**. Putting a high-speed four to six lane freeway through an **environmentally rare and sensitive zone** does not support Saskatoon being a green city.

Sometimes, I despair, wondering why decision makers do not think of the future. Could we please begin to design our city for the future, rather than for tired and unhealthy past practices? Could we think of cleaner air, water, and living with our environment. Could we think of how to have cleaner air, healthier land, fewer forest fires? These changes will mean that people will be healthier mentally and physically. Please support Option1: Do not endorse the study.

Yours,
Janet McVittie
[REDACTED] Cavers Street, Saskatoon
S7K [REDACTED]