

**From:** [Nicholas Davies](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Subject:** No on 65039 (cutting off default pedestrian priority)  
**Date:** Monday, April 12, 2021 1:18:47 PM

---

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

Dear commission members,

I want to be clear about why I oppose item 65039:

Pedestrian signal buttons not only require a non-motorized traveler to reach the button, you have to reach it at the right time in the signal's cycle. Otherwise, vehicle traffic is given a green light, while you're given a "do not walk" signal.

Crossing in that situation is both needlessly unsafe and perceived as rude. Waiting a full cycle is also an option, but inconveniences you in a way that isn't expected of motorized vehicles passing through the same intersection.

When we talk about "restoration" of the way these intersections used to work, what we're really talking about is taking priority away from non-motorized users of our streets, and handing it to unsustainable single-occupancy motor vehicles.

The materials attached to this item justify it as, "To reduce intersection delay and accommodate increased traffic volumes as the community recovers from the pandemic." But how is that a justification at all?  
Why is this implicitly prioritizing the needs of cars over all other road users?  
Why should we "accommodate increased traffic volumes"?

This Commission is also going to be considering Vision Zero proposals to reduce traffic deaths in our city. That agenda item is expected to be referred to a later meeting. However, this already isn't our Vision Zero year. Traffic deaths are already occurring.

I urge this Commission to consider your role in those deaths, and your power to prevent them, in how you consider all the agenda items before you.

Thank you,  
Nick Davies  
3717 Richard St