

Good morning.

I'm a Winnipegger, born and raised here. I vote, pay taxes, and am very involved with my community centre. I've lived in north Fort Garry for 8 years, more than enough time to get to know and appreciate my neighbourhood and the people who live and work there.

The Parker lands mean many things to Winnipeggers...an off-leash dog park, a playground, a photographer's delight, a birdwatcher's paradise, a place to hike, relax, and learn about and appreciate our natural environment. It's home to deer, fox, skunks, raccoons, owls, hawks, northern shrike, frogs, ducks, geese, and the list goes on. It's a natural filtration system that didn't cost anything to build. All this within walking distance of many communities, not just Fort Garry, and a short drive from the centre of Winnipeg!

I've read the report that justifies option 1B as the best choice and I would ask...the best choice for whom? Maybe this is the cheaper choice with fewer obstacles, but is that how it should be decided? With all three options costing around \$300M, saving just \$21M by going with option 1B seems trivial. And cost should not be based solely on financial implications. The irreversible loss of the Parker lands is a cost that many Winnipeggers are not willing to pay.

I'm not advocating against Rapid Transit, and I definitely support infill and densification, but in a way that preserves the positive attributes of our city, keeping unique features like the Parker lands intact and accessible for Winnipeggers now and in the future.

Last week, the Parker Wetlands Conservation Committee launched a petition in support of suspending plans to develop Rapid Transit through the Parker lands. To date, we have collected over 500 signatures from Fort Garry residents, transit riders, dog park patrons, naturalists, and people who just don't see the logic in such an indirect route. Here are a few of the comments received:

Lara Friesen - It is a beautiful area that should be preserved for future generations. (Neither) the city nor the province really have any more money to blow on things that offer no return and only become a bigger tax burden for the citizens of Winnipeg.

Fenton Jordan - Green belts are important to the emotional and mental health of this city

Walter Mirosh - any wet land is important to save to prevent quick floodings , filter out pollutants and give native plants and grasses and wildlife to thrive.

Lorne Hasinoff - The City has waffled on this project for years. Why should we all "cave" to a high pressure sales technique that we have a "limited time offer" that we must rush to take advantage of instead of doing the proper and promised diligence of a thorough environmental assessment.

Theresa Feakes - I'd like to see the Rapid Transit go the most direct route - along Pembina Hwy where users live and connections are easy. Let's not be so quick to get rid of such a valued area. Once it's developed there is no turning back. Don't let \$ be the deciding option either as some things you can't buy back.

Damon Johnston - Greenspace is what makes Winnipeg attractive as a city. Let's keep what we have. An alternative route should be a priority even if it costs more.

Lionel Leston - While I appreciate the development of Rapid Transit lines to reduce automobile use, as well as in-filling development to reduce urban sprawl, I also support maintaining large tracts of wildlife habitat within easy access of urban residents. If at all possible, the City of Winnipeg should try to maintain all three.

Anita King - I am tired of this City administration just going about it's business as if the people who live here are at best irrelevant, and at worst, nuisances.

Rob McKenzie - I am opposed to the loss of any existing wetlands when there are other, better alternatives for rapid transit.

Kristen Robson - I am a faithful transit patron, but the wetlands are more important.

Bonnie Freeman - Proper consultation, due process, and foresight in preserving the natural beauty of our great city must be observed. Joni Mitchell resonates the fears we share when she sings, "They paved Paradise and put in a parking lot."

Kim Pepler - We need to save our inner city green spaces - they are our lungs!

Andrew Alkier - We need to support established older neighborhoods. Moving new transportation services away will discourage investment in established neighborhoods and encourage further migration to new suburban developments. This new route does not appear to be consistent with city planning objectives of supporting decaying inner city neighborhoods

Donna Peters-Small - There is so much evidence that the mental and physical wellbeing of city dwellers is enhanced by areas of green and natural habitat. We certainly benefit from living in cities, but we need to develop and grow carefully, always keeping in mind the human cost.

Lawrence Cherniak - I am very familiar with the area, having used it as an off-leash dog park. It is very beautiful and supports so much wildlife. I support rapid transit as a wonderful green initiative; I don't think, however, that a green initiative should get rid of greenery! Have the courage to do what has to be done -- if some expropriation needs to be done, then expropriate, as has been done for years for all kinds of vehicular needs.

Ina Koseva - I feel strongly about the conservation of natural areas in the city environment. I believe strongly that we can achieve this without hindering infrastructural progress in

Winnipeg. Natural areas such as the Parker wetlands and Aspen forest are important both for social and environmental reasons. Wetlands are important systems that protect the quality of streams and plan water supply, and forests are an important dwelling and sanctuary for wildlife in the city. These natural areas are also very beneficial to the health and social interactions of city people who cannot afford to travel far in and outside of the city to enjoy a nice walk. The alternative route for the transit is a good option, given the tradeoff between the social, environmental & economic benefits and the cost.

Audrhea Lande - The transit rider population lives on Pembina highway...that's where the buses should run.

Gilles Noel - Development of land should be meaningful, not merely convenient. Use another route closer to a higher density of population.

Carle Radimer - This meandering route assumes future ridership; the direct route will serve a current customer base. It's time Winnipeg starts doing things properly rather than cheaply.

Virgil Pauls - Wetlands are necessary for the natural purification and regeneration of the water cycle. They are also important in the prevention of flooding. So many wetland areas have already been drained, that there is nowhere for melt water to go but into basements. The remaining wetland areas should receive greater consideration and priority. The preservation of green spaces and ecosystems existing within urban areas is also important. A healthy ecosystem is key to a healthy community.

MJ McKenty - I expect decision makers at every level of government to base their decisions on thorough sound evidence, and render decisions for the greatest benefit not just for today (but) for the future also. Development of rapid transit through the Parker wetlands does not fit those criteria.

Janet Gilchrist - The RT federal grant funding is from a "green fund" yet there is no comprehensive impact study on the wetlands and aspen forest. We destroy green space - to get "green" funding? This is VERY disturbing and wrong

Thank you for your time and consideration.