SOUTHWEST TRANSITWAY (STAGE 2)

Public Engagement Report (Round 1)
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The public consultation program associated with the Southwest Transitway (Stage 2) project is being undertaken in two ‘rounds’ between October 2014 and March 2015. This report is an interim report summarizing results of Round 1 of the engagement process.

The purpose of Round 1 consultation was two-fold:

- Provide basic, early project information (i.e. scope, timing, design, etc.)
- Identify issues and ideas that the design team should consider during the preparation of the functional design

The consultation approach includes the following components:

- Meetings with approximately 25 internal and external stakeholder groups or individuals (e.g. City departments, utilities, nearby institutions, advocacy groups, etc.)
- Meetings with individuals (i.e. residents, landowners, renters, etc.)
- Small Group Meetings with residents or businesses with property directly adjacent to the proposed transitway corridor
- Information sessions for the general public
- Information provided via a project website
- ‘Full-time’ direct access by phone or email to the public consultation team

Stakeholders provided a mix of opinions concerning the project:

- Adjacent commercial and multi-family property owners (owners of vacant land) see the benefits of this project with respect to the potential for the transitway to increase value for transit-oriented development (TOD) on these sites, which, in turn, will increase the City’s property tax base and contribute to OurWinnipeg’s infill development goals along rapid transit corridors. Owners would also like to ensure residents have access to active transportation (AT) pathways along the route;
- Existing and future transit users expressed a range of opinions regarding the Stage 2 project; many were supportive of the new service and the overall rapid transit plan for Winnipeg; others were not supportive for various reasons as outlined below;
- A significant number of individuals that participated in the consultation expressed a concern regarding the loss of ‘perceived public space’. The ‘Parker Lands’ are privately held lands mistakenly seen to be public lands due to the frequent use by local residents for strolling, dog-walking, etc. The desire is to ‘preserve’ all or part of these lands.
- There is concern regarding the potential impact to the existing City of Winnipeg dog park; it is apparent that many dog park users think the dog park area is much larger than it is (i.e. the entirety of the ‘Parker Lands’ versus an area about 1/6th the size); users are concerned about loss of the dog park;
- Individuals living in homes directly adjacent to the proposed corridor expressed concerns regarding the potential for disruptive effects such as noise, vibration, transitway lighting and odour;

- Individuals living directly adjacent and to the west of Letellier rail line expressed concerns about the potential for increased noise, vibration and risk associated with the potential relocation of the rail line closer to their residences;

- A number of individuals expressed concern regarding potential decreases in transit service on Pembina Highway;

- Many participants provided commentary considered to be outside the scope of this functional design project; the commentary can be generally summarized as advocating for: elimination of rapid transit as an option altogether; relocation of the selected rapid transit route to another route (e.g. Pembina Highway, Letellier rail corridor); or concern regarding project cost.
1.0 Introduction

The public engagement program is being undertaken to assist with the development of a functional design for Stage 2 of the Southwest Transitway in Winnipeg, Manitoba. The program is geared towards maximizing basic public engagement principles of early, regular, and integrated involvement of key stakeholders and the general public throughout the development of the functional design.

The consultation program is being carried out as a two-round process over a period of five months between October 2013 and February 2014. This report describes the consultation methodology and project inputs received to the end of Round 1 of the consultation program, which occurred from October 2013 to December 2013.

The scope of the work involves the preparation of a functional design for a general alignment as selected by Council. The selection of this alignment was the result of a previous study that examined a number of alignment options for the transitway. Therefore the focus for stakeholder feedback was specifically directed towards commentary relevant to this selected alignment option, and a substantial amount of useful, project-relevant feedback was received and integrated into decision-making by the design team.

Many stakeholders provided feedback concerning other alignment options not selected for study by Council, as well as feedback concerning the suitability of rapid transit as an overall City direction. Stakeholders were made aware that this type of feedback would be received, collected, formalized and provided to City of Winnipeg representatives for their further consideration, while feedback directly associated with the functional design project at hand would be directly incorporated into project decision-making.

1.1 Consultation Methodology

Figure 1.0 illustrates the stakeholder and public engagement process. This process is being carried out using a ‘two-round’ methodology, whereby input is gathered at key milestones during the development of the functional design. Round 1 was conducted early in the process with the purpose of communicating the general alignment, scoping issues, and understanding expectations from stakeholders and the general public. Round 2 will occur following the development of a draft functional design with the purpose of receiving feedback on the functional design that can be used to refine the functional design and respond to participant questions.

This report summarizes input from Round 1. Various consultation mechanisms were employed including individual and stakeholder group meetings, public open house events, telephone
conversations, public notification and the use of a project website to provide materials, project updates, and accommodate public comment.

### 1.2 Notification

A variety of means of notification were undertaken in order to ensure maximum opportunity for input into the plan development. Notification methods included local and city-wide newspaper advertisement, website posting, community posters in prominent neighbourhood locations, direct notification by postcard to nearby residents and businesses\(^1\), email notification to all email addresses submitted to date, and letter notification to directly adjacent residents, building managers, and commercial operations\(^2\).

**Figure 1.0 Public and Stakeholder Consultation Approach**

```
ROUND 1 (October - December 2013)
- Adjacent Residents Meetings
- Adjacent Commercial and Multi-family Meetings
- Public Open House 1 - Draft Concept

ROUND 2 (January - February 2014)
- Adjacent Residents Meetings
- Adjacent Commercial and Multi-family Meetings
- Public Open House 2 - Functional Design

SM = Stakeholder Meetings
```

### 1.3 Overall Participation

There was substantial participation by stakeholder groups and members of the general public during Round 1. Approximately 400 people participated in one form or another. Figure 2.0 illustrates the location of individuals or organizations that participated in the process.

---

\(^1\) Some individuals reported that they received this postcard notification late. All who reported this were offered a one-on-one conversation to provide a briefing on the project and were directed to the project website to view the material that was displayed at the open house. These individuals were also invited to attend planned Round 2 open house events and to provide further project input.

\(^2\) A sample of notification materials can be found in Appendix A.
Figure 2.0  Stakeholder Location Map

Large red dots indicate a business, organization or City of Winnipeg department that participated in a meeting. Small red dots indicate an individual or business that participated in an adjacent residents and businesses meeting. Yellow dots indicate an Open House participant. Not all participants provided location information for this map.
2.0 Stakeholder Meetings and Public Feedback

2.1 Stakeholder Meetings
The study team had discussions with the following stakeholder groups during Round 1:

**Government, Schools and Utilities**

- Winnipeg Transit (regular meetings)
- Canadian National Railways October 4, 2013
- City of Winnipeg - Planning, Property and Development October 10, 2013
- City of Winnipeg - City Naturalist October 10, 2013
- City of Winnipeg - City Forester October 10, 2013
- City of Winnipeg – (regarding Parks) October 10, 2013
- City of Winnipeg - (regarding Dog Parks) October 17, 2013
- University of Manitoba October 17, 2013
- City of Winnipeg - Public Works October 18, 2013
- City of Winnipeg - Active Transportation October 18, 2013
- City of Winnipeg - Water and Waste October 21, 2013
- City of Winnipeg - Real Estate Division October 21, 2013
- City of Winnipeg - (regarding Lot 16 Drain) October 21, 2013
- Manitoba Hydro October 21, 2013
- Chancellor School November 6, 2013
- Ralph Maybank School November 6, 2013

**Adjacent Landowners**

- Hopewell October 10, 2013
- Gem Equities October 18, 2013
- Resident at 1500 Parker Avenue (potential acquisition) October 22, 2013
- Winnipeg Blue Bombers October 25, 2013
- Victoria Hospital November 6, 2013
- Winnipeg Humane Society November 1, 2013
- Thompson in the Park (Funeral Home) November 4, 2013

**Community Groups**

- Parker Wetlands Conservation Committee October 22, 2013
- Bike Winnipeg October 24, 2013
- Winnipeg Rapid Transit Coalition October 24, 2013
- Bishop Grandin Greenway November 12, 2013
The general format for each of these stakeholder meetings included the following elements:

- Overview of project scope, process and timing
- Overview of existing Stage 1 rapid transit facilities
- Overview of stakeholder interest map
- Overview of general corridor alignment and design constraints
- Discussion concerning specific stakeholder interests
- Discussion concerning particular concerns and questions
- Identification of next steps

All participants indicated that these meetings were appreciated and helpful. Participants were advised that they could contact a project representative at any time during the project process, and that a follow-up meeting would be held early in 2014 as part of Round 2 consultations.

A more specific summary of meeting outcomes will be provided in the final consultation report following Round 2 of the engagement process so that a good accounting of issues raised and responses to the issues can be provided. Meeting notes from each meeting can be found in Appendix B.

### 2.2 Adjacent Residences and Businesses Meetings

Residents and businesses living or operating directly adjacent to the proposed transitway corridor were invited to attend one of seven small group meetings. One purpose of these meetings was to communicate project information such as project timing, project process, general alignment, station information, etc. A second purpose was to answer questions and to hear from participants the factors they felt should be considered when the design team would be preparing the draft functional design for the transitway.

Meetings were held at Dillon Consulting offices (1558 Willson Place) and generally consisted of about 10-25 individuals. Meetings lasted approximately 90 minutes and facilitators committed to staying as long as participants had questions. Facilitators also committed to recording the questions raised and returning with as many answers as possible during Round 2 of the engagement process.
The following notes provide a summary of comments and questions raised during Round 1 meetings⁴:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Service</th>
<th>Would there be new transit routes? Would service continue on Pembina Highway?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many buses would run on the rapid transit (RT) corridor? How often?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Will there be a pedestrian crossing to the Taylor Avenue development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How will pedestrians and bikes be accommodated? What about connecting existing pathways with new active transportation (AT) pathways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How will the corridor be designed to avoid vehicles on AT/pedestrian paths?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Uses</td>
<td>Would commercial development occur along the RT line in existing residential areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What will happen with the dog park? How will this be addressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Design</td>
<td>What will the intersections at Chancellor and Chevrier (and others) and the corridor look like? How will they be designed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How will the corridor cross Pembina?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How will the RT corridor be designed on Markham (i.e. on-street low speed, high speed busway)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will there still be vehicular access via Markham for condos/residents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can there be separate roads for vehicles and transit at Markham?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How will the RT be enclosed to keep children and people out and safe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the corridor designed with LRT in mind (upgrade at a future date)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why access U of M at Markham?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>What will happen to the old Public Works yard site on Markham? Park and ride lot?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will a park and ride lot be provided at Markham at the corridor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will park and ride lots be provided along the route?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise/Vibration</td>
<td>What about mitigation measures for noise and vibrations; both from rail and RT corridor? Walls, fences, berms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What will the noise mitigation walls look like? What will the design look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the noise comparison between buses and trains?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the bus tires be designed to reduce noise/hum?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ See Appendix C for a complete list of flipchart questions and notes from each meeting.
| Rail Impacts | Will the corridor include rubber in pavement to reduce noise?  
How will dust/particulates be handled?  
Are the train tracks moving closer to homes from the RT corridor?  
Why and how can this be avoided?  
What about train speeds? Will they slow down?  
What about potential train derailments and moving the rail closer to homes to make room for RT corridor?  
How close will the rail tracks be to the property lines? Any regulations dealing with this?  
How will the rail line relocation be handled? Will private land be required?  
At what point will the rail line return to the centre of the rail ROW?  
Will property owners by the rail be compensated if the rail line moves closer? Voluntary buy-outs? |
| --- | ---  
Other Impacts | What about drainage in the rail corridor? This needs to be improved  
What about the smell of the buses - what will be done about the fumes?  
What will happen to the garden lots near Parker and elsewhere? How much notice will be given?  
What about light pollution from the stations and the RT corridor to houses?  
How will buffering/screening of Markham condos be addressed?  
How will you keep people from parking in the neighbourhood to take RT?  
How will privacy be addressed for those homes adjacent to the corridor?  
Will there be mitigation for impacted landowners? Particularly by grade separated crossing at McGillivray?  
What will be the impacts of the RT corridor on lanes and parking to the east of the rail line?  
How close will the corridor be to Parker Avenue residents?  
Can the corridor be moved as far west as possible by industrial park in hydro corridor?  
What about property values and the rail and RT corridor? How will this impact us? |
| Parker Lands | What about the forest and wetlands in the Parker Lands area?  
What about wildlife and natural area? How will this be addressed? |
| University of Manitoba | How far into the campus is the RT planned to go?  
How will RT corridor planning be integrated with planning of UofM Southwood lands? |
### Stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there more info on station locations, design, etc?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will there be a rapid transit station at Bison Drive?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will there be a BRT stop at Markham and Pembina? Would like to avoid stops due to noise, disturbance, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will people on Pembina Highway get to the stations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will pedestrians move to and from the stations without going through backyards?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What vehicles will be allowed on the RT corridor? Just transit vehicles?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will snow be dealt with? Clearing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until what time will the buses run on the corridor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Timing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When would construction start? When would the line be operational?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would the construction schedule be? When would the RT corridor be operational?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who pays for the cost of relocating the rail line and cost of RT corridor construction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens if we don’t get the funding?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will copies of the materials from the meetings be made available?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can drawings/cross sections be provided showing hydro towers, gas, rapid transit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leaseholder Meetings

- Anchor Marine                                                                 October 24, 2013
- Church of the Rock                                                            October 30, 2013
- Buhler Industries                                                            November 1, 2013
- Fort Garry MB Church                                                          October 29, 2013

A number of project stakeholders hold rights to existing leases with Manitoba Hydro to use lands located within the same Hydro corridor that the transitway is proposed within. Project representatives met with each of the stakeholders noted above to introduce the project and understand what, if any, impacts the project may have on these lease arrangements.

In each case the project team committed to outlining what impacts there may be as part of the functional design process and subsequently looking for means of mitigating any impacts as they became apparent. Meeting notes can be found in Appendix D. Follow up meetings are anticipated in Round 2.
2.4 First Public Open House

2.4.1 Description

Four public open house sessions were held with two on November 18th, 2013 and two on November 19th, 2013 at the CanadInns Fort Garry (1792 Pembina Highway). Approximately 300 people attended. Participants were invited to review a range of concept display boards (see Appendix E), and to speak with project representatives.

Participants were provided with a comment sheet (see Appendix F). The following figures provide a summary of the data received from 140 open house participants. Figure 3.0 illustrates that respondents living both near and far from the proposed transitway alignment attended the meeting and provided feedback.

This data was used in a manner that could help address concerns and take advantage of any noted opportunities in preparing the functional design for the transitway, pathways and stations.

2.4.2 Effectiveness

Participants were asked whether they found the information provided helpful, and whether they found the staff on duty helpful. Figure 4.0 shows that of the 140 respondents that provided input to this question, the vast majority of respondents (92%) found the information provided at the meeting to be useful and 89% found the staff at the event to be helpful. This is significant given that many participants also expressed concerns about the project, which suggests that the meeting format and information content were effective and appropriate for this stage of the project. Of those respondents that did not find the meeting useful (11% or 10 respondents) only three offered explanation, which focused on the amount of information being provided (too extensive/detailed).

Comments about notification:

- Would have liked to have been notified earlier
- Do not prohibit people from giving out flyers
- Use newspapers & flyers to residents in immediate areas
- Put a detailed notice on the board in the dog park
- More notice on open houses
- Have TV stations announce meetings in advance. I get all my news from TV. I found out about this meeting form the Cycle Winnipeg list serve.
Figure 3.0  Open House 1 Respondent Type

Figure 4.0  Open House 1 Effectiveness
Comments about staff:

- Have all parties present to answer questions. i.e. a CN representative.
- Staff was very knowledgeable, yet also polite. Excellent job!
- More staff/get more of the consultants to come out and answer questions.
- Felt ignored, wondering if anyone is listening, or is this just a placate the common folk.
- Very helpful.
- Friendly.
- Have more people available to talk to.
- Stakeholders to answer questions.
- Interesting that you have a transit guy here, but not an A.T. person... that would help.
- Be more open to alternative points of view. You can’t engineer out the human factor effected by and advancing this proposal.
- It would have been nice to have someone from Gem Equities here to elaborate on the housing plans going in nearby (i.e. when/what) as it seems to impact many of the questions I asked tonight.
- Yes they were helpful.

Comments about content:

- More info about routes IE: Express on Transitway redundant routes. Service on Pembina.
- You need to have better answered based on factual projections and not what and how you might develop.
- Information somewhat helpful; have all answers to questions; appears lots unknown.
- Hoping for more substantial detail/design suggestion. Much of this presentation was recycled info.
- Perhaps display a timeline of city, province involvement in the project - planning decision, finance.
- Scale bars should be all over your maps. There were some with scale bars but some without. It just helps to give an idea of how far things are from each other.
- Concrete answers about liability concerns (i.e. who will be held accountable for shifting/vibrations that cause damage to homes/foundations). For how long will they hold responsibility?
- More detail is needed regarding crossing at intersections.
- More detail on grade separation areas.
Comments about reporting and due diligence:

- Provide copies of meeting minutes/notes to anyone requesting. ([staff] have committed to this.)
- [Whether this process was helpful] remains to be decided when we see if you have taken into consideration any of our concerns & suggestions. Perhaps in January.
- Use the internet, put info and plans online.
- You showed the stakeholders meeting dates but not what any of the stakeholders thought. Can’t you summarize the results of those meetings?
- [Improve the process] by providing maps that we could take home and show our families.
- Correct the spelling and grammar in the final report on the city web site.
- Make the reports concerning this project available online electronically. Have a clear statement of who the target future bus/transit riders are (What are we trying to achieve? What problems are solved?).
- Where is the assessment study? How can you go ahead with this idea without finding out if it will lose money in the long run.
- Do an unbiased environmental impact assessment.
- Do transit research to justify the project.
- We think that they are on the right track.
- Actively engage cyclists in discussion.

Comments about process:

- Stop rushing the project to source funding and do a proper study before carrying on.
- Wait to hear from the community; do ridership surveys before going through with this.
- Town Hall where we can voice our options to the crowd. Conscientious thinking is good.
- Appreciate the "open house" process.
- More evening open houses for those who work regular hours.
- This is a good consultation process. The public has had every opportunity to hear and provide input. Continue as planned.
- So frustrating – It seems your plan is decided, you know who makes money here, you don’t care what users feel, you can build an overpass for this?? What about Waverley/Wilkes??
- Ask sincerely for consultation before significant decisions are made.
- The city needs to listen to what the tax payer has to say. I believe the City of Winnipeg had their minds made up before any of these meetings began.
- Doing this just to go faster doesn’t make any sense, so go where the people are.
• This was good!
• Implement the suggestions given by community members!
• Keep us informed.
• Ongoing communication during the planning process.
• It’s beside the point. What engagement do they need? There are engineering challenges that don’t need public input.
• Actually listen to people and do some studies on feasibility of different options before coming up with all kinds of designs.
• Thanks for including the public on this process.
• Continue to offer information sessions open to the public as you have been doing.
• No representation by those that voted this travesty.
• Do more route selection consultations

Other Comments:

• No matter what “avenue” you take it will affect some people and ensure the decision makers are a mix of professionals, directly concerned folk and Winnipeggers who are very “pro” Winnipeg.
• I am also a part of the neighbourhood network team for the University. I feel the University is trying to listen to the neighbourhood and I hope the Rapid Transit Team does the same to alleviate impact on the neighbourhood.
• Take into account public opinion and listen to the majority that is against this alignment
• Presentation explaining what the project is would have been good. Not sure what stage the project is in.
• A better understanding of project.
• I am glad to see this happening.
• My interests are more specific to deal with at this stage.
• Streamline the downtown portion somehow?
• A walk through of Fairway Woods would be good; meet with residents once complete.
• Letellier straight south to old rail line on south side of U of M property.
• Instead of park & ride the city should encourage mixed use development at transit stops.
• Parker lands, U of M, golf course - needs to be spelled out more.
• Toronto transit has info on their website as to why they favour subways - stops further apart yields increased speed. Our bus transit has advantages - stops are closer less walking and few stairs.
• I think the project is not efficient or economically feasible and should be reassessed.
• Be patient - despite all the nay-saying this route is best.
• The stations should include surface parking for commuters
2.4.3 Respondent Interest Areas

Figure 4.0 summarizes participants’ response to the question “What are three reasons you are interested in this project?”

The following information provides summary of each topic as listed in Figure 4.0., cited in order of frequency. 5,6

**General Support:** Respondents indicated general support for the Stage 2 rapid transit project.

**Negative Impacts:** Respondents listed specific concerns about the project to specific properties, including those associated with noise, vibration, light and dust pollution, and property values.

**Active Transportation:** Respondents were typically existing AT users hopeful that active transportation would be included within the project scope; respondents provided specific suggestions 7.

**Parks and Parker Lands:** Respondents were concerned about the impact to the Parker Lands areas 8. Many respondents felt that these lands were of value to the community and of ecologically importance for the City of Winnipeg.

**General Project Interest:** Respondents indicated a variety of reasons for their general interest in this project.

**Transit Routes, Transit Service:** Respondents were both interested and concerned about existing and future feeder bus routes and frequency of service on selected routes. Pembina Highway transit services were of particular concern to a number of respondents.

**Specific Project Benefits:** Respondents cited a series of specific project benefits they were interested in, including reduction in vehicle use, reduction in greenhouse gases, and reduction in travel time.

**Other Project Options:** Respondents indicated a preference for a series of other rapid transit project options including, light rail transit and alternative routes such as the Letellier Corridor and Pembina Highway.

5 Verbatim transcriptions of comments provided are included in Appendix G.
6 These project comments will be reviewed to capitalize on opportunities presented and to address concerns as part of the Round 2 consultation process.
7 See Section 2.4.4 of this report under heading “Active Transportation”
8 Respondents did not distinguish between publicly owned Dog Park lands and the privately owned ‘Parker Lands’.
Figure 4.0 Respondent Interest Areas

Respondent Main Reasons for Project Interest

- General Project Support
- Neighbourhood Impacts
- Active Transportation
- Parks/Parker Lands
- General Project Interest
- Bus Routes/Service
- Specific Project Benefits
- Other Project Options
- Traffic Concern
- Transit User
- Lives Nearby
- Project Cost
- Project Process
- General Opposition
- Stations
- Project Due Diligence
- Existing Dog Park
- Other General Comments

141 respondents offered 250 reasons for their interest in the project.
Traffic Concern: Respondents had specific concerns related to the potential for bus rapid transit to negatively impact other vehicular traffic in specific locations.

Transit User: A number of respondents indicated they were interested in the project as existing transit users.

Lives Close: A number of respondents indicated they were interested in the project because they live near the proposed route.

Project Cost: A number of respondents were concerned about the cost of the project.

Project Process: A number of respondents had concerns or were skeptical about past and future decision-making process associated with this project.

General Opposition: A number of respondents indicated general opposition to the project without indicating a specific concern.

Stations: A few respondents had concerns or suggestions with respect to the location and number of rapid transit stations.

Project Due Diligence: A few respondents had concerns or suggestions with respect to the research and investigation that had been or would be carried out to justify this project and ensure good project planning and design.

Existing Dog Park: A few respondents expressed a desire to either preserve or replace the existing dog park if this project would disrupt it.

Other General Comments: A variety of other reasons were cited for respondents’ interest in the project. A complete list of comments provided is in Appendix C.

2.4.4 Project Improvement Suggestions

Respondents were asked how they felt that the rapid transit project could be improved during the functional design process. These responses will be used to help improve the functional design presented in Round 2 of the engagement process.

Specific Comments included:

Alternate Routes

- This transitway should run down Pembina Highway (x11)\(^9\)
  - It’s not too late to reconsider the route.

\(^9\) Where this term occurs: “(x11)”, it indicates that the number of respondents that provided the same or similar comment, in this case, 11.
- I think “Gem” is waiting for their money.
- Our Councillor John Orlikow supports Pembina Hwy development.
- Pembina to McGillivray or all along railway puts the route closer to more people.
- Keep it close to Pembina Hwy. businesses.
- Greater effort needs to be made at studying Rapid Transit on Pembina or Letellier-Line makes much more sense from a business perspective.
- I fail to see how you will get people to take Transit on any other route.
- Build all crossings above ground or all below ground along Pembina Hwy.
- A route that benefits the bulk of riders/existing commercial business on Pembina
- We need LRT straight down Pembina.
- Anyone travelling to an address on Pembina will not find the Phase 2 route helpful or useful.

• Improve Transit Routes and Scheduling (x6)
  - Make sure fast/frequent service on Pembina is created or maintained (x4).
  - Improve scheduling so buses have more capacity.
  - Extend route 99 out to University.
  - Make sure 36 route stop @ Pembina and Windermere is maintained
  - Keeping the 160 and possibly adding another route or more buses for the 160 route once it is open

• The transitway should run on the Letellier right-of-way (x5)
  - Nearer Pembina will increase ridership.
  - Could mean shared grade separations with the railway.
  - Divert Letellier line for Rapid Transit. This would eliminate cost of two tunnels.
  - More direct route along the railway right of way.
  - Make transit readily available to those who use it.
  - Slower speeds are not a factor to reject the rail line.

• Present alternatives - Pembina, Waverley, and Kenaston that respond to actual developmental traffic volumes.
• Run the transit in a different route. Other options were proposed.
• It can’t be improved; it’s in the wrong place to begin with.
• Routes do not seem to be well thought out.
• Enter to U of M via Markham has problems.
• Be sure to have Markham route.

Active Transportation

• Jubilee underpass; make sure pathways are bike friendly/accessible from Harrow. (x2)
• Make crossing at Jubilee and Pembina available to cyclists and pedestrians.
• Convenient bicycle path that doesn’t wind through neighbourhoods.
• More direct/efficient cycle routes (Pembina). Better indication of cycle/bus routes (e.g. painted lanes) signs don’t always work.
• AT level of services should be as high as Transit in terms of intersection design, travel priority, quality of infrastructure, amenity.
• Current bump outs on Pembina are dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians alike- please don’t make this mistake consider buffers seriously. – signage very NB!!
• Relocate the railway and use the rail for cyclist.
• The bike pathway comes too far off Pembina Hwy. for cyclists looking for a quick safe way to get downtown.
• Prefer to have active transportation routes alongside the Letellier line.
• Bike route along Pembina.
• Straight AT paths that follow the whole route. Including the overpasses and tunnels.
• Add in AT from Whyte Ridge.
• As long as cyclists are separated from cars and buses - I'm in favour. Like the way it is now from Jubilee to transitway at Osborne - do more of that phase.
• Don't make me stop and get off my bike - if you do I'll stick to the road and won't get to benefit from these improvements.

Crossings

• The grade crossings need to be like railroad crossings with arms and complete transit priority. (x2)
• No grade separation crossing on Beaumont/Parker Lands, which is in a quiet neighbourhood area. (x2)
• Please ensure that if light-controlled intersections are installed that pedestrians do not have to wait 3 min to cross.

Parker Lands, Southwood Lands and Dog Park

• Rapid Transit should not go through the Parker Lands (x5);
  - Examine alignment at East end of Parker Land.
  - Leaving the Parker Wetlands as natural reserve or park.
  - Stay out of the Parker wetlands
  - An environmental impact assessment is critical. The forest and Parker Wetland are functional ecosystems that must be protected.
- I cannot see how a rapid transit corridor through a quiet back part of Fort Garry with forest and wetlands can truly be protected. How would we access it with buses coming and going?

- Please make sure there is a green space saved for the dog park and make it accessible from the neighbourhood with a few more overpasses for pedestrians. (x4)
- Allocation of where the dog park will be relocated in the functional design phase must be shown.
- Having the bus route go through the Brenda Leipsic dog park is insane.
- Find a way to go around the dog park and the forest

- Keep the green space and trees in Southwood lands.
- Respect viable cultural and ecological corridors.

**Park and Ride**

- Coordination with being able to Park and Ride should continue.
- Have Park and Ride lots on stations by McGillivray, Clarence, and Chevrier.
- Easy access to Park and Ride, try to improve the image of Winnipeg.
- Park and ride opportunities should not be limited to routes adjacent to rapid transit.
- Park & ride along feeder routes, express routes to connect to rapid transit.
- The stations should include surface parking for commuters.
- Instead of Park and Ride the city should encourage mixed use development at rapid transit stops.
- Important to have door to door service to the U of M park & ride facilities would help to increase ridership.

**Stations**

- Need off street drop off loops at transit stations for cars and bus. (x2).
- Not too many bus stops along route need to have connection to west end of the City.
- Clarence station would be much better if it was situated near Waller - serves McGillivray Park (relatively dense for Fort Garry) and is closer to AT pathway, which is quite busy.
- The U of M and Stadium should be very functional and accessible.
- A station located closer to Hurst Way near Wilkes Avenue.
- Remove the Chevrier station as it is redundant.
- Cycling lockup places at the stations.
Mitigation Suggestions

- Implement project with the least amount of impact on the nearby community and surrounding green space.
- Make this an enhancement to our community. Put up trees like Manitoba cedar, that will provide a “green” barrier between houses & corridor. Use low head lighting so it’s less intrusive. Make it a “park” space.
- Earth berms to separate from homes along corridor (including trees).
- Limit destruction of trees with sewers instead of ditches.
- Just leave as much marsh forest as possible for the neighbourhood.
- If it must proceed, leave forest intact and preserve the dog park.
- I would like to see a plan that would preserve as much of the wooded area as possible.
- Put fences beside the lanes thru the dog park.
- The entrance to the university property at Markham should be located further from our property with trees and a raised berm to alleviate the continuous noise at houses.
- Consider traffic calming in Beaumont area and side streets.
- Sound barrier where close to homes.
- Move the tracks towards Pembina and put the transit closer to our property with wall.
- Do not move train tracks! Or move them towards Pembina.
- Slow down the trains to reduce risk of vibration and safety concerns.
- Can you please build the barrier wall before construction starts to minimize the noise and invasive nature of construction mess/dust.
- Continue to leave Parker/Hurst Way, so those living in ‘Planet Bays’ do not need to back track to get out of area (i.e. having to drive back to Beaumont to get to Waverley). Connect bike and sidewalks to existing streets and sidewalks. Lots of signs on bike paths. It’s hard to understand how to follow existing paths.
- Build it closer to the rail line behind Parker Ave.
- Re-route via different location; cover any damage caused by train/vibration; have trains lower speed; buffer wall for noise.
- If the transitway misses my compound and a turnaround area for my customers and suppliers to access my business is constructed, my needs will be met.
- I understand that no changes will be made to address our concerns but an elimination of business taxes would help.
Timing

- I hope it is built soon.
- Hope the project is finished soon, increase in land prices over time.
- Get the funding in place and proceed with finished design and construction ASAP.
- Build the stadium component next year. It is difficult to do progressive work in the City. Don't despair.
- Build it ASAP.

Other

- I ride daily from For Rouge to Downtown and it is incredibly efficient.
- Don’t do it, save your money. For students: build some student residential high rises at the U of M. Problem solved.
- Make density targets as part of the surrounding corridor.
- In favour, want to support a higher-density mixed use development.
- Not that I ride, but concerned about the increased bus traffic on Markham Rd from the U of M.
- Why can’t they share the railway track? There must be a new track wheel out there.
- The downtown part is anything but "Rapid".
- Plan for the future as much as possible - lane width along the full transit way, access by residents/users to transitway.
- For Stage 2, include rails in the concrete transitway so when the time come to upgrade from bus to light rail some of the infrastructures is already in place. It’s cheaper in the long run.
- Move track as little as possible- provide CN Inspection track for hydro access between property & track.
- A train system that would avoid congesting the downtown and would build for the future would make more sense.

2.4.5 Interactive Drawings

Large-scale drawings were provided at each open house and participants were encouraged to add small ‘sticky-notes’ to the drawings and to provide comments concerning specific locations along the transitway. One of the drawings was dedicated to Active Transportation concerns and ideas, while the other was dedicated to any other concerns or ideas.
The following comments were provided on the Active Transportation drawing:

- Cycling path needed for Waverley between Bishop Grandin and McGillivray.
- Multi-use path between Markham Station and University through new development needs to be considered.
- What happens to local pedestrians and cyclists when trying to cross BRT intersections (i.e. Kids)?
- If alternatives are needed for AT, priority must match rapid transit line.
- Need AT grade separated at McGillivray and at Bishop Grandin.
- Provide AT connection from Plaza/Pembina to transitway and improve directional signage.
- Existing signal at Pembina eastbound to Plaza is too fast.
- Improve Copenhagen ‘left box’.
- Waller connection for AT would be convenient.
- Tie AT pathway to park at Marshall Crescent.
- Create a ‘habitat corridor’ alongside pathway.
- Benches for old (and not so old) folks to rest please.
- Winter snow clearing a priority please.
- Pembina ‘bike bays’ impossible [to navigate] today.
- Bump outs are dangerous - pedestrians must be separated from cyclists.
- Cycle path along Pembina should be positioned along highway rather than double stop along Lettelier.
- If there is going to be a cycling path along Lettelier have a fence along Hudson back lane.
- Need cycling along Pembina - way too difficult to take the dogleg.
- A ‘living fence’ please.

10 These comments are paraphrased.
• Pathway on Hurst Way would be safer and more accessible for pedestrians and cyclists.
• How would the crossing of transitway at Parker work?
• Fence along the walking and bike path.
• AT way-finding signage with distances and walk times please.
• Would like more bike garages.
• Consider native vegetation in planting plan please - tall grass prairie species.
• Left turn going south on Point and Windermere.
• Buffered cycling along Pembina for cyclists who live in Beaumont area.
• Yes! Bike racks needed at each station.
• More on street signage for bicycle paths.
• Painted cycle paths in critical areas area great!
• Important to connect AT from Pembina and Harrow - how do we cross?
• Would be great to connect walking path at Bishop Grandin to Superstore by this transitway.
• Extend AT on Markham to connect to schools.
• Need to provide quality bicycle facilities to Chancellor Square and mall.
• Make sure to connect cyclists across University Crescent.
• Improve Plaza for bicycle traffic.
• Cyclists heading downtown won’t follow the detour - they will go straight down Pembina.
• Connect AT to Buffalo Place.
• Bicycle paths that are direct, not winding through residential areas.
• Make sure there are bike and pedestrian connections over Pembina.
• Pedestrian Crossing at Jubilee.
• Please keep AT at end of Sommerville.
• Ensure good, safe cycling from Waverley Heights, Whyte Ridge and Linden Ridge.
• Connect to Investors Group Field by flyover trail - let's do it right!

Other comments provided by ‘sticky-note’ follow a similar pattern as the written comments provided. They include:

• Keep Parker green area/wetlands. (x7)
• Avoid/minimize damage to forest. (x6)
• The bogs, foxes, deer, dogs, swamps and forests need protection. Look at the City’s own planning mandate.
• I visit the wetlands regularly – please do not destroy this place. (x2)
• Leave the forest alone; Parker needs the sound/sight buffer.
• Build an overpass over the forest or go around.
• Forestry and parks are an asset to the City.
• Use land for water retention – do not want/need increase drainage in river.
• Did you know there are tonnes of Saskatoons in this forest?
• There is too little greenspace inside the Perimeter as it is; don’t take this away.
• When will a thorough environmental study be done? (x2)
• Why was the environmental study an after-thought?
• No more Kentucky Bluegrass – use native plants!
• Save the dog park. (x3)
• What will happen to the dog park?
• Community gardens, where do these go?
• Don’t cause drainage issues that impact residents.
• Maintain vibrant regular transit down Pembina.
• [Private companies] are laughing all the way to the bank. (x2)
• Transitway is too far off of Pembina to make any sense to collocate with industrial area.
• Wrong place (no passenger base).
• Too expensive (buying back land given away).
• Rapid Transit? Two miles out, two miles in?
• Why even build it? Why spend $300m on something that really won’t make much difference?
• How exactly are the people who will eventually live in this “major development” supposed to get out of here with the train line on one side and the rapid transit on the other - they will be boxed in.
• Yes! [to the Parker alignment]
• Yes! [to Jubilee overpass]
• No grade separated crossing on Beaumont.
• Don’t move Hurst Way.
• Will you build overpasses at every major crossing?
• Will there be lights at Parker/Hurst? I’d rather not be T-boned by a bus on my drive home.
• Why not integrate north from Beaumont and Hurst Way.
• Need a bus station at Clarence.
• Lots [of industrial community employees] use the bus.
• [The industrial community] does not use the bus.
• [Industrial employees] do not use the bus now, but might with better service.
3.0 Next Steps

The project team is incorporating all of the areas of interest, questions and suggestions into the functional design planning for the Stage 2 transitway. Responses to questions and design solutions will be presented as part of the draft functional design project during Round 2 consultations. Round 2 consultations will run from January 2014 to March 2014.
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Notification materials (Sample)
YOU ARE INVITED:

SOUTHWEST TRANSITWAY PROJECT
PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION

Drop in anytime:  
3:30 to 5:30PM Monday, November 18  
7:00 to 9:00PM Monday, November 18  
3:30 to 5:30PM Tuesday, November 19  
7:00 to 9:00PM Tuesday, November 19

Venue:  
CanadInns  
1824 Pembina Hwy.

Winnipeg’s City Council recently approved the alignment for the extension of the Southwest Transitway from Jubilee Avenue to the University of Manitoba. This alignment will bring the transitway west and south creating new opportunities for transit oriented development (TOD) and extending rapid transit service to existing and new neighbourhoods in the southwest part of the city.

As part of the design of the precise location for the transitway within the approved alignment, the project team is currently identifying opportunities and constraints. Please attend to find out more about the project and to provide us with input on such topics as station sites, active transportation pathways, transit routes, and other considerations for the transitway.

For more information please contact:
Donovan Toews
Landmark Planning & Design Inc.
Winnipeg, MB R3B 0G5
204-453-8008

Project website:
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Stakeholder Meeting Notes
[Meeting notes available on request]
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Adjacent Residents and Businesses
Flipchart Meeting Notes
October 28, 2013 - Evening Session

Issues/Comments:

- Larger city/corporate interests on the back of individuals.
- Will people use it?
- Cost?
- Vibration/dust/lights.
- Can it be moved westerly?
- Berm/sound attenuation.
- Station to ‘fit community’.
- Timing?
- Concern regarding bridge at McGillivray mitigation.
- Wildlife (EA).

Questions:

1. How will the corridor handle snow drifts, particularly on Hydro and Parker Lands?
2. Why did the “dog leg” corridor route get chosen? Why not the rail line alignment?
3. Are noise abatement features (walls, fences, etc) going to be included, particularly along the rail line?
4. Will there be a rapid transit station at Bison Drive?
5. Can corridor be moved as far west as possible by industrial park in hydro corridor?
6. Where will the park and ride lots be?
7. Will there be mitigation for impacted landowners? Particularly by grade separated crossing at McGillivray?
8. What will the noise wall look like? Height? Design?
9. How will dust/particulates be handled?
10. How close will the corridor be to Parker Ave?
11. Is the corridor designed with LRT in mind (upgrade at a future date)?
12. Can drawings/cross sections be provided showing hydro towers, gas, rapid transit?
13. What happens if we don’t get the funding?

October 29, 2013 - Afternoon Session

Issues/Comments:

- Rationale for bump out.
- Existing routes.
- Noise/vibration (fencing buffer, asphalt? rubber?).
Appendix C – Adjacent Residents and Businesses Meeting Notes

- Privacy.
- Parker “natural area”.
- Jubilee overpass?
- Kneeling buses?

Questions:

1. How do we get to the stations?
2. What about noise & vibration? How will this be mitigated?
3. What about property values? Will they go down?
4. What about the forest and wetlands in the Parker Lands area?
5. Why can’t the corridor go down the rail line?
6. How will the corridor cross Pembina?
7. Why is the corridor proposed to cross Pembina at Markham?
8. How close will the corridor be to Parker Avenue residents?
9. Will the corridor include rubber in pavement to reduce noise?
10. Until what time will the buses run on the corridor?
11. Would fencing/noise abatement walls be built where rail line is being moved?
12. How will privacy be addressed for those homes adjacent to the corridor?
13. Will park and ride lots be provided along the route?
14. Will a park and ride lot be provided at Markham at the corridor?

October 29, 2013 - Evening Session

Issues/Comments:

- P&R.
- Intersection configurations.
- Acquisition.
- Rail relocation/speeds vs. vibration.
- Pedestrians crossing main line.
- Community gardens.
- Timing.
- Compensation/buyout.
- Hurst Eay/Parker connection.
- Wall height.
- Rail construction techniques.
- Vibration mitigation.
- Capital costs of buses, diesel, etc.
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- Two or one lane on Chancellor-Bison?
- Priority signal at Bison/Chancellor?

Questions

1. What will the intersections at Chancellor and Chevrier (and others) and the corridor look like? How will they be designed?
2. How will the rail line relation be handled? Will private land be required?
3. At what point will the rail line return to the centre of the rail R.O.W?
4. Will there be a pedestrian crossing to the Taylor development?
5. What will happen to the garden lots near Parker and elsewhere? How much notice will be given?
6. How long will the construction period last? When will the Corridor be open?
7. Will property owners by the rail be compensated if the rail line moves closer? Voluntary buy-outs?
8. How far will the transitway be from the rear of the houses on Parker Avenue?
9. How will noise and vibration be handled? Will noise wells be built, and if so how will they be designed?
10. Will the bus tires be designed to reduce noise/hum?
11. What will happen at the old city works yard at Markham and the rapid transit corridor? Will it be a park and ride lot?
Will the capital costs (fleet maintenance, GHG, etc.) of the “dog leg” route be accounted for?

Idea: Bus ticket at meeting to try RT? Try RT at event?

November 4, 2013 - Afternoon Session

Issues/Comments:

- Letellier option rational.
- Routes (McGillivray/rail, additional?)
- Limiting distances (houses).
- Mitigation (walls), privacy.
- Park and ride ‘spillover’.
- people accessing industrial buildings for work.
- parking problems.
- Using pathways for cars.
- Environmental reviews (wildlife, emissions, contamination?).
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- Open field at Markham?
- Speeds? Noise? Vibration?
- Property values?
- Dog park.
- Staging.
- Project timing.

Questions:

1. How close will the rail tracks be to the property lines? Any regulations dealing with this?
2. How will people on Pembina Highway get to the stations?
3. How will you keep people from parking in the neighbourhood to take RT?
4. How will the corridor be designed to avoid vehicles on AT/ped paths?
5. Are there any plans for noise mitigation measures, such as walls, berms, fences, etc.?
6. What about wildlife and natural area? How will this be addressed?
7. What will happen to the old Public Works yard site on Markham? Park and ride lot?
8. What is the noise comparison between busses and trains?
9. How will this affect property lines?
10. What would the construction schedule be? When would the RT corridor be operational?
11. Would commercial development occur along the RT line in existing residential areas?
12. What will happen with the dog park? How will this be addressed?

November 5, 2013 - Morning Session

Issues/Comments:

- New routes? (160?)
- Could BRT become LRT?
- Safety barriers? Fencing? Noise?
- Timing.

Questions:

1. Would there be new transit routes? Would service continue on Pembina Highway?
2. What about LRT? Is the RT corridor designed with this in mind?
3. How many buses would on the RT corridor? How often?
4. How will the RT be enclosed to keep children and people out and safe?
5. Is the RT corridor alignment “set”? Will other corridors be examined?
6. Will copies of the materials from the meetings be made available?
7. Is there more info on station locations, design, etc?
8. How long is the route?
9. When would construction start? When would the line be operational?
10. What will be the impacts of the RT corridor on lanes and parking to the east of the rail line?

November 5, 2013 - University of Manitoba Neighbourhood Network

This meeting was hosted by the University of Manitoba. It is an existing organized group that meets regularly with the University to discuss development on or near the University Campus. 34 neighbours attended together with three University representatives and three members of the design team responsible for planning/designing the University southwood lands site.

Questions:

1. Why access U of M at Markham?
2. How will the RT corridor be designed on Markham (ie. on street low speed, high speed busway)?
3. Why will it take until 2019 to open? Why not faster?
4. Will there still be vehicular access via Markham for condos/residents?
5. How will buffering/screening of Markham condos be addressed?
6. Can there be separate roads for vehicles and transit at Markham?
7. Will there be a BRT stop at Markham and Pembina? Would like to avoid stops due to noise, disturbance, etc.
8. How will noise be mitigated?
9. How will snow be dealt with? Clearing?
10. How will pedestrians and bikes be accommodated? What about AT and existing pathways be connected?
11. How far into the campus is the RT planned to go?
12. What vehicles will be allowed on the RT corridor? Just transit vehicles?
13. How will RT corridor planning be integrated with planning of UofM Southwood lands?

November 6, 2013 - Evening Session

Issues/Comments:

- Why Markham?
- Noise/vibration.
Appendix C – Adjacent Residents and Businesses Meeting Notes

- Why is the rail being relocated to the west?
- Train speeds/safety/light.
- Drainage/smell.
- What about property value?
- Cost? Is it worthwhile?
- Type of wall?
- Lost bus routes?
- Isn’t it too ambitious?
- Is it safe?
- How frequent are buses?
- Who will be responsible for damage?
- Why not the other side?
- Soil investigation?

Questions:

1. Are the train tracks moving closer to homes from the RT corridor? Why and how can this be avoided?
2. What about mitigation measures for noise and vibrations; both from rail and RT corridor? Walls, fences, berms?
3. What about train speeds? Will they slow down?
4. What about property values and the rail and RT corridor? How will this impact us?
5. What about drainage in the rail corridor? This needs to be improved.
6. What about the smell of the buses - what will be done about the fumes?
7. What will the noise mitigation walls look like? What will the design look like?
8. What about light trespass from the stations and the RT corridor to houses?
9. How will pedestrians move to and from the stations without going through backyards?
10. What about potential train derailments and moving the rail closer to homes to make room for RT corridor?
11. What about vibration and property damage due to construction, rail operations and RT operations? Who is responsible?
12. Who pays for the cost of relocating the rail line and cost of RT corridor construction?
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Leaseholder Meeting Notes
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Round 1 Open House Display Materials
Appendix E – Display Boards Open House 1

WELCOME!

SOUTHWEST TRANSITWAY (STAGE 2)
PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE
Monday, November 18, 2013 3:30 to 5:30PM and 7:00 to 9:00PM
Tuesday, November 19, 2013 3:30 to 5:30PM and 7:00 to 9:00PM

- Welcome to the Southwest Transitway (Stage 2) Open House Meeting
- While the general routing for the transitway has been determined, the precise alignment and other project details are being worked out
- This Open House is being held to provide project information about this project and to ask for your input concerning items such as station sites, bus routing, active transportation, property or other impacts and mitigation
- Project Representatives are available to answer questions or discuss issues or concerns with you
- Follow up public Open Houses are planned for January 2014

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT?

- Stage 1 of the Southwest Transitway was opened in April 2012 and is currently in operation from Downtown to Pembina and Jubilee. Stage 2 will run from Pembina and Jubilee south to Bison Drive.
- Winnipeg City Council has selected this alignment for the transitway.
- The main objective of the study team is to prepare a “Functional Design” for the Transitway in order to prepare a cost estimate that can be included in a submission for project funding to the federal government
- The Functional Design must consider many variables including existing constraints within the corridor, impacts and benefits to stakeholders and cost
WHAT IS BUS RAPID TRANSIT?

- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is a very popular form of rapid transit implemented throughout the world. BRT uses specific transit-only roadways, called "Transitways" that transit vehicles use to operate at high speed, away from traffic congestion.
- BRT vehicles are state-of-the-art rubber-tired vehicles that can operate on and off the Transitway, using the regular street system to pick up passengers, then travel at high speeds on the Transitway to major destinations. When operating on-street, BRT vehicles take advantage of transit priority measures already built, such as diamond lanes, transit signal priority lights, and the Graham Transit Mall.
- A number of transit routes use the Transitway, with buses entering/exiting at either end of the Transitway or at intermediate points. This permits operation of a very flexible route network, which minimizes the need to transfer, providing a one-seat trip for a majority of passengers.
- The BRT systems have the following features:
  - Transitways - exclusive to transit vehicles for high-speed service
  - High-frequency service throughout the day
  - Rapid Transit Stations along the Transitway
  - Modern state-of-the-art buses with air-conditioning and other passenger amenities
  - Electronic real-time passenger information systems (such as GPS tracking, on-board "next stop" displays, and electronic "next bus" displays at stations)
  - Traffic signal priority at intersections

WHAT PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION IS TAKING PLACE?

- We have been speaking with numerous stakeholder groups early in our process to identify specific transitway issues;
- This Open House meeting is similar in that we are asking for your opinions on the transitway. The list of stakeholder meetings is displayed to the right;
- Over the next few months we will review our engineering and stakeholder information and prepare a draft of the Functional Design; we will then hold further public meetings to ask for your input on the transitway functional design.
CONSTRATENTS

- In order to prepare this Functional Design, it is important that we understand what all of the constraints are.
- Constraints include things like existing infrastructure (roads, rail lines, transmission towers, underground pipes), Constraints can also include property ownership, land leases, and neighbourhood or property impacts.
- All of these factors need to be considered in preparing a functional design.

CROSS SECTIONS

- These three cross sections illustrate the potential location of the bus runningway in relation to other features within the corridor such as transmission towers, underground utilities, property lines and adjacent structures.
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**STATIONS**

- Stations will be located at strategic points along the transitway.
- The exact number and design of these stations is currently being studied and designed; the final recommended station details will be available during Round 2 of the engagement program.
- The stations will vary in terms of their size.
- There will be opportunities for Park and Ride sites either near the corridor or in areas further west of the corridor.
- These images are examples of what the stations could generally look like, no station designs have been prepared to date. “Kiss and Ride” opportunities are also being considered.

**RAPID TRANSIT ROUTES**

- The transitway will be used by the existing rapid transit routes in the southwest quadrant of the City as well as potential new rapid transit routes.
- A high level of transit service will be maintained on Pembina Highway including the 60 Pembina local service and the 160 Rapid Transit service.
- The map below illustrates a conceptual rapid transit route network for the Southwest Transitway.
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION (AT)

- The project design will include walking and cycling paths and connections to the existing pedestrian/bicycle network along the route.
- The drawing below illustrates existing and potential pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

![Diagram of active transportation network]

NEXT STEPS

- Over the next two months we will consider all of the information we have collected to date and prepare a draft Functional Design for the transitway.
- We will hold another public meeting in January to share the draft Functional Design with stakeholders and listen to feedback.
- We will then revise the draft Functional Design and prepare a cost estimate for submission to the federal government.

Thank you for attending this event – your feedback is valuable to us.

For more information please contact:
Donovan Toews, MCIP
Landmark Planning & Design Inc.
dtoews@mts.net
204-453-8008

These display boards are available on the Winnipeg Transit website: [winnipegtransit.com](http://winnipegtransit.com)
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Round 1 Open House Comment Sheet
This comment sheet is being provided following a meeting you have attended. The comment sheet is intended to help us understand your perspective regarding both the project itself and the process we are undertaking. Your feedback will help improve the project and our public engagement process. Thank you for participating.

1. Please check the answer that most closely describes your interest:
   - [ ] I am a resident that lives directly adjacent to the planned corridor
   - [ ] I am a resident that lives nearby
   - [ ] I am a resident of Winnipeg
   - [ ] I am a business owner/manager of a nearby business (__________)
   - [ ] I am part of an organized interest group (__________)
   - [ ] Other (__________)

2. Please tell us some of the reasons you are interested in this project. Your responses can be negative or positive in nature:
   1. __________________________________________
   2. __________________________________________
   3. __________________________________________

3. Please tell us a way in which you think this project can be improved, or a way in which your ideas or concerns could be addressed:
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

4. Did you find the project team helpful?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

5. Did you find the information provided helpful?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

6. Do you have any suggestions for us to improve our engagement process?
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

7. Feel free to use the reverse side of this paper to provide additional comments.
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Round 1 Open House Respondent Comments
(Raw Data – Interest Areas)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>I’m a cyclist and transit rider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>I am an active cyclist and transit rider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>I use AT daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Location of AT for cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Cycle year around, need a alternative to Pembina. Bike path from Bison Dr to Chevier must be separate from transit and plowed regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>I use AT as a primary method of travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Pembina underpass is one of the scariest places to bike in town. Looking forward to improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Active transportation, bike paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Cycling/walking should be viable transportation options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>AT improvements relating to the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>I work nearby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Use bike &amp; walking trails in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Absence of cycling route along Pembina connecting to Jubilee path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>People who use AT frequently are short changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>A lot of Winnipeg AT infrastructure poorly deals with places where it interfaces with roads, sidewalks, etc.. I hope it will be done well this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Cyclists should not have to travel miles out of their way to reach their destinations. Following the route phase 2 takes does not address problems on Pembina HWY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Cyclist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>I often cycle in the area being changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>AT is important to us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Bike form &quot;Planets&quot; to Ray Fennel Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Cycling paths are very important, especially connection to GF and U of M from SW neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Interested in AT improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>AT route integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>The existing RT was poorly planned in relation to AT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Need to improve bike/pedestrian interception at lane stops along Pembina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>People who do the planning don’t use AT and should listen to those who do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Pedestrians passing through our site on N &amp; S side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>I support active transpiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>Concerned about a tax dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>As overburdened City of WPG taxpayer, wasting money on over budgeted projects including existing transitways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>Wondering why there is high cost for transit and super transit routes are not adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>The amount of infrastructure required may prove more costly than the Lettellier or Pembina option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>This plan too convoluted and too expensive and too much away from population on Pembina Hwy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>Money – every major city project lately has exceeded its budget significantly. How can we prevent this with this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>Cost to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>The cost to taxpayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park</td>
<td>Preserving the dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park</td>
<td>Dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park</td>
<td>Find a nearby alternative to the Parker Dog Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park</td>
<td>I live right beside Pembina/Windermere; you’re going to kill our dog park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park</td>
<td>I go to the dog park EVERYDAY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Diligence</td>
<td>I’m interested because there are flaws in projected costs of Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Diligence</td>
<td>There is a lack of transit ridership statistics and research to support the forecasted ridership anticipated from southwest suburbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Diligence</td>
<td>Concern about lack of environmental study RE: Parker lands. Who does this benefit? Let’s see the study to show this going to truly increase transit ridership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Diligence</td>
<td>Lack of studies too many unanswered questions regarding development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Diligence</td>
<td>Review route alignment with respect to Hydro fibre cables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impacts</td>
<td>Because it is going to disrupt my neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impacts</td>
<td>TOD is too risky to depend upon its success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impacts</td>
<td>It will impact our children’s safety (biking across the bus path at intersections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impacts</td>
<td>This will affect my life. If we chose the location because there was no transit route on the street and a quiet back yard. Gone, quiet gone!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impacts</td>
<td>I live in at Southwood Green Condominiums on Markham and the proposed corridor would bring buses very close to the house along Markham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impacts</td>
<td>System is directly behind my house. Huge transition for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impacts</td>
<td>My concern is barrier concerns along my backyard (Saturn Bay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impacts</td>
<td>It directly impacts my quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impacts</td>
<td>It will impact our home directly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>As a citizen to inform myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Interested to see that resources are used in the best way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Just to stay informed and understand what will be built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>May be a future user of BRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>To understand the City’s choice of location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>General interest as a transit user.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Sustainable transportation field of study in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Technical interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>This project affects my community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Understand active transport plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>It took forever for my children to ride bus from Chareswood to U of M (over 1hr).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Wanted to see new plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Interested in City of Winnipeg plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Generally interested about this topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Concerned about Winnipeg's development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>I’m a student at U of M with a particular interest in planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Sensible development of southland (U of M property)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Opposition</td>
<td>Profit for the few has taken priority over the representation of nature of the many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Opposition</td>
<td>Believer in the importance of open network urban spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Opposition</td>
<td>My children use the bus, why would you take them 2 miles off track?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Opposition</td>
<td>There is no reason to have this new project; the service is fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Opposition</td>
<td>Because it’s going to lead to more unwanted development in the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Opposition</td>
<td>Even in the plan view the absurdity of this proposal is grossly evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Opposition</td>
<td>Because it impacts on the future of Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Was supportive of the project since it began 10 years ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Progressive move to hopefully reduce the amount of vehicular congestion in the South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Interested in sustainable transportation. – Live near “for Rouge Yards” which the success of in some way is hinged to this expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Rapid transit is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Want to see a comprehensive RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Love the 1st stage of Rapid Transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>I want to see bus transit improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>About time we have proper public transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Looking forward to a better system since ’76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>I own my Condo suite at Logan on the Red and I take the bus a lot. I like the first phase of RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>There is a need to provide a rapid transit option for this City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>I want to be able to use transit more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Rapid Transit is good for the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Faster connection to the U of M and downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Anything that lightens the traffic on game days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Rapid transit is a necessary step forward for the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Need a viable rapid alternative to private vehicles/a rapid alternative for non-car owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Transportation system must be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>A good transit system is important to the well-being of the entire city and its inhabitants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Transit is critical to the City's future vibrancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>RT to U of M is essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>We use the current bus a few times a week and find the new rapid transit terrific. I see the need for this expansion; we've used the bus trail by the current rapid transit and love it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Interested in an expanded transit system in Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Want to see my area grow in a positive way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Strategy that works for a larger part of the City from St. Norbert to Tuxedo, St. James to U of M, Transcona to Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>I want rapid transit to succeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Improve transit in Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>RT is 20 years behind schedule here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Wanting the best outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Rapid transit is key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>I support a Rapid Transit system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Winnipeg needs to be seen as a progressive city, currently is not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Let's do it right - best-in-class design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>Make the route attractive and get the right type of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives Close</td>
<td>I live in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives Close</td>
<td>Live very close to the new route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives Close</td>
<td>We live directly adjacent to this corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives Close</td>
<td>I live by the Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives Close</td>
<td>Residents close to IG stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives Close</td>
<td>I work at U of M &amp; live by Osborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives Close</td>
<td>I live nearby - will use transit &amp; bike connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives Close</td>
<td>I live close by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives Close</td>
<td>Proximity to where I live and work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>There will be a decreased in ridership on Pembina which will hurt our business since we supply less expensive (I.E. refurbished) equipment and many of our clients ride.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>Speeding up route by not going by many potential riders along Pembina. This doesn’t make any sense. Planner said McGillivray route was not considered, don’t see why not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>Would like to see a transitway similar to Calgary &amp; Edmonton (light rail transit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>I always thought light rail was the most effective. BUT can see value in the accessibility of the bus routes, - I also thought that the Lettelier line would be most efficient. That too has been tampered with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>I hoped Transitway would be on the alternate Pembina Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>Rerouting the transit corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>Don’t like the dog leg at the beginning. I think you should follow the rail Line from the start.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>Cynical about the decision- making process RE: Routing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>Develop Pembina more extensively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>Hate where the 2nd stage will be located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>Service along Pembina vs Transitway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>Poor route selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>Use the existing rail line that parallels with Pembina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RT Options</td>
<td>I had hoped phase 2 would be closer to my home because I would have used it if it was going to shorten my commute. It will pass out community too far West to be much use for us in old Fort Garry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Greenspace</td>
<td>I use the greenspace, I enjoy going there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Greenspace</td>
<td>The development of the remaining parks. Save the parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Greenspace</td>
<td>I do not appreciate getting rid of all the green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Greenspace</td>
<td>We need to keep existing greenspace within Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Greenspace</td>
<td>Protection of green space allowances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>Parker green space is precious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>Protection of the Parker wetlands &amp; forest area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>I live by Parker Woods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>Destruction of Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>I live near the Parker forest &amp; dog park and would like to see them maintained. This route should be along Pembina or the railway tracks not through the forest and greenspace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>The Parker wetlands are an ecologically sensitive area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>I don’t want the Parker Wetlands destroyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>I don’t believe the transit needs to go through the Parker Wetlands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>My concern is regarding the rush this project has been handled without proper study of the impacts on the Parker Wetlands and mostly important the interest behind the project (such as Gem equity, etc.) It seems to be more important to spend a little less and destroy our green areas than spend a bit more and consolidate both sides: City/Transit development and citizens interest/well being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>To see the Parker Area preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>Concerned about Parker Wetlands/forested areas be preserved as much as possible. We need to save our green spaces. I am concerned about potentials light/noise impact for the area. The increased traffic in the area is also concerning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>Concerned about forest areas North of Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>Would love to see wetlands untouched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>People can relax there. Preserve nature in mid-city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>Because it is ruining a green space used by lots of people and animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>Parker wetlands should be left undisturbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>Loss of Parker Wetlands and Dog Park is a big negative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>Infrastructure of area cannot support development of Parker lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Lands</td>
<td>Use Parker wetlands for recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Poorly coordinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>To take pre-emptive action rather than after the fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>This project is driven by special interest and shady politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Hoping the political responses does not delay the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>When will we find out if there will be anything done to address concerns?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Don’t have faith in the City Hall bringing this to a positive outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Tired of planning serving [?], instead of vice versa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>The timing and congestion to get to the stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>To drive less and use my bike more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>Climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>Interested in the City becoming more transit oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>More efficient transit systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>Big GHG reduction opportunity (transit, bus, walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>Will help develop under-used land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>Access for me as I get older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>Need ways to reduce greenhouse gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>Transit oriented development increasing urban density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>Need reliable and safe active transport corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>I want to reduce Winnipeg’s dependence on cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>Faster route to downtown area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>Only RT will improve auto congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>Rapid Transit helps increase density and new developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Benefits</td>
<td>Only RT will really create vibrant downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route/Service</td>
<td>I want to know how the plans will affect my commute?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route/Service</td>
<td>Bridgewater forest routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>Pembina Hwy(McGill &amp; Windermere) transit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>Routing of bus routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>Loss of service at Pembina and McGillivray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>I am afraid of losing service, glad to see the 160 will continue on Pembina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>Location of proposed routes and effect to bus service for morning commutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>Keep the bus frequency on Pembina since the proposed bus stations are far and Pembina is near.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>The bus service will be all but destroyed for people who live in that corridor between Osborne and U of M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>Concerned about access to RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>Sunday service is really bad to downtown - will it get better from here (Pembina to Adamar)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>Replacing routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>As it is the bus routes &amp; schedule to and from HSC do me no good unless I want to be murdered @MN waiting for a bus. So any changes to bus routes &amp; accessibility do me no favors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>Wanted to know how service on Pembina would be affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>Impacted by the removal of most bus services off of Pembina HWY onto the first phase of Rapid Transit (North of Jubilee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing/Service</td>
<td>Wondering what the planned frequency of service will be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>How will the Transit planned affect my family in regards to traffic volume, noise, expropriation and cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>The railway tracks CN line that is directly behind my house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>This may lower the cost of real estate due to noise &amp; pollution from the buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Impact on my property value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>I don’t want buses rumbling behind my home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Worried about losing compound space that is required to operate my business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Vibration damages to my home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Added vibration causing damage to my property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Drainage damages to my home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Water and drainage issues cause by moving tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Increase in noise and vibration from busses, general disruption of a chosen quiet neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>I am concerned about flooding in my home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Impact of noise levels near my house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Noise from bus route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Risk of moving train tracks closer to my property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Noise and safety issues caused by moving train closer to property line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Concerned about noise, dust &amp; lights. Would like this addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>The relocation of the train 25’ closer to my yard concerns me for: Noise, vibration, drainage between my yard and the track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Interested in turnaround for land adjacent to Chevrier Blvd. and Manahan Rd (or connection of the two).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Proximity of train to house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impacts</td>
<td>Vibration from train - foundation and other damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>Concerned the new stations are not close to shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>Location of stations - close to current address in Ft. Richomond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>Proximity of stations to industrial area (Clarence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>More storage for bikes at stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>Concerned the new stations are isolated, would not transfer at night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concerned the Beaumont overpass &amp; related road upgrades will increase traffic through Beaumont and nearby Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Very busy by Windemere and Point Rd going south on Pembina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>I am concerned about increased traffic on Beaumont especially with a K-8 school on the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concerned with possible increased traffic and noise in area via-Beaumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Traffic has major affect on us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>It will impact our daily commute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Feedback on traffic impact near Waverley Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>The will help alleviate heavy traffic on Pembina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>I drive on Parker Ave all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Definitely have grade separation over/under Parker Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Are you going to build overpasses on all major roadways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>I use BRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>This is my route to/from work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>Plan to use 2nd phase to go to events at IGF and U of M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>Transit is my ride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>Transit rider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>Visit the U of M frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>I use the bus in the winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>I have to use buses regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>Avid user of transitway already in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Want to be engaged in the planning and development phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>I am co-chair of [WRTC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Will our land be required for the construction of the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>I spoke at the 1st meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>We are considerably behind in getting this done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Attend U of M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>I’m a tax payer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Wheelchair access to all stations &amp; pathways, true access not just one “cut down” as an afterthought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>The original project 2011 affected my residence (918 Jubilee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Transport Engineering Masters Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>U of M Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>I hear once the transit goes up 3000 condos will be built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>There will be no development under the Hydro line to drain the Parker lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Other        | I hear that Katz sold our land and that was once City property!!!