

Appendix B

| |
|---|
| Do you have any additional comments on the Strategy objectives? |
| Better management and more access to superintendent (we never see ours at the park) |
| Reconsider fees charged for Conservation Areas. For families with limited incomes, the fees are really too high. Advertise membership in more places and more often. |
| Not at this time. |
| Thanks for an excellent job! |
| Better communication and action dates |
| No |
| No |
| no |
| No |
| Do a better job connecting local residents with local parks/trails. Perfect example is the Elora Quarry - locals hardly use it any more. You should open up the first week (maybe in place of one of the tv/film shoots) for locals to reconnect with their local natural environment. |
| Invasive Species Management needs to be addressed such as LDD moths |
| What are you doing about managing cottaging? -what are your building standards - cottages seem to be getting larger - what are you dock requirements - they seem to get larger -how are these structures affecting the environment and water - cottagers should have naturalize waterfronts not grasslands as they encourage pollution from various birds and cottagers tend to use fertilizer thereby increasing the phosphorous levels in the water |
| What are you doing to prevent blue-green algae and high ecoli? |
| No |
| No |
| n/a |
| No |
| After using other rail trails the Cambridge to Paris trail is largely neglected and in need of upgrades. Funding through Provincial or Federal government or local business could be sought out for this work. |
| None |
| n/a |
| no |
| No |
| Don't be so close minded and listen to users of the parks more. Don't make blanket policies for all parks. |
| All parks can have the same goals with regards to financials and conservation but they need to be treated individually. Some parks have lots of things to do while others don't. There has been and continues to be many missed opportunities for generating income at Guelph lake. I have seen things deteriorate year after year there, but this year it has been over the top! |
| And also the wasteful spending at Guelph lake is unreal. 1.5 million to build the new office /maintenance building was ridiculous , especially when you already own the land! |
| Its a waste of money having 4 employees in the gatehouse at a time. Usually 3 girls are in the gatehouse and only 1 is tending to customers coming through the gate. The rest just sit there chatting. |
| Seeing 3 security personnel driving around in 1 truck but never getting out to correct people breaking rules is ridiculous. 2 Saturdays ago, I witnessed 5 cars that had driven through the open gate at the main beach and backed there cars right up to the beach sand and partied and picnicked all day with music blaring. I had to run to move my daughter out of the way as she was playing in the sand close to where this was occurring. No Security came to correct this issue! I stopped at the gate on my way out and let the gate staff know, but I doubt anything was done about it. |
| You see the maintenance people driving around on Gators a lot, quite fast at times (more than the 25km limit) and never get off to pick up trash left by patrons. There are no garbage cans throughout the park for people to throw out their trash, so many just leave the trash laying around. |
| Also, being a conservation area, why are full-size trucks being used for security? Wouldn't electric golf carts or Gators be better for the environment and cost less to operate? Especially in a "conservation area"? |
| The roads are full of potholes, the bathrooms need to be cleaned more frequently and rules are not being followed that are huge safety issues. I understand that a new Superintendent is now managing Guelph lake and it shows. The difference between this year and last year is quite significant. The park is unkept, the staff are not doing there jobs and rules are being broken and not addressed. The park is not even close to being what it once was and is getting worse by the day. |
| no |
| Don't bend to the whim of political pressures. |
| No |
| Missing strategy: To protect environment/wildlife/watershed from over exposure and environmental grooming of natural areas mainly in regards to invasive species, manicured nature and human garbage. |
| Read below |
| Don't trust the province |

Appendix B

Do you have any additional comments on the Strategy objectives?

As a hunter I obviously would want more hunting areas to be added - 3 have been removed in the last 4 or 5 years!! Also the GRCA needs to ensure that: a) the Tracts currently on the Miscellaneous Hunting Areas list are managed and maintained so they remain accessible (the state of many of these areas has vastly deteriorated over the last 20 years!); b) when areas are being “forest-managed” and trees are cut on a large scale, the timber cut so far has made many of those areas now impassable without risk to life and limb!!!! Maybe as a suggestion, when cutting trees in a line/lane, at least clear one of every 3 or 4 lines/lanes, so one can still traverse the tract without having to climb over boles and trunks! Thank you 🙏

No

"Enhanced relationships with First Nations and increased understanding of how to better incorporate Indigenous values in land management decisions, where applicable." sums it up nicely

No

Not sure why selling land is necessary

We need more GRCA Conservation areas and more of The Grand River needs to be protected. Adjacent properties are being turned into large private developments not beneficial to the general public.

no

I just hope that the GRCA doesn't feel pressured to sell land due to financial constraints or provincial government demands, especially land that is important for flood management or watershed health in the long term.

Control beaver activity as they are destroying wildlife and trees! I realize they are a protected fur bearing animal but they DO need to be controlled. Nothing is being done about flooding from these creatures.

I don't believe 'compliance' provides sufficient protection to CA lands. ie CA lands should be managed in favour of more protection from development.

Yes I think GRCA and other conservation authorities should always inform the public if the areas are accessible by public transit. I think that Rockwood can be reached by GO bus on hwy 7. I travelled by bus to Rockwood with a grandchild decades ago from Toronto and we camped there, meeting other family members. Private car use should be discouraged where practical

I am appalled to hear that the Kortright Waterfowl Park by Niska Road in Guelph may be developed into a new subdivision. Much biodiversity lives there, snapping turtles, owls, coyote, Igris during summer, rabbits as well as many plants such as birch, cedar, pine, old maple trees, lily pads, columbine etc. Turning this land into a subdivision will be such a great loss to the residents of Guelph. It would not take much effort to form a committee of people (perhaps in collaboration with the Guelph Hiking Club) who already use these trails on a daily basis and would be more than willing to help with the upkeep of this beautiful area. And for the developers out there, there is plenty of land elsewhere to build on. Please let this piece of paradise live and be enjoyed by everyone.

Keep people well informed

Governments change, and some are less concerned with the ecosystem (Doug Ford). I would like to see the GRCA be able to operate as the voice of defence of the land outside of politics, rather than “in compliance with”. Once the land is developed, there is no returning.

You state one of your objectives is to “provide sustainable outdoor recreational and educational opportunities and connections with the natural environment”. We live in Elora and, given the significant barriers the GRCA imposes for even the most basic outdoor activity of walking, it is surprising that this is, in fact, one of its objectives.

We have walked, hiked and cycled in many areas across Canada and internationally and, sadly, our home area falls far behind others. Despite the GRCA saying that it aims to provide access to outdoor programs, including in a “welcoming” setting, this is not at all the message the GRCA is delivering.

We hear a lot about mental health, the fact that kids are spending too much time on their screens, and about the prevalence of obesity with young people, to name but a few ‘hot’ topics. Being outdoors is of tremendous value in combatting all these things. We are so fortunate to live in an area that nature has blessed with beauty and where open spaces that seem a world away from the congestion of Toronto. Yet, the GRCA's motto seems to do “Stay Away” and “Stay Out”.

Among other things:

1. Despite the GRCA's property touching the centre of town, there is no “permitted” access from town. Rather, we are obliged to drive to one of the parking lots (not within easy walking distance from town) to access the trails.
2. Despite the GRCA being fully aware that the fences erected in town are continually cut by those who insist on having access from town, it continues to erect barriers which, in at least one case, have increasingly forced those who are intent on accessing the gorge to go dangerously close to the edge of the gorge, thereby knowingly increasing the potential of a fatal accident.
3. Despite that fact that the GRCA's lands are in Canada, with relatively cold weather for 6 months of the year, the GRCA has somehow concluded that providing access to the outdoors in winter is irrelevant. This is a fundamentally incorrect assumption and, with the shorter darker days, having access to the outdoors is even more important for mental health.

No additional comments

There should be more designated green spaces than the province is currently requiring developers to contribute

Excited to see a watershed approach being taken with GRCA lands.

Do not sell any GRCA land.

No part of our conversation areas should be sold under any circumstances. Especially Laurel creek. We need to do the absolute most to keep the green spaces we have in cities.

Appendix B

Do you have any additional comments on the Strategy objectives?

The Strategy is high level. Would like to see more engagement with local municipal and their community and work to identify areas where land use could be modified , enhanced to improve the water quality and reduce flooding. Revamp Rural Water Quality and promote it more. Where the GRCA sees areas contributing to a decline in overall health of river and water shed and having a negative effect on the river banks, work with land owners to come up with solutions and if necessary fine or charge land owners who choose not to be enviromental stewards. We dont have time to waste.

I'm a bit conflicted with prioritizing the objectives. I don't see any point to this exercise.

No i do not

Guelph doesn't have enough parkland, even with GRCA managed lands included. The Niska/Hanlon Creek/Kortright Waterfowl lands absolutely needs to remain within the holdings of GRCA or the city of Guelph to maintain watershed health and resilience, enhance community partnership and it is strategic, fiscally responsible and sustainable.

The strategy does not contain any specific, measurable goals around activating public access to inactive landholdings.

There is nothing in the Conservation Area Strategy about increasing conservation land holdings to respond to population growth pressures and increased community demand for recreation.

There are no metrics for land acquisition.

Specifically the Hanlon Creek Conservation Area plan should be revisited and activated as part of the Conservation Area Strategy (The Niska Lands).

Responding to and mitigating climate change should be a strategic priority.

There is a very small percentage of the land holdings which are grassland - this needs to be increased..

Please don't let developers gain any more green space

Need more focus on climate change and the future resilience that will be required. Please don't sell off any lands. Please work on acquiring more like previous generations had the foresight for. Please keep the nature centers open for youth education.

Balance of environmental and fiscal concerns

Why is there such a focus on flooding. Is there something GRCA know that the public does not. Do you know anything about the initiative the federal government (Freeland)has put out regarding need for flood insurance.

No

Climate change mitigation and adaptation need to be added to your overall goals. Conservation lands play an important role in flood control, carbon sequestration, and protection of plant and animal species. We need to protect these green spaces for our immediate and long term well being.

no

When you sell off land for short-term gain, you are not thinking of future generations. The GRCA should be protecting our conservation land legacy, not cashing it in. This is a betrayal of your mandate.

Sale of conservation lands only benefit developers, not citizens.

The GRCA should honour the land gifts received, and not sell them for profit. Keep the Niska (former Kortright Waterfowl Park). Develop it, don't sell it

It makes me sad to see that there is nothing about preserving conservation land.

Generally ranked from the core mandate (watershed protection and enhancement) down.

No

The reward of protecting land for future generations as well as preserving it's beauty allowing people to connect with nature far outweighs the financial gain of selling. We should be focusing on repurposing brown space and abandoned property already developed

Don't sell off any land or water

Please keep the Waterfowl park in Guelph as part of the GRCA and develop it for sustainable recreational use. Please do not sell it for development.

Don't sell Kortright trails. We need this green space in Guelph. People need access to natural areas and if population grows the green space needs to grow, not be reduced.

sell land that is not required to meet strategic objectives keep things simple and understandable for the average person. listen to the people----experts aren't the only ones with valuable opinion.

Preserve the Niska Lands as parkland for the public.

Do not sell GRCA land to developers

Do not sell assets to satisfy capital needs. GRCA is not a developer, rather a conservator.

Protect more land, not less

The mental health of all residents requires more green spaces and natural habitats

We must not take away any more land from wildlife areas...

Niska Road is gem that the community loves. Developing it will be devastating for users and for animal habitat.

We need to maintain the outdoor spaces we have left for communities

don't sell the land to developers!

Sale of lands is NOT an option to be considered in strategy. It is a land grab by the provincial government.

No

Not at this time

Don't sell the Niska former waterfowl space! It's such a gift to wander through this community space!

No additional comments.

Appendix B

| |
|--|
| <p>Do you have any additional comments on the Strategy objectives?</p> <p>Government policies should not decrease protected GRCA lands</p> <p>Do not sell Niska/kortright conservation area. Thanks.</p> <p>I think the fact that it is called the conservation authority means the land should be kept as conservation land and not sold off for housing ever.</p> <p>Keep and expand parkland and natural spaces-in Guelph Yorkand Green Hib is important</p> <p>The Niska lands in Guelph need to be preserved, to provide natural habitat and greenspace within the city. The city of Guelph is already lacking parkland, as new developers are given the option of providing parks, or cash in lieu, and always choose the latter option. Guelph doesn't need to be stripped of even more natural space. It's unhealthy for the environment and for the residents of the city.</p> <p>Lobby the Government to restore integrity of thr GRCA!!!</p> <p>I placed my objectives based on the lack of faith I have in the current government's approach to preserving the natural environment.</p> <p>Please do not sell or develop the Niska Rd property, it has a deep connection to the city and it's residents being the former site of the Kortright Waterfowl Park.</p> <p>The recurring use of the word "sustainable" inspires concern that sale and development are the real "objectives". Further, "compliance with relevant" government regulations surrenders to potentially reckless, environmentally-harmful political agendas.</p> <p>The objectives are clear and intentional.</p> <p>They don't include anything about the procurement of any lands to expand the GRCA or prevent the disposal of any properties for non-recreational and education uses</p> <p>I agree that sustainability is a key mandate of the GRCA. However, there needs to be an emphasis placed on preserving and maintaining a certain amount of greenspace, and indeed watershed capabilities, for future generations as well.</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>The objectives are vague and could be misinterpreted. For example, fiscal responsibility could be thought to include solvency of currently owned properties to provide income to manage other areas. This is not acceptable.</p> <p>I noted neutral in developing connection with community members since many times I have noticed the negative impact visitors to protected areas have on the natural surrounding i.e. garbage, land encroachment, abuse of natural growth, noise, impact on wildlife</p> <p>First Nations should & must be consulted, engaged & assume leadership positions in the development of any "Strategy" involving GRCA lands. Informed & responsible Stewardship - not governmental policies - is what must guide GRCA strategic plans & actions.</p> <p>Red flags are raised every- & anytime developers are involved in or will benefit from GRCA strategies/plans because of environmental & ground/surface water impacts.</p> <p>Sale of greenspace for housing in an area without main road infrastructure in a community that needs the greenspace is irresponsible</p> <p>NA</p> <p>I'm not sure of the meaning of 3 of the objectives, so I did not respond to the survey items pertaining to them in Question 6 above. Regardless, I strongly agree with any objective that PRESERVES OUR CONSERVATION AREAS AND DOES NOT ALLOW HOUSING OR OTHER NON-NATURAL DEVELOPMENT on these sites.</p> <p>The language around fiscal responsibility is leaning towards divestment and or neglect. It would be shortsighted and reckless to diminish this area. We need more parkland and access to nature. It is not a tradeoff with housing. Access to nature makes high density living tolerable and humane.</p> <p>I'm a birder, a dog walker, and a parent. It's important to me that the Conservation Area Strategy consider increasing conservation land - especially grassland, to help migratory and year-round bird species, and to ensure that other families are able to discover and use the conservation lands even as we grow. The green spaces around Guelph are a big reason why we decided to move here, and I think continue to be a draw.</p> <p>Also - climate change! It continues to be a crisis. How can we address this emergency in the plan? This should be a priority.</p> <p>Selling the land is wrong</p> <p>no</p> <p>Do not sell any surplus land. Surplus today may be required tomorrow.</p> <p>Once it's gone it cannot easily be replaced.</p> <p>Happy to see mention of forming stronger working relationships with Indigenous people.</p> <p>Please protect the property owned by GRCA from development</p> <p>Please help preserve our natural park space and environment.... we are losing our lands.</p> <p>Have great concerns about GRCA selling land.</p> <p>No</p> <p>The strategy should be looking to increase land holdings to account for population growth and the benefits of all citizens to be able to access recreational lands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The strategy does not contain any specific, measurable goals around activating public access to inactive landholdings. - There is nothing in the Conservation Area Strategy about increasing conservation land holdings to respond to population growth pressures and increased community demand for recreation. - There are no metrics for land acquisition. - Specifically the Hanlon Creek Conservation Area plan should be revisited and activated as part of the Conservation Area Strategy. - Responding to and mitigating climate change should be a strategic priority. - There is a very small percentage of the land holdings which are grassland - this needs to be increased.. <p>Please do NOT sell the Niska/Kortright lands in Guelph, and honour the core mandate of "Connecting people to the environment through outdoor experiences.</p> |
|--|

Appendix B

Do you have any additional comments on the Strategy objectives?

GRCA should aim to sustain and increase land holdings dedicated to publicly accessible recreational/parkland within or contiguous to municipal boundaries.

The strategy does not contain any specific, measurable goals around activating public access to inactive landholdings. There is nothing in the Conservation Area Strategy about increasing conservation land holdings to respond to population growth pressures and increased community demand for recreation. This in my opinion is key - we need more green spaces for recreation and for public mental and physical health. There are no metrics for land acquisition. Specifically the Hanlon Creek Conservation Area plan should be revisited and activated as part of the Conservation Area Strategy. Responding to and mitigating climate change should be a strategic priority. There is a very small percentage of the land holdings which are grassland - this needs to be increased.

Please do not consider selling the Kortright/niska conservation area.

Do not sell the Niska/Kortright lands. The name "conservation lands" should be an indicator that these lands should not be developed and should remain natural areas. My family and I are firmly against the selling of the lands.

Protect what the GRCA has, increase conservation efforts by not selling valuable, much needed forests and lands. Continue building future stewards of nature by keeping and increasing lands, not reducing the hectares.

Environment is the most important

No Conservation Areas should be lost or sold.

None of the Niska landholdings should be sold

DO NOT sell Kortright Waterfowl park

No

Maintenance of the lands around the Grand River for nature enjoyment, water quality, habitat quality for flora and fauna around the river and reiver banks.

I support these objectives but decisions are being made that are contradictory.

Please do not sell off our conservation land! We will never get these back. They need to stay in conservation.

Promote conservation and biodiversity for future generations.

No

No

There is nothing in the Conservation Area Strategy about increasing conservation land holdings to respond to population growth pressures and increased community demand for recreation. We walk through Crane park and the niska bridge area weekly. It is such an important space in our community and should be protected.

No

CONSERVE!

No

Responding to and mitigating climate change should be a strategic priority.

The wording of these priorities masks the purpose. I'm very concerned about the GRCA selling land for development. Is selling land in keeping with provincial priorities? Obviously the GRCA needs to abide by the laws of Ontario, but if managing land holdings means selling supposedly "excess" land then I am firmly opposed.

Continue to protect the natural environment surrounding GRCA areas and out of the hands of those looking to destroy what little green space we have left.

No

there are no metrics for land acquisition

No

The only thing that that should really matter is keeping the watershed healthy. Lands should not be sold. We have lost too much to development. It's not all about humans - we have a lot to answer for in the way we have maintained the land.

As our population has grown demand for outdoor space has as well- the areas close to us are a lot busier than they ever have been before because people drive from the GTA to enjoy. Sometimes deterring locals from going because so busy. We need more spaces for the community to connect and enjoy the outdoors and protections in place to safeguard the parks and trails for generations to come

None.

None of the Niska landholdings should be sold! The agricultural fields are candidates for picnic areas, sports fields, or restoration, as suggested by the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation and the Six Nations. This proposed Conservation Area Strategy is not clear about the fact that the GRCA is selling land in order to finance capital projects. This is a betrayal of the mandate of the GRCA under the guise of "fiscal responsibility". It is not a sustainable method of funding capital projects, and does not protect our watershed.

No

Do not sell conservation lands!!!

We need to stop using outdoor recreational and educational land to build homes

It's time to get Doug Ford and his government out! This premiere is not fit for office. He's uneducated, ignorant and corrupt. He doesn't believe in the science and in regards to the environment and protecting our wet lands he will destroy all in order to line the pockets of the developers and his cronies. His devious illinformed actions will have terrible consequences for our communities and the people of Ontario in the generations to come.

None

Recent provincial government actions regarding CA's make it increasingly difficult, but CA'a must do whatever is possible to maintain their original objectives, as mandated by former governments.

Do NOT SELL OF THE NISKA / KORTRIGHT LANDS IN GUELPH.

Appendix B

Do you have any additional comments on the Strategy objectives?

The point of view that wildfire depends on many of the areas needs to be emphasized more. Your goals are very human centric.

Do not sell off conservation areas. Protect the ecology.

I'm not opposed to partnerships but I need to understand what ideas are circulating. Additionally I agree with fiscal responsibility and a strategic approach but in partnership with sustainability.

The health and resilience of the ecosystem is paramount. When the land suffers so does everyone on it. I'm hoping for a new provincial government in the next election that will be more pro-land and pro-people.

Stewarding and protecting the lands and waters and animal life should be the primary objective. Along with Indigenous-led and partnered conservation. Also it is vital to 'indigenize' your policies and strategies and intentions (more balanced ways of living/working that we can also likely find, if we look back far enough in all our settler lineages). Vital to disconnect from colonial practices, intentions & actions, that support continued 'expansion', 'development' and profit, 'dominance of man' exploitive, extractive thinking and actions. Focus on restoring health and well-being to all the lands and waters, and respecting inherent sovereignty and rights of the waters,lands and nature, and working to restore biodiversity, rewilding, planting native species etc., and also cleaning up the watershed so that the water is once again healthy, naturally flowing, and 'drinkable' again - that is our colonial responsibility and accountability to restore.

Also, what are your actions and commitments for Truth & Reconciliation?

What are your actions and commitments for Land Back ?

Do not allow the land to be sold for housing

Yes, keep the NISKA lands out of developers hands.

No.

Everything depends upon a healthy, thriving environment. This might be more explicit here. The term viable ecosystems should be there. We depend upon these. So everything the GRCA does has to and should contribute to vibrant ecosystems. That should be explicit in the now general wraparound term "sustainable development".

•Responding to and mitigating climate change should be a strategic priority. There is nothing in the Conservation Area Strategy about increasing conservation land holdings to respond to population growth pressures and increased community demand for recreation. Number one concern should be the environment and wildlife protection of these sensitive areas.

Don't sell Kortright!!!

There's never been a more important time to protect our natural areas and waterways. Thank you for your important work.

I do not support selling conservation lands in order to build housing. This is so backwards. We need to be setting aside more conservation lands, not infilling wetlands. I'm referring to Niska/Kortright lands

I would agree with the levels of government if they are being responsible with their decision-making and not proposing things that would impact or destroy the watershed, such as Doug Ford's Conservative's housing development proposal.

No

If provincial, federal or municipal regulations are not strong enough to protect and keep GRCA properties sustainable and in public hands, GRCA might have to ignore or move beyond them

Conservation lands essential to balance impacts of continued intensive development within the watershed (urban growth, big ag impacts on water quality; seen and unseen consequences of climate change)

Don't develop gcr land. You can maintain it to keep it safe but don't sell it to be developed. We are losing too much forest at a rapid rate.

Please don't let Ford ruin our protected natural sites.

I am concerned about the potential sale of 20 acres of the Kortright Waterfowl Park. I know provincial legislation is guiding this and I am opposed. All conservation lands need to be maintained in perpetuity. We have existing land zoned for housing well into the future. We want to maintain the health and resilience of our watershed.

Responding to and mitigating climate change should be a top strategic priority! Protect all flood plains from development.

There is nothing in the Conservation Area Strategy about increasing conservation land holdings to respond to population growth pressures and increased community demand for recreation.

There are no metrics for land acquisition.

The Hanlon Creek Conservation Area plan should be revisited and activated as part of the Conservation Area Strategy.

Increase grasslands!

In the face of climate change, urban sprawl, monocultural farming, and skyrocketing biodiversity loss/extinctions, there is no such thing as "surplus conservation land".

The GRCA must not sell the Niska/Kortright lands in Guelph. It is bad environmental stewardship, and contrary to the GRCA's core mandate of connecting people to the environment through outdoor experiences.

These lands were acquired nearly 50 years ago with joint municipal and ministry funds, for the purposes of protecting them from development. It is unethical, shortsighted, and unsustainable to "cash them out" to fund infrastructure projects. I consider it a betrayal of the GRCA's foundational governing principles.

Please do not further consider any plan to treat these valuable natural lands as "surplus" or eligible to be placed on the market.

No.

Appendix B

Do you have any additional comments on the Strategy objectives?

- There is nothing in the Conservation Area Strategy about increasing conservation land holdings to respond to population growth pressures and increased community demand for recreation.
- There are no metrics regarding land acquisition.
- The strategy does not contain any specific, measurable goals around enabling public access to inactive landholdings.
- The Hanlon Creek Conservation Area plan should be revisited and activated as part of the Conservation Area Strategy.

Hopefully no conservation lands needs to be sold for development

natural lands and accessible to the public lands are both important. areas that have bike and walking paths, river and lake access are super important. but so are lands that are rewilded and kept intact with wildlife corridors and watershed integrity are also very important

Giant Hogweed hazard is not identified in the plan. This must be considered as it affects the ecology, recreation, tourism, and public safety. Detailed comments on the plan will be sent by email.

Once land is protected by the GRCA, it should never be allowed to be sold for development. Humans, plants and animals need watersheds and lands to be protected and kept natural and nourished

I found the nuances of the previous question a bit difficult to parse out. I am concerned that GRCA lands stay as conservation land and not be sold for development. We need as much green space and nature habitat as we can conserve with a growing human population.

Enhance the availability of seasonal camping to be an enjoyable extended stay experience.

do not sell waterfowl park lands and lands adjacent to Niska Road conservation area

I strongly support the maintenance and on-going availability of the Grand River Watershed parks.

In the opinion of City staff, "Consider watershed health and resilience when making land management decisions" and "Enhance community partnerships on GRCA properties" are the most important and of equal importance.

Keep these area protected from development in perpetuity. Natural area will become more important every year that passes into the climate crisis. We must protect the watershed. Also, there is enough land inside of city limits to build housing, Everyone knows this. The rush to build multimillion dollars houses on these lands only caters to a very small market, who all ready have more than enough.

No.

Use GCRA land and water to manage droughts and floods which will increase in frequency with climate change. Enhance wetlands. Develop stricter guidelines to reduce pollution in the GCRA watershed

It must be a challenge to be "in compliance" with Provincial policies when they are not on the best interests of the GRCA - and that can change at an "impulse" of Doug Ford.

I have to rank "compliance with Provincial regulations" last because the Province is not acting in the best interests of nature or the overall health of the watershed. In the best of all possible worlds, we would have thoughtful Provincial, Federal and Municipal government leadership and complying with them would be important. But not today.

GRCA should do what it can to conserve the natural resources in the Grand River watershed. GRCA leadership should be creative in finding ways to do what it knows it needs to do -- in spite of provincial regulations which tell it not to worry about the entire ecosystem, to just focus on flood control and water quality. GRCA should listen, more than ever, to the scientists in its employ, and take an ecosphere approach. Do not let current provincial regulations -- focused as they are on economic development first, foremost and sometimes exclusively -- cause you to throw away the good judgement and careful environmental management you have shown in the past.

And please, please, please, do not stop creating well-informed future generations.

Public education programs are crucial -- like those at the Nature Centres. The annual Heritage Day programming was excellent. That is the single event that made me love GRCA -- and contribute financially to GRCA operations. I so wish you would bring it back. It was a fabulous way for people throughout the watershed to discover common cause and work together.

The grca should not be declaring any conservation lands as surplus land. These lands should be reforested, converted to meadows or other ecological uses not sold for housing. The GRCA has a bad reputation because of the limited amount and limited public activities and engagement compared to other conservation authorities such as Halton, credit valley and Toronto. There would be more support of the GRCA if you had more activities such as what is happening in Halton and Credit Valley for instance.

Re: government compliance objective: While understanding of the fact that CA's need to adhere to legislation, please do not sell yourselves and your residents short as merely a creature of the government. The GRCA is entrusted with our land stewardship. The government has consistently made cuts and harmful legislation to our environment. "Steward" is only found in the Strategy draft twice. We are counting on you - the experts, the knowledgeable - to advocate for our lands and protect them for us now and for future generations. Can this objective be expanded to include stewardship/environmental advocacy to the government? "'Engaging' with authorities" sounds like seeking direction from government on how to implement, it is a careful but impactful word choice that may not include advising. If it is meant to, this should be more clearly stated.