

# Appendix B

<b>Do you have any additional comments related to the Conservation Areas Strategy?</b>
You are doing an excellent job and we are happy to have you taking care of our environment.
None
Just hoping that the gates are repaired as I miss the water this year!
No
No
Give the Damascus conservation area back to the Township of Wellington North. GRCA has abandoned it while pumping money into new areas while letting Damascus go to hell. The Township would be a much better caretaker of this area and will open it for the public that pay taxes in this area and get nothing in return from the GRCA
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.
The phosphorous levels between Cambridge and 6 Nations Reserve has been high and between Caledon and to Byng Island. Farms have been dumping fertilizer into the water - why hasn't this been addressed in the the plan?
no
No
n/a
Residents in the area really do not want to see any part of Laurel Creek sold off for development. I recently invested my money into purchasing a home in this area with the notion that the conservation area would be an integral part of this neighborhood, as well as for mental & physical well-being. I would NOT have made that investment had I known that there was a chance that one day it wouldn't be there.
n/a
no
1. A map of all dams and weirs on the river system is needed (even for those not managed by GRCA). Kayakers resort to using google maps to figure it out - which isn't reliable. 2. Please make your river data charts online easier to understand for the average person. Thx!
no
Green space is vital for the long-term health and sustainability of the community. Land sales should not come from conservation areas, rather the government should do more to buy land to be protected by conservation authorities.
No
1. More conservation efforts and mention of efforts in strategy to protect wildlife within conservation areas. 2. Too many multiple uniformed people riding around in vehicles and not actually walking the trails or out on the water. (this is the first year I have felt less safe - people related not environment related) 3. Parks losing revenue with people getting around loophole about number of people in a car for a certain price. Said people leaving park and coming back in with more people but not paying since they paid the first time coming into a park. Said people doing this multiple times in one day. Season pass holders feel they are subsidizing non-payers! 4. Stop over manicuring nature! More effort required on removal of recent invasive species.
I would like to know how you consider what properties are open year round and which are closed. I cross country ski in Elora and would love to have access in the winter. why do I have to pay for a select time to visit the Quarry when I hold a membership. I should be entitled to entry if I have a membership without additional costs and booking entry. Lastly, how much revenue is generated every time some production company uses the properties and closes it to both members and the general public. I don't see this as enhancing community partnership.
Don't trust the province
Guelph Lake Forest has a lot of barbed wire in many spots!!!
No
Don't sell off the Niska lands
Elora Gorge Park needs an outdoor swimming pool installed where the old leech pond used to be. Charge for swimming lessons and fit classes and it would be great to have a safe pedestrian/bike trail from Centre Wellington to the park.
no
Just a general comment that I am very pleased to live in a region where we are protecting land, water in a thoughtful manner. The GRCA has done a great job historically, and I hope protection can continue in spite of political or fiscal pressures.
Convey surplus to municipalities for use as public parks
Nature study should be encouraged, with check lists for birds and plants available
I really hope the GRCA will consider the impact of destroying the Kortright Waterfowl Park with a new subdivision will have. It's an amazing place with so much wildlife and plants - such a rarity to have a piece of paradise like this in a city.
No
The Arboretum area in Fergus is owned by GRCA, but "maintained" by Centre Wellington, to my knowledge. The town plan provides for a bridge to be built across the Grand at the end of Beatty line, destroying the natural ecosystem adjacent, and greatly affecting the river itself. I am strongly opposed.
We need to strengthen partnership with Elora Cataract Trailway Association Board of Directors . The Trailway is a major contributor to the health and well being of the communities it serves. Also , there needs to be a link for pedestrian traffic coming from Elora to the Elora Gorge Park that is inviting , not the barbed wire fencing that precludes traffic.

# Appendix B

## Do you have any additional comments related to the Conservation Areas Strategy?

It would be nice to see more action against invasive species. Invasive Phragmites is our worst invasive species right now and it is present on GRCA lands among other invasive species that should be treated. Pioneer populations are much easier and less expensive to control which really pushes for action to happen before these species take hold of these areas. It would also tie into the watershed approach to control and remove invasive species such as phragmites.

Do not sell any GRCA land.

I've noticed that the GRCA does a particularly bad job at advertising or hosting events in its space. It could absolutely make money on its own without the need to sell to developers. I am happy to give ideas as I follow many other conservation areas and marketing and would love to see the grca areas become treasured for everyone.

Make sure on the ground you have more foresters and more communication on basic things like windbreaks, riparian buffers . Not just on line but in paper publications where farmers and land owners read.

Two things that would be in the public interest.

1. I think there are opportunities for the GRCA to be able to do more with less. I would love to see the role of a Community Outreach and Volunteer Coordinator re-established. Many Conservation Authorities are actively involved in the Communities they serve.
2. The GRCA owns and manages a lot of land which requires resources and costs. I would recommend that the strategy consider working with Land Trusts in managing, partnering, and/or disposing of lands. Land Trusts, particularly those under the Ontario Land Trust Alliance (OLTA) have a greater ability to protect and manage sensitive lands than a Conservation Authority. They also have an ability to secure large donations or grants that would not be available to Conservation Authorities.

Public investment in GRCA lands needs to be recognized, especially in relation to the Niska lands. Without having a full EA of the so-called surplus lands at Niska, we don't even know if the lands are developable. Any Conservation Area Strategy must include proper environmental assessments to ensure that any land deemed surplus are actually developable. Niska lands are unique, include water recharge and the citizens of Guelph deserve continued access, especially since the Guelph Hiking Trail Club has funded and installed a connecting bridge from Crane Park.

Strategic priority: "managing GRCA landholdings in compliance with relevant Provincial regulations, policies and guidelines" potentially means fulfilling Doug Ford's agenda of serving up Conservation land to his developer friends. The GRCA Board needs to think very carefully about the core principles of Conservation Authorities and their long-term responsibility to the public interest.

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.

The Conservation Area Strategy is not transparent and clear about the fact that the GRCA is selling land in order to finance capital projects. This is not "fiscal responsibility", it is a betrayal of the mandate of the GRCA. It is certainly not a sustainable method of funding capital projects.

Urban conservation land only represents 9.% of GRCA land holdings. Given the importance of contact with nature and recreational opportunities for Ontarians, it should not be sold.

Stand up to the province. The need for your water and natural heritage management will be here long after this current government is gone.

No

The GRCA needs to develop more democratic processes and include the voice of Indigenous peoples. The conservation lands belong to all of us. They are our legacy for future generations. Please do not sell them off to developers for short term gain. Please provide more opportunities for local people to feed into GRCA processes.

no

How is it that you are called a "Conservation Area" when you are selling off conservation land. The land should be conserved in perpetuity. I am concerned about the ongoing sale of conservation land. I have watched the GRCA whittle away former Laurel Creek Conservation land holdings in Waterloo where I live. I am opposed to the sale of the Niska/Kortright lands in Guelph where some of my children and grandchildren live.

See answer to question 8.

We need to PRESERVE conservation land, not sell it off and destroy parts of it for development. The fact that you're even considering this is disgusting.

Please sell the 20 acres of Kortright Water Fowl property. Its agricultural table land, not river valley, and as its within the City of Guelph it should be used as urban land for development.

Keep kortright undeveloped

Save as much land as possible yiu a regain biodiversity once it's gone

GRCA is a rich and valuable treasure for all Ontarians.

Protect nature

Please DO NOT take any more land from wildlife!!

Please do not develop Niska.

No

Not at this time

Don't sell conservation areas for development. Conserve them.

GRCA land should not be sold or portioned off but protected and increased

Sorry for the incredibly damaging policies foisted upon the GRCA. I'm sorry.

Please honour and do NOT sell the Niska/Kortright lands in Guelph, while honouring the core mandate of "Connecting people to the environment through outdoor experiences."

Niska Rd is already overused and ignored by law enforcement (weight restrictions and speed limits are flagrantly defied with impunity, 24 hours a day). Nevertheless, residents enjoy the trails and the opportunity they afford to connect with nature.

Selling the Niska Lands for development would be irresponsible and catastrophic to the local watershed environment.

Public lands should not be sold, other than to other public entities if there are opportunities for partnerships.

DO NOT sell the Niska/Kortright lands in Guelph, and honour the core mandate of "Connecting people to the environment through outdoor experiences." Selling off the Niska/Kortright lands would be a betrayal of that core mandate

# Appendix B

<b>Do you have any additional comments related to the Conservation Areas Strategy?</b>
N/A
DO NOT sell off current property holdings to provide land for housing developments . As a global green leader, Guelph needs to make a clear stand in protecting our conservation /sensitive land from the pressure of federal government to build new homes. Once gone, the land is gone for good.
I am asking you NOT to sell the Niska/Kortright lands in Guelph,
NA
I am in favour of PRESERVING OUR CONSERVATION AREAS AND NOT ALLOWING HOUSING OR OTHER NON-NATURAL DEVELOPMENT on these sites.
My grandfather was mayor of Brantford in the 30's and was among the leaders that established the GRCA. In school, there were annual field trips to Kortright. Environmental legacy is important. We need to take even more care for even more people. Let your grandkids take pride that you protected that land.
Don't sell our parks! Animals have limited areas they call home - where do they go once we tear up their land for OUR greed? These parks are here for a reason. If money is the root cause, put up QR codes that ask for donations or small parking fees of \$2. I would gladly pay \$2 to use Snyders or Kortright/Niska if that meant the land was to remain the same.
We need land to build homes - the Kortright/Niska property needs to be sold so it can be developed for homes. The NIMBY is expected but people need to live somewhere which is more important than land sitting and not being used to it's full potential.
We live close to the former Kortright Waterfowl Park. While it is now a restricted access space, it is still an incredible resource that has been a form of parkland in the past and could be again in the future. We are facing a looming shortage of parkland. This will impact everyone in the city as a growing population crowds into finite recreational spaces. City of Guelph tax dollars covered 30 per cent to 40 per cent of the GRCA purchase of the former Kortright Waterfowl Park in 1977. This parcel of land has a unique and important history in our community, and it holds great significance for our family and our neighbours. That is why the city put in money and trusted GRCA to preserve it. While I understand that GRCA is working in a very difficult financial situation, cashing out conservation lands to help the provincial government fund infrastructure budgets is a completely unsustainable way of responding to those challenges. I think selling off this land would be a betrayal of the GRCA's mandate.
<b>Please protect Smith Property from any development</b>
Land should be protected, not sold.
The Niska conservation area will only grow in use and importance as Guelph expands. Please do not sell this.
If the strategy is just pandering to current governments' undermining of conservation authorities and lands, then it is not in the best interest of residents.
Urban lands are especially valuable since they are easiest for low socioeconomic status residents to access and should not be sold!
- Strategic priority: "managing GRCA landholdings in compliance with relevant Provincial regulations, policies and guidelines" potentially means fulfilling Doug Ford's agenda of serving up Conservation land to his developer friends. The GRCA Board needs to think very carefully about the core principles of Conservation Authorities and their long-term responsibility to the public interest.
- 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.
- The Conservation Area Strategy is not transparent and clear about the fact that the GRCA is selling land in order to finance capital projects. This is not "fiscal responsibility", it is a betrayal of the mandate of the GRCA. It is certainly not a sustainable method of funding capital projects.
- Urban conservation land only represents 9% of GRCA land holdings. Given the importance of contact with nature and recreational opportunities for Ontarians, it should not be sold.
- Financial contributions of municipal tax dollars have not been mentioned in the "History of Land Acquisition."
<b>Please do NOT sell the Niska/Kortright lands in Guelph, and honour the core mandate of "Connecting people to the environment through outdoor experiences.</b>
Strategic priority: "managing GRCA landholdings in compliance with relevant Provincial regulations, policies and guidelines" potentially means fulfilling Doug Ford's agenda of serving up Conservation land to his developer friends. The GRCA Board needs to think very carefully about the core principles of Conservation Authorities and their long-term responsibility to the public interest. This is very important to me.
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.
The Conservation Area Strategy is not transparent and clear about the fact that the GRCA is selling land in order to finance capital projects. This is not "fiscal responsibility", it is a betrayal of the mandate of the GRCA. It is certainly not a sustainable method of funding capital projects.
Urban conservation land only represents 9% of GRCA land holdings. Given the importance of contact with nature and recreational opportunities for Ontarians, it should not be sold.
The mission is so important. Education to communities might be needed to encourage support. Please don't grow weary of the stewardship of this vital work. Thank you
Financial contributions of municipal tax dollars have not been mentioned in the "history of land acquisition"
Connecting people to the environment through outdoor experiences
Niska lands should be maintained. I often took children there to experience ducks, geese etc. in their natural habitat which was nature in its essence. GRCA should NOT be selling off its land, especially when we know that the Mississaugas of the Six Nations really own all the areas on either side of the river. The Niska lands should be a low developed park with picnic tables etc. to encourage anyone to spend time in this environment. Medicine now advocates for more time in nature for people to improve/maintain their health.
The Niska Kortright land was acquired so it would be protected from development and enable Guelph residents to enjoy this land. Guelph is growing and these types of spaces are sacred. They need to be protected as was the original mandate by GRCA.
There is a large environmental impact to selling this land off. Selling this off for development contradicts the mandates of GRCA.
<b>Please do not sell off GRCA holdings for development.</b>
No
No

# Appendix B

## Do you have any additional comments related to the Conservation Areas Strategy?

The Conservation Area Strategy is not transparent and clear about the fact that the GRCA is selling land in order to finance capital projects. This is not "fiscal responsibility", it is a betrayal of the mandate of the GRCA. It is certainly not a sustainable method of funding capital projects.

No

Do NOT sell off any lands! My children are coming of an age that we will be carving out fond outdoor memories in all of the areas currently under your protection.

Tell whoever is cutting your funding and telling you to sell where to go.

"Managing GRCA landholdings in compliance with relevant Provincial regulations, policies and guidelines" basically means achieving Doug Ford's model of handing over protected land to his developer buddies. The GRCA Board should consider their core principles and responsibility to the public.

Keep GRCA lands out of the hands of builders.

Areas deemed for conservation ought to remain as such. They are vital areas to human wellbeing and wildlife habitat. Selling these lands for development is not their purpose and it violates public trust to do so.

Conservation lands should not be sold.

No

Look for opportunities to engage with Parks Canada and communities regarding the National Urban Park program.

Thank you for your time

Do not sell Conservation Lands!!!!

It is important that GRCA keep community lands like the Niska/Kortright conservation land accessible to the public. There is sufficient land for housing within the City of Guelph boundaries, and it is a betrayal to those before us who helped get this land for public access and it is an obligation to future generations that we not squander what we have now by selling it for development.

It is important for GRCA to ensure that the land is used in a way that maintains or increases biodiversity and greenspace.

Don't sell the Niska Lands

I am totally against giving up conservation land, and I am in favour of getting more!

I am so depressed about this, and I am willing to fight it. We need to think of our future and what we want to leave to those that come after us, so they can be proud of the decisions made now. If people in the past had not thought about us, what would we have? Currently we have beauty and habitat, and I am so thankful for that. Housing should not replace our wonderful conservation lands. I also feel it is disgusting that the gov't is making the CA do this and trying to undo all of the hard work.

No

Putting any houses there would be a sin and Mr Mack would never have wanted this. It has had so many dignitaries famous people visit the park. This would be an absolute travesty to destroy this land.

A user from 1967 to present and family had used it before

Kara Beitz

Southend resident from childhood to now!

I am fearful financial pressures may fuel irreversible loss of important environment conservation.

Do not sell properties. Increase costs if money is needed.

Grca land should never be sold

Would be really nice to have the Kortright waterfowl lands reopened to the public. Educational talks on the watershed would be good. It was a wonderful place to get back to nature. I have missed this wonderful piece of nature since it closed.

Conserve the land

Don't cave to the Provinces ever changing demands and policy changes that pivot constantly based upon the leaders changing whims.

I am concerned about the phrasing of the goals based on following provincial rules, as these have not shown to be in the best interest of our communities and environmental sustainability down the line (as well as focusing on fiscal benefits when we may need to prioritize investing in better futures at this time (i.e. sustainability and environment vs cutting corners/developing for short term gain)

Again, please do not sell conservation lands to developers. Beautiful places to walk and enjoy nature are already dwindling.

GRCA should give much weight to local residents and Guelph city development objectives in deciding on the Niska lands' future.

I am sorry that the provincial government is not supporting or acknowledging the true importance of green space to the communities that thrive through having access.

Don't turn our cities into parkless desert islands. Don't cave to political pressure and sell off lands that are protected for a reason.

DO NOT SELL lands for housing development.

SELL the Niska Kortright parcel.

Strategic priority: "managing GRCA landholdings in compliance with relevant Provincial regulations, policies and guidelines" potentially means fulfilling Doug Ford's agenda of serving up Conservation land to his developer friends. The GRCA Board needs to think very carefully about the core principles of Conservation Authorities and their long-term responsibility to the public interest.

- 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.

- The Conservation Area Strategy is not transparent and clear about the fact that the GRCA is selling land in order to finance capital projects. This is not "fiscal responsibility", it is a betrayal of the mandate of the GRCA. It is certainly not a sustainable method of funding capital projects.

- Urban conservation land only represents 9% of GRCA land holdings. Given the importance of contact with nature and recreational opportunities for Ontarians, it should not be sold.

- Financial contributions of municipal tax dollars have not been mentioned in the "History of Land Acquisition."

Please don't sell Niska/Kortright Lands

# Appendix B

## Do you have any additional comments related to the Conservation Areas Strategy?

Yes we need to fight against a misguided province. They conservation lands were visionary, we need to keep them and expand.

Keep Kortright water fowl area for public access. I think not even people even know this exists. Little Tract and Fletcher creek are often very busy and they are further away for south Guelph residents.

Do not sell off the land by the Old Bird Sanctuary.....it's so full of wildlife, plants, animals, and creates a calming zone to the forest and waters that house even more wildlife.

selling land to builders is a bad idea

Kortright Waterfowl Park is a jewel that should be polished and kept.

no

No

Some Areas need to be maintained with the benefit of wildlife as the goal. Recreation for humans should not be allowed in such areas.

Ecologically develop conservation areas to mitigate the adverse effects of climate change.

They are an important part of our community serving more than just an aesthetic purpose and I'd like to understand the environmental impacts of developing areas of them.

Selling off land should be a last resort, I think. Thank you.

Decolonizing your objectives and strategies is vital - to shift towards protecting and stewarding long-term health, biodiversity, vitality, and respecting inherent rights/sovereignty of lands and waters, for the long term health of all life, all generations (not just people's use, profits, or 'entertainment!').

Align with Indigenous land-based leadership, indigenous-led stewardship and strategies.

Focus on strategies that promote:

- 'fossil free', and climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies,

- biodiversity, resilience, reforestation/rewilding,

- less or no growth, less/no human development/'urbanization'/'human expansion',

- simplicity, zero waste, and energy conservation.

- land-based learning & restoring (including volunteer work on the land for cleanups, restoration, plantings), to steward long-term health, resilience and bioersity.

Focus less on imbalanced political 'demands' and the use/diversion/'entertainment' of settlers on conservation lands, and work more as people to restore lands and waters, everywhere. More advocacy for positive change that puts Earth and well-being of all life first, and NOT profit, development and 'human recreation'.

Also, every time I visit the Guelph Lake conservation I see a lot of garbage collected from visitors and lots of irresponsible littering - where is the follow-up and accountability for visitors by park staff? (should be part of going around to tour, and speak with, and teach visitors to ensure respectful behaviours and good practices. Actively work to evolve 'modern society' thinking and behaviours, so people evolve from treating the Earth like a 'garbage dump' with entitled dominance, and encourage ways of visiting that promote land-based restoration and long-term health, and promote attitudes of care, respect and humility with the Earth and all life. This should be normal! : )

Keep public use to a trail to preserve the land for wildlife

Selling lands is wrong, since the whole concept of conservation land is to conserve it. The sake of lands to developers is cheap and a cash grab. Don't betray the planet and those who dared to stand up to capitalism before each of you considered selling the land.

Survive Provincial political likes and dislikes. Serve the community first; see it, and cultivate it as an ACTIVE, engaged partner, to ward off the political vagaries of Provincial deal making and short-term political compromises.

- Strategic priority: "managing GRCA landholdings in compliance with relevant Provincial regulations, policies and guidelines" potentially means fulfilling Doug Ford's agenda of serving up Conservation land to his developer friends. The GRCA Board needs to think very carefully about the core principles of Conservation Authorities and their long-term responsibility to the public interest.
- 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.
- The Conservation Area Strategy is not transparent and clear about the fact that the GRCA is selling land in order to finance capital projects. This is not "fiscal responsibility", it is a betrayal of the mandate of the GRCA. It is certainly not a sustainable method of funding capital projects.
- Urban conservation land only represents 9% of GRCA land holdings. Given the importance of contact with nature and recreational opportunities for Ontarians, it should not be sold.
- Financial contributions of municipal tax dollars have not been mentioned in the "History of Land Acquisition."

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. This is so disappointing.

Provide access to Puslinch lake. Now, it is essentially a private lake for use only by those with money to buy expensive homes on its shore. Access should be available to everyone

As population intensifies and densities it is critical to maintain all GRCA landholdings in public domain! Fundraise if you have to.

Expand conservation areas to address biodiversity loss and other impacts of unchecked urban growth

Don't sell land

Thank you for inviting input on this important topic.

# Appendix B

## Do you have any additional comments related to the Conservation Areas Strategy?

"managing GRCA landholdings in compliance with relevant Provincial regulations, policies and guidelines" potentially means fulfilling Doug Ford's agenda of opening up Conservation land to developers. Please, keep in mind the core principles of Conservation Authorities and their long-term responsibility to watershed management in the public interest.

Please do not sell off the Niska landholdings. The land is suitable for recreation, or restoration, as suggested by the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation and the Six Nations.

Urban conservation land only represents 9.% of GRCA land holdings. Given the importance of wetlands, flood plains, habitat loss, biodiversity, species at risk etc and contact with nature and recreational opportunities for Ontarians, it should be increased not decreased.

Financial contributions of municipal tax dollars have not been mentioned in the "History of Land Acquisition."

The Conservation Area Strategy is potentially selling land in order to finance capital projects. This is not a sustainable way to fund capital projects.

I strongly object to selling of the lands in Guelph on Niska Rd. The acquisition of these properties was partially funded by the taxpayers of Guelph and they have a right not to have these sold off to commercial development.

- 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.

- Urban conservation land represents only 9.% of GRCA land holdings. Given the importance of contact with nature and recreational opportunities for Ontarians, it should not be sold.

- The strategic priority: "managing GRCA landholdings in compliance with relevant Provincial regulations, policies and guidelines" potentially means fulfilling Doug Ford's agenda of serving up Conservation land to his developer friends. The GRCA Board needs to think very carefully about the core principles of Conservation Authorities and their long-term responsibility to the public interest.

Conservation of the balance of the ecosystem must include an acknowledgement of giant hogweed invasion and its detrimental effects.

Keep conserving our watershed!

do not sell waterfowl park lands and lands adjacent to Niska Road conservation area. keep the original commitment to maintain lands as public parkland area. making money is NOT the priority.

The health of the environment must be top of mind.

The City of Guelph is very supportive of the draft Conservation Areas Strategy and notes the alignment of the draft strategy with the City's Strategic Plan, Official Plan and Natural Heritage Action Plan. Many of the draft strategy's listed "Outcomes", "Future Direction" and "Actions" align with:

- the "Environment" theme of Guelph's Strategic Plan,
- the "watershed planning to manage growth and infrastructure", "natural heritage and biodiversity conservation", "resilience and restoration planning", and "fostering community support, raising awareness and engagement" actions identified in the City's Natural Heritage Action Plan, and
- the strategic goals, objectives and policies of Guelph's Official Plan.

What will it take to make our environment a priority? All these lands need to be protected for everyone, not permanently destroyed by the wealthy few. We are rushing towards catastrophe, let's take the time to consider the implications of every decision to tear these lands down. Please

Do not sell off for development any of the Niska Lands. Guelph has plenty of available properties for development and needs to retain its open areas to match the future population growth. Guelph also has to be careful about use of its ground water resource with respect to population growth.

Do not sell the Niska/Kortright lands in Guelph

The strategy should be written in a way that anticipates better provincial government leadership.

Be creative!

I don't think your properties are being managed very well there is limited removal of invasive species for example. There is virtually no policing of illegal activities on areas such as Preservation Park and the Niska lands in Ontario. There should be more interpretive signage so people understand the reason why dogs are not allowed off leash and why people should stay on the trails in order to protect the forest. Many plant species have disappeared such as wild leaks because of over foraging on grca lands. Why isn't the grca conducting more bio blitz's on their property so they know what species are there in order to protect them. As cities in the watershed grow more and more destruction thru over use will occur without better education and stewardship.

The mini-golf in Rockwood is one of our favourite activities. School field trips to Guelph Lake have significant impact on youth's environmental values.

Please note we visit more frequently in the warmer months but probably less than 12 times per year total. We also visit Halton conservation areas.