

## Open House 1 – General Comments from Attendees

Item	Topic	Comment
1	General Support	15 years over due
2	General Support	Anybody that live and use Kenaston know why.
3	General Support	Long Overdue
4	General Support	Long Overdue
5	General Support	Long overdue
6	General Support	Needs widening
7	General Support	I like the improvements to route 90 but wish Ikea was going to be built at the Downs
8	General Support	Start immediately
9	General Support	Widen it!
10	General Support	Travel between Academy and Polo Park area on weekends and at peak times is very difficult.
11	General Support	There is no question improvements must be made
12	General Support	This is the major N-S truck route to USA, aside from residential south to commercial north
13	General Support	Far too much traffic for only 4 lanes esp. with Waverley West
14	General Support	Improvements must be substantial - not just for today but for the future
15	General Support	Required with Waverley west and other SW developments
16	General Support	Well overdue - Waverley West, Kenaston McGillivray
17	General Support	Improving the traffic of Kenaston is the only way to ease problem
18	General Support	Widen to three lanes each way
19	General Support	Kenaston should be widened
20	General Support	Building to 'just enough' levels should not be considered. Go Big.
21	General Support	Do it right the first time. Traffic will only inc. as SW builds up
22	General Support	Do it now! Don't wait for future problems to arise
23	General Support	Changing to accommodate more traffic is required
24	General Support	Leave it to the experts
25	General Support	Route 90 must be widened to accommodate traffic
26	General Support	Need 6 lanes in future. Identify the plan and work towards it even if it takes many years.
27	General Support	More traffic lanes should be added
28	General Support	Widen Kenaston to keep noise concentrated in one area only
29	General Support	Need to get this in the capital budget and make it a priority
30	General Support	Planning of traffic systems seems to be done peacemeal. As a result there are no effective through routes. There is a constant need to change direction. Can't get from here to their directly.
31	General Support	Can't happen too soon!
32	Option 1 Support	Take west side when widening. Military housing and base empty
33	Option 1 Support	Use Kapyong Barracks on westside to widen Kenaston
34	Option 1 Support	Option 1, west side
35	Option 1 Support	Number 1 Option (West) offers the least disruption to River Heights residents (owners). DND houses will go regardless of what option is used - so the loss of 7 or 8 houses near Academy and the Post Office is all that is really lost.
36	Option 1 Support	Option 1 will cause the least disruptions to the neighbourhood
37	Option 1 and 4 Support	Option 1 and 4 seem to make the best of an awkward situation. Something like this needed to be done for over a decade

38	Option Alternate Support	6th option - No extra lanes, but improvement of access and egress to route 90 and improvement to traffic flow
39	Option 3 Support	Widening both directions would be best
40	Option 5 Support	The most efficient way would be down the railway, this would eliminate construction pains.
41	Option 5 Support	Railway should be used to form one way traffic north and existing rte90 south
42	Option 5 Support	They should think about the heavy traffic that will continue along that route even if they enlarge it. They should even the weight by separate one ways along railway and Kenaston
43	Option 5 Support	They should use the rail as a one way and Kenaston as a one way
44	Option 5 Support	I prefer the split road option.
45	Option 5 Support	Option 5 would appear to offer the least disruption during construction
46	Option 5 Support	Option #5 is the best. It has least impact on residents, it also provides better distribution of traffic and doesn't depend on federal land
47	Option 5 Support	Undecided, although Option 5 appears the most interesting providing there is a wide space for AT
48	Option Alternate Support	Option 6: Reduce amount of widening on existing rte90 and place AT route on old CN ROW combined with option 1 (with reduced widening). What happens if access to Carpthia school is so negatively impacted that the school has dropped enrolment and shuts down. Where will our children go to school? Those on the west side of Kenaston most logically would go to Ecole Tuxedo. This school cannot support additional students and parents of that school would strongly oppose this influx
49	Option Alternate Support	Bike path from Ness to Taylor would be a good idea. If you use Option 5 for a transit path, you really wont need extra lanes on Kenaston, it would alleviate the traffic issues in a major way.
50	General Opposition	Consider other options, ie, don't do anything
51	General Opposition	Leave it alone. It has been short sighted to develop Kenaston South with big box stores etc and then destroy our neighborhood in the process
52	General Opposition	You care more about stores and cars than residents near proposals
53	General Opposition	All of the options presented seem to take it as a foregone conclusion that expansion and expropriation are inevitable. There need to be other options than the ones presented tonight
54	General Opposition	Living at Kenaston and Grant affords us easy access anywhere, traffic is not an issue
55	General Opposition	Vision - we are not seeing any vision here - it's a bandaid solution / require a holistic approach
56	General Opposition	Expanding capacity only increases traffic
57	General Opposition	I travel this frequently between 9-4 and rarely encounter problems
58	General Opposition	Never ending cycle, the more we improve roads, the more vehicles we attract. The future is to reduce cars and use mass transit
59	General Opposition	No problems right now (traffic light improvements helped)
60	General Opposition	We are from Toronto/Ottawa. 10 minutes of traffic is not a concern. Money should be used more wisely elsewhere
61	General Opposition	We should be trying to discourage private vehicles
62	General Opposition	Not in favour of increasing the number of vehicles or removal of homes from east side
63	General Opposition	Answer to traffic problems is not to develop Waverley West but develop downtown
64	General Opposition	Land use planning and demand side management. Ikea should be downtown not on Kenaston of SW area
65	General Opposition	Money could be used for something better

66	General Opposition	Unless this turns into a real freeway it's a waste of money
67	General Opposition	Not doing it. This is a project that is not being driven by Winnipeg's citizens but by business in the southwest, e.g. IKEA
68	General Opposition	Leave as is
69	General Opposition	Environmental impact, hazardous waste movement, loss of property value, noise
70	General Opposition	Do we actually want to encourage people to drive? Single vehicle occupancy?
71	General Opposition	Divert Traffic away from Kenaston instead of adding to it
72	General Opposition	Just leave it the way it is
73	General Opposition	I oppose any increase in traffic on Kenaston but obviously this is not realistic
74	General Opposition	Widening of Kenaston will do nothing if route 90 not widened south of Taylor. Should have been done with overpass.
75	General Opposition	Widening roads to deal with a traffic problem is like loosening your belt to deal with a weight problem. This ranking options unacceptable, what about my option of not widening Kenaston.
76	General Opposition	This does not mean expansion of rte 90
77	General Opposition	I feel some upgrades are necessary but not the massive expensive upgrades you plan
78	General Opposition	This money should be spent on providing retail and grocery stores for people in the inner city who need it a lot more than we do
79	General Opposition	You want more speed, more traffic to flow into an area (Polo Park) that cannot handle the current load, let alone an increased load of traffic. Fix St. James/Ellice/Polo Park first
80	General Opposition	Adding two lanes will invite a heavier traffic flow, especially from Waverley West in the near future. Due to the necessity of traffic lights, the build-up soon to come will not withstand the added burden.
81	General Opposition	Even if homes are not taken, increasing lanes to accommodate more traffic will result in vast increase of noise and air pollution. With economic downturn residents life styles would be taken from them when having to borrow to purchase homes. For traffic to IKEA and new developments, Moray should be extended south to the new housing development, intersecting with Bishop Grandin
82	Option 5 Opposition	Keeping two way traffic
83	Option 5 Opposition	Neighbourhood impact. A major highway divides neighbourhoods. If you add another major highway two blocks further down you will create a second major divide. Whereas widening route 90 will not change the neighbourhood. However, that too should be done with the least impact on existing homes
84	Option 5 Opposition	Please do not consider option 5
85	Option 5 Opposition	I am disappointed that the city is evaluating the idea of option 5., after they tore down the CN to purchase the property. Check previous studies
86	Option 5 Opposition	Option 5 is not an option. It destroys new buildings and affects all houses between centennial and route 90.
87	Option 5 Opposition	Do not use centennial CN rail
88	Option 5 Opposition	Why would you show option 5 when the land from Corydon south has been sold to developers. They're building condos there.
89	General Impact	Residential properties, access and quality of life
90	General Impact	Why should the established area suffer because of urban sprawl. We're losing out house value
91	General Impact	Do not take more land than you have to. Do the least disruption to displacing people from their homes
92	General Impact	Protect the community
93	General Impact	Least impact on home owners

94	General Impact	Expropriation due to traffic lanes too close to some homes. It is too loud, too dirty, too much vibration
95	General Impact	Impact on community, noise, pollution, property values
96	General Impact	Please think of long term residents. These are our homes and our property values will decrease.
97	General Impact	Impact to the residents of River Heights and Tuxedo, removing peoples homes, safety of our children, property values especially for those who have decided to stay in their home and renovate upgrade their homes/ increase that value rather than move
98	General Impact	Residents in the area- Safety, noise, property value
99	General Impact	Impact on surrounding area
100	General Impact	Absolutely [improve vehicular flow] but community needs to be protected from the upgrade
101	General Impact	With as little impact on our community as possible.
102	General Impact	I also fear for the approx. 3000 people displaced.
103	General Impact	Being senior citizen I can't imagine moving again
104	General Impact	Avoid destroying community
105	General Impact	The neighbourhoods bordering the area
106	General Impact	The least disruptive for current residents
107	General Impact	Have least impact on least number of people
108	General Impact	To choose the option that has the least impact on the least amount of residents
109	General Impact	Remember that humans live here
110	General Impact	Least impact on people and communities
111	General Impact	The least disruptive for current residents
112	General Impact	Must balance needs between commuters and fact that this is a residential neighbourhood
113	General Impact	Future development, the residents in the surrounding areas
114	General Impact	How it impacts people next to route 90 (3 blocks)
115	General Impact	Minimizing number of properties that have to be expropriated.
116	General Impact	Minimizing the impact on the people
117	General Impact	The area residents
118	General Impact	Impact on adjacent neighbourhood
119	General Impact	Maintaining current neighbourhood as much as possible. Providing active transportation. Impacting the least number of houses.
120	General Impact	The volume of lives being affected vs traffic
121	General Impact	With more traffic the houses will shake more. Therefore, help should be given to home owners with basement, water and gas lines.
122	General Impact	Residents in the are - these are peoples homes - very emotional issue
123	General Impact	Cost, noise, property to be torn down
124	General Impact	Sound barrier, sidewalk, heavy traffic in median lane
125	General Impact	Which option impacts the least amount of people and safety an aesthetics of the area
126	General Impact	Minimal impact on existing residents, but planning for improvement to the neighborhoods that will be affected
127	General Impact	What option would have the least residential intrusion
128	General Impact	Minimize the amount of property expropriation, especially expensive commercial properties
129	General Impact	The lives and communities on the east side of Kenaston. The only responsible option is to develop the west side - much less disruptive and much less destruction.
130	General Impact	Keeping down traffic noise and pollution for those who live in the

		area
131	General Impact	The families living immediately adjacent to route 90 and their quality of life. Route 90 is only four lanes all the way to Bishop grandin so why the push at this end?
132	General Impact	The families living immediately adjacent to route 90 and their quality of life. Route 90 is only four lanes all the way to Bishop grandin so why the push at this end?
133	General Impact	Noise, efficient, neighbourhood impact, property values, Quality of life for residents
134	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Left turn off Kenaston should be eliminated up to Grant.
135	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Current road not built to withstand traffic
136	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Don't want it to get worse
137	Traffic Flow/Congestion	The volume of cars is increasing
138	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Traffic congestion especially wee hours
139	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Traffic is increasing, therefore congestion and safety concerns
140	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Average speed 15km/h without Waverley west
141	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Terrible bottleneck at rush hours
142	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Too much stop and start, no flow
143	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Too much traffic for road. Not designed to handle this much flow
144	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Traffic flow in off hours is not too bad but traffic density in too high even on Sunday
145	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Winnipeg needs a major NS corridor and rte90 is the logical choice
146	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Sharp curve on south side of bridge very dangerous (Lived there 34 years, many maimed and people killed in that area)
147	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Continuous flow most important, eliminate traffic lights
148	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Development on the CN will definitely affect traffic.
149	Traffic Flow/Congestion	I drive down Lockwood to avoid congestion
150	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Long term Traffic increase north and south, next 30 years
151	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Safety, smooth and steady movement of traffic
152	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Stop lights as opposed to traffic control lights waste gas and time and cause unnecessary delays when roads are slippery
153	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Speed up traffic
154	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Improving traffic flow
155	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Twice the current traffic volumes, improved flow
156	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Improving flow and access
157	Traffic Flow/Congestion	good traffic flow, not bottlenecked at the bridge, least amount of expropriation
158	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Smooth traffic flow and least neighbourhood disruption
159	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Maximizes traffic flow with the lowest expenditure. If possible fewer traffic lights
160	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Design project to maintain traffic flow
161	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Flow and safety
162	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Citizens who live at Denman Place and the Ponds are allowed to make a "U" turn at Bolton Bay when they are travelling south on Kenaston. The "U" turn practice uncontrolled is the cause of many near missed accidents as well as a number of real collisions.
163	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Flow capacity, safety
164	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Allow better flow of traffic by coordinating traffic lights
165	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Traffic flow
166	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Bridge is bottleneck
167	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Traffic flow, Access, Egress
168	Traffic Flow / Congestion	Traffic flow

169	Traffic Flow/ Congestion	Increase traffic flow without expropriation
170	Traffic Flow/ Congestion	Speedy and efficient traffic flow especially car traffic which comprises most of the traffic now.
171	Traffic Flow/ Congestion	Increase number of lanes and improve alignment of traffic flow
172	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Too congested, too many fumes, unsafe, noisy and not turning lanes
173	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Vehicular traffic bottlenecks around the bridge. 18 wheelers have to gear up and down at every light. The noise is terrible
174	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Traffic congestion during rush hours is horrible, especially if there has been an accident or stalled car which happens frequently during the winter.
175	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Left Turns from Boulton onto Kenaston Blvd are a major challenge but even more problematic for seniors. Right turns which proceed north are also difficult often throughout the day. Often one has to force the north flow to stop by just entering the intersection and turning quickly. The cars travelling on Kenaston are bumper to bumper. Bus Drivers confirm my findings and often have difficulty when they are required to change lanes during peak times.
176	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Too much delay at Grant - Kenaston Intersection
177	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Flow of traffic was to improve. 3 lanes each way. Timing of the lights can improve
178	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Traffic should flow to reduce exhaust, trees are stunted and lack leaves
179	Ideas - Synchronization	Constant speed limit with synced lights
180	Ideas - Synchronization	I don't see any difference between north of Ness traffic and South of Ness traffic (2 or 3 lanes). The lights are the issue
181	Ideas - Synchronization	Keep the traffic moving, better synchronization of lights
182	Ideas - Synchronization	Make the lights timed so traffic could flow, presently they are not timed
183	Ideas - Synchronization	Lights could be timed better
184	Ideas - Synchronization	Co-ordinated traffic lights
185	Ideas - Synchronization	Time the lights so traffic flows. Make sure there's no bottleneck areas
186	Ideas - Synchronization	Careful consideration in pedestrian synchronized traffic flow
187	Ideas - Synchronization	Synchronization
188	Ideas - Synchronization	Synchronization
189	Ideas - Synchronization	Even better traffic light syncing
190	Ideas - Synchronization	Smooth Traffic flow, fewer or better coordinated lights, service or access roads for immediate area
191	Ideas - Synchronization	Better syncing of lights
192	Ideas - Synchronization	Better timing of lights
193	Ideas - Synchronization	Sync lights along entire route and add turning lanes at controlled intersections
194	Ideas - Synchronization	Signal at Sterling Lyon OK, Corydon, Grant and Academy need longer greens.
195	Ideas - Synchronization	Sync lights along entire route and add turning lanes at controlled intersections
196	Ideas - Synchronization	First, Sync the traffic lights!
197	Ideas - Synchronization	Coordinated traffic lights
198	Ideas - Synchronization	Traffic lights at Kenaston and Boulton Bay.
199	Ideas - Synchronization	Traffic light synchronization. Finding ways to minimize traffic, not expand capacity
200	Ideas - Synchronization	Improve light signals
201	Ideas - Synchronization	I live at Kenaston Estates. If lights arent synced properly how will I be able to get in and out with the increase in speed and traffic in a

		safe manner?
202	Ideas - Synchronization	Synchronize lights
203	Ideas - Synchronization	Synchronize lights, Taylor to Ellice as a first priority
204	Ideas - Synchronization	Is there really a need to build any additional lanes for traffic? Better light synchro or restricting semi traffic would help move traffic
205	Ideas - Synchronization	The synchronization of lights on Route 90 should be a top priority before any project is considered
206	Ideas - Synchronization	Synchronization of lights to keep flow but allow for cyclists/peds to activate stoppages
207	Ideas - Synchronization	Traffic improves with proper use of lights
208	Ideas - Synchronization	Traffic lights need to be synced
209	Ideas - Signals	Need traffic lights at Doncaster and Tuxedo b/c of youth centre and Asper centre traffic.
210	Ideas - Signals	Remove lights from Kenaston
211	Ideas - Signals	Co-ordinating the traffic lights
212	Ideas - Signals	Less traffic lights
213	Ideas - Signals	Left hand turn signals, easier access from Boulton Bay
214	Ideas - Signals	Elimination of traffic lights
215	Ideas - Signals	Longer traffic cycles
216	Ideas - Signals	Turning lights at intersections
217	Ideas - Signals	Remove traffic lights at residential accesses
218	Ideas - Signals	Access changes and traffic lights, especially ones affecting residential areas
219	Ideas - Signals	Remove traffic lights, replace with right turn only, fly over at Grant
220	Ideas - Signals	Less traffic lights.
221	Ideas - Signals	Corydon needs to run lights east to south now.
222	Ideas - Signals	Many traffic lights are too short in duration, traffic barely gets moving then changes to red. The red turns green in front of you then red at the next intersection
223	Ideas - Signals	Lights should all have turning capacity
224	Ideas - Signals	Limited access. Reduce number of traffic signals. Turning signal for crossing traffic
225	Ideas - Signals	Longer light cycles at each intersection.
226	Ideas - Signals	Minimize/remove traffic signals.
227	Ideas - Signals	Be consistent and allow left turn at all intersections when solid green and traffic clear in conjunction with arrows. Want least cost proposal with least impact on remaining residents
228	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Have you addressed truck transport?
229	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Re-routing truck traffic.
230	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Get the trucks off
231	Ideas - Remove Trucks	No Truck access
232	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Stop allowing big rig traffic
233	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Remove truck route status from Ness to Taylor to prevent rte 90 from being used as a shortcut to pth75
234	Ideas - Remove Trucks	No transport trucks, reroute to Perimeter.
235	Ideas - Remove Trucks	No trucks
236	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Reroute all trucks
237	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Stop allowing big rigs to travel on Kenaston. Restrict to peak hours or right hand lane only
238	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Remove transport trucks from Kenaston
239	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Adjust zoning to concentrate a truck hub which would make perimeter use advantageous

240	Ideas - Remove Trucks	My neighbours and I have a problem when the big rig trucks drive north past our homes causing them to shake.
241	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Get the truck traffic reduced
242	Ideas - Remove Trucks	No heavy truck traffic
243	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Make it a non heavy truck route. Add ped over or underpasses. Block off Carpathia at Kenaston to prevent access through traffic. Make it a dead end and add trees and landscaping.
244	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Make it a non heavy truck route. Add ped over or underpasses. Block off Carpathia at Kenaston to prevent access through traffic. Make it a dead end and add trees and landscaping.
245	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Eliminate the large heavy truck traffic, intermodal is now in Transcona, re-route the truck traffic via the perimeter or Moray Blvd. Eliminate/sync lights.
246	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Truck Traffic should be routed to the Perimeter (noise, pollution, damage to road, traffic flow)
247	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Restrict Semi-traffic
248	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Transport of Freight for airport would be better accommodated by access to perimeter from Saskatchewan Ave
249	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Try to limit large truck traffic by making them use perimeter and don't put IKEA on route 90
250	Ideas - Remove Trucks	Reroute transport trucks to Perimeter Highway. Especially if route 90 widened - will bring more trucks
251	Ideas - Freeway Concept	Currently as the "inner loop" its setup is embarrassing.
252	Ideas - Freeway Concept	I prefer grade separations to allow full movement of traffic
253	Ideas - Freeway Concept	This route should be considered as an inner ring road. Limited traffic signals. Not shared with non motorized traffic
254	Ideas - Freeway Concept	Eliminate some traffic lights, close off crossing traffic, use merge lanes on and off rte 90
255	Ideas - Freeway Concept	Less stop lights, 70 km/h, grade separations, berms, billboards, highway signage
256	Ideas - Freeway Concept	Tunnel under Kenaston (no exits at smaller streets just Grant and Kenaston)
257	Ideas - Freeway Concept	Key to have high speed route without traffic lights. Access to a high speed route can be achieved by accessing major access roads via merge lanes
258	Ideas - Freeway Concept	Do not turn into freeway
259	Ideas - Freeway Concept	Grade separations (go over academy)
260	Ideas - Freeway Concept	Grade separation at intersections
261	Ideas - Freeway Concept	Grade separation at major intersections
262	Ideas - Freeway concept	I live on the west side of Centennial and I didn't purchase my property on a freeway so I do not want Route 90 as my back lane
263	Ideas - Freeway concept	Another option is a flyover. Existing streets like Corydon would just cross under. Very expensive though
264	Ideas - Freeway Concept	Tunnel Would be better, quiet and maybe cheaper. Would remove long distance traffic.
265	Ideas - Freeway Concept	Why not a freeway? City should be planning 30-50 years ahead.
266	Ideas - Freeway Concept	How long have we lived with rte90 like this? We have an excellent opportunity to buy/expropriate/acquire land to build it properly with grade separations. Build something that Winnipeg can grow and expand with not just because "Waverley west is being developed". Make it a ring road Highway. Build the separations now as they will not be cheaper in the future.
267	Ideas - Interchange	It might not be cost effective, but an interchange could be considered for Kenaston and Grant. If there wasn't a traffic light there to halt traffic, things would flow more smoothly as traffic gets better after Grant heading SB. It would be nice to have an area for scooters to travel on since the speed limit is so high



268	Ideas - Interchange	How about a flyover from McGillivray to Academy
269	Ideas - Service Roads	More service lanes, crosswalks
270	Ideas - Service Roads	Add service roads. Reduce cross streets and traffic lights
271	Ideas - Service Roads	Service roads to have access to residential areas, commercial businesses, etc. Show some vision.
272	Ideas - Service Roads	Service road lanes by big retail or 3 lanes
273	Ideas - Service Roads	Back access for apartments between Taylor and Grant
274	Ideas - Service Roads	Exits behind buildings on Kenaston
275	Ideas - Service roads	Residents on east side of Kenaston definitely need access roads to get in and out. What about emergency vehicles?
276	Ideas - Service Roads	Access roads are an excellent way to achieve this. Look at other cities for examples of high speed routes ie: Regina Calgary Saskatoon
277	Ideas - Service Roads	There is no need of service roads at all
278	Ideas - Traffic Calming	Traffic calming.
279	Ideas - Traffic Calming	Traffic calming.
280	Ideas - Traffic Calming	Traffic Calming
281	Ideas - Traffic Calming	Traffic calming, rather than increase speed and flow, moderate it. Access??
282	Ideas - Traffic Calming	Traffic calming
283	Ideas - Traffic Calming	Calm areas that will be used to bypass Kenaston
284	Ideas - Traffic Calming	Traffic calming = Always good
285	Ideas - Traffic Calming	More traffic calming
286	Ideas - Traffic Calming	Traffic calming
287	Ideas - Traffic Calming	Traffic Calming
288	Ideas - Traffic Calming	Traffic Calming
289	Ideas - Traffic Calming	Further traffic calming on Centennial
290	Ideas - Traffic Calming	Traffic calming
291	Ideas - Turn Lanes	Blocking left hand turns at uncontrolled intersections
292	Ideas - Turn Lanes	Keep left turn lanes on Tuxedo, Corydon, Grant and Taylor
293	Ideas - Turn Lanes	Left hand turns on Corydon and Tuxedo
294	Ideas - Turn Lanes	Left turn lanes for people living in the area, keeps traffic flowing
295	Ideas - Turn Lanes	Turning lights, turning lanes
296	Ideas - Turn Lanes	Storage lanes for turning
297	Ideas - Turn Lanes	It would be nice if roads could be widened, but the most important areas to be widened are the areas where cars pull off to the left/right sides for turning at Corydon, Grant and Tuxedo. Even if these areas were elongated traffic would flow better
298	Ideas - Turn Lanes	High speed merge and exit lanes
299	Ideas - Turn Lanes	Left hand turn lanes and lights at every intersection
300	Ideas - Turn Limits	No left or right turns onto Beaverbrook/Centennial. Eliminate Option 5.
301	Ideas - Yield Lanes	Yield lanes at all 4 corners of controlled intersections
302	Ideas - Landscaping	Landscaping that fits with the character of River Heights
303	Ideas - Landscaping	Berm or landscaping to decrease noise
304	Ideas - Landscaping	Smooth flow of traffic. Be attractive as it will be a major route once IKEA is here
305	Ideas - Landscaping	Keep it safer and more attractive. (Tired of Winnipeg understating its beauty)
306	Ideas - Speed Limit	Traffic Speed should not increase.
307	Ideas - Landscaping	Should enhance Winnipeg's treed beauty. Do not make another Pembina hwy (Freeway)

308	Ideas - Landscaping	Traffic calming can be integrated by treed landscape
309	Ideas - Landscaping	Strive to look like Charleswood Parkway
310	Ideas - Sound Walls	Proper walls and landscaping
311	Ideas - Sound Walls	Using sound barrier walls
312	Ideas - Sound Walls	Sound barriers of some sort
313	Ideas - Speed Limits	Increase speed limit
314	Ideas - Speed Limits	Increase speed limit to 60
315	Ideas - Speed Limits	Maintain 50km/h speed limit, traffic already goes 60-70. Increasing it will mean they will go 70-80. Look at safety factor at 50km/h
316	Ideas - Speed Limits	One speed limit throughout
317	Ideas - Speed Limits	Speed limit at 50
318	Ideas - Speed Limits	Traffic speed higher
319	Ideas - 3-Way Split	3 way vs 2 way split. 3 NB in morning, 3 SB in evening
320	Ideas - Alignment	Straightening of south and of St. James Bridge
321	Ideas - Alignment	Ease the SB curve off the bridge
322	Ideas - Berms	Berms to reduce noise on adjacent properties
323	Ideas - Landscaping	Adequate noise buffers (Greenscaping)
324	Ideas - Lighting	Better lighting
325	Ideas - Limit Access	Close all access to route 90 except Grant, Taylor, etc.
326	Ideas - Limit Access	Cut off Academy west at Route 90
327	Ideas - LRT	An LRT line
328	Ideas - Merge Lanes	Provide merge lanes that allow traffic to maintain speed.
329	Ideas - No Turns	Do not allow left turns at several location. Eg - Tuxedo
330	Ideas - Noise Reduction	Noise suppression
331	Ideas - Noise Walls	Noise abatement and landscaping
332	Ideas - Noise Walls	Some kind of buffer should be between Route 90 and residential housing to reduce noise
333	Ideas - Noise Walls	Noise abatement - berms, landscaping etc.
334	Ideas - Ped Crossing	Pedestrian crossings
335	Ideas - Ped Crossing	Pedestrian river crossing
336	Ideas - Reduce Access	Limit vehicle access of interchange on Academy Tuxedo Lockston
337	Ideas - Reduce Access	Reduce connections to side streets
338	Ideas - Reduce Access	Closing off the end of Carpathia onto Kenaston because it is dangerous (northside)
339	Ideas - Reduce Parking	Reduced Parking on Academy especially during peak hours
340	Ideas - Restrict Turns	Take away all left turn options where traffic flow is halted by left turning arrow
341	Ideas - School Buses	Keep School buses off Academy West of Kenaston
342	Ideas - TDM	Traffic Management is the key
343	Ideas - Think Big	I feel this is a unique opportunity to significantly improve out standing as a transportation hub. I am disappointed by Winnipeg's lack of vision/ future planning when construction and maintaining roads. Recent examples include the relatively new Kenaston shopping area - which was recently built from scratch and had such potential. Similarly Polo Park. Please aim to make this a high speed traffic corridor. Minimize/avoid traffic lights. They are not the solution at every intersection. Consider merge lanes, roundabouts or simply blocking streets off
344	Transit General Support	Transit is most important in order to reduce vehicular traffic
345	Transit General Support	A separate bus lane would be great
346	Transit General Support	But in a way that it does not disrupt the flow of other traffic. Which for example on Arlington between Sargeant and Ellice is a

		constant problem
347	Transit General Support	Traffic flows have peaked - mass transit needs to be address.
348	Transit General Support	Boulton Bay is home to 100s of seniors, many don't drive
349	Transit General Support	Unless something improves city wide transit improvements on Kenaston area a waste of money
350	Transit General Support	I work north of McGillivray; bus travel is terrible. This would be a place to start.
351	Transit General Support	Would make sense to do so depending on need. Would be good to have separate bus loops to not stop traffic
352	Transit General Support	A lot of older adults live in the condos between Taylor and Grant
353	Transit General Support	Always have to plan for the future
354	Transit General Support	Good routes increase ridership, make transit solution irresistible
355	Transit General Support	I think that it is a major route used for people to get to work and if there was a bus dedicated to rte90 it would make less traffic on the road and help in getting people to their final destination.
356	Transit General Support	Improved transit might reduce dependency on cars
357	Transit General Support	Limited upgrade. Even with improvements in transit service, most people will travel by car
358	Transit General Support	Long Overdue
359	Transit General Support	Sustainable transport is key
360	Transit General Support	Transit is the way of the future
361	Transit General Support	Transit should be a priority to access the development along route 90
362	Transit General Support	Why not?
363	Transit General Support	Will improve with road improvements
364	Transit Difficulties	Route 90 approaching, humpback style bridge, buses and heavyweight transports transfer weight into the roadway causing bridge to shake and my house shudder violently
365	Transit Difficulties	Buses currently stuck in traffic
366	Transit Difficulties	Only takes one bus to run entire length of route 90 until McGillivray. 2 hours bus with transfers is unacceptable for a 10minute car ride
367	Transit Difficulties	The transit link from Linden Woods are really bad to get to the Polo Park area
368	Transit Ideas - Bus Islands	Provide for bus islands
369	Transit Ideas - Bus Lanes	Bus lanes required
370	Transit Ideas - Bus Lanes	Bus lanes required
371	Transit Ideas - Bus Lanes	AT - bus lanes, bus priority to encourage people to use as faster green solution
372	Transit Ideas - Bus stops	Cut outs for bus stops
373	Transit Ideas - Bus Stops	Except for heated bus shelters service along route 90 is good
374	Transit Ideas - Bus Stops	Except for heated bus shelters service along route 90 is good
375	Transit Ideas - Bus Stops	Eliminate bus stop on the south ramp to the bridge going north
376	Transit Ideas - Bus Stops	Recessed bus stops
377	Transit Ideas - CN Rail	Relocate transit to former rail ROW. Eliminate bus traffic from rte 90 (possible LRT and park like appearance)
378	Transit Ideas - CN Rail	Should be light rail using CN ROW to McGillivray, eventually to U of M
379	Transit Ideas - CN Rail	Relocate to former rail ROW
380	Transit Ideas - CN Rail	Where does rapid transit fit into this plan? Short term: bus cut outs. Rapid transit on old rail line
381	Transit Ideas - Express	Only express busses
382	Transit Ideas - Express	Express

383	Transit Ideas - Express	Express buses with fewer stops and pull off areas for buses.
384	Transit Ideas - Express	The Stretch should be express routes
385	Transit Ideas - More Service	Poor service to Kenaston/McGillivray development
386	Transit Ideas - More Service	Our transit system is so poorly supported ( freq. And hours of duration) that other than 9-5 use, transit use is discouraged
387	Transit Ideas - More Service	More buses, but no need for improvements to road
388	Transit Ideas - More Service	More frequent service in off peak hours
389	Transit Ideas - More Service	More transit during the day
390	Transit Ideas - More Service	New bus routes
391	Transit Ideas - More Service	No bus past Grant and Kenaston except Waverley weekday
392	Transit Ideas - More Service	Probably - there should be one bus that goes along all of route 90
393	Transit Ideas - More Service	Transit bus 78 and 79 should be one bus to eliminate transfer at Polo Park as it now takes 1/2 hour longer by bus from McGillivray to Logan than by car (20mins) 700am vs 735am
394	Transit Ideas - More Service	Why does the 66 and 78 come one after the other?
395	Transit Ideas - No Diamond	Not a diamond lanes
396	Transit Ideas - Park & Ride	Park and bus options could be examined. Kapyong Barracks and empty housing would be excellent parking
397	Transit Ideas - Priority Signals	Priority Signals
398	Transit Ideas - Pullouts	Bus pullouts
399	Transit Ideas - Rapid Transit	A diamond lane - yes - eventually rapid transit
400	Transit Ideas - Rapid Transit	But also buses, rapid transit is not incorporated
401	Transit Ideas - Rapid Transit	The future will probably require an LRT line at minimum from Portage south to new district
402	Transit Ideas - Rapid Transit	RRC, Airport, Polo Park, Kapyong and IKEA developments, Kenaston/McGillivray, Waverley West and the U of M all line up in a dense active corridor; with 25-40% of retail business; post secondary students; 40000 more residents in Waverley west; millions more sq ft of development in Kapyong and IKEA. I think a good quality rapid transit network for this corridor is a necessity and no thought about it seems to have been considered. As important as a proper route for cars and trucks is, proper transit infrastructure is also important
403	Transit Ideas - Rapid Transit	Take Rapid Transit into consideration
404	Transit Ideas - Rapid Transit	Future allowance for rapid transit
405	Transit Ideas - Rapid Transit	Like proposed SW corridor
406	Transit Ideas - Rapid Transit	Use old Railway ROW for rapid transit, even if it means expropriating some buildings. Plan ahead.
407	Transit Ideas - Rapid Transit	Emphasize bus lanes and rapid transit
408	Transit Ideas - Rapid Transit	Why not have dedicated bus lane for rapid transit. I'd favour overhead wires for electric trolley buses. It is buses that cause delays
409	Transit Ideas - Rapid	Rapid rail transit ( use the rail lines)

	Transit	
410	Transit Ideas - Rapid Transit	A dedicated transit way
411	Transit Ideas - Service Road	Not unless they are on a service road, stops the flow of traffic
412	Transit Ideas - Timing	Buses between 930am and 4pm
413	Transit Ideas - Timing	Buses currently follow each other. Spread timings out.
414	Transit No Improvements	Unless something improves city wide irregular, isolated improvements are limited in value.
415	Transit No Improvements	Already sufficient
416	AT Alternate routes	Existing CN rail track can be used for non-vehicular traffic
417	AT Alternate routes	Ideally the ped and bike traffic would not have to put up with exhaust fumes
418	AT Alternate routes	But cyclists need a route, but they need a space away from the traffic - Parallel location - A back lane west of existing route 90
419	AT Alternate routes	People traffic doesn't belong on a highway. Non vehicular traffic should have its own corridor through less car travelled routes
420	AT Difficulty	Too much traffic and large trucks for safe biking
421	AT Difficulty	Its not a priority for the city. I asked about getting a bus shelter on the west side of Kenaston 2 years ago - response was theres not enough ridership to warrant it
422	AT Difficulty	Too much traffic and large trucks for safe biking
423	AT Difficulty	Peds avoid this route if they can
424	AT Difficulty	Would you want to walk or cycle on Route 90 in future with all the carbon monoxide pollution not me.
425	AT Difficulty	Would still be too narrow. Who wants to be hit by a big rig?
426	AT Difficulty	Try crossing the street or better yet, try riding a bike down Kenaston
427	AT Difficulty	Not good at this time
428	AT Difficulty	Major arterial with as much traffic as Portage and Pembina
429	AT Difficulty	I ride a bike as a primary mode of transportation and find route 90 to be extremely dangerous
430	AT Difficulty	Have you ever tried to have a healthy stroll on Kenaston?
431	AT Difficulty	Cyclists are not welcome and AT must be incorporated. AT is growing rapidly
432	AT Difficulty	Current sidewalks OK for Peds. Cyclists take their lives in their hands on roads.
433	AT Difficulty	Biking on Kenaston is very dangerous
434	AT Difficulty	Bike accessibility is almost non-existent and hazardous
435	AT Difficulty	Unsafe for cyclists
436	AT Difficulty	Cyclists ride on the sidewalk
437	AT Difficulty	Cyclists ignore pedestrians especially coming off bridge at very high speed, hit a couple of times, one newspaper boy knocked unconscious
438	AT General Opposition	There is very little cycle or Ped traffic on route 90 now
439	AT General Opposition	Get bikes off road
440	AT General Opposition	These should be the only transportation on the road [no AT].
441	AT General Opposition	This should be high speed, limited access
442	AT General Opposition	There has been too much emphasis place on AT in my opinion. The population is 700,000 what is the percent of at - 2% at best.
443	AT General Opposition	Pedestrians and cyclists should not be part of the problem
444	AT General Opposition	It is already difficult to live next to Kenaston without making it wider
445	AT General Support	It would be nice if it can be done but vehicular traffic should be given more priority

446	AT General Support	But not at the expense of residents on east side of Kenaston
447	AT General Support	Incorporate AT and green space
448	AT General Support	Making it safer for pedestrians and cyclists. Reducing traffic pollution, not making it easier to continue our addiction to cars
449	AT General Support	Design and build for all modes of traffic. Use separate facility for AT
450	AT General Support	Active transportation and connecting Waverley West to the Polo Park area
451	AT General Support	Impact on AT
452	AT General Support	Improve for non-vehicular traffic
453	AT General Support	You do one you also do them all [Non-vehicular support]
454	AT General Support	Widen only to allow for AT
455	AT General Support	To lessen dangers
456	AT General Support	This will generate more bike traffic and help the environment
457	AT General Support	Long Overdue
458	AT General Support	Instead of accepting vehicles as the only option, the usage would increase significantly.
459	AT General Support	In a way that protects peds and bikes
460	AT General Support	If you are going to radically change the area wouldn't this be the right time to do it?
461	AT General Support	I walk and bike on a regular basis
462	AT General Support	For school children and shopping, ie Corydon and Grant crossing of Kenaston
463	AT General Support	Definitely, city needs to support sustainable transport strategies
464	AT General Support	AT needs to be improved in all areas, especially with an upgrade
465	AT General Support	We need to stop designing for the single occupant vehicle - the car should not be the driving force to design. We need good alternatives
466	AT General Support	Absolutely
467	AT General Support	Why not at the same time, although no as high a priority as vehicular traffic.
468	AT General Support	All new major thoroughfares should have bicycle lanes
469	AT General Support	Consider safety first for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers
470	AT General Support	More walkability design
471	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Need alternate route for cyclists
472	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Use part of old CN route from Polo Park to Taylor
473	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Use old rail line for bike path
474	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	This should have been done on the CN line before the city sold the land to Canadian Tire
475	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Route 90 is a major city thoroughfare for vehicular traffic. Cyclists/peds can go to side streets.
476	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Parallel, not on Route 90
477	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	No bike lanes, use vacant rail line
478	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Cyclists could be accommodated on alternate routes
479	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Cyclists and peds should not be using this route. A railway bridge already exists for cyclists
480	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Cyclists and Pedestrians should be routed to adjoining streets
481	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Abandoned rail line could be designed for AT

482	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Cyclists should not be allowed on Route 90
483	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	There are many alternate routes
484	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	I believe ped/cylist traffic should be separate ( Given a wide berth)
485	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Bike path away from Kenaston
486	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Move pedestrian walk from St. James bridge to CN Rail bridge (out of the wind)
487	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Ideally an AT route along the former CN rail line
488	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Maintaining green space. Ie CN Rail property and light rail transit route
489	AT Ideas - Alternate Routes	Utilizing the old CN lines
490	AT Ideas - Pathways	Old CN line should be turned into an AT corridor. This would promote and make AT a viable and usable option
491	AT Ideas - Pathways	Hopefully some other expropriated ROW can be used for walkway/bike path
492	AT Ideas - Pathways	Wider walkway to accommodate peds and bikes on St. James bridge
493	AT Ideas - Pathways	Sidewalks and bicycle lanes SB and NB
494	AT Ideas - Pathways	Bike path to aid non motorized vehicle connection to Bishop Grandin, University
495	AT Ideas - Pathways	Walking and cycling path to University of Manitoba
496	AT Ideas - Pathways	Separate Bike lane from vehicles and peds
497	AT Ideas - Pathways	Need bike paths
498	AT Ideas - Pathways	Bike paths could be implemented
499	AT Ideas - Pathways	Bike path should be constructed on west side
500	AT Ideas - Pathways	Bike path
501	AT Ideas - Pathways	Also expand connecting cycle paths
502	AT Ideas - Pathways	Should widen existing Kenaston, don't use CN line.
503	AT Ideas - Pathways	Separating pedestrian and cycle traffic along what is basically a freeway
504	AT Ideas - Pathways	Pedestrian and cycling pathways. Better traffic
505	AT Ideas - Pathways	A bicycle boulevard
506	AT Ideas - Pathways	Bike/walking path on former CN Rail line
507	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Considerations for ped crossings. Bikes should be separate for their safety.
508	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Better/wider sidewalks, speed limit consistency
509	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	But well away from rte 90. How about overpasses?
510	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Crossings are required at Academy, Tuxedo, Corydon and Ness (Over or Under0
511	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Crossings are required at Academy, Tuxedo, Corydon and Ness (Over or Under0
512	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	No bikes should be allowed on Kenaston whatsoever. School children should not cross Kenaston in the middle of a block
513	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Add pedestrian overpass walkways at the major intersections of Grant, Corydon, and possibly Taylor. Coordinate lights so that traffic moves more like the highway that it really is.
514	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Obtain sufficient land to provide for future overpass and entry and exit ramps at major intersections
515	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Improve pedestrian and cycle crossing of the Assiniboine River
516	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Under or overpass for peds at Boulton

517	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Obtain sufficient land to provide for future overpass and entry and exit ramps at major intersections
518	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Improve pedestrian and cycle crossing of the Assiniboine River
519	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Under or overpass for peds at Boulton
520	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Sidewalks not used much on overpass
521	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Crossing made easier
522	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Eliminate cross intersections and provide merge lanes on and off only
523	AT Ideas - Ped Crossing	Must have low slope walking bridge wide enough for person and bike
524	AT Ideas - Pathways	Currently no connection between older (Wellington) and new (Linden Woods) Trail system
525	AT Land Requirement	Need additional ROW
526	AT Land Requirement	If the option has adequate ROW
527	AT Ideas - Pathways	Bike paths
528	Access	Easy Access
529	Access	Access from residences and condominiums
530	Access	Access to route 90 from Portage
531	Access	Access changes
532	Access	Access
533	Access	Access from condos onto Route 90 is difficult now and that is our only access
534	Access	Access changes, Planning?
535	Access	Access changes
536	Access	Alternate access for the condos on the east side of Kenaston between Grant and Taylor would help safety concerns
537	Access	Ease of use, lots of places to turn off without lights
538	Access	Get rid of access from Fulham, Willow, Carpathia and army housing streets. Put in noise attenuation. Get things moving faster and more safely.
539	Access	The access from residential side streets should be eliminated. Only have access from Academy, Corydon, Grant and Taylor
540	Access	Access changes (put in bays on Fulham, Willow, Carpathia and army housing streets. Put in noise attenuation. Get things moving faster and more safely.
541	Access	North-South service road on old rail line for local access
542	Access	Cut down on access points, traffic calming to keep speeds in check
543	Access	Access changes
544	CN Line	I think using the CN line in some capacity would be beneficial
545	CN Line	Possible access to condos from old CN track area
546	Cost	However the cost would be prohibitive and lengthy if it's done correctly.
547	Cost	If at all possible. How much will it cost?
548	Cost	Cost effectiveness
549	Cost	Cost of expropriating houses
550	Cost	Built in infrastructure deficits are eliminated
551	Cost	Cost to taxpayers
552	DND Land	They should be looking at the vacant military land first and foremost
553	DND Land	Use Kapyong Barracks land which is sitting empty for years now
554	DND Land	Use former barracks to widen
555	DND Land	Negotiations should be made to obtain the army lands before a



		firm plan is made.
556	DND Land	If armed forces houses have to be moved, then use as infill houses in core area
557	DND Land	If they went from Tuxedo road to Taylor using Kapyong house property and barracks land it would ease the congestion north of those with improvement to lights
558	DND Land	Unless army land can be used to expand 3 lanes each way it should not be changed
559	DND Land	Use DND Property
560	DND Land	Widen road from Tuxedo to Taylor using Kapyong houses and Barracks property then you would not need to build a new St. James bridge or take private housing, saving millions and leaving the existing area and neighbourhood as is
561	DND Land	Widen Kenaston from Tuxedo road to Taylor Using Kapyong houses and Barracks. You would then not need to build a new St. James Bridge or take private housing from St. James bridge to Tuxedo road. This would save millions of tax payer dollars and minimize the impact on existing neighbourhoods
562	Due diligence	Do your homework
563	Due Diligence	Plan looking 50 years ahead
564	Due diligence	Think 50 years from now. Add four lanes not two.
565	Due Diligence	When this project is completed for 2 extra lanes we will need 4 extra lanes
566	Due Diligence	Study entire route 90, if widened what happens north of Portage, just as congested
567	Due Diligence	I hope that the plans take the long term into account and not just the near future so that we are not talking a bout another expansion in 10 years from now.
568	Due diligence	The ultimate usage must be studied and costed. Efficient traffic flow is a must
569	Due Diligence	Half Measures are illogical, buy up plenty of property and do it right
570	Due Diligence	Lets give this serious thought with the future in mind. A long term plan is required. City planners are paid to do this.
571	Enforcement	No police enforcement of existing regulations ie, No right turn Wellington onto Academy in am, Academy west of Kenaston not a truck route.
572	Expropriation	How can expropriation of houses happen while this is on hold federally?
573	Expropriation	Expropriate all the land needed for future and current needs, so it doesn't have to be redone in the future. Whatever is the smartest option according to the experts.
574	Funding	Approach federal govt for funding.
575	Noise	Too much noise and too many accidents
576	Noise	Noise reduction
577	Noise	Please do something about the noise for residents who live close to Kenaston and close to the bridge. Do something visionary that will be appreciated.
578	Noise	Noise and safety
579	Noise	Noise level, homes around area
580	Other Projects	Other options like extending Charleswood Parkway to Wilkes and widening Wilkes to Route 90. Build overpass at Waverley.
581	Other Projects	Waverley overpass should be done at same time
582	Other Projects	Sterling Lyon and route 90 should be interchange
583	Other Projects	Expand the scope to include St. Matthews
584	Other projects	Obtaining land for future improvements such as overpass

585	Other Projects	Include improvements to other routes (McGillivray 3 lanes to 2 lanes to 1 lane to 2 lanes)
586	Other Projects	Put an overpass at Waverley and expend Charleswood Parkway before doing route 90. Decide on the future of Kapyong before doing anything
587	Other projects	Traffic volumes not changing in last 14 years, major route 90 bottlenecks are around McGillivray. Commercial Traffic in future planned for inland port with routes to perimeter. Biggest bottleneck CN mainline, now resolved
588	Other projects	Why was Sterling Lyon.rte90 not an interchange with right egress facilities.
589	Other projects	Charleswood Freeway good example of city planning
590	Other Projects	You should consider improvements to McGillivray left turn area at Rte90 intersection
591	Other Projects	Why not push some of this traffic towards the Moray bridge and extend Moray through the old golf coarse to Bishop Grandin.
592	Other projects	Traffic lights and driver training. There should be an underpass on Waverley
593	Other Projects	Don't add to the problem by building IKEA on route 90
594	Other projects	Use Charleswood Pkwy as example of sensible and attractive planning
595	Other Projects	Why not finish Bishop Grandin to Charleswood Bridge to relieve traffic on Kenaston. Rail line is probably toxic. Has anyone done an environmental assessment?
596	Pedestrian	West side of bridge - Peds should be protected better from cyclists and from spinning crashes near the south sharp curve. There is no barrier for peds.
597	Pedestrian	Noise, Safety for Peds
598	Pedestrian	How the kids get across 6 lanes of traffic to attend Carpathia school.
599	Pedestrian	Limit Pedestrian Traffic
600	Pedestrian	For the many pedestrians walking off the bridge, Portage Ave traffic ignore Peds. The signage for peds is minimal (UK for tips)
601	Pop. Growth	Keep Waverley west in mind - future increases in traffic
602	Pop. Growth	Future needs
603	Pop. Growth	Also looking to future growth, not just past and present
604	Pop. Growth	Address current and future needs (Centre-Port, Waverley West)
605	Pop. Growth	Future growth. The ease of traffic to move smoothly without disruption or stops leads to savings on fuel and wear and tear.
606	Process	Will there be another meeting before going ahead with this project?
607	Process	I hope this process is more than mere window dressing
608	Process	Why was housing construction allowed to begin when this problem was evident
609	Process	When will the final option be made?
610	Process	When is this going to happen, if I have to sell when will it be?
611	Process	This process is unacceptable as a citizen. We need a town hall meeting where people can voice their concerns.
612	Process	Process needs to be made clear - concerned home owners need to be informed. I don't want to be living next to another Bishop Grandin.
613	Process	The process needs to be as straight forward and transparent as possible or it will encounter heavy resistance.
614	Process	Decision should be based on sound factual information and not by political decisions
615	Process	When would expropriation begin on the west side of Kenaston at the bridge area?

616	Property Value	Be mindful of people living on route 90 and don't degrade property values
617	Property Value	The value of our home will go down substantially
618	Property Value	impact on non-expropriated properties value
619	Property Value	The impact on people who own the homes in the area.
620	Property Value	Homeowners who will have lose value of homes, have to borrow to acquire homes, loss of lifestyle
621	Property Value	Minimize disruption to long-standing private residences. Utilize DND housing/Kapyong to the max.
622	Property Value	Adequate consulting of property owners and compensation. Will it be sufficient in 20 years? Involve all groups in consultation
623	Property Value	Loss of property value and decrease in safety of family oriented area.
624	Property Value	Want city to guarantee property values given impact associated with upgrade
625	Property Value	Property value concerns
626	Property Value	If any of this happens the value of our home will never be the same.
627	Property Value	Will the city guarantee the value of my home at the time of any alteration?
628	Reconstruction	Upgrade road quality to reduce vibrations
629	Other/Unknown	Special Lanes
630	Other/Unknown	Right now transit shares with the traffic all right (I ride the bus)
631	Other/Unknown	But we also will have up to 300 new residents by summer.
632	Other/Unknown	Thinking of the peds walking possibly to the stores and cycling as I have been trained to ride with traffic
633	Other/Unknown	Sharrows on road - PR gesture (no room)
634	Other/Unknown	Access/Egress
635	Other/Unknown	Don't ride the bus
636	Other/Unknown	Again, a perfectly good rail line was ripped out to "upgrade transit"
637	Other/Unknown	From Academy to McGillivray
638	Other/Unknown	I do not use transit
639	Other/Unknown	Not familiar with current level of service on route90
640	Other/Unknown	Not intrusive in our lives
641	Other/Unknown	Homes
642	Other/Unknown	I think the politicians should listen to the city planners
643	Other/Unknown	Realism
644	Other/Unknown	What makes the most sense for all needs
645	Other/Unknown	All
646	Other/Unknown	Better construction material to reduce number of potholes
647	Other/Unknown	All of the above
648	Other/Unknown	Efficiently, safely
649	Other/Unknown	I don't take the bus on Route 90
650	Other/Unknown	Why has the proposal been brought forward without all the pieces and possible costs?

## **APPENDIX G – Raw Data Open House 1 – St. James Bridge Comments**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Comment</b>
651	Merging Weaving	Lots of accidents. Movement from lane to lane exiting to Academy.
652	Merging Weaving	Merging lanes at both points going south are dangerous and backlogged
653	Merging Weaving	Academy on ramp N to west side of 90 north for left turn at Ness. Kenaston N to Kintyre exit
654	Merging Weaving	Merging into right lane when entering N from Academy.
655	Merging Weaving	Very difficult driving north and changing lanes to go east on Portage Avenue
656	Merging Weaving	Bottle necked, change merging from Academy, Route 90 to Portage
657	Merging weaving	Should have less weaving manoeuvres
658	Merging Weaving	NB Academy entrance on to Route 90 dangerous
659	Merging Weaving	Too many lane changes in short distance
660	Merging Weaving	No Accel. Lanes SB
661	Merging Weaving	Too much lane changing
662	Merging Weaving	Exit southbound onto Academy is problematic
663	Merging Weaving	Extend merge lane or make lane from Portage south to Kenaston south. No real merge lane today
664	Merging Weaving	Heading SB before Academy is dangerous in snowy/wet conditions
665	Merging Weaving	Lots of drivers changing lanes, especially during rush hour
666	Merging Weaving	Merging and Weaving concerns.
667	Merging Weaving	Very dangerous to cross three lanes of traffic from the route 90 south exit to the Academy exit
668	Merging Weaving	Merging to get to Academy, sharp curves, slippery during winter season.
669	Merging Weaving	Entering bridge from Kenaston going north and changing lanes to go Portage EB is very dangerous because of Academy merge onto bridge
670	Merging Weaving	The bridge bottlenecks at the south end. Changing to the east Portage Ave. exit lane can be difficult when you access the bridge from Kenaston going north.
671	Merging Weaving	The ramp merge from Portage West doesn't work - Winnipeg drivers need to be taught to merge. Changing lanes from the West Portage ramp merge to the Academy road exit is difficult and tight - rethinking required
672	Merging Weaving	Going Northbound over the St. James bridge it is very difficult and at times very dangerous to get into the Kintyre ramp exit lane because it is also an entry lane coming from Academy.
673	Bridge Capacity	Will the bridge be able to handle the increased vehicular traffic
674	Bridge Capacity	Even if you increase the number of lanes on the roadway, the number of lanes on the bridge are not discussed
675	Bridge Capacity	3 Lanes required at all points
676	Bridge Capacity	No longer adequate to meet existing traffic patterns, will get worse with Waverley west.
677	Bridge Capacity	Make it wider

678	Bridge Capacity	If the number of lanes increases, bridge needs to accommodate, cannot be a bottleneck
679	Bridge Capacity	Perhaps if the bridge worked well Kenaston would not need to be widened
680	Bridge Capacity	Needs to be replaced
681	Bridge Capacity	Improve NB flow
682	Bridge Capacity	More lanes on bridge
683	Bridge Capacity	Too few lanes
684	Bridge Capacity	Widening the bridge
685	Bridge Capacity	Unless new spans are built, adding lanes on rte 90 will not lessen congestion
686	Bridge Capacity	Could be widened a lane or two or independent structure on east side near old rail bridge
687	Bridge Capacity	Will the bridge be able to handle the increased vehicular traffic
688	Bridge Capacity	With the onramp approaching the rest of the bridge (both ways). The bridge should be widened
689	Bridge Capacity	Only two lanes wide NB just north of Academy
690	Bridge Capacity	Add more lanes, improve bridge design
691	Bridge Capacity	More lanes should be added to the bridge.
692	Bridge Capacity	Currently the bridge is inadequate and changes/enlargement should be considered as part of this plan.
693	Bridge Capacity	Bottle neck on Academy side
694	Bridge Capacity	Should be widened
695	Alignment	Poor alignment.
696	Alignment	Straighten Access
697	Alignment	The west bridge should be rebuilt to straighten the curve at Academy
698	Alignment	Could it be straightened?
699	Alignment	SB curve onto Kenaston needs to be straightened
700	Alignment	Needs to be widened. Too narrow and curved
701	Alignment	Awkward heading south at the end of the bridge
702	Alignment	The angle to access from the south
703	Alignment	Needs to be straightened
704	Alignment	SB on the downslope, the right hand bend needs better grading. Too many cars on the boulevard in winter.
705	Alignment	SB onto Kenaston - curve is too tight
706	Alignment	Many accidents at foot of bridge. Unsafe for homeowners.
707	Alignment	Eliminate sharp curve on SB exit. Lengthen on ramps SB
708	Alignment	Exit off bridge to rte 90 South way too tight - especially dangerous in winter
709	Alignment	Too narrow at Academy turn off.
710	Alignment	If Kenaston expanded, make SB curve less sharp
711	AT Facilities	Too narrow for the traffic, not pedestrian and cyclist friendly
712	AT Facilities	Pedestrian walkway is brutal. Either a separate bridge for people and cyclists or a more appropriate approach.
713	AT Facilities	Must have cycling and pedestrian traffic
714	AT Facilities	Already very busy, not safe for pedestrians
715	AT Facilities	Make it pedestrian friendly
716	AT Facilities	Cycling and peds
717	AT Facilities	Preserve AT easement
718	AT Facilities	Not safe for cyclists
719	AT Facilities	Not ped or bike friendly
720	Academy	Remove lights at Academy, protect community in this area

721	Academy	Bottleneck NB Academy
722	Academy	Bottleneck where Academy on ramp merges NB
723	Academy	Replace or modify SB bridge, add overhead lane for Portage avenue east traffic to academy.
724	Academy	If you restrict access from Academy, you will cause irrevocable problems in River Heights
725	Academy	Suggest no right or left turn onto Academy from Kenaston NB
726	Academy	Academy off ramp
727	Access	Easy Access
728	Access	The access from Portage west to route 90 south is terrible
729	Access	Open a lane coming off St. James Bridge onto Lockwood. River Heights traffic could use Kingsway, Grosvenor and Corydon off of Lockwood. Grosvenor would have to be opened at Lockwood.
730	Lifespan	The anticipated life remaining.
731	Lifespan	Concern that it will crumble and fall down.
732	Lifespan	Age of bridge itself
733	Rebuild	Widened and redone. Old with bad access
734	Rebuild	Most of the problems are at the St. James Bridge
735	Rebuild	The old bridge needs to be replaced
736	Speed limit	It is foolish to have a higher speed limit over this short section. It is a horror to walk over
737	Speed limit	Speed limit should be 60 max
738	General Support	Only if you increase lanes on route 90
739	General Support	This is the key to any Kenaston development
740	Design	No, but original design unorthodox
741	Design	Design an attractive structure
742	Construction	Build a car bridge at empress to allow moderate traffic flow during re-construction. View from bridge blocked by concrete walls.
743	Cost	Cost
744	DND Land	Would not have to be widened if property from Tuxedo road to Taylor was widened.
745	Flatten	If a new bridge is built, take the arc out of it and make it flat
746	General Impact	My neighbourhood would be affected - My home of 55 years
747	Noise	I live close to Kenaston and Im concerned about the noise and proximity of my property
748	Other	The only way to the airport!
749	Process	How long will construction affect traffic?
750	Property value	Live close to bridge on Academy may lose property or property value
751	Safety	Bridge barriers should be higher to prevent people from throwing trash onto the walking pedestrians and river
752	Seperate Lanes	Should be more accessible with separate lanes for trucks and buses

## **APPENDIX H – Raw Data Open House 1 – Portage Interchange Comments**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Comment</b>
753	Merging Weaving	Portage heading south is an entry to avoid
754	Merging Weaving	Merging and Weaving
755	Merging Weaving	Replace yields with true merge lanes, move exit for Portage east to same as west
756	Merging Weaving	I always hold my breath to move from the Kenaston lanes onto the off ramp by Jet Car Wash
757	Merging Weaving	EB to SB route 90, vision is difficult, backs up quickly
758	Merging Weaving	Educate people to ease into traffic coming off Portage to go South on Route90
759	Merging Weaving	EB Portage to 90S dangerous at night. No access from Portage E to 90N. Portage E to 90 N dangerous to get to Ness for left turn.
760	Merging Weaving	Entering to go south on route 90very difficult, needs merge lanes
761	Merging Weaving	Merge lanes are too short
762	Merging Weaving	Entrance onto route 90 south is too tight
763	Merging Weaving	The access from Portage EB to Kenaston SB is dangerous
764	Merging Weaving	Access from Portage to Kenaston SB is horrible (visible)
765	Merging Weaving	Yes, poorly designed. Dangerous trying to get off. Route 90 - merging cars coming from Academy
766	Merging Weaving	Merge lane Portage Ave SB is a real hazard
767	Merging Weaving	Educate the public what merging traffic means.
768	Merging Weaving	Driver education on how to use merge lanes
769	Merging Weaving	Route 90 access from Portage - Dangerous
770	Merging Weaving	SB exit onto route 90 very dangerous. Also NB onto route 90. Poor exit from route 90 on to Portage.
771	Merging Weaving	Merges to SB lane too short with poor visibility
772	Merging Weaving	Merging and Weaving
773	Merging Weaving	Ramp from portage east to route 90 south is too short
774	Merging Weaving	Short merge lanes, Queen street stop sign
775	Merging Weaving	Merge lanes from Portage avenue are non-existent , don't allow room to see traffic coming or to speed up to enter route 90
776	Merging Weaving	Better line of sight accessing rte 90
777	Merging Weaving	Dangerous intermingling of lanes from Stafford and rte 90
778	Merging Weaving	Storage lanes used for merging traffic should be extended to permit accel. To merge with rte90 traffic
779	Merging Weaving	NB ramp from Portage Academy intersection, SB off of Portage
780	Merging Weaving	Extend the merge lanes to at least 2x the length it is already
781	Merging Weaving	Curve at the south end SB ramps don't have accel.. Lane
782	Merging Weaving	Turnoffs from Portage WB onto route 90 S, as well as Portage EB to rte 90 S are dangerous. They require a better view of the traffic they have to merge with.
783	Merging Weaving	Lengthen on ramps
784	Merging Weaving	Entrance from off Portage ave W onto Rte 90 way to short for Academy exit
785	Merging Weaving	Turning off Portage Ave west to travel south to Academy road and changing lanes dicey during peak traffic times
786	Merging Weaving	EB onto Portage confusing
787	Merging Weaving	Entering Kenaston from Portage (going east) is also very dangerous - poor visibility)

788	Merging Weaving	What about ness? Portage east turn off lane being the same lane as Academy exit.
789	Merging Weaving	WB Portage on rte 90 S is dangerous
790	Merging Weaving	Lack of proper merge lanes for Portage traffic moving south onto Kenaston. Bottleneck at kintyre and Portage
791	Merging Weaving	Lack of proper merge lanes for Portage traffic moving south onto Kenaston. Bottleneck at kintyre and Portage
792	Merging Weaving	Merging can be difficult and can back up
793	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Not controlled properly
794	Traffic Flow/Congestion	It's a bottleneck and needs to be widened
795	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Competing traffic demands, NB 90 vehicles waiting to go eastbound on Portage.
796	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Congested at rush hour
797	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Both approaches going south get congested
798	Traffic Flow/Congestion	Something to help the flow from the Kintyre ramp onto Portage during rush hour. Maybe entry lights onto Portage Ave that sync with the light at St. James street so that the cars on the ramp need not slow almost to a halt as they yield to Portage traffic flow.
799	Access	Access to Route 90 not good
800	Access	Improved access please
801	Access - EB to NB	No access to rte 90 north when travelling EB
802	Access - Portage East	Access to Portage east is bad Viscount Gort in the way, Bottleneck
803	Access - SB to Portage	SB rte90 to Portage must be improved
804	Access - To Portage	Widen entry onto portage if required
805	Access - Signals	Why not consider having a stop and go light at the bottom of the merge lanes to remove accidents
806	General Support	Improve
807	General Support	Do whatever is needed
808	General Support	Probably needs some improvement
809	Alignment	Bottleneck on off-ramps. Blind corner on the far southbound ramp
810	Alignment	Angle on NB exit heading west is too tight especially in winter
811	AT difficulty	Not safe for cyclists
812	AT Facilities	Yes, it is dangerous for peds and vehicles in the winter
813	AT Facilities	Very difficult for a bike to cross Portage
814	Safety	I almost get killed there everyday
815	Safety	Safety
816	signals	Need lights
817	signals	Very busy at rush hour
818	Cloverleaf	Maintain cloverleaf
819	Congestion	that is always crowded/congested in the am
820	Cost	cost
821	Design	Ridiculous design shoehorned into a small area.
822	No change	It works
823	Other/Unknown	Proper in
824	Other/Unknown	Could be better defined
825	Process	Property is within project, want to know what will happen
826	Roundabout	Upgrade to a roundabout
827	Transit	Give buses priority, it's a bottleneck!





## **APPENDIX I – Raw Data Open House 1 – Options Comments**

<b>OPTION 1</b>	
829	O1: Canada post and youth center affected, not desired.
830	O1: Does not address future traffic volumes, only fixes current volume.
831	O1: Limited.
832	O1: Home values would drastically decrease. Children trying to cross route 90 would be at much greater risk.
833	O1: Although residents would not lose their homes, increased traffic would result in a vast increase noise and air pollution.
834	O1: But what about the buildings being built now and in the future
835	O1: Very intrusive.
836	O1: No connectivity for AT along west side.
837	O1, O2, O3, O4: Roadway was never designed to accommodate this type of traffic.
838	O1, O2, O3, O4: All involve increasing traffic flow and increase peoples reliance on cars. All affect air quality. City should not plan based on IKEA and Waverley West and develop a mass transit strategy that will make it easy to give up cars. Trucks need to be off the corridor.
839	O1: Not worth pursuing if option 2 makes bridge access easier.
840	O1: Youth centre in the way!
841	O1: Affects least amount of people.
842	O1: This or Option 4 make the most sense as far as impact on local residents.
843	O1: This option makes sense as it widens the side with least amount of existing houses and back lanes
844	O1: Houses on west side are worthless.
845	O1: DND land acquisition is far better than private home acquisition
846	O1: Don't be afraid of the Politics, least impact on the community
847	O1: Effective negotiations should make this doable.
848	O1: Go ahead, option 1 is the only option.
849	O1: Impacts the least number of privately owned homes.
850	O1: Do not rush this project. Wait for the Kapyong property to become available and negotiate with the federal government for the good of everyone. Fewer people will be forced out of their homes. Make sure there are service roads for people living along the east side. How will emergency vehicles get in and out?
851	O1: Least neighbourhood impact. ie. very few properties effected by expropriation. It is already a highway so little effect on adjacent property values. Does not create another division of communities.
852	O1: Many military houses are empty, so less people would be affected.
853	O1: More reasonable decision due to less private expropriation, unsafe for peds, bikes, very unattractive.
854	O1: The land on the west side is mostly not owned by individuals so would impact the least homeowners.
855	O1: Go big.
856	O1: Good compromise, least expensive.
857	O1: Has the least impact on the least people.
858	O1: I like it.
859	O1: Imposes least on private homes.

860	O1: Least disruption, expropriation.
861	O1: Makes the most sense.
862	O1: Most logical
863	O1: Less displacement of people due to number of apts and condos than option
864	O1: The only option we would agree to readily. We would probably sell if any other options are chosen by the city.
865	O1: This is preference.
866	O1: Use Kapyong Property east side property excessive cost.
867	O1: Use Kapyong property. This will not involve excessive costs of obtaining properties on east side of Kenaston.
868	O1: Seems to impact fewer residents.
869	O1: Landscape to decrease noise
870	O1: Make some sort of access road to Academy and close roads from Willow north to Fulham (at rte 90)
871	O1: Is this more or less cost effective than option 4?
872	O1: Wait until the army lands are available before doing anything
873	O1: reduce extent of widening and place AT route on CN line, but then concerns of intersecting AT route with Academy, Kingsway, Grosvenor, Corydon etc. Ensure safe ped crossing for children from west of Kenaston to get to Carpathia school.
874	O1: Mostly military housing and commercial property impact.
875	O1,O2: If traffic is to be sped up, both sides, north and south will have to be widened.
876	O1: This option could work if all development is on west side of Kenaston. Current east lane should be kept as service access road and new street constructed on west side
877	O1-O5: Protect communities, support landscaping, sustainable transportation and berms/walls to protect communities.
878	O1, O2, O3, O4, O5: All are bad - Effort should go towards Moray extension
879	O1: Connecting to the bridge might be a problem.
880	O1: Because of the empty military housing - there is some viability to this option but we should buy into the city of Vancouver's mentality and not widen Kenaston - Fix its access points, sync the lights, eliminate trucks, build ped bridges, but do not widen streets. Streets do not make for viable communities.

## OPTION 2

881	O2: A lot of property acquisition, extensive damage to condo.
882	O2: Affects way to many residents
883	O2: meh
884	O2: Many 2 storey beautiful homes would be lost. It would be impossible for these residents to find equivalent housing in the city without having to borrow large sums of money. With the economic downturn, this would destroy their lifestyle.
885	O2: Condos on south end of Kenaston increases the difficulty and cost significantly. Also ignores most efficient use of existing surplus army barracks
886	O2: Does not address future traffic volumes, only fixes current volume.
887	O2: Expropriation of too many homes, berms required
888	O2: extreme negative impact on neighbourhood.
889	O2: Limited
890	O2: Extremely undesirable option, which simply impacts to many Winnipeggers
891	O2: No
892	O2: Many high density apt. buildings would be removed. Many people impacted.
893	O2: No connectivity for AT along east side.

894	O2: Not an option
895	O2: Property to be expropriated too expensive = too much burden on taxpayers.
896	O2: Too developed.
897	O2: Too much destruction of buildings and Condos.
898	O2: Way too much displacement?
899	O2: Will destroy my property value.
900	O2: Will sell our home. Do not want Kenaston closer to our home (Carpathia).
901	O1, O2, O3, O4: Roadway was never designed to accommodate this type of traffic.
902	O2: Do not consider! Way too much expropriation of commercial and higher density property required.
903	O2: Would require destruction of too much commercial property and condos.
904	O1, O2, O3, O4: Roadway was never designed to accommodate this type of traffic.
905	O2: Way too many properties effected by expropriation.
906	O2, O3, O4: Too expensive, unsafe for peds, very unattractive.
907	O2, O3, O4, O5: Strongly oppose, however, should one of these be selected, you must ensure a substantial berm is constructed, complete a fence and plant a large number of mature spruce trees to protect our neighborhood.
908	O1, O2, O3, O4: All involve increasing traffic flow and increase peoples reliance on cars. All effect air quality. City should not plan based on IKEA and Waverley West and develop a mass transit strategy that will make it easy to give up cars. Trucks need to be off the corridor.
909	O2: Too much private property acquisition.
910	O2: Go big
911	O2: It seems like the east side does not run into public buildings, better bridge alignment.
912	O2: Probably the easiest option.
913	O2: OK.
914	O2: Reasonable option.
915	O2: Is this more or less cost effective than option 4?
916	O2: Eliminate Academy west access at Kenaston to stop traffic cutting through (Happens when Wellington Cres is blocked off). Strongly favour wall not berm
917	O2: Landscaping ++, Noise Abatement ++
918	O2: Leave intact.
919	O2: Only if there is a beautiful nature berm behind my house.
920	O1,O2: If traffic is to be sped up, both sides, north and south will have to be widened.

### OPTION 3

921	O3 Too much property expropriated
922	O3: Does not address future traffic volumes, only fixes current volume.
923	O3: extreme negative impact on neighbourhood.
924	O3: Many 2 storey beautiful homes would be lost. It would be impossible for these residents to find equivalent housing in the city without having to borrow large sums of money. With the economic downturn, this would destroy their lifestyle.
925	O3: Will sell our home. Do not want Kenaston closer to our home (Carpathia).
926	O3: Impacts both sides too much. Would cost less.
927	O3: Many houses expropriated. No apts or condos expropriated.
928	O3: No
929	O3: Not an option

930	O3: Seems least practical - why rip up both sides if not necessary?
931	O3: Too expensive.
932	O3: Too many houses lost.
933	O3: Too much disruption for both sides of the street
934	O3: Too much impact, widening in our backyard
935	O3: Too much property acquisition.
936	O3: Impacts the second most amount of people so shouldn't be considered.
937	O3: Very intrusive.
938	O2, O3, O4: Too expensive, unsafe for peds, very unattractive.
939	O1, O2, O3, O4: Roadway was never designed to accommodate this type of traffic.
940	O1, O2, O3, O4: All involve increasing traffic flow and increase peoples reliance on cars. All effect air quality. City should not plan based on IKEA and Waverley West and develop a mass transit strategy that will make it easy to give up cars. Trucks need to be off the corridor.
941	O1, O2, O3, O4: Roadway was never designed to accommodate this type of traffic.
942	O2, O3, O4, O5: Strongly oppose, however, should one of these be selected, you must ensure a substantial berm is constructed, complete a fence and plant a large number of mature spruce trees to protect our neighbourhood.
943	O3: Way too many people effected.
944	O3: Way too much displacement?
945	O3: Not feasible.
946	O3: Widen west side only.
947	O3: If you're going to disrupt.
948	O3: Nice wide ROW would be beneficial. I love driving on Charleswood parkway.
949	O3: Allows most room for service roads, sound barriers, and AT. Similar to Charleswood parkway, a great integration of transport and park.
950	O3: AT route, berms to reduce noise, future needs can be accommodated
951	O3: Ultimate choice but hardest to pursue because of acquiring houses and traffic during construction.
952	O3: Best option because no people lose their homes.
953	O3: Do it right the first time.
954	O3: Large AT areas, green space.
955	O3: Most expensive and disruptive to properties, but best in long run. More room for future expansion. Keeps traffic in one corridor
956	O3: Probably the best option for redevelopment as multi-use along corridor - 3 to 4 storey development will provide good sound abatement opportunities.
957	O3: Think 10 years down the road, I don't want to have to come to yet another planning session later on [CHOOSE THIS OPTION]
958	O3: Land development is key, yet no info on St. James Bridge and transit concerns. What's the big picture? How can the public assets if you don't state what the concerns are? My concern is the bridge and the Grant intersection.
959	O3: Needed?
960	O3: AT would have to move from one side to the other.
961	O3: Buy All Property and develop as conditions dictate. Let residents have a choice to stay if they want.
962	O3: No additional ROW options on Route 90. Place bike path on part of old CN route instead.
963	O3: Put in service roads like already on Grant. Two tier bridge on Kenaston, commercial on top, residential on bottom.

964	O3: Use a 32 m ROW
965	O3: Providing there is adequate green space
966	O3: Decrease the number of trucks, especially the large transport trucks. Except for the trucks servicing the stores in Kenaston shopping area.
967	O3: Forget the service road, it serves no purpose.
968	O3: I don't feel it is necessary to increase the number of lanes to get better traffic flow: What slows traffic is the number of controlled intersections and cars making turns off route 90.
<b>OPTION 4</b>	
969	O4: Curving route would be inefficient, could cause accidents.
970	O4: Does not address future traffic volumes, only fixes current volume.
971	O4: Doesn't provide opportunity to do it right (not like Moray)
972	O4: Many 2 storey beautiful homes would be lost. It would be impossible for these residents to find equivalent housing in the city without having to borrow large sums of money. With the economic downturn, this would destroy their lifestyle.
973	O4: This is a mish mash.
974	O1, O2, O3, O4: Roadway was never designed to accommodate this type of traffic.
975	O2, O3, O4, O5: Strongly oppose, however, should one of these be selected, you must ensure a substantial berm is constructed, complete a fence and plant a large number of mature spruce trees to protect our neighbourhood.
976	O2, O3, O4: Too expensive, unsafe for peds, very unattractive.
977	O1, O2, O3, O4: All involve increasing traffic flow and increase peoples reliance on cars. All effect air quality. City should not plan based on IKEA and Waverley West and develop a mass transit strategy that will make it easy to give up cars. Trucks need to be off the corridor.
978	O4: More scenic but worse for snow-clearing, sliding etc..
979	O4: Too much disruption for both sides of the street
980	O4: Best option by far.
981	O4: Best? [RANKED 4 FIRST]
982	O4: If option 4 is more cost effective than option 1 or 2 use option 4.
983	O4: impacts fewest occupied homes and set backs from existing properties are best..
984	O4: Looks good.
985	O4: Major portion of property acquisition is government property. Affects least amount of residences.
986	O4: May be ok.
987	O4: This is the way I envisioned the project.
988	O4: If you're going to disrupt.
989	O4: No impact on Apts or condos or Canada Post or youth center.
990	O4: Not opposed in any way if it can be done.
991	O4: The least of all evils.
992	O4: Uses mostly available land (empty houses).
993	O4: Obviously this is the most sensible. The others are not worth commenting on. This would also provide room for a decent rapid transit corridor
994	O4: More efficient use of expropriated property.
995	O4: Perhaps an alternative as less homes involved.
996	O4: This option seems to impact the fewest people and will get rid of military housing. Seems least costly.
997	O1, O2, O3, O4: Roadway was never designed to accommodate this type of traffic.

998	O4: I like the idea of the street not being a straight line.
999	O4: More efficient use of expropriated property.
1000	O4: East side to connect to the bridge. Up to Tuxedo its all empty housing. Very easy to take care of.
1001	O4: This would reduce "drag strip" effect and have less of an impact on existing established neighbourhoods.
1002	O4: Least intrusive to residential owners.
1003	O4: Only to be done if land acquisition is too expensive.
1004	O4: Uses Kapyong lands and fewer houses. Can make noise acceptable.
1005	O4: Need more information.
1006	O4: So-so
1007	O4: AT would have to move from one side to the other.
1008	O4: The approach to bridge is no more difficult than current, hopefully south bridge exit could be straightened
1009	O4: Sound barrier, few back lanes, proper lighting, fire hydrant, proper sidewalks.
1010	O4: Make some sort of access road to Academy and close roads from Willow north to Fulham (at rte 90)
1011	O4: Landscape to decrease noise
1012	O4: Move transition north to curve south of Fullham
1013	O4: Ok, but will create more traffic delays during construction.
1014	O4: Not too many properties affected, though a lot more than option 1.
1015	O4: Service roads for local traffic only

**OPTION 5**

1016	O5: Impossible.
1017	O5: Hurts people living on quiet streets
1018	O5: Area between the routes will become an island and negatively impact these homes and the school
1019	O5: How are the children across the vacant corridor going to get to school? Another big street? It is already dangerous. What about pedestrian traffic down Kingsway and Grosvenor? It would kill the neighbourhood. Our residential neighbourhood between two large traffic corridors.
1020	O5: Creates safety issues for children going to Carpathia school. Lots on Centennial are not deep so substantial noise issues.
1021	O5: Why?
1022	O5: Will destroy life for the people living on the quiet streets
1023	O5: Creates two high speed traffic zones. Very inconvenient when crossing on side streets
1024	O5: Effects whole neighbourhood, destroys new buildings, creates an island of houses from centennial to route 90
1025	O5: Land is not available.
1026	O5: Impacts a second area.
1027	O5: Forget it, east side of Kenaston behind my home. Divides community, lowers property values. City shouldn't buy back land from developers. Not good for transit.
1028	O5: having one way routes so far apart creates problems for turning around or accessing businesses
1029	O5: Extremely disruptive to the neighbourhood.
1030	O5: If you choose this option you should purchase all of our homes because our neighbourhood would be ruined.
1031	O5: Not viable with condos going in

1032	O5: Too close to residential area
1033	O5: Leave this area alone. Noise and exhaust will be hazardous
1034	O5: Prefer developers option for 6plex bungalows for 55+ population. Relatively new construction.
1035	O5: Noise and safety, green space, now small birds paradise. Will reduce property value.
1036	O5: Much too expensive
1037	O5: Never. Why do you think people would want to live with heavy traffic and trucks surrounding them
1038	O5: No
1039	O5: Property sold to developer for single family units
1040	O5: Not keen on one ways. Would not like this is I lived where new route is planned
1041	O5: Please consider the number of families you would be disrupting by pursuing this option. Also consider how this option would stifle development. Condos have already been built and others proposed. This option is ridiculous.
1042	O5: Limited property to purchase. For reason given, improved intersection control. This is an opportunity to improve and be part of the Winnipeg airport transportation hub. Limit use of traffic signals. Use round-abouts, merge lanes.
1043	O5: This option will destroy the value of hundreds of homes.
1044	O5: This would ruin multiple blocks of River Heights
1045	O5: Should not knock down new buildings to save 50 year old homes. New area subject to traffic noise, fumes. Island created between roads. Access to school by Grosvenor becomes safety concern.
1046	O5: Scrap it ! We would be enclosed by 2 large, busy highways.
1047	O5: There would be no buffer for houses along lockwood and centennial. Carpathia school becomes an island - not good!
1048	O5: Too expensive for city to acquire this property. They had a cheap opportunity to buy it ten years ago.
1049	O5: use this land for housing
1050	O5: Concerns over noise and fumes, safety issue for children crossing at Grosvenor to go to Carpathia school. Devaluation of huge chunk of River Heights neighbourhood. Houses shaking/cracking due to high truck traffic. Neighbourhood between north and south routes would look like an island
1051	O2, O3, O4, O5: Strongly oppose, however, should one of these be selected, you must ensure a substantial berm is constructed, complete a fence and plant a large number of mature spruce trees to protect our neighborhood.
1052	O5: Already being developed, not an option
1053	O5: This expands the smog problem and effects more of the neighbourhood. CN rail should be used for AT not cars and trucks
1054	O5: No, don't even consider this option! This old CN ROW is too narrow to be much use for anything
1055	O5: The neighbourhood would be split into an island ghetto
1056	O5: new condos, backs onto a lot of residents, too much separation affecting a wider area, more residents
1057	O5: Doesn't seem to be enough room for any significant roadway. Would have to tear down new buildings. A nonstarter
1058	O5: This would really ruin our area. We would be between 2 major roads.
1059	O5: This option appears most efficient. Good traffic flow during construction. Would appear to be least expensive as land is cleared and the least amount of properties to purchase.



1060	O5: Scrap it, it is insanity. \$400000 condos in the process of being built to increase density which we badly need in this city. Are they going to be torn down? You are severing a part of the River Heights community. Dynamic cities depend on ambulatory traffic. How are people going to easily cross two busy thoroughfares safely? Please read Jane Jacobs.
1061	O5: This option will trap the local residents between 2 freeways. Carpathia school will also be between the two major roads. Negative impact on property values on Carpathia, Lokwood, Fulton and Centennial
1062	O5: Will definitely impact too many River Heights residents. This my least preferred option.
1063	O5: Highways divide communities like RT: 90 currently separates River Heights & Tuxedo. This would create another divide for those living on streets like Carpathia Rd. and would affect families that send their children to school by foot and there are a number of schools just off of where the proposed new one way street would be. Many adjacent properties would see a major decrease in value due to their proximity to the new highway. Almost all of the land would need to be expropriated as well as a number of new construction will have been in vain.
1064	O5: Previous studies show that this could be used as green space and light rail transit route. Other cities have taken over abandoned rail lines and done this.
1065	O5: Our neighborhood has been fighting to have this ROW for AT, a green space in quiet neighbourhood
1066	O5: Develop this property for non-vehicular traffic and connect to already existing trail system. This option will impact the most residents. I feel this will decrease property values
1067	O5: You have to be kidding
1068	O5: Best Option
1069	O5: Feel this is the best choice. Intersections are easier to plan. Less homes and buildings need to be removed.
1070	O5: It's the nicer choice
1071	O5: Might be best to pursue. Least impact during construction.
1072	O5: Most forward looking as would have very high capacity in both direction for the future. Requires very small loss of houses. Least dangerous for pedestrians.
1073	O5: This is the best option
1074	O5: With proper protection for the people on both sides of the new roadway this seems to be the least disruptive of the schemes proposed
1075	O5: Very safe and very attractive (can easily accommodate peds and bikes)
1076	O5: Least impact on existing housing. Less expropriation required. Less traffic interruption during construction
1077	O5: Provides opportunity for more than 3 lanes in either direction
1078	O5: Removes ugly Condos
1079	O5: Start now. Why wait any longer.
1080	O5: Need more info. How would one way traffic work?
1081	O5: The city had its chance and missed it. Let housing/condo development continue.
1082	O5: Why has development already been allowed on the old CN ROW?
1083	O5: Incorporate AT along new corridor
1084	O5: Please don't allow ped street crossing at street level. Make this a high speed thoroughfare and try to minimize lights, entry and exit points.
1085	O5: Just make sure to build high wall barricades to shut down noise so current home owners will eventually be accepting
1086	O5: Non vehicular only
1087	O5: Railway bridge for pedestrian and cyclist crossing

1088	O5: Review area south of Taylor for possible extension of rail ROW plan across Wilkes and Sterling Lyon.
1089	O5: This should be bicycle and people green space.
1090	O5: Turn this into paved bike path
1091	O5: Turn this into the cycle/pedestrian route.
1092	O5: Use old rail ROW as transit route as well as bike route with park type landscaping.
1093	O5: Develop rail corridor into AT corridor. Lower noise impact on existing neighbourhood, make AT a viable option
1094	O5: Consider access to properties next to the new road.
1095	O5: Better city planning would have encouraged this option to be better perceived
1096	O5: Have to consider these types of traffic users for environmental reasons.