REPORT OF THE

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

DATED JULY 4, 2000

On motion of Councillor Angus, Clause 5 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works, dated July 4, 2000, was considered.

Strategic Infrastructure Reinvestment Policy (SIRP) Implementation Committee Report
File S-7 (Vol. 4)

238- 5. ***Note: In accordance with Section 61.5 of the Procedure By-law, the Executive Policy Committee recommends that Council grant an additional extension of time of 60 days for consideration of the matter.***

Moved by Councillor Angus,
That an extension of time be granted.

Carried.

REPORT "A" OF THE

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

DATED SEPTEMBER 5, 2000

On motion of Councillor Angus, Clause 4 of Report "A" of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works, dated September 5, 2000, was considered.

Moved by Councillor Angus,
That the Consent Agenda, Clause 4, be adopted.

Carried.

Insert Policy for Water/Sewer Bills
File W (Vol. 2)

239 - 4. Four times per year, the Water and Waste Department uses Canada Post to mail water/sewer bills to 181,000 account holders. The Department has the capability of inserting additional printed items into the water bill envelope, provided that the additional items meet size and weight requirements. Inclusion of these extra pieces does not increase postage costs, provided the total weight of the envelope does not exceed thirty (30) grams.

The Water and Waste Department uses this opportunity to provide important information on the water and sewer utility, such as the recycling program, garbage/recycling calendar, rate increases and emerging issues, to its customers. The Department also, on occasion, includes inserts from various civic departments, government agencies and non-profit organizations, at no charge, save for the cost of preparing the inserts and the actual cost of insertion.

Historically, all non-departmental material submitted for distribution has been reviewed by Water and Waste Department officials to determine suitability. From time to time, the Department has been directed by Council to include information from various agencies, such as WaterCan.

The Water and Waste Department has never had a formal policy governing the insertion of printed materials in water/sewer bill envelopes and deems it necessary at this time for the following reasons:

Optimize Readership and Eliminate Junk Mail

The water/sewer bill is the only communication tool guaranteed to reach all Water and Waste Department customers. In the March 1999, Customer Satisfaction Survey of 500 Winnipeg residents, fifty (50) per cent of respondents said that water bill inserts are the best way to get the information they want or need. Twenty-three (23) per cent of respondents indicated that a separate mailing to homes was the second most preferred method.

Water utility public information is becoming more important, especially with growing concerns about water quality and rate increases. It is imperative that customers trust that inserts in this utility bill contain pertinent information first and foremost about the services provided by the Water and Waste Department. A practical way to build this trust and optimize the readership is to control the number of messages competing for customer attention, in other words, eliminate perceived "junk mail".

- Increased Demand for this Service

  A growing number of groups want to take advantage of the Water and Waste Department quarterly billings to transmit information about their organization. More often than not, these groups appeal for donations from customers. Groups are becoming aware that one of the most cost efficient methods of getting a message to all Winnipeg homes is by placing an insert in the Water and Waste Department utility bills. However, this method is not necessarily the most effective fund raising tool for these groups. For example, in 1998, a local organization which provides housing support for persons with disabilities included an insert with the water bill that received less than two dozen responses to their request for charitable donations, certainly not nearly enough to cover the cost of printing 180,000 inserts.

Report "A" of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated September 5, 2000

Absence of Customer Permission

Customers provide the Water and Waste Department with their address for the express purpose of receiving a bill and information about related services. Customers have never been advised or consulted about the practice of including non-Department information along with their utility bill. A small number of customers regularly telephone to complain about this practice.

Community groups that have used this opportunity in the past will be advised in writing that the Department now has an insert policy in place and they will no longer be able to place their insert in the utility bills. These groups include Goodwill, WaterCan and the Heart and Stroke Foundation.

Costs associated with administering the insert program will be fully cost recoverable for the organizations sponsoring an insert. In 2001, it is expected these costs will be approximately $225.00 per insert.

As requested by the Executive Policy Committee on September 13, 2000, the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works reconsidered the proposed policy with a view to assigning authority for approval of all inserts to the Chairperson of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works.

Pursuant thereto, the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works again considered this matter on January 9, 2001, and now recommends:

I. That the proposed 'Insert Policy and Operational Guidelines' outlined in Appendix "A" hereto, be approved to govern the insertion of printed information into the water/sewer bill envelopes effective February 1, 2001.

II. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing, including the execution of any documents related thereto.

Adopted by consent.

(See Minute No. 260 for "Appendix "A")

REPORT OF THE

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

DATED JANUARY 9, 2001

On motion of Councillor Angus, the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works, dated January 9, 2001, was considered clause by clause.

Moved by Councillor Angus,
That the Consent Agenda, Clauses 1,2,3 and 4, be adopted.

Carried.

Approval to Undertake a Biosolids Management Study

File WW-3.3 (Vol. 4)

240 - 1. The City of Winnipeg has been spreading digested, dewatered biosolids on agricultural land for approximately 35 years. This practice was first regulated by the Province of Manitoba through the Clean Environment Commission and more recently through the Manitoba Environment Act. The current license stipulates that the City can only apply biosolids which meet prescribed conditions, at limited rates, with prescribed buffer zones and transport conditions. The intent of these terms and conditions is to minimize nuisance potential and environmental contamination. The City is required to monitor application rates, biosolids composition, run-off, groundwater and odor levels. The City is also committed to conduct research into the environmental, agronomic, economic and technical aspects of biosolids application rates. All of these research efforts are coordinated through a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and are documented in an annual report. The TAC is chaired by Manitoba Conservation and is comprised of representatives from the following agencies: Manitoba Conservation (2); City of Winnipeg (2); Manitoba Health; Manitoba Natural Resources; Manitoba Agriculture; University of Manitoba; Environment Canada, and the Rural Municipality of West St. Paul.

The City has shared all of the information it has gathered through many years of research and monitoring of the biosolids disposal program and has worked closely with TAC and Manitoba Conservation to resolve any environmental issues associated with this program. Through this close association, the City had anticipated that the required license review would not result in any substantial changes to the existing program. Only recently, in the summer of 2000, has the Province indicated that they have concerns about current application rates and the City's practice of winter spreading. They also indicated they have adopted the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) Soil Quality Guidelines as a basis to establish limits for biosolids disposal regulations. In response to this recent change in approach, the City realized that it must retain a consultant with both biosolids and regulatory expertise to assist the City in preparing for the upcoming license review.

Environment Act License 1089E RR contains a requirement which states, "this License shall be reviewed on or before November 1, 2001". Manitoba Conservation has now confirmed that the City, as the proponent, must submit a proposal to Manitoba Conservation which outlines the City's position on the issues surrounding the dewatering and land disposal of biosolids. The position paper will cite all supporting monitoring, technical and research references and include a proposal on how this program should be operated in an amended license.

To prepare the position paper for the upcoming license review, the Water and Waste Department requires the assistance of an engineering consulting firm to provide a report that would form the basis of the City's position paper to Manitoba Conservation. Attendance and support to City staff at future regulatory hearings may also be required. This report would assemble and present all of the monitoring and research done by the City over the past 12 years, and include an overview of applicable research and practices of other jurisdictions involved in biosolids disposal.

The position paper will be forwarded through Manitoba Conservation to the TAC. TAC will submit comments to the City of Winnipeg, and the City will then have an opportunity to make revisions to the position paper. The City of Winnipeg will submit the revised position paper to Manitoba Conservation along with copies of all comments received from TAC. The submission of this package to the Director of Environmental Approvals will be the first

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated January 9, 2001

formal step in the license review process. The Director will then determine what other steps will be required as part of the overall review, including the need for further TAC input and public hearings.

The consultant assignment would also include undertaking preliminary designs and cost estimates of several alternative biosolids management methods applicable to Winnipeg conditions. These alternatives would provide the basis for further study if the existing biosolids disposal program had to be altered or abandoned due to a ban on winter spreading or a reduction in field application rates. The costs of alternative disposal methods would also be presented at any regulatory hearings to indicate the financial consequences to the City of any regulatory decision around biosolids disposal.

Initial discussions with Manitoba Conservation and TAC regarding the current review of the existing license have brought to light concerns over three major issues: application rates, winter spreading, and heavy metal accumulations. Discussion on the implications to the Water and Waste Department's biosolids disposal program as a result of these concerns is as follows:

Application Rates

If a new license were issued with significant reductions to the current biosolids application rates, changes would be required to the existing spreading program and the equipment used. At current application rates, farmers receive approximately four year's worth of residual fertilizer benefit in one application. Manitoba Conservation has suggested that application rates be based on annual plant nutrient uptake requirements, which are approximately 20 percent of the current application rates. Farmers may be reluctant to take their land out of production to receive only one year's worth of fertilizer benefit.

Even if repeat applications were allowed, the annual program would immediately require five times more available land for biosolids application. More land would mean increased annual costs for set-up, spreading, incorporation and restoration. The equipment that the current contractor uses was customized to spread at the existing application rates. If this equipment cannot be modified to spread at reduced rates, new spreading equipment will be required. The City may also be forced to use land which has poor drainage and marginal production value and is at greater distances from the NEWPCC. All of these factors could result in a significant increase to the present disposal costs.

Winter Spreading

Although digested and dewatered biosolids are a very different material than untreated livestock manure, the spreading of the City's wastewater biosolids on agricultural land is often compared to the field disposal of hog manure. Winter spreading of hog manure is not permitted under current environmental regulations because of concerns related to spring thaw and surface water run-off. A similar prohibition for winter spreading of wastewater biosolids is a possibility. The City has expressed the view that the comparison of wastewater biosolids to undigested hog manure is not legitimate. However, many involved in the hog production industry feel that the City is receiving preferential treatment in being allowed to winter spread. If a new license banned winter spreading of biosolids, the subsequent requirement to store the winter production of biosolids for later spreading would be much more expensive than the current program. The City would then have to consider alternate disposal strategies that did not involve land spreading such as: landfill co-disposal, composting, incineration, heat drying or conversion to Class A soil. All of these alternatives would require careful consideration by the City including preliminary engineering, functional design and cost estimates, prior to selection of a new system. The cost of a new system can be expected to be much higher than the current program and would take several years to implement.

Heavy Metals

Another environmental concern associated with the application of wastewater biosolids to agricultural soils is the potential for increased levels of heavy metals such as cadmium, copper and zinc, in the soil. These metals concentrate in the biosolids as a result of their removal during the wastewater treatment process. Although the City has conducted research showing that the heavy metals in the City's biosolids would have little or no effect on soil, crops and groundwater, many other regulatory agencies have limited biosolids application rates because of their heavy metals content. Manitoba Conservation has indicated that they have adopted the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment Soil Quality Guidelines, and these new guidelines will form the basis for future environmental license limits. If a new license was issued that reduced biosolids application rates due to metals content, the City's biosolids disposal program would greatly increase in cost because of the additional land and hauling requirements.

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated January 9, 2001

Other Issues

Two other issues which may be of concern to the regulator and may have implications on the City's biosolids disposal program are groundwater quality and back-up disposal strategies.

Groundwater monitoring has not been required under any licenses issued to the City, however, because of possible concerns by area residents, the Water and Waste Department has carried out extensive groundwater monitoring in the various biosolids application areas to establish an analytical database for various chemical and microbiological parameters. This monitoring was conducted between 1993 and 1998 and has shown that the application of biosolids to agricultural land has had no measurable effect on the region's groundwater resources.

When farmland is wet and inaccessible for spreading purposes, biosolids are either hauled to a storage pad at the old drying bed location in the Rural Municipality of West St. Paul or hauled to the Brady Road Landfill for co-disposal with refuse. Both of these back-up strategies are subject to review and regulation by Manitoba Conservation and future licenses issued for these activities may impose restrictions which will limit their use.

Assignment of an engineering consulting firm to prepare the position paper will be done through a competitive proposal process at an estimated cost of $500,000.00. The draft 2002 to 2006 Five-Year Capital Forecast contains an amount of $1,000,000.00 in 2006 for a project titled "Biosolids - Alternative Disposal Study". In light of the Water and Waste Department's need to proceed with this study immediately, it is proposed that unexpended funds from the surplus cash-flow forecasted funds in the Fort Garry Interceptor Sewer - McGillivray/Kenaston Extension project be utilized for the Biosolids Management Study.

The financial status of the Fort Garry Interceptor Sewer - McGillivray/Kenaston Extension project is as follows:

Authorized Capital		$3,400,000.00
Amount of Previous Awards, Expenditures, Transfers	$2,873,627.00	
Amount required for the Biosolids Management Study	$ 500,000.00	
TOTAL	$ 3,373,627.00	$3,373,627.00
ESTIMATED SURPLUS		$ 26,373.00

A financial impact statement for the assignment of an engineering consultant has been prepared and is identified as Appendix "A" hereto. The financial impact statement for any future biosolids management system and its long term operation and maintenance costs will be included in subsequent contract award reports.

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works recommends:

That a new Capital project be approved at an estimated cost of $500,000.00 to undertake a Biosolids Management Study.

I. That surplus cash-flow forecasted Capital funds in the amount of $500,000.00 be used from the Fort Garry West Interceptor Sewer - Kenaston/McGillivray project (Account No. 44118xxx 5100070702) to retain Professional Engineering Services for the Biosolids Management Study.

II. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Adopted by consent.

(See Minute No. 261 for Appendix "A")

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated January 9, 2001

Continuation of the Approved Design of the Provencher Paired Bridges Project
File SB-13 (Vol. 5)

241 - 2. At its meeting held on December 16, 1999, Council approved in principle the recommended New Provencher Paired Bridges alternative conceptual design, involving separate vehicular and pedestrian bridges, for implementation and authorized the commencement of Preliminary Engineering Design. The conceptual implementation plan involves the CentreVenture Development Corporation as a partner for the development of the pedestrian bridge as part of its larger Boulevard Pedestrian Link Project. This pedestrian walkway project links St. Boniface City Hall with Broadway at Main Street. The City has allocated up to $5.6 million from the project budget to the pedestrian bridge, which is the cost of a multi-use sidewalk no longer required on the south side of the vehicular bridge as a result of the pedestrian bridge. The estimated cost of the pedestrian bridge is $15 million, with CentreVenture Development Corporation to secure the balance of funding required.

At its meeting held on September 5, 2000, Council approved the Preliminary Design for the Provencher Bridge Project, and authorized commencement of the Detailed Engineering Design and Environmental Impact Assessment. The CentreVenture Development Corporation was also granted an extension to September 30, 2000, to confirm its funding.

Pursuant thereto, the Detailed Engineering Design and Environmental Impact Assessment commenced in early September, 2000, and is continuing on schedule to permit tendering of the vehicular bridge construction in May, 2001, all in accordance with the Council adopted project schedule.

At its meeting held on October 31, 2000, the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works was advised that the CentreVenture Development Corporation had not yet been able to confirm its funding of the pedestrian bridge, and the project design was proceeding in anticipation that Canada/Manitoba Infrastructure Program funds or funds by other means would be announced for the pedestrian bridge. Further, should a funding source not be secured by January 1, 2001, the Administration would report to Council.

To date, the CentreVenture Development Corporation has not been able to confirm its funding of the pedestrian bridge. CentreVenture Development Corporation is at this time making application for Canada/Manitoba Infrastructure Program funds for construction of the pedestrian bridge portion of the project. The earliest announcement of Infrastructure Program projects is anticipated to be the end of February, 2001.

A change in the approved design of separate bridges would have to be effected no later than February 1, 2001, in order for the project to remain within budget and on schedule to ensure the reliability of the river crossing beyond 2002.

There is a risk that if the pedestrian bridge is not approved as a Canada/Manitoba Infrastructure Project, the bridge crossing would operate with a single sidewalk until CentreVenture Development Corporation is able to secure the funding. On the basis that CentreVenture Development Corporation secures funding for the pedestrian bridge construction, there is no financial impact. However, if CentreVenture Development Corporation is unable to secure the funding, the City would then need to forecast the necessary funds for a pedestrian bridge from future Capital budgets.

Council approval is required to continue the detailed design at this time in order for the Administration to undertake the project within previously identified time frames and cost.

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works therefore recommends:

I. That the Public Works Department be authorized to continue with the approved Detailed Engineering Design for the Provencher Paired Bridges Project, including a vehicular bridge with a sidewalk on the north side only, on the basis that funding for a separate pedestrian bridge will be secured by the CentreVenture Development Corporation.

II. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Adopted by consent.

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated January 9, 2001

Extension of Project Limits – Main Street from Higgins Avenue to Redwood Avenue
Files SC-3.4 (Vol. 23) and FC(1996)

242 - 3. The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works has been advised that the adopted 1996 Capital Program includes a street renewal project on Main Street from Sutherland Avenue to Redwood Avenue, which has been completed except for a property acquisition. Available funds in the amount of $613,000.00 remain in the project under Account No. 5196040702.

The Savoy Hotel at the northwest corner of Main Street and Higgins Avenue was recently demolished. The City-owned land on the west side of Main Street from Higgins Avenue to the CPR is being transferred to CentreVenture as a developable site. A portion of these City-owned lands is being retained to add a southbound right turn lane from Main Street onto Higgins Avenue and to widen Higgins Avenue. The existing southbound right turn lane will become the third through lane.

The sidewalks on the west side of Main Street and the north side of Higgins Avenue, adjacent to the former hotel, are in very poor condition due to their age and the demolition of a series of buildings. Prior to development of the site, pavement widening, sidewalk renewal and construction of a new retaining wall are necessary to establish the new grades at property line. The estimated cost of these works is $600,000.00.

If the project limits for the Main Street resurfacing project was extended one block south from Sutherland Avenue to Higgins Avenue, the remaining funds in the street renewal project could be utilized to add the southbound right turn lane and renew the sidewalk and retaining wall. The surplus lands would then be ready for development. Inasmuch as approved funding is contained within the 1996 Capital Program there is no financial impact.

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works recommends:

I. That the project limits for the approved Main Street resurfacing program be extended one block south from Sutherland Avenue to Higgins Avenue, and revised to include a southbound right turn lane as well as renewal of the sidewalk and retaining wall at the northwest corner of Main Street and Higgins Avenue.

II. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Adopted by consent.

(See Minute No. 262 for Appendix “A”)

Access and Loading Bay for a Proposed Hotel to be Located at the Northwest Corner of St. Mary Avenue and Main Street
File SC-1(32) (Vol. 2) [c/r DDB 94/2000]

243 - 4. The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works has been advised that an application has been received from Nejmark Architect, for the construction of a non-conforming angular “exit only” private approach on the west side of Main Street, and a bi-directional private approach on the north side of Mary Avenue, for the proposed Hampton Inn at 250 Main Street.

This application is non-conforming under The City of Winnipeg Private Approaches By-law No. 6546/95, Section 8, Subsection (a), Section 3, Subsection (2) and Section 7, Subsection (1), which state:

> “8 (a) Provided such approach or private walk fully complies with the provisions of Subsections (4) and (5) of Section 3 and with Section 7 hereto, then, upon the receipt of a written application therefore, the Commissioner shall approve of the construction, installation of same, unless the Commissioner is of the opinion that approval of such approach or private walk would be detrimental to the public interest.”

> “3 (2) No approach shall be constructed, erected or installed in any street or section of street set forth in Schedule 1 hereto, provided that on those streets or sections of street which have service roads adjacent to the main roadways, this Schedule shall apply only to the main roadways and not to the service roads.”

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated January 9, 2001

This section of Main Street is contained within Schedule 1.

> "7 (1) No approach shall be constructed, erected or installed within an intersection, nor within six (6) metres of the intersecting street line projected at right angles, measured along the street curb line or its straight projection, from the straight projection of the nearest edge of the approach."

This section of Main Street contains northbound and southbound 13.4 metre roadways, with a 2.8 metre median, all within a 40.2 metre right-of-way, and carries approximately 14,250 northbound and 14,500 southbound vehicles in a typical twelve hour weekday period between 07:00 and 19:00. There are two left turning lanes for northbound vehicles on Main Street onto St. Mary Avenue. This section of St. Mary Avenue contains a 12.1 metre westbound roadway, within a 20.1 metre right-of-way and carries approximately 11,700 vehicles in a typical twelve hour weekday period between 07:00 and 19:00.

The site is currently vacant, however, there are plans to construct a six storey hotel with a 56 vehicle parking lot to be located to the rear and the north side of the proposed building. Existing access to this site is off the public lane at the rear of the property.

PRIVATE APPROACHES

The applicant wishes to construct a non-conforming angular "exit only" private approach on the west side of Main Street approximately 70.4 metres north of St. Mary Avenue, and a non-conforming bi-directional private approach on the north side of St. Mary Avenue approximately 24.4 metres west of Main Street, as shown on Drawing No. A-9475, identified as Appendix "C" hereto.

The non-conforming angular "exit only" private approach will serve as an exit from the site for motorists who wish to continue southbound onto Main Street. The Private Approaches By Law does not allow for the construction of any private approaches on this section of Main Street, and furthermore, all private approaches must be a minimum distance of 6.0 metres from an intersection, in this case Wesley Street.

The proposed 6.0 metre non-conforming bi-directional private approach on the north side of St. Mary Avenue, is intended to operate as the only entrance to the development, and an easier exit onto St. Mary Avenue for westbound motorists. The proposed approach with a width of only 6.0 metres is too narrow to operate as a bi-directional, as it is impossible for two vehicles to simultaneously enter and exit the property. The Public Works Department feels that if this bi-directional private approach is approved, it will cause traffic operating problems on St. Mary Avenue, which may back-up into the Main Street intersection. As there are no left turns permitted for northbound vehicles on Main Street to Graham Avenue, the westbound movement is very heavy on St. Mary Avenue. There are 11,700 westbound vehicles on this section of St. Mary Avenue in a typical twelve hour weekday period between 07:00 and 19:00. There are 400 vehicles during the heaviest 15 minute period during the morning rush.

Due to the heavy westbound movement on St. Mary Avenue and traffic problems associated with a bi-directional movement into and out of the proposed hotel site, the queue from the proposed approach will extend into the intersection of Main Street and St. Mary Avenue, causing delays and traffic operating problems on both St. Mary Avenue and Main Street.

Alternatively, the Public Works Department recommends that two angular private approaches be approved in conjunction with each other, so that there is a "one way" traffic pattern within the site, that being an "entrance only" angular private approach on the north side of St. Mary Avenue, which would be convenient for all motorists wishing to enter the site from southbound and northbound Main Street, and an angular "exit only" private approach on the west side of Main Street, convenient for all motorists to continue in all directions from the proposed hotel, as shown on Drawing No. A-9475-A, identified as Appendix "D" hereto.

Notwithstanding, if the bi-directional private approach on the north side of St. Mary Avenue is approved, the Public Works Department recommends that it be a minimum 8.0 metres in width and that the proposed angular "exit only" private approach on the west side of Main Street not be approved, as there would be no need to have this exit from the proposed development.

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated January 9, 2001

MAIN STREET LOADING BAY

Main Street and Portage Avenue have historically been recognized as the two primary streets in the Downtown area. As such, they have been treated in a special manner. Private approaches have been restricted and the sidewalks have been maintained with a minimum width of 5.3 metres. To maintain this minimum width, the medians on Main Street and Portage Avenue are very substandard in width. Pedestrian volumes on Main Street and Portage Avenue fluctuate greatly depending on the season and the time of day. In addition, special City wide events in the Downtown area and at The Forks can generate large crowds. It is therefore important to maintain the existing 5.3 metre wide sidewalk on Main Street along the proposed hotel site. This portion of Main Street will ultimately be streetscaped and the existing sidewalk width is the minimum required to achieve a successful result. It should be noted that some sections of sidewalk adjacent to bus stops on Portage Avenue were widened from 5.3 metres to 8.5 metres as part of the recent streetscaping project. With the peak hour stopping restrictions on the west side of Main Street, along with the reserved bus/bicycle lane for Transit, it is illegal for loading and unloading to take place within the curb lane of Main Street.

Construction of a 3.0 metre wide loading bay on Main Street in front of the proposed hotel development would accommodate front door loading and unloading. This would require that an easement of at least 3.0 metres in width and 3.0 metres in height be secured upon adjacent private land to maintain a 5.3 metre sidewalk. This can be achieved by relocating the hotel building slightly to the west and is feasible with the existing property size and proposed building dimensions, as indicated on Drawing No. A-9475-A.

Pursuant to its deliberations thereon, the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works did not concur in the recommendations of the Public Works Department, and recommends:

I. That the construction of one 7.2 metre bi-directional private approach on the north side of St. Mary Avenue, west of Main Street, be approved.

II. That the construction of one 7.0 metre angular “exit only” private approach on the west side of Main Street, north of St. Mary Avenue, be approved.

III. That the construction of a 3.1 metre in width loading bay on the west side of Main Street, north of St. Mary Avenue, be approved, subject to the applicant locating the proposed building to maintain a 4.75 metre in width sidewalk on the west side of Main Street by way of providing an easement at least 2.438 metres in width and 3.1 metres in height across the front of the building where the loading bay is located, except in the vicinity of the main entrance to the proposed building where the proposed building will encroach into the required easement and sidewalk, as shown on Figure “A”, identified as Appendix “B” hereto.

IV. That the City Solicitor/Manager of Legal Services be instructed to prepare for submission directly to Council, an amendment to Schedule 1 of the Private Approaches By-law No. 6546/95.

V. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing, including the execution of any documents related thereto.

Adopted by consent.

(See Minute No. 263 for Appendices “A” and “B”)

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

244 - On motion of Councillor Angus, By-law No. 7770/2001, a by-law of The City of Winnipeg to amend By-law No. 6547/95, being a by-law of the said City concerning the reservation of certain portions of streets and public parking sites for the purpose of parking vehicles and the use of parking meters in connection therewith, was read a first, second and third time, the rule being suspended for the third reading, and was passed and ordered to be signed and sealed. File ST-2 (Vol. 22)

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

QUESTION PERIOD

245 - Councillor Smith questioned why the City contracted a firm to pick up recycling when the firm did not have a place to handle the material without littering, to which Councillor Angus replied he would take the question under advisement.

Councillor Smith questioned why the City was soliciting other cities to bring their garbage to the Brady Landfill Site, to which Councillor Angus replied he would take the question under advisement.

Councillor Steek questioned if there had been an official award of Tender No. 820-2000, for five pumper trucks to which Councillor Angus replied in the affirmative. His Worship Mayor Murray noted that questions on in camera tenders were not to be discussed in open session and the Speaker ruled all related questions out of order.

Councillor Steek questioned whether the City consulted on safety standards with representatives from the Fire Paramedic Service on tenders, to which Councillor Angus took the question under advisement.

Councillor Steek questioned if it would be more beneficial to have contracts relative to public works vetted through Council as opposed to being decided by the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works.

Councillor Angus noted that Council policy delegated authority on specific contracts to the standing committees and that the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works awarded contracts of sizeable amounts on a regular basis.

Councillor Prystanski noted that it was the City's intention to encourage other municipalities to bring their garbage to the City of Winnipeg for a fee and questioned the intention of having Winnipeg residents pay for their garbage collection while allowing other municipalities to rid of their waste in Winnipeg despite whether they have a recycling program.

Councillor Angus replied that the Brady Landfill site had a huge storage capacity and also that the cost of garbage collection had yet to be addressed. He noted that City policy stated that any municipality who we receive garbage from must have a recycling program, and also that they, like everyone else, are charged a standard rate.

Councillor Prystanski noted that the City direction was to reduce the amount of garbage going into the landfill by contracting out the landfill, and questioned how this would reduce the amount of garbage.

Councillor Angus noted that the program would have to be approved by Council and stated that the City was going to do the best it could to take a responsible position in protecting the environment.

Councillor Prystanski requested that all Members of Council be provided with a copy of the business plan for the Water and Waste Department and questioned whether the plan included a fee for garbage

Councillor Angus advised he would provide the business plan that was part of the waste minimization strategy to Councillor Prystanski. He also advised that the proposed fee for an extra tag for garbage was $1.50.

Councillor Timm-Rudolph questioned whether Councillor Angus was aware that John Gerrard, the leader of the Liberal Party had called on the Provincial Government to form one hydro utility and that he had requested that the City make public the Hydro document that was commissioned by the City two years ago.

Councillor Angus advised that he was not aware of this.

Councillor Timm-Rudolph asked if it was the City intent to meet with Mr. Gerrard to discuss the issue and find out what the Province's intent was.

Councillor Angus noted that such matters fell under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Intergovernmental Affairs.

Standing Policy Committee on Public Works - Question Period (continued)

Councillor Lazarenko requested a copy of the contract between Kenora, Ontario and the City of Winnipeg, pertaining to Kenora's garbage being sent to the Brady landfill site.

Councillor Angus spoke to the existing agreement and advised that he would have the administration provide the requested information.

Councillor Lazarenko questioned what the costs were for holding the town hall meetings on waste minimization and questioned who decided the location of the meetings.

Councillor Angus replied that when KPMG had conducted a user fee study last year, there was a public consultation budget and a public information budget. He noted that they identified five open houses to be held, one in each community committee area, which would each represent three wards.