STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON

PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

On motion of Councillor O'Shaughnessy, the Report of the former Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997, was considered clause by clause.

Moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,
That the Consent Agenda, Clauses 1,2,4,5 and 6 be adopted.

65 - Councillor Silva asked to be recorded as having voted against Clause 1, in accordance with Rule 50.7 of the Procedure By-law.

66 - Councillor Golden asked to be recorded as having voted against Clause 6, in accordance with Rule 50.7 of the Procedure By-law.

The motion to adopt the Consent Agenda, Clauses 1,2,4,5 and 6 was put and declared carried.

Proposal for Designated Areas for Off Leash Dogs
File EL-4 (Vol. 28)[c/r PR-7(35) (Vol. 3)]

67 - 1. The Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture has been advised that on March 17, 1997, the Riel Community Committee considered a proposal from Iva Cerny, on behalf of the Designated Area for Unleashed Dogs (DAUD) Action Committee, for the establishment of an exercise area for unleashed dogs in King's Park, as well as considered a petition purporting to contain the signatures of 134 area residents in support the proposal.

The Riel Community Committee referred the proposal to the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture for favourable consideration and to identify an appropriate area in King's Park for unleashed dogs.

On September 8, 1997, the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture laid over consideration of the matter, pending an administrative report on the concept, including the pros and cons of the proposal, and what would be required to implement the proposal in King's Park as expeditiously as possible.

Prior to receipt of the request from Riel Community Committee for establishment of an off leash area for dogs in King's Park, the Parks and Recreation Department and the City of Winnipeg Animal Control Services Branch had been actively investigating this concept. Other cities such as Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon and Vancouver were contacted to determine their experience with off leash areas. In general these cities reported that the off leash areas were well accepted by the general public and posed few problems.

In the City of Winnipeg, both the Parks and Recreation Department and the Animal Services Division recognize the need to legitimize what is and will continue to be an existing practice among dog owners - that is running their pets off leash. Public demand has also indicated that this is a desirable concept and provides an additional means by which responsible pet ownership can be promoted and reinforced.

The Parks and Recreation Department has initially identified thirty potential sites (as outlined on Appendix "A") throughout the City, however, it is expected that as the concept becomes established that the sites will change as a result of adding new sites to accommodate requests and to eliminate sites that prove problematic for either pet owners or the general public. Off leash areas will be established or eliminated in consultation with the Area Councillor, the requesting user group if any, the immediate neighbourhood, the Parks and Recreation Department, and the Animal Services Division using the following criteria and rules of use as guidelines.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING AN OFF LEASH AREA

An off leash area should:

1. Be of sufficient size and/or diverse landscape to allow dogs and owners to pursue activities such as running, fetching and walking.

2. Be far enough removed from major roads and railway tracks to reduce the likelihood of an unleashed dog from running into traffic.

3. Be far enough removed from children's play areas, school grounds and scheduled athletic fields to reduce its potential for conflict between children and unleashed dogs.

4. Be far enough removed from heavily used public open space such as public gardens and picnic areas, to avoid conflict with the users of these facilities.

5. Be reasonably accessible to users.

The basic rules of use for off leash areas would be:

1. Dog owners must be present and within view of their dogs.

2. Dogs must be removed from area at first sign of aggression.

3. Dogs must be under voice control while off leash, ie. come when called.

4. Dog owners shall have leash in hand at all times.

5. Female dogs in heat are not allowed in off leash area.

6. Aggressive dogs are not allowed in off leash areas.

7. Any holes dug by dogs shall be filled by owner.

8. All feeces shall be picked up by owner and removed or deposited in waste receptacles.

9. All dogs must be licenced in accordance with the City of Winnipeg Pound By-Law.

10. Sites will be open for use during the normal park hours, as posted at each site.

CRITERIA FOR ELIMINATING AN OFF LEASH AREA

1. Where there is a consistent violation of the requirement to pick up feeces.

2. Where use of the area by unleashed dogs interferes with public use of the site.

3. Where conflicts between dogs and or dog owners becomes problematic.

4. Where future development of the site changes the nature of the area making it unsuitable for further use as an off leash area.

As an amendment to the Pound By-Law is required in order to establish off leash areas, and it would be cumbersome to have to amend the By-Law for each site change, the Administration recommended that the Director of Parks and Recreation have the authority under the By-Law to both create or eliminate off leash sites. This would allow for a timely response to requests, as well as provide an immediate solution to problems.

Each designated area would have to be identified with proper signage which would set forth the rules for using the sites. Additionally, each site would be equipped with biodegradable "scoop" bag dispensers and waste containers. Parks and Recreation Staff would monitor each site and ensure that the waste containers are emptied and kept in a sanitary condition. The Animal Services Division would also monitor each site to ensure that the rules of use are being adhered to.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

As with any new program, funds are not presently identified in the annual operating budget. Estimates for start-up and annual operating costs are as follows. These costs are based on four pilot sites being used city-wide as off leash areas, in year one.

Estimated Start-up Costs: Year 1 for a minimum of 4 sites

Signs (4 sites x 4 signs at $50 each)	$800
Waste Receptacles (4 sites x 4 receptacles at $105 each)	$1,680
Scoop Bags, 1 year supply (10,000 bags) at $17.50 per 1000	$175
Advertising and Public Awareness Information	$2,240
Total Start-up	$4,895

For the first year of operation these costs could be accommodated in the Parks and Recreation Department's annual budget.

Subsequent Annual Operating Cost of four sites:

Scoop Bags (1 year supply (10,000 bags) at $17.50 per 1000	$75
Sign & Receptacle Repair/Replacement	$267
Advertising and Public Awareness	$1,240
Total Annual Operating	$1,682

It would be desirable to start with four to eight sites as a pilot project in the first year of the program and to add additional sites in successive years according to demand. This approach would also allow the opportunity to explore partnerships and sponsorships to offset the additional start-up and operating costs, such as donation or sponsorship of signs, scoop bags, and other site amenities.

It should also be noted that there may be sites that could be used as off leash areas if they were fenced off for safety. The costs of fencing large areas for this purpose are not included in either the Operating or Capital Estimates at this time, and would need to be considered individually as the need arises.

The Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture therefore recommends:

I. That the City of Winnipeg Animal Control By-Law No. 2443/79 be amended to allow for dogs to be off leash in certain designated areas.

II. That the Director of Parks and Recreation in consultation with the Manager of the City of Winnipeg Animal Services Division have the authority to designate or cancel the designation of off leash areas, based on the criteria as set out above.

III. That a phased in approach to the creation of off leash areas be adopted to spread the start-up costs over several budget years and allow for the development of partnerships and sponsors.

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

A copy of Appendix "A" is on file in the Office of the City Clerk.

Adopted by consent.

(See Minute No. 65 for opposition recorded by Councillor Silva)

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

Proposed Amendment to the Fees and Charges Policy - Additional Funding for the Athletic Field Maintenance "Sweat Equity" Program

File PR-2.10 (Vol. 10)

68 - 2. The Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture has considered a request from the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC) to readdress City Council's previous directive that 50% of the user fee revenues be distributed to the GCWCC for the community centre program and the remaining 50% be deposited to the general revenues of the City of Winnipeg; and that as of January 1, 1998, all athletic field user fees be distributed to GCWCC for allocation to the Athletic Field Maintenance Program.

On October 6, 1997, the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture referred the request from the GCWCC to the Administration for review and report back, and noted that the report should include the amount of funding required for the 1998 Athletic Field Maintenance Program.

The Administration has provided the following information:

On February 22, 1994, Council approved the introduction of an athletic field user fee for adult and youth groups utilizing fields booked by the Parks and Recreation Department. The youth user fee was subsequently rescinded by Council. Up to 50% of revenues collected from athletic field user fees was to be directed to athletic field improvements, with the remaining fees to be deposited to the City's general revenues.

On June 22, 1994, Council approved, effective in 1995, up to 50% of all revenues generated through the use of City allocated athletic fields be redesignated to GCWCC in recognition of the work (sweat equity) performed on their designated fields. The remaining user fees would be deposited into general revenues.

In 1995, the Community Centre Athletic Field Maintenance Program criteria was developed cooperatively by GCWCC and the Parks and Recreation Department. Each year, individual Community Centres have the option to participate in the program and to choose between two levels of maintenance - full or assisted.

Upon implementation of the program in 1995 and subsequently in 1996 and 1997, the Department recognized (based on the number of Community Centres opting into the program) that there was a requirement to make an additional $50,000 contribution each year in order to make the program viable. In 1997, based on further increased participation in the program, an additional $27,500 (over and above the Department's $50,000 contribution) was required to keep the program operating.

On September 8, 1997, the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture requested the Administration to identify a source for the additional GCWCC funding of $27,500 for the 1997 Athletic Field Maintenance Program.

On October 6, 1997, the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture approved the additional funding request from the GCWCC for the 1997 Athletic Field Maintenance Program, with the amount of $27,500 to be provided from the 1997 Parks and Recreation Department Budget, acknowledging that the projected year end surplus would be reduced by that amount. As of July 31, 1997, the Department was projecting a year end surplus.

The Athletic Field Maintenance "Sweat Equity" Program, a program between the Community Centres and the Parks and Recreation Department, has been a successful joint venture since its 1995 implementation, with mutual benefits occurring to both the City and participating Community Centres. The program has just completed its third, successful year of operation. As indicated in correspondence dated October 3, 1997, from GCWCC, "the program has become such a success that the revenues dedicated to the program no longer cover the needs". The Department anticipates further growth in the program in 1998 and beyond, and therefore recommends that the distribution of funds be changed in order to satisfy the ongoing concerns of GCWCC as to availability of sufficient funding levels to maintain a viable program into the future.

The Parks and Recreation Department recommends that the Fees and Charges Policy and accompanying Fee Schedule be revised to provide up to 100% of all future athletic field revenues to GCWCC in order to fully support continually increasing community centre involvement. The current policy designates up to 50% of athletic field fees to GCWCC, with the remaining fees going into the City's general revenues.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

The Parks and Recreation Department therefore recommends that the following wording be deleted from the Council Policy on Fees and Charges relating to Facilities, Programs and Services of the Parks and Recreation Department, namely:

> That commencing in 1995, up to 50% of all revenues generated by the City of Winnipeg through the use of athletic fields, based on 100% participation rate by the Community Centres, be redesignated by the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres to the Community Centres in recognition of work performed (sweat equity) on their designated athletic fields; the value of work performed to be determined using City maintenance standards.

And add the following wording to the aforesaid Fees and Charges Policy (Section 21):

> That commencing in 1998, a value of up to 100% of all revenues generated by the City of Winnipeg through the use of athletic fields be provided to the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres for distribution to Community Centres in recognition of work performed on their designated athletic fields; the value of work performed to be determined using City maintenance standards and the allocation based on the Athletic Field Maintenance "Sweat Equity" funding formula.

The 1998 program funding requirements can only be estimated at this time as two factors must be considered - Community Centre participation and athletic field revenues. Community Centre participation will not be known until two months prior to the beginning of the 1998 athletic field season, as individual Community Centres have the option to participate in the program each year and to choose between two levels of maintenance - full or assisted. Athletic field revenues are unknown until the end of the season and are dependent upon a number of factors, including weather conditions. However, based on the history of the last three years of the program, athletic field revenues are estimated to be approximately $100,000. Assuming increased Community Centre participation, the Parks and Recreation Department can only estimate that approximately $125,000 will be required by GCWCC to sustain the 1998 program. The Department will make every effort in 1998 to provide an offsetting contribution of approximately $25,000 to help ensure that a sufficient level of funding is available to meet the needs of this program.

The Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture therefore recommends:

I. That the Council Policy on Fees and Charges and Recovery Rates for User Fees relating to Facilities, Programs and Services of the Parks and Recreation Department, and accompanying Fee Schedule (1997-2000), be amended to designate up to 100% of the athletic field revenues to the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC) Athletic Field Maintenance "Sweat Equity" Program, as follows:

> "That commencing in 1998, a value of up to 100% of all revenues generated by the City of Winnipeg through the use of athletic fields be provided to the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres for distribution to Community Centres in recognition of work performed on their designated athletic fields; the value of work performed to be determined using City maintenance standards and the allocation based on the Athletic Field Maintenance "Sweat Equity" formula."

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

Adopted by consent.

Declaration of Surplus Park Property - Northwest and Northeast Corners of Pandora Avenue East at Redonda Street
File FI-2.4 (Vol. 7)

69 - 3. The Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture has considered the matter of declaring the properties located at northwest and northeast corners of Pandora Avenue East and Redonda Street, as outlined on Plan No. 20-97, as surplus to the City's requirements.

On February 18, 1997, the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee recommended that the subject properties be declared surplus, and that the east side of Redonda Street be utilized for residential purposes only.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

On April 11, 1997, the Committee on Finance and Administration considered report dated March 27, 1997, from the Director of Land and Development Services, with respect to the subject property located at the northwest and northeast corners of Pandora Avenue East and Redonda Street, as outlined on Misc. Plan No. 37C/85.

The report contains the results of circulation of the particulars to the other Civic Departments and the Community Committee. Outlined in the report is the opinion that if the Parks and Recreation does not require the subject property, then the property should be "listed" with suitable arrangements to be made respecting the retention of the bus loop. It was noted that in the distant past, a church organization had expressed interest in the east side of the property.

On April 11, 1997, the Committee on Finance and Administration referred the matter to the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture for consideration.

On June 13, 1997, the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture referred the matter to the Commissioner of Protection, Parks and Culture, for subsequent submission to the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee, for review and recommendation as to whether or not the subject property is surplus to the City's parks and recreation requirements.

The Administration advised that the subject properties situated at the northwest and northeast corners of Redonda Street and Pandora Avenue East, as identified on Plan No. 20-97, are currently undeveloped and exist in a level graded condition with ten mature trees situated along the most northerly 25 feet of Parcel A. Parcel C is & 3.5 hours acres which is currently developed as a bus loop, and is utilized by the Transit Department for local transit operations.

Parcel A is situated in the Kildare-Redonda Neighbourhood which is bounded by Larche Avenue East to the north; Redonda Street to the east; a portion of Pandora Avenue East to the south; and a portion of Day Street to the west.

The current population (1991) of the Neighbourhood is 7,545 residents, and therefore in accordance with the Departmental Open Space Standard of 3.86 acres/1000 people, the subject neighbourhood should have 29.12 acres of open space for neighbourhood parks and recreation purposes.

Currently, the City owns 50.91 acres of parkland in the Kildare-Redonda Neighbourhood, as outlined on Plan No. 20-97A, which represents an open space position in excess of the minimum Departmental Standard by 21.79 acres. Moreover, a review of the geographic distribution of the open spaces within the Neighbourhood indicates a high level of accessibility and site programmability.

Given that the Neighbourhood is above the minimum open space standard and that the existing parkland is well distributed within the Neighbourhood and that the property is only approximately 1.3 acres in size, the Parks and Recreation Department is supportive of recommending that Parcel A be disposed of accordingly.

Parcel B and Parcel C are situated in the Canterbury Neighbourhood. It is bounded by a line extending east and perpendicular to Redonda Street, north of Harold Hatcher School to the north, Highway 101 (Perimeter Highway) to the east, Dugald Road-Pandora Avenue East to the south and Redonda Street to the west. The current population (1991) of the Canterbury Neighbourhood is 4,505 residents, and in accordance with the Departmental Open Space Standard of 3.86 acres/1000 people, the Neighbourhood should have 17.38 acres of open space for neighbourhood parks and recreation purposes.

Currently, the City owns 35.79 acres of parkland in the Canterbury Park Neighbourhood, as outlined on Plan No. 20-97B, and which represents an open space position in excess of the minimum Departmental Standard by 18.41 acres. Moreover, a review of the geographic distribution of the open space within the Neighbourhood indicates a concentrated hierarchy of open spaces and a reasonable degree of accessibility. In future development applications involving lands to the east of Redonda Street and south of Kildare Avenue East, it is assumed that these issues will be addressed.

Given that the Neighbourhood is above the minimum open space standard and that the existing parkland is reasonably well distributed within the Neighbourhood and that the property is only approximately 1.12 acres, and that a major school site is located in close proximity to the north of the property; the Parks and Recreation Department is supportive of recommending that Parcel B be disposed of accordingly.

Parcel C is currently used by the Transit Department for transportation operations and should be considered as a separate matter. The Transit Department has requested that the property be retained at this time.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

Being as Parcel A and Parcel B may be disposed of without significantly affecting the Open Space Systems in the Kildare-Redonda and Canterbury Neighbourhoods, and that the sale of same will provide additional cash flow to the City's General Revenue Account, the Parks and Recreation Department is supportive of disposing of both parcels.

However, prior to a Standing Committee making a recommendation on declaring the property as surplus to Departmental Open Space Requirements, the Administration recommended that the matter should again be referred to the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee for its review, as requested at the Protection, Parks and Culture meeting on June 13, 1997.

On October 6, 1997, the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture referred the matter to the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee.

On October 14, 1997, the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee recommended that Parcel A and Parcel B on Plan No. 20-97 be declared surplus, and that it supports the sale of Parcels A and B for residential purposes only (ie. "R1" or "R2" housing only). The Community Committee also recommended that Parcel C not be declared surplus and be retained by the City under the jurisdiction of the Parks and Recreation Department.

The Parks and Recreation Department further advised that the sale of the subject properties will not require the City to incur any new capital debt as all land development costs will be borne by a future purchaser. Moreover, all administrative costs associated with implementing the proposal are provided for in the City's Current Budget and as such, no additional funding will be required.

Pending the approval of the subject proposal, the sale proceeds from the property will be directed to General Revenue in accordance with Council's Directive, thus contributing to the City's revenue. The estimate of sale proceeds is not available at this time. As well, future realty tax revenue will flow to the City upon the sale and subsequent development of the aforementioned property. At this time, the exact nature of the development is unknown and as such, an estimate of future realty tax flows has not been provided.

Pursuant to Section 156(2) of The City of Winnipeg Act, the approval of at least two-thirds majority of Council is required for the sale of property designated or acquired for park purposes.

The Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture concurred in the recommendation of the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee, and therefore recommends:

I. That the properties identified as Parcel A and Parcel B on Plan No. 20-97, and located at the northeast and northwest corners of Pandora Avenue East at Redonda Street, be declared surplus to the City's parks and recreation requirements, and be disposed of accordingly;

II. That the property identified as Parcel C on Plan No. 20-97, and located at the northeast corner of Pandora Avenue East at Redonda Street, not be declared surplus to the City's requirements, and be retained by the City of Winnipeg under the jurisdiction of the Parks and Recreation Department.

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

Copies of Plan Nos. 20-97, 20-97A, 20-97B and Misc. Plan No. 37C/85 are on file in the Office of the City Clerk.

The Executive Policy Committee recommends that recommendation I. be amended to read as follows:

I. That the properties identified as Parcel A and Parcel B on Plan No. 20-97, and located at the northeast and northwest corners of Pandora Avenue East at Redonda Street, be declared surplus to the City's parks and recreation requirements, with the sale of Parcel A and Parcel B for residential purposes only, i.e. "R1" or "R2" housing only, and be disposed of accordingly;

Moved by Councillor Timm-Rudolph,
Adoption of the clause.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

In amendment,

Moved by Deputy Mayor Eadie,
That the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee be adopted.

The amendment proposed by Executive Policy Committee was put and declared carried.

The motion for the adoption of the clause, as amended, was put and declared carried.

Concession Equipment Replacement Reserve Fund - Revision to the Criteria for Expenditures File PR-3 (Vol. 7)

70 - 4. The Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture has been advised that the Concession Equipment Replacement Reserve Fund (a component of the Parks and Recreation Reserve Fund) established by Council on January 26, 1995, presently limits expenditures to the purchase of new concession equipment and the replacement of old worn out or broken equipment.

The establishment of the Concession Equipment Replacement Reserve Fund has allowed the Parks and Recreation Department to replace broken down or unusable equipment during these past two years without disruption in the food service areas. However, the Department is unable to take advantage of opportunities which present themselves to increase sales and revenue through specific upgrades in the area of food services. By accessing funds from the Concession Equipment Replacement Reserve for improvement purposes as well, the Department would be able to proceed and obtain the benefits within a reasonable pay back time period.

By extending the current criteria for expenditures out of the Reserve Fund, it will also allow the Parks and Recreation Department to keep up with the changes in the food service industry with an ability to enhance the operation to present day standards. It is envisioned that funds would be used to create or upgrade patios and/or outdoor decks, outdoor furniture and basically any other requirement that would enhance the food service operations. These expenditures would continue to be subject to the approval of the Director of Parks and Recreation.

The Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture therefore recommends:

I. The criteria for expenditures from the Concession Equipment Replacement Reserve Fund be expanded to also permit enhancements to food service areas, and therefore read as follows:

That funds in the Concession Equipment Replacement Reserve be used to purchase new concession equipment, to replace old worn out or broken equipment, and to make improvements to enhance the food service areas of Parks and Recreation Department facilities.

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

Adopted by consent.

Community Incentive Grant Program - Kiwanis Homes of East Kildonan and Transcona Kiwanis Centre Inc. File PR-2.6(33) (Vol. 4)

71 - 5. The Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture has considered an application from the Kiwanis Homes of East Kildonan and Transcona Kiwanis Centre Inc. for a Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $2,318.16 towards the cost of installing a commercial grade (heavy duty) six foot high chain link fence, approximately 500 lineal feet in length, to delineate the Transcona Seniors Home property at 500 Widlake Street from the adjacent City-owned park property (Crocus Park).

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

The application does not meet the eligibility criteria contained in the Community Incentive Grant Program inasmuch as the organization, although non-profit, does not offer recreational services and the criteria outlines that the applicant is to be a non-profit community recreation and sport organization, or a non-profit organization offering recreation services. In addition, the project benefits only those homeowners who own property adjacent to the park, rather than benefitting the community-at-large as also outlined in the program criteria.

On October 14, 1997, the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee recommended that a Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $2,318.16 be approved to the Kiwanis Homes of East Kildonan and Transcona Kiwanis Centre Inc., for the purpose requested, and if required, the eligibility criteria be waived in this instance.

The Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture concurred in the recommendation of the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee, and therefore recommends:

I. That the following eligibility criteria for the Community Incentive Grant Program, be waived in this instance:

(a) The applicant is to be a non-profit community recreation and sport organization, or a non-profit organization offering recreation services;
(b) The project is to benefit the community-at-large and remain accessible to all members of the community.

II. And That a Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $2,318.16 be recommended for approval to the Kiwanis Homes of East Kildonan and Transcona Kiwanis Centre Inc., for the purpose requested, subject to the following conditions:

(a) Confirmation of other funding sources;
(b) Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the Director of Parks and Recreation; and
(c) The applicant entering into a formal agreement with the City of Winnipeg.

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

Adopted by consent.

Red Light Cameras - Strategic Traffic Safety Plan File GF-2 (Vol. 49)

72 - 6. On July 24, 1997, Council adopted Clause 10 of the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated July 11, 1997, approving the implementation of the concept of the red light cameras and rail crossing cameras. The said Clause outlined that the Winnipeg Police Service was to prepare and bring forward a strategic traffic safety plan, including a feasibility and cost benefit study, on the implementation of Image Capturing Enforcement Systems.

The Winnipeg Police Service has extensively researched the use of automated traffic enforcement technology or Image Capturing Enforcement Systems (ICES). These include speed cameras, red light cameras and rail crossing cameras. These ICES automatically photograph or record an image of a vehicle disobeying a traffic law.

Worldwide, this twenty five year old traffic enforcement technology has proven to be effective in reducing motor vehicle collisions and modifying driver behaviour. The reduction in collisions has translated into documented cost savings for insurance companies, health care systems, law enforcement and society in general.

In 1994, the Winnipeg Police Service recommended the City of Winnipeg request enabling legislation from the Manitoba Government for the use of ICES. This recommendation was approved by City Council and the request was conveyed to the Minister of Urban Affairs. The initial request was to allow for the use of speed cameras followed by a subsequent request to piggy back red light cameras on that request. The processing for both is identical except speed cameras are viable by themselves due to large numbers of violations, while red light cameras are not usually viable by themselves due to smaller numbers of violations.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

In March 1997, the Minister of Highways and Transportation confirmed the Government would be proceeding with the introduction of ICES legislation. The legislation would allow the use of red light cameras and rail crossing cameras, but would not permit the use of speed cameras. Law enforcement agencies were invited to participate in drafting the required legislation.

During the initial meetings of the legislation drafting committee, Winnipeg Police Service highlighted that red light cameras by themselves were not viable and the City would not endorse a traffic enforcement tool which is not self sufficient. This position was echoed by other law enforcement agencies. It was agreed any legislation, including the set fine structure, would need to ensure a full cost recovery of all operating expenses associated to red light enforcement.

On June 28, 1997, Bill 57, to amend The Highway Traffic Act and the Summary Convictions Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act, with respect to ICES, received Royal Assent.

In order to consider the financial implications of red light cameras (RLC) one must examine how these technological tools work and the process for issuing an offence notice. Although referred to as red light cameras, the camera is only one component of an integrated system.

The camera unit must be portable and is composed of a high-speed, high-quality camera and photographic flash, and a computer. The camera unit not only takes a photograph, but also records the date, time of day, time elapsed since the beginning of a red light phase, the time the vehicle entered the intersection, the time the vehicle was photographed and the speed of the vehicle. The camera and flash must be capable of producing clear images of vehicles under all weather and light conditions. The camera itself is housed in a bullet proof housing and placed on top of a special metal pole. The pole must be capable of being lowered to remove both camera and film. The camera is interfaced with existing traffic control light systems. The camera and the traffic control light system are connected to sensors which are buried in the pavement at the stop line of the intersection.

The system continuously monitors the traffic signal and the camera is activated by a vehicle passing over the sensors after the signal has turned red. Two photographs are taken, one as the vehicle enters the intersection and one as the vehicle proceeds through it. Exposed film and the stored computer information is regularly removed from the cameras and conveyed to an offence notice processing centre. The film is developed and the computer information is down loaded into a specialized computer program.

A sworn peace officer examines each photograph through a specialized viewer interfaced with the specialized computer software. The peace officer determines whether an offence was committed, confirms the license number is readable and accesses the Provincial registered owner data base. The photographs selected as evidence of a red light offence are then viewed by a second peace officer through similar equipment to allow for verification. Only after the second verification occurs is an offence notice printed and mailed to the registered owner of the vehicle. Archiving the photographs and the information must then be completed for future reference and availability for court purposes.

OPTIONS FOR ACQUISITION/IMPLEMENTATION OF RLCs

There are several vendors of ICES equipment in North America. Some vendors have developed both hardware and software for their system. Others have developed the hardware and joined with software companies for offence notice processing needs. All of the vendors are willing to supply ICES equipment on the basis of purchase or lease or on a contract basis. The preferred option is one of out-sourcing the RLC program to a private contractor.

During the introduction of photo enforcement to North America in the 1980's, most local governments chose either purchase or lease agreements with the vendors because of the availability of start up finances. Speed camera programs in Calgary and Edmonton were established in this manner. The City purchased all the equipment, hired personnel to manage the entire system, developed software and maintained everything.

During the 1990's the availability of finances for big ticket purchases has decreased. Both established and new photo enforcement operations are now choosing the out-sourcing option.

ICES out sourced operations work on a fee per paid ticket basis. The contractor supplies and installs all equipment, plus provides equipment maintenance and upgrades as needed at locations selected by police based on accident frequency. Only after the fine has been paid does the contractor receive payment. This arrangement allows for a violator funded traffic safety initiative. Edmonton Police Service recently changed from their original ownership operation of their speed camera program to an out-sourced operation. The benefits of an out-sourced operation are numerous:

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

1. Minimal start-up costs
2. Vendor has responsibility for human resources
3. No maintenance costs
4. Vendor provides latest technology and guarantees upgrades
5. No down time costs
6. Requires minimal Police involvement

The Winnipeg Police Service recommends strong consideration be given to out-sourcing the RLC program.

START UP AND OPERATING COSTS

Without exception all ICES traffic enforcement equipment is expensive to purchase and operate. Such initiatives require top grade cameras, secure installation, computer equipment, specific software, other associated processing equipment and trained, qualified people to operate it. The following will bring those costs into focus.

START UP

Camera and flash (one unit)	$90,000
Installation, single direction (four locations)	$100,000
Computer hardware, office equipment	$100,000
Offence notice processing software	$200,000
1 camera, 4 locations Total	$490,000
2 cameras, 8 locations Total	$680,000
3 cameras, 12 locations Total	$870,000
4 cameras, 16 locations Total	$1,060,000

OPERATING (annual) WPS Operated RLC System

Clerk C (Special Constable)	$46,700
Clerk B (x 2) (Special Constable)	$83,400
Camera/Film Monitor (Commissionaire)	$25,500
Police Supervisor	$86,700
Facility expenses	$50,000
Office equipment, stationery, supplies	$15,000
Vehicle	$ 5,500
Summons service (offenders who do not respond)	$90,000
Total	$402,800

REVENUE ANALYSIS - FINE AND COURT COSTS

Bill 57 creates a two tier fine structure for red light offences. A red light offence observed by a Police Officer who personally issues an offence notice to the driver, retains the fine of $40.00 and court cost of $15.00, plus a convicted driver receives two demerit points on their license.

A red light conviction based on a RLC is assessed a fine of $100.00 and a court cost of $37.00. No demerit points will be assessed because the offence notice will be issued to the registered owner of the vehicle. It is believed that the increased fine should meet the need for cost recovery. The increased fine compensates for the lack of demerit points which serve as a significant deterrent to drivers who would otherwise re-offend.

When the Police Service issues an offence notice under The Highway Traffic Act, and after the offender is convicted, the Provincial Court forwards the fine to the City of Winnipeg. The Court Costs are retained by the Province. The City will receive $100.00 in revenue for all RLC offence conviction.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF OFFENCES

Projecting the number of RLC offences that would be issued in the City of Winnipeg is not a simple task. No other city in Canada has red light cameras and there are no suitable USA cities to compare with.

One method of projecting the volume of RLC offences for Winnipeg is to use a simple percentage calculation. During the initial research into speed cameras it was projected Winnipeg would generate between 150,000 and 200,000 speed camera offences annually. Information from other jurisdictions indicates RLC offences are usually about ten percent of speed camera offences. This calculation projects that the City could possibly issue between 15,000 and 20,000 RLC offences annually.

A second method of projecting RLC offence volumes for Winnipeg is to use our knowledge of the City and actual accident and offence statistics for a number of high risk intersections. It is projected that a RLC will photograph a minimum average of 12 offences daily times 365 days of the year, or in other words 4,380 tickets annually. This total would increase with the number of RLCs installed.

1 camera	@	4,380	=	4,380
2 cameras	@	4,380	=	8,760
3 cameras	@	4,380	=	13,140
4 cameras	@	4,380	=	17,520

During the introduction period of RLCs the actual number of offence notices issued per camera will be high. As the driving public becomes more aware of the enforcement the numbers will drop to a point where they will level out. This is the point where it is projected the 12 offences daily times 365 days of the year will occur. The objective in introducing RLCs to Winnipeg is to reduce the number of right angle collisions at intersections. The amount of that reduction will be the measurement of success.

In both examples there is an end result of between 15,000 to 20,000 offence notices issued by RLCs annually in Winnipeg. Therefore for the purposes of further calculations, 15,000 offence notices per year will be used in projecting revenues.

PROJECTED REVENUE

The City of Winnipeg will receive $100 per RLC conviction. Using the projection of 15,000 offence notices per year, the City would receive total annual revenues of $1.5 million.

Should an out sourced operation be chosen, it is believed the contractor who would be expecting a minimum $60 fee per paid ticket. This is comparable to current RLC operations in the USA (after dollar conversion). Total monies to be paid to the contractor on 15,000 convictions would be $900,000, leaving the City with $600,000 of the revenue.

It is estimated up to 40% of the registered owners will not respond to the initial summons mailed, therefore Police will be committed, by virtue of the Summary Convictions Act, to serving a summons in person. This adds an additional cost of about $15 to the cost of the offence process. Estimated annual cost for serving these additional summons would be $90,000.

This would provide the City with $510,000 annual revenue from the operation of RLCs. Given that the figures used are conservative there is potential for additional revenue should the number of convictions be higher. However, should the reverse occur, where the RLC program is so successful that fewer offence notices are issued, there will be less revenue.

At this point in time it is suggested that any projections for City revenue from RLCs, after costs, should not exceed $500,000.

USE OF REVENUE

There is often the perception amongst the public that traffic enforcement is revenue driven. Automated traffic enforcement in particular is singled out as a cash grab for government. An out-sourced RLC operation may receive public criticism about a traffic enforcement initiative that is operated by a profit motivated corporation. The real purpose of RLC systems is to reduce collisions and injuries.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

Revenue generated from traffic enforcement is from fines assessed by the Province. The fines act as a deterrent to motorists. Although this revenue is placed into the general revenue of the municipal government, that same government is providing the funds necessary to operate the Police Service Traffic Division. In this way the traffic violator is funding traffic enforcement.

The reality of a fee per paid ticket out-sourced operation is that the company holding the contract must produce a quality product to ensure court convictions. Therefore it becomes a very efficient enforcement tool or the selected vendor could loose money. This keeps the private company attentive to their own performance and provides the public with City streets that are safer for everyone.

The objective of any traffic enforcement, regular or ICES, is to reduce the number of persons who disobey traffic laws which cause collisions. Right angle collisions at Winnipeg intersections for 1996 totalled $91 million in related costs which include medical care, property damage, lost production, and pain and suffering. Any reduction of this type of collision through RLCs will translate into a reduction of the related costs. If the introduction of RLCs provides a 5% reduction in these collisions City wide, the public would save $4.5 million in one year. The small amount of actual revenue that may be generated does not even compare to the actual collision savings for the citizens of Winnipeg. The Winnipeg Police Service strongly supports the idea of revenues from the implementation of RLCs being specifically directed into other traffic safety initiatives to help remove the stigma of being a cash grab for the City. There are a number of traffic safety initiatives waiting for funding. The RLC funds could provide the additional traffic safety resources the public has requested of the Winnipeg Police Service.

SITE SELECTION

The goal of a RLC program is to reduce the number of motorists who disobey red traffic lights. Through issuance of traffic offence notices police hope to modify the behaviour of those motorists so they stop for all red lights in the City, not just the ones with RLC installations. Critical to the entire RLC initiative will be determining which intersections should be monitored by RLCs.

Site selection for RLC installations must be determined through careful analysis of traffic volume, incidence of red light running, engineering information, collision data including injury and fatality data, and the cause of the collisions.

Recently the Alberta Transport Minister expressed concern that speed camera programs within Alberta were only targeting locations that generated high revenue. The Alberta Minister was concerned that if such practises were in place it was detracting from the goal of photo enforcement and gave credibility to claims that it was only a government cash grab. If this was occurring the Minister promised to put a stop to such action through legislation.

The Winnipeg Police Service is examining the issue of site selection and will develop the necessary criteria for identifying suitable intersections for RLCs.

COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

Enforcement of The Highway Traffic Act sections through ICES technology is, and has been, a sensitive matter. The Winnipeg Police Service will continue to keep the entire issue focused on the goal of traffic safety and the benefits to the public. The issue of revenue has always been acknowledged but only as a deterrent to those who might commit offences.

The Winnipeg Police Service has identified red light infractions as a specific traffic enforcement concern facing the City of Winnipeg. An automated enforcement tool is available to deal with the problem both efficiently and cost effectively, and that has been the basis of all communications to date.

Other jurisdictions have chosen large glitzy and expensive media campaigns to introduce a twenty five year old traffic enforcement tool. In most cases the media and the opponents to such enforcement have focused on the issue of revenue instead of traffic safety. Often too many stakeholders promoting too many messages have caused unnecessary focus on revenue and costs instead of safety benefits to the taxpayer.

Feedback from reliable sources across Canada and the USA indicate a traffic safety focus has proven to be a very effective communication tool for keeping the entire implementation of RLCs at the community level. Manitoba Highways and Transportation and the other Police agencies support the Winnipeg Police Service as a leader for providing clear and informed communication about RLCs in Manitoba.

The Winnipeg Police Service recommends the continuation with this style of communication on the RLCs. Officers from the ICES team can provide a briefing if required.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated November 3, 1997

IMPLEMENTATION TIME LINE

The Winnipeg Police Service has discussed this matter both with other jurisdictions and various vendors. Most agree an ICES can be operational six to eight months after a Request for Proposal is issued. Most agree rushing to meet deadlines may result in poor product choices. This has been proven by what has transpired in British Columbia with their speed camera program.

The Winnipeg Police Service is ready to proceed on this traffic safety initiative upon approval of this plan. Some further research will be required before drafting a RFP.

On November 3, 1997, the Chief of Police indicated the Police Service's preference that the revenues from the implementation of Red Light Cameras be specifically directed to other traffic safety initiatives, rather than directed to the General Revenue Fund as recommended by the Board of Commissioners.

The Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture therefore recommends:

I. That the Winnipeg Police Service and the Corporate Finance Department be authorized to do all things necessary to call for proposals for the implementation, management and maintenance of four Red Light Camera systems at sixteen locations.

II. That revenues from the implementation of Red Light Cameras be directed to other traffic safety initiatives.

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

Adopted by consent.

(See Minute No. 66 for opposition recorded by Councillor Golden)

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Thomas,
Seconded by Councillor Vandal,

73 - WHEREAS Community Clubs are City of Winnipeg facilities run by community boards;

AND WHEREAS the recreational programming which occurs at these facilities is solely a matter between the city, the respective community club and the residents of the area;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg Minor Hockey Association is attempting to dictate programming to community clubs, by demanding that East Elmwood Community Club, Melrose Community Club, Chalmers Community Club and Kelvin Community Club suspend their free intramural hockey program for six and under or they will cancel all Winnipeg Minor Hockey paid registrations for other age groups out of these clubs;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Council of the City of Winnipeg go on record as supporting their community clubs and their right to determine recreational programming in their centres to meet the needs of area residents;

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Council send a letter to the Winnipeg Minor Hockey Association, Sport Manitoba, The Honorable Eric Stefanson, Provincial Minister responsible for sport demanding that Winnipeg Minor Hockey Association rescind their directive to these clubs and allow these clubs to continue to determine their own recreational programming needs unfettered by outside organizations such as the W.M.H.A. and their Canadian Amateur Hockey Association from whom this directive originated.

The Speaker ruled automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, in accordance with Rule 16.1 of the Procedure By-law.

Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services - Motions (continued)

Moved by Councillor Thomas,

That the rule be suspended to allow consideration of the motion at this time.

Carried.

The motion was put and declared carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

74 - On motion of Councillor O'Shaughnessy, the following by-laws were read a first, second and third time, the rule being suspended for the third reading of each by-law, and were passed and ordered to be signed and sealed, namely:-

By-law No. 7118/97, a by-law of The City of Winnipeg to amend the Amusement Tax By-law No. 3107/81. File FL-6 (Vol. 16)

By-law No. 7119/97, a by-law of The City of Winnipeg to amend By-law No. 2443/79 being The Pound By-law. File EL-4 (Vol. 27)

Councillors Golden and Murray asked to be recorded as having voted against all three readings of By-law Nos. 7118/97 and 7119/97, in accordance with Rule 50.7 of the Procedure By-law.