REPORT OF THE

COMMITTEE ON WORKS AND OPERATIONS

DATED SEPTEMBER 12, 1995

On motion of Councillor Duguid, the Report of the Committee on Works and Operations, dated September 12, 1995, was considered clause by clause.

Moved by Councillor Duguid,
That the Consent Agenda, Clauses 1,2,3,4 and 5, be adopted.

1150 - Pursuant to The Municipal Council Conflict of Interest Act, Councillor Boychuk advised that he would refrain from entering the discussion and from voting on Clause 4, because of a conflict with business interests, and left the Chamber.

The motion for the adoption of the Consent Agenda, Clauses 1,2,3,4 and 5 was put and declared carried.

Councillor Boychuk here returned to the Chamber.

Her Worship the Mayor and Councillors:

Five Foot Concrete Sidewalk on the West Side of Enfield Crescent from the First East-West Lane North of Goulet Street to Goulet Street - 1995 Local Improvement
File SL (1995) (Vol. 1)

1151 - 1. On September 12, 1995, the Committee on Works and Operations considered a favourable recommendation from the Riel Community Committee for the above-referenced local improvement which was advertised on April 28, 1995.

Petitions insufficiently signed against were received as a result of the portion of the City-owned property. Although 100 percent of the privately owned frontage opposed the proposed local improvement, petitioners against cannot attain the required 60 percent to defeat the improvement as only 16.55 percent of the assessable frontage is privately owned property.

The Administration advises that the property on the west side of the street will be assessed for the construction of this improvement. Inasmuch as there is an existing 24 foot approach, the actual sidewalk construction would be less than 120 feet, resulting in no cost to the private property owner. The Administration has expressed support for the subject sidewalk installation.

The Committee on Works and Operations therefore recommends:

I. That the 5 foot concrete sidewalk on the west side of Enfield Crescent from the first east-west lane north of Goulet Street to Goulet Street be proceeded with as a local improvement, and funds in the estimated amount of $4,000.00 be drawn from the 1995 Unused Borrowing Authority, Local Improvement Category.

II. That the City Solicitor/Manager of Legal Services be requested to prepare the necessary Local Improvement By-law in accordance with the foregoing and submit same directly to Council for approval.

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

Adopted by consent.

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated September 13, 1995

Proposed Installation of a Sidewalk on Ashworth Street between Woodydell Avenue and Brixford Crescent - 1995 Local Improvement

Files SC-3.12 (Vol. 12) and SL (1995) (Vol. 1)

1152 - 2. Your Committee on Works and Operations has been advised that a local improvement to install a sidewalk in the east side of Ashworth Street from the south line of Woodydell Avenue to the north line of Brixford Crescent was insufficiently petitioned against as a result of the portion of City-owned property. Although, 100 percent of the privately-owned property owners opposed the subject installation, petitioners cannot attain the required 60 percent to defeat the improvement as only 49.56 percent of the usable frontage is privately owned.

On March 13, 1995, the Riel Community Committee requested a report on the advisability of installing the sidewalk in the west side of Ashworth Street and on a proposal that would best serve the needs of the new school from a safety perspective including associated costs.

The location of the proposed installation of pedestrian sidewalk is the only section of sidewalk missing on the east side of Ashworth Street from the north of Meadowood Drive to the south at Compark Road as outlined on Appendix A. A new school is being constructed on the west side of Ashworth Street between Harlesden Drive and Nova Vista Drive. Inasmuch as the existing sidewalk is on the east side of Ashworth Street and the school is located near the southern end of Ashworth Street on the west side of the street, pedestrians must cross the street when commuting to school. Pedestrian crossing signage and lighting could be installed at the school entrance.

Two options may be considered for the installation of the proposed sidewalk in Ashworth Street between Woodydell Avenue and Brixford Crescent.

Option A

The required sidewalk could be installed on the west side of Ashworth Street between Woodydell Avenue and Brixford Crescent. On the west side of Ashworth Street, 65 percent of the property frontage is City-owned. More than likely, the property owners representing the remaining 35 percent would not be in favour of a sidewalk fronting or flanking their property.

A serious disadvantage of this option is that switching the sidewalk from the east side to the west side of Ashworth Street for one block would require pedestrians and school children in particular to cross Ashworth Street twice, once at either end of the block. These forced crossings of Ashworth Street, which is a bus route collector, would represent a significant traffic hazard to young pedestrians.

In addition, there is a strong possibility that during the summer months, school children may refuse to cross from the east side of Ashworth Street to the west side, preferring instead to walk on the grassed boulevard on the east side of Ashworth Street and on the street during the winter months.

Option B

Following the Community Committee meeting of March 13, 1995, the individual property owners on Ashworth Street between Woodydell Avenue and Brixford Crescent, who would have been assessed local improvement charges, were telephone canvassed to see if they objected to the sidewalk installation or paying for the sidewalk as a local improvement. Survey results indicated that 66 percent of the property owners would tolerate the installation of a sidewalk providing they were not assessed for it. Twenty-five percent responded negatively regardless of whether they were assessed, and 9 percent could not be reached for comment.

Constructing the sidewalk on the east side would result in a continuous sidewalk on Ashworth Street and pedestrians using the sidewalk would be required to cross Ashworth Street only once, directly in front of the school on the west side of Ashworth Street. On the negative side, property owners in this block might consider the installation as a diminution of the aesthetic value of their front yards even though the sidewalk is constructed on the boulevard portion of City property.

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated September 13, 1995

The Administration has expressed the view that Option B is considered to be the favourable option estimated to cost $25,000.00. Inasmuch as 100 percent of the privately-owned frontage petitioned against the project, the Administration has suggested that the installation be funded from cancellations and/or surpluses in local improvements with no assessment to the property owners, or alternatively, the installation be funded as a City-at-large expenditure.

On July 13, 1995, the Riel Community Committee heard representation in support and in opposition to the proposed installation of a sidewalk on the east side of Ashworth Street and, on the recommendation of its Resident's Advisory Group and District Engineer, recommended that the missing sidewalk on the east side of Ashworth Street between Woodydell Avenue and Brixford Crescent be installed so as to provide a continuous sidewalk for the use of the school children attending the new school on Ashworth Street. Community Committee also recommended that the subject installation be funded as a supplementary local improvement funded from cancellations and/or surpluses in the local improvement capital funds with no property owner assessments, or that the installation be funded as a City-at-large expenditure.

On September 12, 1995, the Committee on Works and Operations also heard representation from area residents in support of the installation for safety considerations of children attending the nearby school.

The Committee on Works and Operations therefore recommends:

I. That the installation of a sidewalk on the east side of Ashworth Street between Woodydell Avenue and Brixford Crescent be approved as a local improvement at an estimated cost of $25,000.00.

II. That the City Solicitor/Manager of Legal Services be requested to prepare the necessary Local Improvement By-law in accordance with the foregoing and submit same directly to Council for approval.

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

For the information of members of Council, the Committee on Works and Operations tabled a motion to fund the installation of the subject sidewalk from the City-at-large and requested the Administration to report back to its next meeting relative to a policy for City-at-large funding for the installation of sidewalks on collector streets.

Copy of attachment referred to in the above clause is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Adopted by consent.

Approval of Increased Funding for Nairn Avenue Combined Sewer Renewal Project
File WS-5 (Vol. 16)

1153 - 3. On May 17, 1995, Council adopted Clause 4 of the Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated May 4, 1995, relative to the 1995 Supplementary Nairn Avenue Combined Sewer, Water Main Renewal, namely:-

The Committee on Works and Operations has been advised that renewal of the following sewer and watermain projects at this location would avoid untimely and costly maintenance under the rehabilitated street, sidewalk and boulevard structures as they are aged and in varying degrees of deterioration. They fall within the proposed 1996 street improvements on Nairn Avenue between Grey Street and Panet Road.

Televised inspection of the monolithic concrete egg shaped 850 mm x 1275 mm combined sewer at Nairn Avenue from Grey Street to Panet Road indicates continuous deterioration of varying degrees. It is the opinion of the Administration that as the sewer was constructed in 1913 and forms the downstream end of the severely deteriorated Transcona Trunk Sewer which was renewed in Pandora Avenue in 1993, rehabilitation estimated at $1,500,000.00 be done by a trenchless method of relining to maintain the capacity.

The original estimate by the Operations Department was based on the use of a trenchless sewer relining methodology where past experience indicated that the method was less than the cost of the traditional open-cut installation methods.

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated September 13, 1995

The consultant, SEG Engineering Inc., has now completed a detailed engineering investigation and a preliminary design, and in reviewing alternatives to rehabilitating the existing 850 mm x 1275 mm concrete pipe, has estimated that the likelihood of trenchless costs for the sewer rehabilitation to be actually higher than the open-cut online alternative which requires excavation and replacement of the existing sewer. An estimated cost of $2,952,600.00 is required for the project resulting in an estimated shortfall of $1,452,600.00. However, actual costs and the final methodology are unknown until tenders have closed.

Another factor contributing to the extensive cost variance is the requirement of an inclusion of restoration and realignment of one lane of pavement in the restoration of the open-cut installation. Other factors of note include an original estimate which was overly optimistic and a need to recognize increasing trends in current costs of construction.

Given the severity of the shortfall, other options were evaluated which included project phasing over two years, re-examining engineering options and evaluating additional sources of funding.

The consultant evaluated the strategy of open-cut renewal of some 1,200 lineal metres of the system that was deemed most vulnerable to short-term failure with a view towards addressing the remaining system in subsequent years when normal funding could be allocated and a lining method could be employed. This produced estimated costs of $2,166,000.00 and $1,355,000.00 for the initial and subsequent phases respectively for a total cost of $3,521,000.00. This phasing would also require supplementary funding authorization for the work involved, therefore, this staging alternative is not considered to be favourable.

A secondary review of the preliminary design options identified an online renewal alternative to the traditional open-cut method wherein the old sewer is replaced on a section-by-section basis on the same alignment. Although shutting down local servicing for short periods, this method avoids a significant cost component ($1/4 million) of structurally stabilizing the abandoned sewer and is the alternative now recommended at a total estimated cost of $2,952,600.00.

The renewal will be phased block by block enabling localized traffic management to be carried out in a manner which will minimize the impact on both the local businesses and traffic disruption. The total funding for the project is $2,955,000.00 with funds in the amount of $1,500,000.00 approved by Council on May 17, 1995. Funds in the amount of $360,693.00 are available in the Combined Sewer Renewal Reserve with the remaining $1,094,307.00 in the Wastewater Sewer Renewal Reserve.

The Wastewater Sewer Renewal Reserve will have a remaining balance of $385,992.00 for 1995 contingencies.

The Committee on Works and Operations therefore recommends:-

I. That additional funding for the renewal of the combined sewer on Nairn Avenue from Panet Road to Grey Street be drawn from the current balance within the Combined Sewer Renewal Reserve in the amount of $360,693.00 and from the Wastewater Sewer Renewal Reserve in the amount of $1,094,307.00.

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

Adopted by consent.

Local Passenger Transportation Service - Proposed Agreements Under Sub-Section 573(2) of The City of Winnipeg Act
File GL-5.1 (Vol. 43) c/r TT (Vol.3)

1154 - 4. The Committee on Works and Operations has been advised that with certain exceptions, Section 573(1) of The City of Winnipeg Act provides that no person other than the City shall operate a local passenger transportation service within the City. Subsection 573(2) provides that the City may make an agreement with any person whereby that person will operate a local passenger transportation service of such kind, and in such part of the City as is specified in the agreement.

Two companies in Winnipeg, Arrow Wheelchair Transportation Inc. and Kiddie Shuttle Inc., have demonstrated a desire to operate local passenger transportation services within Winnipeg.

Commencing in 1994, three companies began offering a flat fare, local transportation service, primarily for pre-school age children. In September, the City Solicitor advised all three companies in writing that they appeared to be in

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated September 13, 1995

contravention of Section 573(1) of The Act. As a result, discussions have been ongoing to conclude Agreements for subsequent Council approval. Only agreements with Arrow Wheelchair Transportation Inc. and Kiddie Shuttle Inc. have been concluded. The third company, Safe Ride Winnipeg, appears to no longer be operating.

The proposed Agreements, prepared by the Law Department with input from the Transit Department, contain provisions which will effectively preclude direct competition for Winnipeg Transit's passenger and revenue base. The services shall be limited to children eight years of age or younger or anyone who, regardless of age, is unable to use Transit service because of a physical or mental disability. In addition, the service must be door to door and a minimum one-way fare charge of $3.00 per person is applicable.

The Agreements are subject to the approval, authority and supervision of the Motor Carrier Board or the Public Utilities Board.

The Agreements commence on January 1, 1995 and end on December 31, 1995 with provision to extend them for a further two years.

The Committee on Works and Operations therefore recommends:-

I. That the Agreements between the City of Winnipeg and Arrow Wheelchair Transportation Inc. (Appendix A) and Kiddie Shuttle Inc. (Appendix B) for purposes of allowing a local passenger transportation service be approved.

II. That the Commissioner of Works and Operations be authorized to execute the extensions contained in the agreements if deemed appropriate.

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

Copy of attachments referred to in the above clause are on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Adopted by Consent.

(See Minute No. 1150 for disclosure of conflict by Councillor Boychuk)

Changes to Capital Program - Sewage Disposal File WS (Vol. 5)

1155 - 5. Your Committee on Works and Operations has been advised that subsequent to extensive public hearings in late 1991 and early 1992, the Clean Environment Commission (CEC), in a report dated June 1992, recommended water quality objectives for the Red and Assiniboine River. The recommendations called for the City to disinfect effluents from the wastewater treatment plants and carry out studies to address ammonia and combined sewer overflows (CSOs). The recommendations were adopted by the Province of Manitoba on November 19, 1993.

The recommendations of the CEC included that the City conduct ammonia studies and CSO studies to be ready for July, 1997, with public hearings to be scheduled within six months thereafter. At the hearings the City had requested time to do these studies before action on ammonia objectives or CSOs. Accordingly, the City concurred with these recommendations and has budgeted for the studies. The studies will provide important information on the benefits of potentially large expenditures, in the hundreds of millions of dollars, of improving river quality in and downstream of Winnipeg. The CSO study is well underway. The ammonia study has not yet been completely defined.

A major recommendation of the Commission was water quality objectives that require disinfection of the City's wastewater effluents. The City has long been criticized by environmental groups for not disinfecting its wastewater effluent. The City argued at the hearing that, based on scientific risk assessment, the health benefits were small compared to the $15 to $20 million cost. This position was previously approved. In terms of financial planning, the Administration advises that they recognized that the Province intends to require disinfection. Accordingly, the Department did budget for disinfection, albeit toward the end of the five year period to defer debt load on the utility.

The next step in the process is licensing of each of the three Water Pollution Control Centres. Although the capital budget included funds for disinfection, the Department had planned to argue once again that disinfection should not

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated September 13, 1995

be included in the licenses, because of the costs and limited benefits. In effect, the plan was to repeat the arguments made at length during the first public hearings. It is clear from discussions with Manitoba Environment that disinfection of effluents is a high priority of the government, and a second round of hearings will not change the opinion of the Clean Environment Commission or the result.

In addition, disinfection has benefits to the City, not directly associated with tangible health benefits, as follows.

1. Disinfection addresses a long term citizen, public and media criticism of the City's pollution control efforts.
2. It will increase the pride and satisfaction of staff who operate the plants in their work and the resulting effluent quality.
3. It will increase the credibility of the City's efforts to address ammonia and CSOs.

A factor in the above policy shift is the cooperation of Manitoba Environment, and specifically their recognition of the City's financial constraints in the sewer utility. In recent discussions with Manitoba Environment, they have indicated that they want disinfection to proceed faster than shown in the capital budget. However, accepting the fiscal constraints on the utility, they are willing to see the ammonia and CSO studies delayed or prolonged in order to achieve this. Negotiations took place to produce a modified budget plan as outlined in Table 1 and designated as Appendix A. The changes are summarized as follows:

1. The total capital budget is not materially changed. Only the priority of spending is changed.
2. Disinfection of the SEWPCC is advanced from 1998 to 1996.
3. Disinfection of the WEWPCC is advanced from 1998 to 1996, 1997 and 1998.
4. The timing of disinfection of the NEWPCC is not changed, scheduled to start in 1999.
5. Some of the ammonia funding already approved is used for the SEWPCC disinfection. One million dollars is left in the ammonia project to begin data collection. The rest of the ammonia study funding is delayed until 1998, when funds were previously in the budget for the SEWPCC.
6. One million dollars is transferred from the previously approved capital for CSO Strategy/Mitigation to disinfection. This should not affect the progress of this study as per revised schedules.
7. Funding for the CSO study is reduced dramatically in later years to allow for the increased cost of Ultraviolet (UV) light instead of chlorine as explained below.

The plan meets the needs of Manitoba Environment to advance disinfection as contained in the communication from the Assistant Deputy Minister, Manitoba Environment dated April 3, 1995. The plan meets the fiscal need of the City not to introduce or accelerate spending in wastewater. It addresses the recommendations of the CEC earlier than planned, addressing a long standing criticism and allows disinfection to proceed starting with the SEWPCC, where the most benefit can be achieved for the rivers within Winnipeg. In addition, it stages the works so that the things learned at the SEWPCC can be incorporated into designs at the WEWPCC and eventually at the largest installation being the NEWPCC.

Accordingly, the Administration recommends that the above transfers be approved, subject to advancement of waste water disinfection to the 1996 Capital Budget. This would involve the transfer of previously approved borrowing authority for up to 1995. The Department advises the changes for 1996 and beyond are included in the Departmental submission of the 1996 capital estimates and forecast.

It should be noted that the previous capital budgets for disinfection at the three plants totals $13.81 million. These estimates were based on the use of chlorine for disinfection. An emerging technology for disinfection is ultraviolet light (UV) disinfection. UV disinfection is rapidly becoming the preferred technology because of concerns with chlorine as an environmentally harmful chemical. Accordingly, the new budgets total $23.904 million.

The Committee on Works and Operations therefore recommends:-

I. That, conditional upon advancement of waste water disinfection to the 1996 Capital budget, the following approved (1995 and earlier) borrowing authority be transferred to disinfection at the South End Water Pollution Control Centre (SEWPCC):

   (a) Transfer $1,261,000 in capital borrowing authority from disinfection at the North End Water Pollution Control Centre (NEWPCC).

   (b) Transfer $1,500,000 in capital borrowing authority from ammonia/nitrification studies. Transfer $1,000,000 capital borrowing authority from Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Strategy/Mitigation.

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated September 13, 1995

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

Adopted by consent.

(See Minute No. 1157 for attachment)

COMMITTEE ON WORKS AND OPERATIONS

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,
Seconded by Councillor Duguid,
1156 - BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg By-law No. 5058/88, the Sewer Utility By-law, be amended to provide for special appeals to the Standing Committee on Works and Operations regarding construction and approval of sewage systems, particularly in cases where flexibility is required, and where it can be demonstrated that there is no impact to planning, health, or the environment;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the decision of the appeal be delegated to the Standing Committee on Works and Operations as final authority.

The Speaker ruled automatic referral to the Committee on Works and Operations, in accordance with Rule 16.1 of the Procedure By-law.

Moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,
That the rule be suspended to allow consideration of the motion at this time.

Carried.

The motion was put and declared carried.

1157 - Appendix "A" referred to in Clause 5 of the Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated September 12, 1995

TABLE 1
Proposed Changes to Capital Budgets

1995 and 1996-2000 Capital Forecast - As Approved

Capital Budget	Previously Approved to 1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
Disinfection NEWPCC	$1,394				$6,480		$7,874
Disinfection SEWPCC	$810			$3,000			$3,810
Disinfection WEWPCC	$520			$1,750			$2,270
Ammonia/Nitrification	$2,531	$500					$3,031
CSO Strategy/Mitigation	$6,370	$1,500	$1,000	$1,000	$5,000	$5,000	$19,870
Total	$11,625	$2,000	$1,000	$5,750	$11,480	$5,000	$36,855

Capital Budget - Modifications Discussed With MB Environment

Capital Budget	Previously Approved to 1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
Disinfection NEWPCC	$133 -$1,261				$6,480	$8,520	$15,133
Disinfection SEWPCC	$4,571 +$3,761	$950 +$950		$0 -$3000			$5,521
Disinfection WEWPCC	$520	$750 +$750	$1,000 +$1,000	$980 -$770			$3,250
Ammonia/Nitrification	$1,031 -$1,500	$0 -$500		$2,000 +$2,000			$3,031
CSO Strategy/Mitigation	$5,370 $-1,000	$0 -$1,500	$750 $250	$1,000	$1,000 -$4,000	$1,000 -$4,000	$9,120
Total	$11,625	$1,700	$1,750	$3,980	$7,480	$9,520	$36,055

COMMITTEE ON WORKS AND OPERATIONS

CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

1158 - On motion of Councillor Duguid, 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. 6689/95, a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to widen Chalmers Avenue between Watt and Raleigh Streets. File DAO 16/93

By-law No. 6690/95, a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to authorize the undertaking of certain local improvements during the year 1995. File SL (1995) (Vol. 1)

By-law No. 6691/95, a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to amend By-law No. 1481/77, being The City of Winnipeg Streets By-law. File ST-5.3 (Vol. 5)

By-law No. 6692/95, a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to amend By-law No. 6546/95, being a by-law of the said City to regulate the construction, maintenance and removal of private approaches and private walks. File SC-1 (Vol. 40)

By-law No. 6693/95, a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to amend By-law No. 6546/95, being a by-law of the said City to regulate the construction, maintenance and removal of private approaches and private walks. File SB-19 (Vol. 2)

By-law No. 6694/95, a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to amend By-law No. 6548/95, being a by-law to regulate traffic on certain streets during periods of transportation emergency occasioned by the fall or drifting of snow. File SB-19 (Vol. 2)

By-law No. 6695/95, a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to amend By-law No. 1573/77, being The City of Winnipeg Traffic By-law. File SB-19 (Vol. 2)

On motion of Councillor Duguid, the rule was suspended and 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. 6708/95, a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to authorize the undertaking of certain local improvements during the year 1995. File SL (Vol. 1)

By-law No. 6709/95, a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to widen the northeast corner of Portage Avenue and Sturgeon Road. File DAO 4/93