REPORT OF THE

COMMITTEE ON WORKS AND OPERATIONS

DATED NOVEMBER 29, 1994

On motion of Councillor Duguid, the Report of the Committee on Works and Operations, dated November 29, 1994, was considered clause by clause.

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

Councillor Clement requested that Clauses 2 and 3 be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

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

Her Worship the Mayor and Councillors:

Local Improvement - Lane Lighting in the Lane bounded by Ringel Avenue, Manley Avenue, Bentley Street and Walsall Street
File SL(1994) (Vol. 1)

286 - 1. The Committee on Works and Operations has been advised that on October 4, 1994, the North West District Operations received an informal petition or Application for Local Improvement for the proposed lane lighting project from Mr. Ronald Machinski, a resident of Ringel Avenue.

The Administration has subsequently advised that pursuant to Section 632(1) of The City of Winnipeg Act, the proposed Local Improvement has been successfully "petitioned for", representing 83.86 percent of the total assessable frontage to be benefited. Therefore, the construction of the local improvement can proceed in accordance with Section 362(2) of The City of Winnipeg Act.

The Administration further advises that sufficient funds are available in the 1994 Unused Capital Borrowing Authority from the Local Improvement category for the subject local improvement.

The Committee on Works and Operations has approved the proposal and recommends:-

I. That the local improvement project for lane lighting in the lane bounded by Ringel Avenue, Manley Avenue, Bentley Street and Walsall Street be added to the 1994 Local Improvement Program.

II. That funds in the amount of $2,000.00 for this project be funded from 1994 Unused Borrowing Authority from the local improvement category.

III. That the City Solicitor be instructed to prepare the necessary by-law for submission to Council.

IV. 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 November 29, 1994

Transit Bus Replacement Reserve Fund
File TE-1 (Vol. 6)

287 - 2. Your Committee on Works and Operations has been advised of a proposal to establish a Transit Bus Replacement Reserve Fund (hereinafter called the Reserve) for the purpose of providing financing for the replacement or major refurbishing of transit buses in a scheduled and pragmatic manner. The establishment of the Reserve will enable the Transit Department to budget for the replacement of transit buses within the annual operating budget rather than the capital budget. The long-term objective is that the Reserve will accumulate funds through annual surpluses which will be used to finance future bus requirements, thereby reducing reliance on the operating and capital budgets as sources of financing. As well, the Reserve would act as a stabilization fund for those years where the actual bus costs exceed that budgeted, inasmuch as surplus funds from other years could cover any shortfall.

The format and basic criteria for the proposed Reserve is based upon the City's Equipment Replacement Reserve Fund, established by Council on May 2, 1973. The purpose of the Equipment Replacement Reserve is to provide for the systematic replacement of equipment and to stabilize the effect on the annual budget, and it is because of this similarity that it was used as a model in developing the proposed Reserve.

The Transit Department, under the direction of the Director of Transit as "Fund Manager", will be responsible for the administration and operation of the Reserve and for ensuring that all budgets, statements, reports, and operating criteria are accurately compiled and complied with.

Contributions to the reserve for the replacement or major refurbishing of transit buses would be made through an annual appropriation from the Transit Operating budget. The total annual contribution will be based upon a pre-determined long range fleet bus replacement plan, which encompasses the following:

1) The useful life of transit buses, currently estimated at between 15 and 18 years.

2) The annual transit bus requirements based on the number of buses required in the fleet to meet the annual forecasted demand for service. This figure would be forecasted and projected annually to update the long range fleet plan.

3) The remaining useful life of existing transit buses within the fleet.

4) The replacement cost for transit buses shall include all costs that can be reasonably associated with the acquisition, including but not limited to, the unit price based on current market conditions, taxes, outfitting and preparation costs, overhead costs, and special subsidiary equipment costs.

Other contributions to the Reserve would include the receipts from the disposal of bus equipment, recoveries from bus equipment written off in insurance claims, and investment income from the monetary assets of the Reserve.

Replacements Chargeable to the Reserve

The replacement of transit buses shall be based upon a schedule of replacements maintained as part of the records of the Reserve, with the exception that the Director of Transit may defer or advance the schedule of replacement for one or more of the following reasons:

a) The transit bus becomes functionally obsolete;

b) Replacement transit buses are available that are technologically superior, resulting in lower operating costs, thereby substantiating an economical reason to replace buses;

c) The transit bus is written off due to damage resulting from an accident;

d) The transit bus is not functioning well and has not reached the end of its projected useful life;

e) A change in service levels requires a change to the annual program of replacements;

f) The transit bus has structurally deteriorated due to corrosion or other causes to the point where repair is financially unwarranted;

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated November 29, 1994

g) There is inadequate funding in the Reserve.

The procurement of transit buses in the approved Reserve budget by the Transit Department shall be made in accordance with current approved purchasing procedures with the withdrawal of funds less than or equal to the balance in the Transit Bus Replacement Reserve Fund.

Refurbishing Chargeable to the Reserve

Refurbishing of transit buses utilizing funds from the Reserve may be considered if:

a) The fleet size must be increased more rapidly;

b) The annual usage on the bus is less than anticipated resulting in economics in favour of refurbishing;

c) Where the useful life of the bus can be extended by half or more of the bus' normal life span as a result of refurbishing, and it is economically advantageous to undertake the refurbishing.

An evaluation shall be made on an annual basis for each bus within the bus fleet, which is 10 years of age or greater, include a description of the condition of each bus and serve as substantiation for the reserve acquisition. The record of evaluation shall be kept on file in the Transit Department.

The accounting for the Reserve shall include all necessary financial reports in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The Transit Department will have the primary responsibility for the reconciliation of the Reserve, and will provide suitable documentation to the Director of Corporate Finance.

A statement outlining the status of the Reserve shall be submitted for inclusion in each annual report for the transit utility, commencing with the last audited balance in the Reserve and concluding with the balance anticipated in the Reserve as of December 31 of the budget year.

Without limiting the foregoing, revenue (actual and estimated) shall include interest earned, proceeds from the sale of replaced or surplus buses and contributions from the Transit Department Operating Budget to the Reserve. Expenses (actual and estimated) shall include all replacement buses purchased or cost of refurbishing, and any other related expense.

A Reserve budget shall be prepared annually, listing all expenses and revenues expected to be incurred with respect to the operation of the Reserve for that year.

Disbursements from the Reserve are strictly limited to existing bus replacement and modification costs as approved in the current operating budget of the Transit Department. Requirements for new buses resulting from increased service levels and not previously included in the Reserve for replacement, are not to be purchased out of the Reserve and shall be budgeted for separately in the department's current operating or capital budgets within the appropriate year.

The Committee on Works and Operations therefore recommends:-

I. That the City establish a "Transit Bus Replacement Reserve Fund" to provide financing for the City share of the annual purchase cost of replacement transit buses.

II. That this fund be financed through an annual appropriation from the Transit Operating Budget.

III. That the Director of Transit be appointed as fund manager of the "Transit Bus Replacement Reserve Fund".

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

Moved by Councillor Duguid,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated November 29, 1994

Delegation of Powers of Traffic Authority
File ST-5 (Vol. 21)

288 - 3. On October 5, 1993, the Committee on Works and Operations established an Ad Hoc Committee on Traffic Regulations to address the issue of policy and delegation of authority relative to traffic regulation matters to local community areas.

Under Section 5(c) of Schedule A of the City of Winnipeg Organization By-law No. 4444/86, the Committee on Works and Operations is the Traffic Authority for the City of Winnipeg. Accordingly, all on-street regulations must be approved by the Committee on Works and Operations and in many cases processed through the applicable Community Committee.

The current process for the most trivial on street regulation requires an average of 60 working days to investigate, report and process through a Community Committee and subsequent approval of the Committee on Works and Operations. It is anticipated that this turnaround time could be reduced to an average of 15 days, and in some instances immediate response, if the powers of traffic authority were delegated to the Director of Streets and Transportation or his designate. Additionally, considerable administrative time would be saved through a reduction in the number of reports by the Streets and Transportation Department and the number of decision transmittals by the City Clerk's Department.

The Second Removed Principle adopted by Council underlines a desire to delegate as much authority as possible to provide, amongst other things, Quality Customer Service through empowerment of employees. The delegation of powers of traffic authority to the Director of Streets and Transportation or his designate will meet this objective.

Although it is proposed that all the powers of traffic authority be delegated to the Department Head or his designate, it must be emphasized that this authority would be initially exercised only with respect to the traffic matters outlined in Phase I. That is, through policy, all other traffic matters, including lane control, traffic signals, pedestrian corridors, speed limits, etc., would continue to be processed through the Committee on Works and Operations and/or Community Committees, as is currently the case.

To obtain uniformity in the application and use of traffic control devices and regulations, vocal self-interest groups or individuals should not be able to impose their wishes on the community. Traffic regulations, be they on major transportation corridors or local streets, frequently have negative side effects either at the location in question or elsewhere. Hence, good traffic management is an exercise in balancing the needs of competing groups of road users and or nearby residents.

The use and operation of the major transportation corridors, must be regulated by broad City policies and administered by some central authority that can apply these policies uniformly, balancing the needs of competing groups. Local streets on the other hand could be regulated in a manner that closely reflects the needs of the community. However, even at this level, various persons in an area will have differing perspectives. Thus, consensus must be obtained.

Consensus may be obtained by referendum or surveys of the affected motorists or the local elected representative could serve as a surrogate. However, in the majority of instances warrants/guidelines will also serve as a surrogate as they generally will reflect the needs of all users including the "silent majority".

Between these two extremes (major transportation corridors and local streets) are a myriad of situations wherein both local and City-wide perspectives should be considered. These perspectives can best be achieved through flexibility in the application of warrants/guidelines, recognizing special circumstances where appropriate.

PHASE I

It is proposed that all "minor traffic matters" be processed in a manner outlined on the traffic regulation process chart designated as Appendix "B". In general, these minor traffic matters include basic intersection control including stop/yield signs, loading zones (for the disabled or otherwise), parking/stopping prohibitions (corner clearances, obstructions within a curved portion of the roadway, on the approach to an intersection to bypass left turns, in advance of a crosswalk to improve sight visibility, and adjacent to schools during school hours to eliminate congestion and improve sight visibility), bus stops(new installations, removals or relocations), limited time parking, mid-block crosswalks, No Right/Left Turn on Red, and turn prohibitions.

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated November 29, 1994

The foregoing list of minor traffic matters is not intended to be all inclusive but rather representative of those kinds of matters that would be processed by the Administration in this manner.

In general, the least restrictive form of control that provides a safer, efficient and convenient transportation system should be provided. Within this context, the following guidelines are currently utilized and would continue to be utilized with delegation of authority.

a) stop sign control at a 3-way uncontrolled intersection
- *stop the stem of the "T" intersection*

b) stop sign control at a 4-way uncontrolled intersection
- *stop the minor flows approaching the intersection (with stop signs in the vast majority of cases always opposite each other)*

c) yield control
- *installed within a right turn cut-off*

d) loading zones (parking prohibitions) - normal length is 15 m

i) disabled
- *verification is required from a physician regarding the applicant's disability*

ii) regular
- *requested by a commercial/apartment property owner*

e) parking/stopping prohibitions

i) corner clearance
- *fifteen metres from an intersection is usually sufficient to eliminate interference with turning vehicles*

ii) within a curve
- *prohibiting stopping fifteen metres in advance of a curve, through the curve and for fifteen metres past the curve is usually sufficient to eliminate interference with vehicles manoeuvring through the curve in the roadway*

iii) approaching an intersection
- *fifteen metres is usually sufficient to enable through traffic to bypass delayed left turners; a longer distance will depend upon the queue length of delayed left turning vehicles*

iv) in advance of a crosswalk
- *fifteen metres is normally sufficient to improve driver-pedestrian sight visibility*

v) adjacent to schools during school hours
- *to enable student pick-up and drop-off without interfering with through traffic and to improve sight visibility adjacent to the school; the extent of such regulations is based upon the expressed needs of the school principal and other school/parent representatives*

f) bus stops
- *related to the Transit Department's requirements for service improvements or alterations*

g) limited time parking
- *based on the receipt of a majority supporting petition*

h) mid-block crosswalks
- *under ideal circumstances there should be sidewalks on both sides of the street and a pedestrian walkway connecting either end of a mid-block crosswalk; a public generator of some description (playground, school, etc.) should be present on one side of the street*

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated November 29, 1994

i) No Right Turn on Red
- *prohibited if*
  - *conflicting traffic movements resulting from multi-phase signal operation make right or left turns on red potentially hazardous*
  - *there are two lanes to turn right/left and drivers two abreast restrict visibility*
  - *there is inadequate visibility due to building locations and/or horizontal or vertical curvature*
  - *there is significant pedestrian activity downtown or where children are supervised by patrols to and from school*

j) turn prohibitions
- *intended to increase traffic capacity or reduce accidents*

k) multi-way stop control

Perhaps the most controversial issue is multi-way stops when proposed for the purposes of traffic calming. Currently the following criteria are used to recommend installations:

a) arterial/local or arterial/collector
- *stop signs on the arterial should only be used in very special circumstances as an accident countermeasure and then only as an interim measure prior to signalization*

b) collector/collector and collector/local
- *a minimum of 4,000 vehicles during 8 hours, with a minimum of 20% on the minor street; alternatively when more than 9 right-angle and or left turn with opposing through accidents have occurred in a 3 year period*

c) local/local
- *A minimum of 350 vehicles during the highest hour with a minimum of 20% on the minor street*

The warranting criteria indicated in the foregoing should continue to be utilized for intersection categories a) and b). However, it is obvious that the current criteria utilized for local/local intersections are generally not acceptable, particularly for the purposes of traffic calming. It is therefore proposed that multi-way stop control of intersections in categories a) and b) be included in Phase I, whereas intersections in category c) continue to be dealt with in accordance with the existing process and that the Administration develop revised criteria for approval at a future date.

In developing a new criteria for local/local intersections, consideration will be given to at least the following issues:

1. Should a systems approach be utilized wherein multi-way stops might be limited for example to alternate intersections?

2. Should certain types of local/local intersections not be eligible for multi-way stops, given the public backlash that is occurring in some areas?

3. What input should a resident have who lives at the far end of a Community, and whose only access is via the multi-way stop?

4. In terms of traffic calming, multi-way stops only have a positive effect within close proximity to the intersection.

5. Multi-way stops may increase accident experience where it is negligible to start with.

6. Should there be a petitioning process? If so, how far afield and on which approaches?

7. Are there viable alternative measures for traffic calming?

8. A proliferation of multi-way stops that are not warranted/acceptable to the Community, will inevitably lead to traffic intrusion on nearby streets.

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated November 29, 1994

9. Does it serve any useful purpose to expend scarce resources to obtain traffic counts at local/local intersections?

Controversial issues associated with such regulations would continue to be dealt with by way of resident surveys, meetings with the public and/or discussions with the area Councillor. Community Committees or individual Councillors would be advised of all requests and decisions respecting same.

Where the Streets and Transportation Department does not concur with a request for "minor" traffic regulations, the applicant will be advised in writing with a copy sent to the area Councillor for information in the event that the decision should be appealed. Appeals would be dealt with in the manner shown on the "Proposed Process Chart", wherein the appeal process would be based upon the classification of the street which the request applied to, i.e., regional, collector or local.

PHASE II

At such time as there is a suitable degree of comfort by all concerned respecting the handling of minor traffic matters, consideration should then be given to processing major traffic matters such as traffic control signals, non-conforming private approaches, pedestrian corridors, parking meters, truck routes and speed limits in a more expeditious manner. Although the actual process would not be identical to that shown for Phase I, the intent of the process would be similar. Possible ways of processing these matters are outlined in Appendix "A". Revisions to several by-laws would be required to implement the suggested Phase II changes.

The Committee on Works and Operations therefore recommends:-

I. That the Administration develop new criteria for multi-way stop control at local/local street intersections.

II. That the Law Department be directed to do those things necessary, including revisions to Schedule A of By-law 4444/86, to delegate the powers of traffic authority to the Director of Streets and Transportation or his designate.

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

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

Moved by Councillor Duguid,
Adoption of the clause.

Moved by Councillor Eadie,
That Rule 6.1 of the Procedure By-law be suspended to permit Council to continue in session without taking a recess over the lunch hour.

Carried.

The Deputy Speaker called Councillor Boychuk to the Chair and left the Chamber.

The Deputy Speaker returned to the Chamber and resumed the Chair.

In amendment,

Moved by Councillor Reese,
Seconded by Councillor Clement,
THAT Recommendation II. of the clause be amended to add the following words: "in consultation with the Ward Councillor".

The amendment was put and declared carried.

Councillor Boychuk asked to be recorded as having voted against the amendment, in accordance with Rule 50.7 of the Procedure By-law.

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated November 29, 1994

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

Councillor Boychuk asked to be recorded as having voted against the clause, as amended, in accordance with Rule 50.7 of the Procedure By-law.

Proposed Study of Winnipeg Gateway Cargo Container Port Initiative
File ST-7 (Vol. 12)

289 - 4. The Committee on Works and Operations has been advised that an initiative has recently commenced to examine undertaking a feasibility study to determine the viability of a multi-user intermodal cargo container port in Winnipeg, the recommendations of which could have implications on the Kenaston Boulevard Grade Separation Project.

The concept of examining the feasibility of a multi-user cargo container port in Winnipeg has considerable merit. If located on the periphery of Winnipeg, it could reduce the need for the movement of large "RTAC-type" trucks and other large semi-trailer vehicles to utilize the internal street system. This could result in a reduction of the impact on the load-bearing capacity of street and bridge systems which could delay or eliminate the need for major street and/or bridge rehabilitation works on the current urban arterial street system. In addition, reduction of the number of large semi-trailer vehicles on streets in Winnipeg would reduce safety, environmental and neighbourhood disturbance concerns.

The Streets and Transportation Department has advised that they are of the understanding that draft Terms of Reference for this study have been prepared by the Transportation Policy, Planning and Development Division of the Manitoba Department of Highways and Transportation, and that discussions have occurred and/or will be taking place shortly with public and private stakeholders including the railways, the City of Winnipeg, the Manitoba Infrastructure Council and Winnipeg 2000, given the potential benefits to both public and private stakeholders.

There are considerations relative to the time frame available to undertake the study. Inasmuch as CN has indicated support to undertake the study, the resulting recommendations may have implications to CN's future plans for the expansion of the Winnipeg Intermodal Terminal at Wilkes Avenue and Kenaston Boulevard, and as a consequence, a bearing on the discussions currently underway between CN and the City regarding property requirements for the Kenaston Boulevard Grade Separation Project, in particular, the issue of the closure of the Shaftesbury Boulevard level crossing and the right-of-way for Sterling Lyon Parkway.

The Kenaston Boulevard Grade Separation Project is funded as part of the Canada–Manitoba Infrastructure Agreement. Funding under this Agreement must be expended by March 31, 1997. In order to ensure that the funding deadline for the Kenaston Underpass Project is adhered to under the Canada–Manitoba Infrastructure Program, it will be necessary for the design process to commence no later than February 1, 1995. If the proposed study is not completed prior to that date, CN has indicated that they will be unable to conclude the portion of the property negotiations that relate to the Winnipeg Intermodal Terminal expansion, and as a consequence, will prevent the design process from proceeding.

The Committee on Works and Operations therefore recommends:-

I. That the City endorse the need to undertake a feasibility study to determine the viability of a multi-user intermodal cargo container port in Winnipeg.

II. That, if said study is to be undertaken, it be cost-shared among the public and private stakeholders.

III. That, in order to allow for the timely resolution of outstanding City/CN issues related to the Kenaston Boulevard Grade Separation, the study be completed by February 1, 1995 or alternatively, that the senior levels of government permit the time frame for completion of the Kenaston Boulevard Grade Separation Project under the Canada–Manitoba Infrastructure Program be extended by the time period required for the completion of the above-referenced study and for CN to subsequently develop a position on its Winnipeg Intermodal Terminal expansion plans.

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated November 29, 1994

IV. 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 delegated the matter of source of funding for the proposed study to the Board of Commissioners.

The Executive Policy Committee wishes to advise Council that the estimated cost of City involvement is approximately $12,000.00 - $14,000.00.

Adopted by consent.

Review of the Fine Associated with Trucks Travelling on Non-Truck Routes - Traffic By-law No. 1573/77
File ST-5.2 (Vol. 21)

290 - 5. On June 7, 1994, the Committee on Works and Operations considered a matter referred from the City Centre Community Committee relative to reviewing alternatives and options to address the problem of trucks travelling on non-truck routes, including a review of The Traffic By-law No. 1573/77 as it pertains to truck routing provisions. In this connection, the Administration advised that it is their opinion that the existing $75.00 fine is a sufficient deterrent to secure compliance with the truck routing provisions of the Traffic By-law and any increase in the fine may be perceived by the Courts as being too onerous.

Following review, the Committee on Works and Operations expressed the opinion that the matter was one of enforcement and referred it to the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture for comment relative to enforcement.

In response to a request by the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, the Administration advised that although The Highway Traffic Act provides for escalating fines for subsequent offences in certain specific areas, there is no provision for escalating fines for subsequent offences in respect of trucks travelling on non-truck routes. The Provincial Judges Court does, however, have the jurisdiction to assess higher fines for subsequent offences.

Presently, the minimum fine of $75.00 was validly set by Council by Sub-Section 53(2) of the Traffic By-law, whereby the owner of a vehicle who violates the provision relating to truck routes can be issued an Offense Notice calling for payment of a $75.00 fine or some other fine to be assessed by the Court.

The Administration has suggested that a practical solution might be for subsequent offences to be dealt with by the Provincial Courts whereby a heavier fine could be levied in view of prior convictions.

On October 13, 1994, the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture reviewed the matter and referred the following to the Committee on Works and Operations for favourable consideration, namely:

That Subsection 53(2) of The Traffic By-law No. 1573/77, outlining the penalty for an operator or owner of a vehicle who violates the provision relating to truck routes being issued an Offence Notice calling for payment of a minimum fine of $75.00, be amended to increase the minimum fine to $150.00.

On November 29, 1994, the Committee on Works and Operations concurred in the recommendation of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture and therefore recommends:-

I. That Subsection 53(2) of The Traffic By-law No. 1573/77, outlining the penalty for an operator or owner of a vehicle who violates the provision relating to truck routes being issued an Offence Notice calling for payment of a minimum fine of $75.00, be amended to increase the minimum fine to $150.00.

II. That the Acting City Solicitor be instructed to prepare the necessary amending by-law.

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.

COMMITTEE ON WORKS AND OPERATIONS

CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

291 - On motion of Councillor Duguid, By-law No. 6517/94, a By-law of the City of Winnipeg to close part of the north/south lane north of Sara Avenue and to open the east/west lane to Furby Street, was read a second and third time, and was passed and ordered to be signed and sealed. File DAOC 1/94

On motion of Councillor Duguid, By-law No. 6522/94, a By-law of the City of Winnipeg to close the existing public lane and to open a public lane, both south of Mountain Avenue between Main and Charles Streets, was read a first time. File DAOC 2/94

Councillor Duguid moved that this constitute the first reading of By-law No. 6522/94, which motion was carried.

On motion of Councillor Duguid, By-law No. 6538/94, a By-law of the City of Winnipeg to open a public lane north of rue Desautels, east of rue Des Meurons, 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 DAO 22/93

COMMITTEE ON WORKS AND OPERATIONS

QUESTION PERIOD

292 - Councillor Boychuk questioned why the hydro substation at The Forks site was being dismantled.

Councillor Duguid noted that he would look into the matter and report back to Council.

Councillor Golden noted that he had had meetings with personnel from both the Provincial Government and the City of Winnipeg on the matter of expanding the purpose of the Floodway to enhance the operations of the City's sewer system and questioned whether any further developments had occurred on the question of lowering the lip of the Floodway.

Councillor Duguid advised that the issue was currently being explored by both levels of government.

Councillor Golden questioned the time frame for completion of the negotiations.

Councillor Duguid took the question under advisement.

Councillor Golden noted that citizens had suggested utilization of the Floodway for the Pan American Games and questioned whether citizens will have the opportunity to meet with a committee of City and Provincial persons to explore cost effective uses for the Floodway.

Councillor Duguid took the question under advisement.