REPORT OF THE

COMMITTEE ON WORKS AND OPERATIONS

DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 1997

Restoration of various Retained Earnings Accounts utilizing year end surplus in General Revenue Fund File FT-1(Vol. 5)

1093 - ***Note: Clause 6 has been laid over by the Executive Policy Committee and referred to the Administration for report back.***

Laid over by the Executive Policy Committee and referred to the Administration for report back

REPORT OF THE

COMMITTEE ON WORKS AND OPERATIONS

DATED OCTOBER 7, 1997

On motion of Councillor Clement, the Report of the Committee on Works and Operations, dated October 7, 1997, was considered clause by clause.

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

Carried.

Review of the Handi-Transit Service Policy
File TT-1.3 (Vol. 11)

1094 - 1. Council on November 20, 1996, passed the following motion in connection with the approval of the Additional Appropriation for the purpose of addressing Handi-Transit demands for service to the end of 1996, namely:

> *AND THAT the Committee on Works and Operations be directed to review the Handi-Transit Policy with the express view of creating a system for the "truly handicapped" including an appropriate level of funding and a secondary system for "others who have special transit needs".*

On December 3, 1996, the Committee on Works and Operations considered the above motion and referred same with instruction to the Administration and the Handi-Transit Policy Advisory Committee to consult with the various user groups and report back to Committee.

On February 26, 1997, the Committee on Works and Operations apprised Council that the consultative process was underway and a final report would be forthcoming. Council granted a 60-day extension of time in which to report back relative to the above motion.

On April 15, 1997, the Committee on Works and Operations considered a report dated April 3, 1997, from the Director of Transit entitled "Review of Handi-Transit Service Policy" and concurred in the recommendation that the Handi-Transit Policy Advisory Committee be requested to review and comment on the service delivery options outlined therein, intended to address the issues identified in Council's resolution.

On April 30, 1997, the Committee on Works and Operations apprised Council that a review by the Handi-Transit Policy Advisory Committee on service delivery options proposed by the Transit Administration and alternatives discussed by the Operations Advisory Committee, was underway. Council granted a further 90-day extension of time in which to report back.

On June 10, 1997, the Committee on Works and Operations was advised by the Chairperson of the Handi-Transit Advisory Committee that a review of the options proposed by the Transit Department had been completed, in response to Council's motion of November 20, 1996, and submitted their proposed policies on registration / eligibility criteria and a priority system for Handi-Transit service.

The Handi-Transit Advisory Committee consulted extensively with the disabled community and has spent considerable time in developing these policies. It is the opinion of the Handi-Transit Advisory Committee that by defining eligibility criteria carefully, any abuse of the system will be minimized. The criteria being proposed responds to the functional limitations caused by the design of the buses and placement of bus stops within the public transportation system, which approach has been agreed to by the community. The phrase "truly handicapped" used in the motion is interpreted as being handicapped by the design, such as having to step up 14 inches or walk to a bus stop.

Report of the Committee on Works and Operations dated October 7, 1997

The trip priority system proposed takes into account both the nature of public transportation and financial limitations to respond to all needs. The Handi-Transit Advisory Committee has advised that the community is generally supportive of this approach. It is intended that the proposed policies outlined in Schedules "A" and "B" attached, create a simplified and more equitable system which should be easily understood and implemented by both consumers and Administration.

Committee referred the report from the Handi-Transit Policy Advisory Committee outlining its proposed changes to the registration/eligibility for Handi-Transit Service and the trip priority system to the Administration for report back,

On September 9, 1997, the Committee on Works and Operations considered a further report from the Director of Transit outlining therein the Administration's comments to the policy changes proposed by the Handi-Transit Policy Advisory Committee, namely:

Registration/Eligibility Policy

The Transit Department advised that it supports the changes to the registration and eligibility policies proposed by the Handi-Transit Policy Advisory Committee, as outlined on Schedule "A".

In conjunction with the proposed changes, the Transit Department feels that an initial registration fee should be charged to cover some of the additional costs associated with the new registration process, maintaining the registration list, and providing regular mail-outs to registrants. The issue of charging a registration fee was considered by the Policy Advisory Committee in its review, but was rejected because of the negative feedback from some of the participants at the public meeting that was held to hear comments regarding the proposed policy changes.

Unlike the regular transit system, the Handi-Transit system is restricted to only those persons who are eligible to use this specialized service. Users of the regular transit service do not have to complete any registration forms or pay any registration fees. However, fees are charged to specific user groups who are eligible for special fare concessions. Anyone wishing to obtain a Winnipeg Transit senior citizen or high school student photo identification card has to pay a fee of $3.00. This fee covers some of the processing/material costs associated with the card. The requirement to control the use of the Handi-Transit service through a registration system involves staff time to process and maintain the registration files (this work load will increase with the proposed registration system), the use of a computer system to store and provide access to this information for service operational functions, materials such as identification cards and envelopes, and additional postage expenses. A one-time initial registration fee of $5.00 would cover some of these costs and would be consistent with the senior citizen/high school student identification card fee which, overall, involves less work than the Handi-Transit registration process.

Trip Priority System Policy

The alternative service delivery options outlined in the April 3, 1997, report entitled "Review of Handi-Transit Service Policy" are not consistent with the trip priority system proposed by the Handi-Transit Policy Advisory Committee which visualizes a much greater number of trips being classified as high priority than is currently the case. Expanding the work trip definition to include volunteer work, the medical trip definition to include therapy, and allocating service to all other purpose trips on a "first come, first serve basis" would significantly restrict the options available to address the issues identified in Council's resolution.

The changes to the trip priority system proposed by the Policy Advisory Committee, were reviewed by the Handi-Transit Operations Advisory Committee. This Committee, comprised of Handi-Transit users, has been functioning since the start of Handi-Transit in 1977 and provides the Transit Department with advice on system operational matters and assistance in resolving policy interpretation issues and is involved in the application of sensitive policies such as the "no show" policy. The Policy Advisory Committee envisions that the Operations Advisory Committee would be actively involved in the application of the proposed trip priority policy, including the resolution of controversial and politically sensitive issues. For example, this Committee would be asked to determine if the purpose of a particular trip should be classed as "volunteer work" or as a lower priority "other" purpose trip. It is the opinion of the Administration that the proposed trip priority system will result in considerable conflict and customer dissatisfaction and will be difficult to administer.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated October 7, 1997

The Operations Advisory Committee was particularly concerned with the "first come, first serve" service allocation policy proposed for all non-work/medical trips. The current system gives higher priority to certain trips in the "other" purpose category deemed to be of greater importance to the customer. A trip priority system that would give one customer a trip to a shopping mall while turning down another customer wishing to visit a family member in a hospital, because the person going to the shopping mall called first, cannot be considered as an equitable way of delivering a service that is facing increasing demands and limited budget. A "first come, first serve" (actually means "first call, first service") provides persons who have access to current communication technology with a greater advantage in getting Handi-Transit service than other users of the system.

At their June meeting, the Handi-Transit Operations Advisory Committee discussed the following alternative to the current trip priority system:

1. work and education trips
2. medical (including Doctor prescribed therapy) trips
3. volunteer work trips involving confirmation from a recognized organization/institute
4. "other" purpose trips similar to the current system

On September 9, 1997, after deliberation, the Committee on Works and Operations concurred in Recommendations 1. and 2. of the report of the Director of Transit, dated August 14, 1997, namely:

1. That the policy on registration/eligibility criteria proposed by the Handi-Transit Policy Advisory Committee be adopted, as outlined on Schedule "A".

2. That all current Handi-Transit users be required to-re-register under the new eligibility criteria on the anniversary of their birth date.

Committee laid over Recommendation 3., that a one-time initial registration fee of $5 be charged to all Handi-Transit users when they register under the new eligibility criteria and registration process, in order for the Administration and the Handi-Transit Policy Advisory Committee to report on the implementation of the registration process, details of the proposed application form, and manner in which the policy would be implemented by health care practitioners, and further, that the said report include details on the education process to ensure comprehension of the policy by health care practitioners.

Committee deferred consideration of Recommendations 4. and 5., dealing with the proposed trip priority system as outlined on Schedule "B", the alternatives discussed by the Operations Advisory Committee, and the alternative service delivery options outlined in the April 3, 1997, report from the Director of Transit, pending receipt of a further report from the Administration on the one-time initial registration fee.

As requested, the Handi-Transit Policy Advisory Committee discussed the issues raised and submitted the following comments to the Committee on Works and Operations at its meeting held on October 7, 1997, namely:-

1. As per the $5.00 initial fee, this was proposed to the community and rejected through the public meeting and correspondence to their Committee.

2. As to a process to educate health practitioners, the Advisory Committee feels very strongly that the wording of the criteria, which will be on the application form, precludes such an education process. Defining the functional requirements was proposed to clearly articulate the criteria removing questionable circumstances from practitioners discretion.

3. As to issues related to trip priorities, the approaches offered from the Transit Department and the Operations Advisory Committee have been discussed, and it is the feeling of the Policy Advisory Committee that those approaches create opportunities for unfair value judgments to be made on the purpose of trips. The solution proposed was not developed in isolation from proposals from these other sources, and was developed pursuant to extensive consultation with the affected community. The Advisory Committee remains committed to the policy as proposed, and feels it most adequately reflects the community, and in its opinion, is a fair and equitable use of resources.

In response to Committee's request the Administration further advised that the eligibility criteria and registration process approved by the Committee on Works and Operations at their September 9, 1997, meeting will be introduced effective January 1, 1998. All new applicants, and all current Handi-Transit users who will be required

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated October 7, 1997

to re-register on the anniversary of their birth date, will have to complete a new registration form. This registration form will incorporate the new eligibility criteria and will reflect the form design/content guidelines suggested by the Policy Advisory Committee which is as follows: plain language, easy to complete, questions asking for personal information will be accompanied with reasons why this information is being solicited.

The new registration form is to be completed and certified by a medical doctor, nurse, physiotherapist, occupational therapist, or other accredited health care or rehabilitation professional. The new form will include questions regarding the following:

- *requires the use of a wheelchair or scooter - yes or no*
- *is not consistently able to step up or down a 35 centimetre (14 inch) step unassisted (the height of the first step from the ground of a regular transit bus) - yes or no*
- *is not consistently able to walk 175 metres (575 feet) outside unassisted (approximate distance between 2 bus stops) in winter or throughout the year within a reasonable period of time - yes or no*
- *has 20/200 vision or less - (legally blind) - yes or no*

The registration form currently used can only be certified by a medical doctor. The question related to eligibility is as follows:

Is the applicant able to use regular public transit considering his/her disability?

The response to this question is subject to a fairly wide range of interpretations. Since the start of Handi-Transit in 1977, there has been an ongoing effort to inform/educate the doctors regarding the mandate for Handi-Transit and what this eligibility question actually means. The major service expansion that has occurred over the past 8 years has generated a continued growth in new registrations. In the past, a limited number of doctors were involved in the Handi-Transit registration process, and the majority of persons registering were wheelchair users. However, the number of doctors not familiar with the Handi-Transit system has increased in recent years in conjunction with the growth in number of ambulatory users eligible to use Handi-Transit. This has made it increasingly difficult to maintain effective channels of communication with all of the doctors involved in the registration process.

One of the objectives of the new eligibility/registration system was to make the eligibility criteria very clear and definable. The Policy Advisory Committee addressed this issue and devoted a great deal of thought and effort to the development of the specific eligibility criteria. Although the number of professions has now increased with the new registration system, the questions related to the eligibility criteria are less subject to individual interpretation or misunderstanding by the person completing the registration form. The form will be accompanied with a brochure which outlines the mandate for Handi-Transit and provides a general description about this transportation system. It is the opinion of the Transit Department that a more extensive education/information campaign directed at the persons who will be completing the registration forms is not warranted at this time.

Implementing the new eligibility/registration system will be a major undertaking that will require additional manpower and financial resources. It is estimated that there will be approximately 15,000 persons re-registering during the first 12 months in addition to new registrations (the normal rate is 2,000 to 2,500 per year). A breakdown of the approximate additional cost is:

Clerical	$35,000
Materials	$18,500
Postage	$19,000
Computer	$ 4,000
TOTAL	$76,500
COST PER REGISTRATION	$5.10

There are no provisions in the current budget to absorb these additional costs. Current workloads do not allow for any shifting of duties without impacting the current level of service provided to customers. The Transit Department recommends that the $5.00 fee be charged to cover the costs to implement and maintain the new eligibility/registration system.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated October 7, 1997

The Committee on Works and Operations recommends:

I. That the policy on registration/eligibility criteria proposed by the Handi-Transit Policy Advisory Committee be adopted as outlined in Schedule "A".

II. That all current Handi-Transit users be required to re-register under the new eligibility criteria on the anniversary of their birth date.

III. That a one-time initial registration fee of $5 not be charged to Handi-Transit users when they register under the new eligibility criteria and registration process, and the additional costs associated with the implementation and administration of the new registration system be included in the l998 Current Estimates for the Transit Department.

IV. That changes to the trip priority system be referred to the Administration for development of criteria, for consideration following completion of the re-registration process and assessment of the impact of the new eligibility criteria and registration process on the demand for Handi-Transit Service.

V. 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.

Local Improvements for Wastewater Sewers in the Victoria Crescent Area
File SL(1997) (Vol. 1)

1095 - 2. The Committee on Works and Operations has been advised that in August of 1996, Mr. Mike McDonald, a resident of Victoria Grove, approached the City with a request to install a low pressure sewer system in Victoria Grove and in Victoria Crescent, between Delmar Street and Lotus Lane.

In a letter dated March 21, 1991, the Water and Waste Department turned down a similar proposal from I.D. Engineering Canada who suggested installing a low pressure sewer system in the Victoria Crescent area. The suggestion was deemed unacceptable as it did not meet the Department's standard criteria for wastewater service.

In December of 1991, the property owners in Victoria Grove and in Victoria Crescent, between Delmar Street and Lotus Lane, successfully petitioned 60.4% in favour of the installation of a gravity wastewater sewer fronting their properties. However, because the area is low in elevation, a lift station and forcemain is also required, at an estimated cost of $300,000 in 1997 dollars.

On February 26, 1992, Council approved Capital Budget funding in the amount of $226,000 for the construction of a wastewater sewer lift station to serve the area. However, Council, upon recommendation from Executive Policy Committee and in response to a development application, added the following note to the approval: "*Cost of this project is to be recovered from developer and property owners."* When the Developer and the property owners were advised of the financial implications to them, they decided not to pursue the installation of wastewater sewers. The $226,000 is still included in the Capital Budget for construction of the lift station.

In May of 1997, during spring flooding, problems were experienced with the septic fields in the Victoria Crescent area.

The Victoria Crescent area is a Plan Winnipeg Neighbourhood Policy Area that does not have a City wastewater sewer system as outlined in Schedule "A". There are approximately 76 existing properties in the area without City sewer. Some have total retention system pump out tanks and the rest have septic fields as a means of sewage disposal and it is known that there are at least two special connections to the City's wastewater sewer system. The lots containing septic fields vary in size from 0.48 acre to 1.30 acres. Recent proposed amendments to The Sewer Utility By-Law will require minimum 2 acre lot sizes for septic fields.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated October 7, 1997

During the spring flood of 1997, the septic field systems in the Victoria Crescent area became saturated and ceased to function because of high ground water levels. Following a brief forced evacuation of the area because of flooding concerns, water service was turned off to residents on the outside of Victoria Crescent and Victoria Row to minimize septic field usage during the flood. Residents were advised not to use their in-house plumbing, and portable toilets were provided to the neighbourhood. Water service was shut off for 10 to 12 days during the flood peak. It was also noted during the flood that the septic fields and/or overflow piping at a number of locations created breaches in the City's Primary Dyke. This left the neighbourhood vulnerable to flooding. Potential surface water contamination, and the possibility of direct sewage discharge to the Red River was also noted. Administrative staff on flood duty, the Emergency Operations Centre (EOC), the Water and Waste Department Laboratory Services Branch, and the City/private Geotechnical Emergency Response Team (GERT) spent many hours monitoring and providing recommendations relating to the septic field systems in the Victoria Crescent area during and after the flood. This would not have been such an intense area of concern if a regular City sewer system was in place.

The low pressure sewer system has been proposed by one of the residents as an alternative to the total retention system pump-out holding tanks that would otherwise be used for sewage disposal in Victoria Grove, until such time that a conventional sewer system is installed.

The low pressure sewer system could be considered a special connection in the context of The Sewer Utility By-Law. However, it is the opinion of the Water and Waste Department that the project exceeds the scope of a special connection because of the length of the system and the potential number of homes that would be connected to it. Historically the special connection provision has only been used to permit single connections to the City sewer system.

The proposed system would consist of a small diameter pressure pipe extending approximately 500 metres (1,500 feet) in the public right-of-way with potentially 10 to 12 individual pressurized house connections made to the common line. Essentially this would be a privately owned sewer system constructed in two blocks of public right-of-way. While this type of system is technically feasible and is quite common in small communities outside the City, it is not used within the City. The City's standard method of providing wastewater sewer service is by a combination of gravity sewers, lift stations and forcemains. The standard method of servicing can be applied to the Victoria Crescent area as well, subject to successful advertisement and Council approval for installation of sewers by local improvement, and subject to Capital funding approval for construction of a lift station.

The requested special connection via a low pressure sewer system is proposed to eventually service 10 to 12 homes in Victoria Grove. It should be noted that a conventional gravity/lift station sewer system will eventually have to be built to service the approximately 100 potential homes in the Victoria Crescent area. This would make the proposed private system redundant. The private system would physically encumber the right-of-way in which the future gravity sewer will be installed and it may also confuse the future local improvement process whereby a number of people will have already paid their frontage rate as a special connection. Some may become displeased with the level of service and maintenance required to the private system and insist that the gravity sewer be installed anyway.

The proponents would have to enter into an agreement with the City outlining responsibilities for construction and maintenance of the private sewer system in the public right-of-way. The property owners would be wholly responsible for their individual connections and as well, would be jointly responsible for the pressure pipe to be installed in the public right-of-way. In addition to paying their $38/frontage foot special connection levy, each homeowner would be required to purchase, operate and maintain a grinder pump and pressure pipe system for their home in perpetuity, or until a gravity sewer is installed. Responsibility for the special connections would have to be transferred to new owners with any change in ownership of the land.

To summarize, the Water and Waste Department is not in favour of this special connection because of the long distances involved, the multiple parties and the generally higher level of maintenance required that the City and the residents would not have to put up with otherwise.

Funding for any successfully advertised wastewater sewers would have to come from the 1999 Capital Estimates local improvements budget unless surplus funds from cancelled or completed local improvement projects are identified earlier.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated October 7, 1997

Authorization must be given to construct a lift station before wastewater sewers can be installed in the Victoria Crescent area. As information, lift stations are considered part of the Sewer Utility regional infrastructure and are therefore typically paid for by the Utility. For example, lift stations have been constructed in Cloutier Drive, Parkwood Place, and rue Des Trappistes and paid for by the Utility. These were infill areas not unlike the Victoria Crescent area.

The 1997 estimated cost of the lift station and forcemain is $300,000 including all overheads and engineering. $226,000 is already identified in the 1992 Capital Estimates for the lift station so an additional $74,000 appropriation would be required. It is recommended that additional funding be provided by approval of the use of surplus borrowing authority in the amount of $74,000 from the SEWPCC Screening Operation Upgrade Project (Account No. 44 118112 5195031201).

Alternatively, the additional funding required for the lift station could be included for Council's consideration through the 1998 Capital Estimates approval process.

On September 15, 1997, the Riel Community Committee considered this matter together with a memorandum from the Supervisor of Local Improvements and Miscellaneous Revenue, advising that a "Petition For" in regards to the construction of a wastewater sewer in Victoria Grove from Victoria Crescent to Belfast Street has been received, and recommended the following, namely:

1. That the Administration be authorized to advertise the installation of wastewater sewers by local improvement in the following streets:

    i) In Victoria Grove
    ii) In Victoria Crescent between Delmar Street and Lotus Lane
    iii) In Victoria Crescent between Victoria Grove and Victoria Row
    iv) In Victoria Crescent between Victoria Row and Ferry Road
    v) In Victoria Crescent between Ferry Road and Delmar Street
    vi) In Delmar Street
    vii) In Victoria Crescent between Delmar Street and St. Vital Road
    viii) In Victoria Row
    ix) In Belfast Street fronting Parcel B, Plan 26,219

2. That the August, 1996 resident request to install a low pressure sewer system in Victoria Grove and in Victoria Crescent between Delmar Street and Lotus Lane be denied.

3. That the construction of a wastewater sewer in Victoria Grove from Victoria Crescent to Belfast Street be proceeded with.

The Committee on Works and Operations recommends:

I. That Council rescind its February 26, 1992, condition that the cost of the lift station required in conjunction with the wastewater sewers be recovered from (the) developer and (the) property owners.

II. That Council authorize $300,000 in funds to construct the lift station using the $226,000 that is already available from the 1992 Capital Estimates and authorizing the transfer of surplus borrowing authority in the amount of $74,000 from the SEWPCC Screening Operation Upgrade Project (Account No. 44 118112 5195031201) to this project.

III. That the August of 1996 resident request to install a low pressure sewer system in Victoria Grove and in Victoria Crescent between Delmar Street and Lotus Lane be denied.

IV. That the Local Improvement Project for the construction of a wastewater sewer in Victoria Grove from Victoria Crescent to Belfast Street be proceeded with, to be funded from Cumulative Project Surpluses in the total amount of $57,000.00.

V. 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.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated October 7, 1997

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

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

Adopted by consent.

Lane Lighting Local Improvement Project - On the lane in the block bounded by Arby Bay and McKay Avenue File SL(1997)(Vol. 1)

1096 - 3. The Committee on Works and Operations has been advised that a "Petition For" has been received by the Supervisor of Local Improvements in regards to a Local Improvement Project for lane lighting on the lane in the block bound by Arby Bay and McKay Avenue.

On September 16, 1997, the East Kildonan - Transcona Community Committee recommended that this Local Improvement Project be proceeded with.

The Committee on Works and Operations therefore recommends:

I. That the Local Improvement Project for lane lighting on the lane in the block bounded by Arby Bay and McKay Avenue, be approved to be funded from Cumulative Project Surpluses in the total amount of $500.00.

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 implement the foregoing, including the execution of any documents related hereto.

Adopted by consent.

Amendment to The City of Winnipeg Traffic By-law No. 1573/77 (Portage Avenue Crossing of Omand's Creek Weight Restriction) File ST-5.2 (Vol. 24)

1097 - 4. The Committee on Works and Operations has been advised that the Portage Avenue crossing of Omand's Creek was rebuilt in 1996 and is now capable of carrying a maximum gross vehicle weight of 62,500 kilograms. For these reasons, there is no longer any need to limit the maximum gross vehicle weight of a vehicle on this structure to 36,500 kilograms as is currently the case.

Implementation of this recommendation will recognize the higher structural standard to which this new structure has been constructed and will provide the trucking industry with greater flexibility in the use of the City's Truck Route system.

The Committee on Works and Operations recommends:

I. That The City of Winnipeg Traffic By-law No. 1573/77 be amended by deleting the following portion of Schedule 6 shown in italics:

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated October 7, 1997

SCHEDULE 6

Waterway Crossings and Overpasses Upon Which Gross Vehicle Weights are Limited to 36,500 kilograms, Pursuant to Section 47(f) of the Traffic By-law.

A. On Truck Routes:

(8) Portage Avenue also commonly known as Route 85 and Highway 1 crossing of Omand's Creek.

II. That the Manager of Legal Services be requested to prepare the necessary amending by-law for submission to Council for approval.

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

Adopted by consent.

Review of Snow Clearing Issues
Files ST-5.2 (Vol. 24) & GC-7 (Vol. 27)

1098 - 5. On October 7, 1997, the Committee on Works and Operations considered a report dated October 1, 1997, from the Commissioner of Works and Operations, relative to the above mentioned matter. After deliberation, Committee passed the following motion to amend the City Policy on Snow and Ice Control and submits same to Council for approval, namely:

That the snowfall accumulation requirement for plowing on residential streets be reduced from 15 cm to 10 cm in order to provide an increased level of service.

Adopted by consent.

COMMITTEE ON WORKS AND OPERATIONS

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Thomas,
Seconded by Councillor Murray,

1099 - WHEREAS city streets are in a dirty and unsightly condition from various debris, soil and leaf matter;

AND WHEREAS it is important that the City of Winnipeg not create a hazard for sewer and catchment blockage and the possibility for liability for surface flooding of residents;

AND WHEREAS fall street cleaning is a preventative action that will preempt expenditures in the spring by Water and Waste;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the $80,000 for fall street cleaning be reinstated into the budget for fall of 1997 and the Streets and Transportation Department be notified to commence cleaning when appropriate.

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

The motion to suspend the rule was put.

The Speaker called for the yeas and nays, which were as follows:-

Yea: Councillors Lubosch, Murray, Thomas and Vandal. 4

Nay: Councillors Prystanski, Clement, Lazarenko, O'Shaughnessy, Phillips, Silva, Her Worship Mayor Thompson and Councillor Angus. 8

and the motion to suspend the rule was declared lost.

COMMITTEE ON WORKS AND OPERATIONS

CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

1100 - On motion of Councillor Clement, By-law No. 7101/97, a by-law of The City of Winnipeg to amend By-law No. 1573/77, being The City of Winnipeg Traffic By-law, was read a first, second and third time, the rule being suspended for the third reading, and was passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.
File ST-5.2 (Vol. 24)

COMMITTEE ON WORKS AND OPERATIONS

QUESTION PERIOD

1101 - Councillor Phillips referred to residential street sewer drainage problems and requested that the possibility of having a catchbasin screen installed in the late Fall to catch debris and allow water to flow properly in the Spring be explored.

Councillor Clement advised that the cost would be astronomical and noted that the type of debris that gets into the sewer lines moves quite well with the flow of the water and does not create problems.

Councillor Phillips asked Councillor Clement if he would have any problems with her placing a window screen behind catch basin slots in the Fall to catch debris for removal in the Spring.

The Speaker advised that such action would not be recommended.

Councillor Murray requested that Councillor Clement ensure that areas by the curbs be cleaned out to prevent water build up and the potential for ice formation on the street.

Councillor Clement suggested that Water and Waste Department would respond directly to any Ward Councillor complaint of a specific blockage, and noted the difficulties in sweeping streets at this time of year.

Councillor Murray asked Councillor Clement to obtain from the Streets and Transportation Department a list of the areas that traditionally have had drainage problems and suggested that the Committee on Works and Operations should review and make appropriate changes to the policy to reflect the deletion of funds and the issue of problematic areas.

Councillor Clement noted that the policy was still in place and that a policy review was not required at the present time because the accounts deleted by the 1997 deficit avoidance plan are fully funded in 1998.

The Speaker called Councillor Vandal to the Chair and left the Chamber.

Councillor Thomas questioned the amount of funding available for spot cleaning, and asked for clarification of the policy.

Councillor Clement confirmed that funding was not available for street sweeping but noted that there was probably some latitude in maintenance accounts. Councillor Clement noted that upon adjournment of the Council meeting he would speak to the appropriate Department Heads about dealing with some of the areas in question.

The Acting Deputy Speaker called the Deputy Speaker, Councillor Prystanski, to the Chair in order to participate in the debate.

Councillor Thomas questioned if street sweeping could be done in some areas.

Councillor Clement replied that there was no money in the street sweeping budget but advised that he would look at alternative ways to deal with the situation.

Councillor Phillips questioned if it would be more cost effective for the City to approach residents to act as street foot patrols to man the curb sewers in return for a reduction in taxes.

Councillor Clement responded in the negative and advised that the City does not have the legislated power to reduce individual property taxes. He further noted that there are a variety of ways that residents employ to remedy the problem.

Councillor Phillips referred to a hypothetical situation whereby a property owner decided not to cut the boulevard section of their lawn and questioned if the resident could call the City to have it cut.

Councillor Clement noted that if the City cut the boulevard it would forward a bill for the service to the resident.