bikewinnipeg

**MORE PEOPLE BIKING**
**MORE OFTEN**

December 3, 2019

# Executive Policy Committee

**Re: Item #11 – 2020 Infrastructure Plan**

Dear Councillors,

As the 2020 Infrastructure Plan provides important guidance in your budgeting process. Through its prioritization of capital projects, the 2020 Infrastructure Plan has the potential to profoundly affect the development of the city, its ability to provide services, and its ability to meet policy goals.

Bike Winnipeg is concerned that critical pieces of the decision-making process, namely the criteria scoring matrix and the benefits portion of the cost/benefits ratio, have been left out of the 2002 Infrastructure Plan. The lack of this scoring matrix makes it nearly impossible to evaluate decisions that underlay the cost/benefit scores in the report, which serve as the basis for project prioritization. Similarly, the lack of any costed description makes it impossible to evaluate any benefits expected from the listed projects. For instance, are expected follow through costs factored into project cost/benefit scores? An example would be costing any required recreational facilities and park maintenance into the benefits/cost of a project viewed as enabling or as a prerequisite to any roadway project expected to proceed development in new communities.

A second major concern we have with the 2020 Infrastructure Plan report is that seems to be heavily weighted towards a status quo of maintaining current conditions. We are particularly concerned that projects that are aimed at improving levels of service to people on foot or bike, either on their own, or in addition to improved (or maintained) level of service for motorized vehicles may be classified as Enhancements rather than Maintenance projects. We feel that this essentially ignores recommendations in the Pedestrian and Cycling Standards, Sustainable Development, or Complete Communities Planning Documents to improve conditions for people on foot or bike, and in essence returns us to policies that existed prior to adoption of these strategies and policies. This has the potential to nullify those policies in favour of the very policies that have led us into the infrastructure deficit we now face. Bike Winnipeg argues that city policy has made a strong and unequivocal policy decision that all modes of transportation will be supported in the city's transportation network. The inclusion of waling and cycling improvements should be considered maintenance of level of service, not an enhancement of service.

As an example, the widening of St. Mary's between Marion and St. Anne's is classified as a project to Maintain service. However, the Fort-Rouge - McFadyen Walk/Bike Bridge is categorized as a project that Enhances Service. Given that Maintenance projects are weighted at 31% and Enhancement projects are weighted at 7% this greatly influences prioritization. Given that the Osborne Street Bridge does not provide a safe crossing of the Assiniboine River for anyone on a bike at the moment (the shoulder bike lane on Osborne – not that its actually marked as a bike lane – that does not actually extend all the way from Roslyn Rd to Assiniboine Ave), we would argue that failing to provide such a crossing is essentially failing to maintain a mandated level of service. Thus, we see the Fort-Rouge - McFadyen Walk/Bike Bridge project as a maintenance project, not a mere enhancement to service.

On the issue of cost/benefit ratios, we would like to point to the following observation to help illustrate our concern over the lack of any cost/benefit scoring matrix and benefits accounting in the 2020 Infrastructure Plan.

The cost/benefit ratio of the Chief Peguis Trail Extension West has gone from 1/15th the cost/benefit ratio of the Kenaston Widening project in 2015 to 1/4 the benefit in 2019 (see below). This is despite the fact that scoring criteria and weighting for the two ratio versions were very similar (see pages 16 and 8/9 of the 2015 and 2020 reports).

| | 2015 C/B Score | 2019 C/B Score |
|---|---|---|
| Chief Peguis Trail | 496.00 | 32.38 |
| Kenaston Widening | 32.00 | 7.66 |
| Chief Peguis/Kenaston | 15.50 | 4.23 |

The 2015 cost/benefit scores are from a council seminar on that years Building Canada Fund Application ( https://www.winnipeg.ca/infrastructure/pdfs/BuildingCanadaFundApplication.pdf ). The 2019 cost/benefit ratio is from the 2020 Infrastructure Plan (https://www.winnipeg.ca/infrastructure/infrastructure-plan.stm.

## Benefit Criteria

Winnipeg

| Category | Criteria | This project: | Examples | Weight |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Maintain Service* | *Maintaining Essential LOS* | *maintains the aspects of service as set down in existing legislation/regulation or with regard to public health* | *Safety of Public; HTA Compliance; Drinking Water* | 26% |
| Maintain Service | Maintaining Quality LOS | maintains the aspects of service as directed by current City Policies, Strategies etc | Maintains average time between bus service; provide recreation services | 13% |
| *Maintain Service* | *Maintaining Aesthetic LOS* | *Maintains aesthetic aspects of a service* | *Condition of existing streetscaping* | 6% |
| Enhance Service | Enhancing Quality LOS | enhances the aspects of service as directed by new City Policies, Strategies etc | Reduce travel time between points; reduce basement flooding incidents | 4% |
| *Enhance Service* | *Enhancing Aesthetic LOS* | *enhances aesthetic aspects of a service* | *New streetscaping; new decorative landscaping* | 1% |
| Regulatory | Regulatory Changes (Incl H&S, Enviro) | makes changes to the service to meet new regulatory requirements | New nutrient removal in wastewater; install new safety equipment | 26% |
| *Environmental* | *Enviro/Sustainability Improvement (Voluntary)* | *makes changes to the service to improve environmental/sustainability aspects* | *Reduce greenhouse gases; support active transportation* | 3% |
| Growth | Promoting the Economy/Enabling Growth of City | either supports business development or enables growth of City | Widening/extending major route; extend water supply to new development | 12% |
| *Savings* | *Operational Efficiency* | *replaces existing infrastructure to improve operational efficiency (spend to save)* | *Replace old pumps with new to improve performance and reduce electrical use* | 7% |
| Culture | Promoting Culture and Heritage | preserves and/or protects historic sites; maintains/creates performance venues | Develop stage in Wascana Park | 2% |

Cost/Benefit Weighting from March 2015 Council Seminar for Building Canada Fund Application

| Levels of Service (LOS) | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Description** | **Weightings** |
| **New Regulation** | Satisfies a NEW or MODIFIED regulatory/legal requirement | 31% |
| **Maintain Level of Service** | Maintains the level of service and addresses any underperforming assets | 31% |
| **Enhance Level of Service** | Delivers levels of service over and above target levels | 7% |
| **Strategic Alignment** | | |
| **Criteria** | **Description** | **Weightings** |
| **Environmental Sustainability** | Reduces negative environmental impact or enhances sustainability and resiliency | 7% |
| **Enables Growth** | Is a PREREQUISITE or ENABLER for growth to occur in areas of the city where development does not currently exist or is targeted for densification | 7% |
| **Economic Impact** | Enables job creation, business development and industry productivity | 7% |
| **Operational Efficiency / Revenue Generation** | Replaces or improves EXISTING infrastructure or processes to increase revenue and/or realize savings with on-going operational activities | 7% |
| **Culture/Heritage** | Preserves and/or protects historic sites; maintains/creates performance venues; includes artistic features | 3% |
| | **TOTAL:** | 100% |

Cost/Benefit Weighting from 2020 Infrastructure Plan

Other questions/comments I have are:

- Given that Public Transportation is heavily reliant on Local Active Transportation, it should really also be scored the same as Public Transportation. After all, if you cannot access public transportation, you do not have public transportation, and you need to walk to public transportation (and under our proposed system you'll likely need to bike to transit in many of the areas served by on-request or community service). At the least, we should be seeing regional active transportation ranked as high as regional roads and bridges.
- We are concerned that the Lagimodiere Twin Overpasses project does not include a grade separated walk/bike crossing of Lagimodiere as identified in the Pedestrian and Cycling Strategies (Callsbeck/Ravelstone/Lagimodiere Crossing[i]).
    - This would be an important connection between Transcona and Munroe East , especially the area around Concordia Hospital. It would avoid a significant detour north to cross the Keewatin tracks on Concordia, and would avoid conflicts with merge/diverge lanes that could not be avoided along Concordia Ave.

    - A Through-Pass at the southern end of the Lagimodiere Twin Bridges would provide a connection between:
    - West of Lagimodiere
        - Molson/Panet Bike Lanes
        - CPR Keewatin Rail with Trail (planned)
        - Kimbeley/Concordia Bikeway (planned)
    - East of Lagimodiere
        - CPR Keewatin Rail with Trail (planned)
        - Peguis St Pathway
        - Ravelstone/Transcona Blvd Bike Lanes (planned)



- A Through-Pass similar to the one begin built as part of the Fermor Ave Seine River Bridge should be included in the Lagimodiere Twin Bridges Rehabilitation Project.
- Options for a through-pass at Lagimodiere include a new through-pass along the Ravelstone right of way, similar to what is being done with the Fermor Ave Seine River Bridge rehabilitation project, or a pathway under the CPR Keewatin Bridge similar to what was built along the Bishop Grandin Greenway beneath the CN Letellier rail line.

- We're not sure why the planned Walk/Bike Bridge over the Red River between the U of M and South St. Vital has not been included in the 2020 Infrastructure Plan

Sincerely,

Mark Cohoe
Executive Director
Bike Winnipeg

**End Notes**

[i] Pages 178-179, Pedestrian and Cycling Strategies, City of Winnipeg, 2015