**Submitted:** Mon, 10/20/2025 - 11:47

# Delegation information

**Committee you want to address**
Executive Policy Committee

**Agenda item you want to address (number and title)**
Route 90 Improvements – Taylor Avenue to Ness Avenue Value for Money Study Findings and Next Steps – Purchasing Ref No. 783-2025

**Support or oppose recommendations**
I am opposed to the recommendations

**Register as a delegation_checkbox**
Register as a delegation

**Register as a delegation**
Via zoom

**Submit comments in writing checkbox**
Submit comments in writing

**Comments**
Mayor Gillingham, and members of Executive Policy Committee,

I am writing in opposition to the recommendations. Here's why:

The original report provided a questionable estimate of benefits versus the cost of the project, and that picture has only worsened in the update that's before you. At the October 7, 2025 meeting of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works, written submissions by Mel Marginet and Cyril Li succinctly and powerfully argued against the approval of this project. The benefit-cost factor has fallen from 1.17 to 1.06. We're likely many months from you putting ceremonial shovels in the ground, yet the benefits have already fallen, while the costs have risen dramatically.

With time, the complexities of a major infrastructure project, contingencies, and inflation, it's not unreasonable to believe the benefits will fall further. And I'm sure those around the table will recall the City Auditor examining the Waverley West Arterial Roads project, approved at $55 million but which cost $70 million to complete. That kind of margin of error or overspending here will put your project over a billion dollars.

Just as important as the benefit-cost ratio and cost, the City has failed to address the

concept of induced demand. In urbanist circles there’s a witticism to the effect of saying, “One more lane, dude, just one more lane, I promise.” Even the initial report didn’t project a lasting or even considerable impact on commute times. Will we be back here a couple of years after completion, debating about "just one more lane"?

As an aside, I suppose to those engaged in construction and transportation, the issue of trees may be irrelevant. Your proposal will call for the killing of many, many mature, healthy trees that line Kenaston and capture carbon dioxide while providing shade to people walking or waiting for buses and beauty for all who see them.

I would argue, as many have, that the funds you are about to commit to this doubtful gamble would give a far greater return if diverted to the unfunded priorities councillors and residents actually want, and other major, unfunded projects including the Arlington Bridge replacement. Deflecting to the possibility of rail relocation there is a ruse; the cost to expropriate, remediate and relocate the rail yards would vastly overshadow the Kenaston estimate. And that's assuming CPKC would ever consent to its main line being detoured around the city, adding delays to its fast freight trains. A bridge will continue to be needed. In addition to Arlington, we also have the Louise and the Harry Lazarenko bridge on the horizon, both of which appear headed to the same fate of abandonment as Arlington, along with the people of the north end who deserve to be served by those three vital links.

I acknowledge and understand that you, Mayor, are compelled to advance this project as it was a major plank in your election campaign. However, it can be argued that only 27% of Winnipeggers endorsed your Kenaston plan. To obtain a stronger level of support for this project, I’d urge you to put the matter to a plebiscite. If that were to provide a mandate, then so be it. Nonetheless, people in the north part of the city would be that much more entitled to ask, "You've spent all these hundreds of millions in the south, Mr. Gillingham... what about us?"

The funds you are considering for this project will commit our children, grandchildren and many generations to pay for the building and maintenance of what many have labelled a boondoggle and a vanity project.

Please stop, reconsider, and obtain input from citizens as your predecessor did with a much smaller infrastructure proposal, opening Portage and Main to pedestrians. Thank you.

Steve West

## Public engagement (optional)

**I consent to being contacted to participate in potential public engagement related to this matter.**
Yes

## Personal information

**First name**
Steve

**Last name**
West