REPORT OF THE

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

DATED APRIL 2, 2002

On motion of Councillor Angus, the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works, dated April 2, 2002, was considered clause by clause.

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

Councillor Smith requested that Clauses 1 and 2 be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

The motion to adopt the Consent Agenda, Clause 3, was put and declared carried.

Award of Contracts for the Provision of Public Transportation Services for Persons with Disabilities - RFP 892-2001
File TT-1.3 (Vol. 13)

379 - 1. The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works has been advised that Handi-Transit service began in 1977. Between 1977 and 1988 all Handi-Transit service was delivered by Winnipeg Transit bus operators, utilizing Winnipeg Transit Handi-Transit vans. In 1988, Winnipeg Transit began to accommodate the increasing demand for Handi-Transit service by contracting out the increasing service requirement to private contractors.

In 1996, Council approved contracting out 100% of Handi-Transit service delivery. Contracts were awarded in 1996 for a five-year period covering approximately 85% of the work. A further Request For Proposals was issued in 1997 and a five-year contract issued for the remainder of the work.

In 2001, an RFP was issued to replace the contracts expiring on June 30, 2001. Eight different contracts, covering approximately 73% of the total service requirement were awarded for a period of five years, expiring June 30, 2006.

On February 20, 2002, RFP 892-2001 was issued for the provision of public transportation services for persons with disabilities for approximately 20% of the total contracted service (the remaining 7% of the work is contained in a contract with Blue Ribbon Transit). The RFP closed on March 13, 2002.

RFP 892-2001 allowed offerers to respond with proposals on portions or all of 2 types of work which were defined as follows:

Item 1: Hourly Service - Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles
Item 2: Hourly Service - Ambulatory Passenger Vehicles

Responsive proposals were received from the various companies, as outlined in Attachment “A”.

Winnipeg Transit is satisfied that the Offerers providing the proposals considered to be most advantageous to the City have the necessary resources to perform all the work in accordance with the requirements of the specifications based on the evaluation criteria is outlined on Attachment “B”. Offerers have satisfactorily carried out previous work of a similar nature.

Materials Management and Legal Services have advised that proposal submissions from the following offerers should be deemed to be non-responsive due to their failure to complete and sign the RFP cover page. The completion of the cover page is a mandatory requirement. It contains the formal offer to perform the work, incorporates the RFP into the proposal and makes the proposal irrevocable for a specified period of time. Those terms and conditions are fundamental to the eventual contract.

- We Care Transit
- London Limos

A summary, by section, of the evaluations on each offer received is outlined on Attachment “C”. The proposals recommended are considered to be most advantageous to the City, meeting all the requirements of the specifications.

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated April 2, 2002

The unit prices submitted by the successful bidders to this RFP are very advantageous to the City. They are lower than the current prices being paid under the expiring contract, lower than the prices bid last year by the successful bidders, and lower than the assumptions contained in the 2002 budget and the 2003 and 2004 administrative budget.

This presents an opportunity for the Transit Department to meet expected Handi-Transit service demand that was not accommodated in the budget.

Bids are open for acceptance until June 15, 2002, however it is very important that this contract be authorized for award at the April meeting of City Council in order to provide the successful contractors with sufficient time to order and receive delivery of vehicles, and for Handi-Transit to train the contractor's drivers prior to the June 15, 2002 start up date.

Council approval is required for the award of multi-year contracts.

The Financial Impact Statement is outlined on Attachment "D".

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works recommends:

I. That the offers received from London Limos and We Care Transit be determined as non-responsive.

II. That contracts for the provision of public transportation services for persons with disabilities as outlined in RFP 892-2001, for the period of June 15, 2002 to June 30, 2007, be awarded based on the unit prices submitted, to those Offerers providing the proposals considered to be most advantageous to the City of Winnipeg, in the following approximate amounts:

Offerer	Item 1: Hourly Service Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles	Item 2: Hourly Service Ambulatory Passenger Vehicles	Total Contract *Price*
Gull Wing Transit Services Ltd.	$831,024	$929,511	$1,760,535
Assiniboine Handy-Transit and Taxi Inc.	$374,994		$374,994
Duffy's Taxi (1996) Ltd.	$374,994		$374,994
Super Transit Ltd.		$934,836	$934,836
Mona Transit Services Ltd.	$725,892		$725,892
			$4,171,251

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

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

Moved by Councillor Angus,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Employer Sponsored Bus Pass Program
Revised Discount Structure
File TT-2 (Vol. 12)

380 - 2. The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works has been advised that the Transit Department, as part of its 1996 budget, included in the Innovative Transit Program a project to investigate alternative forms of employer sponsored transit programs.

On December 13, 2000, Council granted the Transit Department authority to negotiate and commit to EcoPass (Employer Sponsored Bus Pass) agreements based on a 5:1 cost-sharing ratio between the employer and Transit (for every 5% an employer reduced the price of a monthly pass to employees, Transit would rebate 1% to the employer).

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated April 2, 2002

In February 2001, the Transit Department began what was to be a six-month pilot project with Manitoba Public Insurance. Based on the December 13, 2000 authority granted by Council, Manitoba Public Insurance agreed to provide a 50% discount to employees and Transit would rebate 10% to Manitoba Public Insurance. Unfortunately, at the time the program began, there was considerable negative media concerning bonuses for Y2K (Year 2000) changeovers paid to senior Manitoba Public Insurance staff. The EcoPass Program became associated with this negative publicity and the Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance made a decision that the EcoPass Program would be curtailed after three months at Manitoba Public Insurance. Based on the three-month trial at Manitoba Public Insurance, the results were very positive including:

- Monthly Pass sales increased almost 800% increase from approximately 40 per month to 270 per month.
- Transit users almost doubled from approximately 34% of MPI employees (primarily downtown) to 58%.
- 44% of respondents indicated they were using transit more frequently.
- Reduced auto travel and parking; the number of people who were parking in unassigned spots (parking on a daily basis) decreased from 48% to 32%.
- Reduced car usage: The number of people who indicated they do not drive increased from 34% to 52%.
- 834 more trips per week: It's estimated that the program resulted in approximately 834 more trips per week of which 275 came from former auto drivers or passengers.
- Manitoba Public Insurance Management and employees felt it was an excellent program. Employees (particularly single parent families and lower income earners) appreciated the savings. Management found the program very easy to implement and administer, and there were many compliments to Manitoba Public Insurance from its staff for offering the program.

Over the following months, the Transit Department then contacted approximately 180 major organizations in the City seeking participants in the EcoPass Program. This contact included an original "teaser package", follow-up mail, follow-up phone calls, and appointments as appropriate. From these contacts, the Transit Department learned the following:

- Universally, all organizations liked the EcoPass program, its objectives, potential benefits and innovativeness.
- While the organizations liked the "innovativeness", they were also concerned that this innovativeness presented a risk in that the program was unproven and untried. No one particularly wanted to be first to implement it.
- A few organizations commented that the 5:1 cost sharing formula was not sufficient to warrant their participation.

Based on this information, the Transit Department felt there would be an opportunity for a group of organizations to jointly implement the EcoPass program. In this way, the program would gain greater momentum, greater public profile, and no single organization would be the first to implement the program alone.

A luncheon presentation regarding the EcoPass Program was then made to 15 major organizations. The objective was to secure a group of approximately 6 - 8 organizations that would participate in a joint pilot project to implement the EcoPass program and provide some momentum for more organizations to join. As a result of this luncheon and subsequent discussions, the Transit Department now has a verbal commitment from 6 organizations to participate in a joint pilot project, subject to Council approval of the discount structure. The pilot project would include the following key elements:

- It would be a 6-month pilot project beginning in June 2002. The pilot project would be coordinated with Environment Week/Clean Air Day/Commuter Challenge initiatives and it would be strongly positioned as a commitment by all of these organizations to protecting our environment by reducing auto congestion and air pollution.
- The employers would offer monthly bus passes to employees at a 30% discount and the Transit Department would rebate 10% to the employer.

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated April 2, 2002

- Each employer would be encouraged to have surveys conducted prior to the program being implemented and near the end of the program. This would provide additional information to assess the overall benefits.

By undertaking this program on a "pilot project" basis, it allows the Transit Department and the employer to assess the benefits, costs, and operational considerations. Assuming both parties are satisfied with the results of the pilot project, a longer-term agreement would be signed with flexibility for both parties to discontinue the program should circumstances change.

The program direct costs for development and promotion are covered in the existing Transit budget. It is conservatively expected to be revenue neutral at minimum, and has the potential to substantially increase transit ridership and revenues. The risks to the City and Transit are minimized for two reasons:

- Surveys would be conducted where appropriate within organizations before implementing the pilot project to determine the existing transit usage, ridership patterns, and revenues. This will allow the Transit Department and the employer to assess the potential risks and benefits.

- The program has been structured with the employer providing the largest portion of the discount in a 3:1 ratio with the Transit rebate. Employers would have the option of offering greater or lower discounts, but the original 5:1 sharing formula would apply in these circumstances. For example, an employer deciding to offer only a 20% discount would receive only a 4% rebate from Transit. Similarly, an employer deciding to offer a 40% discount would receive a 12% rebate (ie. 10% rebates on the first 30% discount plus 2% rebate on the next 10% discount).

The following information summarizes the financial impact at the 30% level. For example purposes, it has been assumed that an employer currently has 100 employees purchasing monthly bus passes. This would currently provide $6,355 monthly in revenues to Transit. If the employer were to offer passes for sale at a 30% discount, the Transit discount to the employer would be 10% or $635.50. Based on this, only 11 additional monthly passes would have to be sold for the program to break even (ie. $635.50 / $57.20 net revenue after rebate to Transit for additional pass sales). This is very achievable given the substantial discount offered by the employer and the results of the pilot project experienced at Manitoba Public Insurance.

The Employer Sponsored Bus Pass Program has the potential to provide significant benefits for employers, employees, the Transit Department and our environment. The Transit Department is requesting approval/authority to negotiate and conclude pilot project arrangements with potential participants per the details outlined in this report, with a view to maintaining the arrangements if the pilot projects prove successful.

Council approval is required for Transit fare adjustments.

The Financial Impact Statement is outlined on Attachment "A".

On April 2, 2002, the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works considered a report dated March 14, 2002, from the Director of Transit and approved the following amendment, which has been incorporated into the recommendations set out below, namely:

- Recommendation II, be added as follows:

  II. That the Employer Sponsored Bus Pass Program be reviewed in six months for report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works.

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works recommends:

I. That the Transit Department be granted authority to negotiate and commit to EcoPass (Employer Sponsored Bus Pass Program) agreements under which the Transit Department would provide:

   A. A 10% rebate to employers on the price of adult monthly bus passes based on the employer selling passes to its employees at a 30% discount, and

   B. Any discounts below or above the 30% level would be based on a 5:1 ratio (i.e. 1% rebate from Transit for every 5% discount offered by the employer to employees).

II. That the Employer Sponsored Bus Pass Program be reviewed in six months for report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works.

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated April 2, 2002

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

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

Moved by Councillor Angus,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Local Improvement District Initiation By-laws - Lord Avenue and Parkwood Place Community Ring Dikes
File SL-1 (Vol. 21)

381 - 3. On June 23, 1999, Council adopted the recommendation of 2 reports of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated May 31, 1999 titled: 1) Secondary Diking Enhancements - Community Ring Dikes - Policy on Funding and Maintenance; and 2) Canada-Manitoba-City of Winnipeg Agreement on Secondary Diking Enhancements.

In November 1999, the Canada-Manitoba-City of Winnipeg Agreement on Secondary Diking Enhancements was finalized.

On September 26, 2001, Council approved the Priorities for the Secondary Diking Enhancements Program, including the Lord Avenue and Parkwood Place community ring dike projects.

Pursuant to Section 392.1(2)(b) of The City of Winnipeg Act, Council may by by-law designate a committee of the council to conduct one or more public hearings as required by the local improvement district legislation.

The Canada-Manitoba-City of Winnipeg Agreement of Secondary Diking Enhancements is a funding agreement that provides a total of $11.135 million towards secondary diking projects. Canada and Manitoba are each contributing $5.2 million and the City of Winnipeg is contributing $735,000.00. The funding is allocated to a Community Ring Dike Sites Feasibility Study ($400,000.00), and design and construction of individual flood proofing projects ($4,400,000) and community ring dikes ($6,335,000). Pursuant to the Council order on June 23, 1999, the City's share of community ring dike costs is to be recovered from the benefiting property owners through the local improvement process.

On September 26, 2001, Council adopted "The Priorities for the Secondary Diking Enhancements Program", which included the Lord Avenue and Parkwood Place Community Ring Dike projects. The total estimated cost of the Lord Avenue Community Ring Dike is $1.393 million, and the City's share is 10% or $139,300.00. The total estimated cost of the Parkwood Place Community Ring Dike is $265,000.00 and the City's share is $26,500.00.

The City of Winnipeg Act provides a mechanism for conducting district local improvements. In the cases of the Lord Avenue Community Ring Dike and the Parkwood Place Community Ring Dike, the benefiting properties are readily identifiable and have been consulted on flood mitigation options through a series of public meetings. An informal community vote has been undertaken in each project area that indicates a willingness to proceed with each of the projects for construction of the community ring dikes and those works necessarily incidental thereto.

A series of local improvement initiatives have been initiated for other community ring dike projects under the Canada-Manitoba-City of Winnipeg Agreement on Secondary Diking Enhancements, namely the Grande Pointe/Hallama Drive project, Kingston Crescent/Row project and Kilkenny Drive North project. The Riel Community Committee was designated as the District Proposal Committee for these projects since these projects are within the Riel Community. Similarly, the Lord Avenue Community Ring Dike and the Parkwood Place Community Ring Dike projects are within the Riel Community and therefore the Riel Community Committee has been recommended as the District Proposal Committee for each of those local improvement districts.

The next step in the process will be the conduct of public hearings by the District Proposal Committee where the property owners again have an opportunity for input into the process. This is followed by amendments to the District Proposal if deemed necessary by the District Proposal Committee who will then provide its advice and recommendations to Council. If Council gives first reading to the District Proposal it then proceeds to the "notice

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated April 2, 2002

of objection" stage in the process. This is the opportunity for the property owners to cast their vote against increased flood protection in their respective communities.

The Financial Impact Statement for this project is shown on Attachment "A" and has been prepared in accordance with the recommendation adopted by Council on December 13, 2000.

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works recommends:

I. That Council direct the Administration to prepare a Local Improvement District Initiation By-law for the Lord Avenue Community Ring Dike Local Improvement District that will designate the Councillors of the Riel Community Committee as the committee of Council (District Proposal Committee) to conduct public hearings as required for the Lord Avenue Community Ring Dike Local Improvement District.

II. That Council direct the Administration to prepare a Local Improvement District Initiation By-law for the Parkwood Place Community Ring Dike Local Improvement District that will designate the Councillors of the Riel Community Committee as the committee of Council (District Proposal Committee) to conduct public hearings as required for the Parkwood Place Community Ring Dike Local Improvement District.

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

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

Adopted by consent.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

QUESTION PERIOD

382 - Councillor Steek inquired as to the amount of budget surplus for snow removal, to which Councillor Angus advised that funds from the account would still be utilized for cleaning and de-icing the streets, but agreed to obtain a preliminary up date. He further noted that unutilized funds would go into the snow reserve.

Councillor Lubosch questioned if the City's new environmental plan and / or the Chair of Public Works had a plan for using an aggregate to make streets less slippery that could be recycled similar to the process utilized in the national parks.

Councillor Angus replied in the affirmative and noted that various alternatives had been examined and experiments conducted on different streets in an attempt to find something that would work and be more environmentally friendly. He also indicated that the Federal Government was moving towards introducing environmental standards.

In noting that many of the backlanes were in bad condition, Councillor Smith asked for a report on the state of the backlanes and the amount of work required to improve them, to which Councillor Angus advised that the information could be obtained from the asset management software.

In reference to the City's spring cleaning program currently being undertaken at a cost of approximately $2.2 million, Councillor Lubosch inquired if the City would consider exclusively using media and public service announcements to keep automobiles from parking on the streets during the street cleaning operation so that some savings could be accrued from the program. Councillor Angus agreed to investigate and report back to all Members of Council.

Councillor Lubosch questioned if the Chair was aware that street cleaning had commenced on Springfield Road and that signage was not placed and, as a consequence, a number of automobiles were parked on Springfield Road and caused the entire procession of street cleaning equipment and efforts to go around the vehicles.

Councillor Angus advised that signage is not placed on the first go round of cleaning but acknowledged that it does create a bit of a problem, and agreed to further investigate.