

WINNIPEG

# TransPlan 2010

MOVING TOWARD SOLUTIONS

Released January 28, 1998

## Table of Contents

- [1.0 Introduction](#)
  - [1.1 Plan Winnipeg...Toward 2010](#)
  - [1.2 The Mandate of TransPlan 2010](#)
  - [1.3 The Steering Committee](#)
  - [1.4 Steering Committee Ground Rules](#)
- [2.0 From Process to Product: Community Involvement](#)
  - [2.1 What is Different about TransPlan 2010?](#)
  - [2.2 Components of the Community-Involvement Process](#)
  - [2.3 The Public-Opinion Survey](#)
  - [2.4 Phase I: Inventory, Issues and Themes](#)
  - [2.5 Phase II A: Scenario Development](#)
  - [2.6 The TransPlanning Model](#)
- [3.0 Fundamental Considerations](#)
  - [3.1 Description of the Winnipeg Region](#)
  - [3.2 Population Profile and Projections](#)
  - [3.3 Employment Profile and Projections](#)
  - [3.4 Land-Use Planning Profile](#)
    - [3.4.1 General Considerations](#)
  - [3.5 Commuting Travel Trends and Projections](#)
- [4.0 A New Approach to Decision-Making and Funding](#)

- [4.1 A Regional Focus](#)
- [4.2 A Shared Vision](#)
- [4.3 Better Coordination](#)
- [4.6 Applying the Principles](#)
  - [4.6.1 Option 1: Increase Government Cooperation](#)
  - [4.6.2 Option 2: Create an Independent Agency](#)
- [4.7 Accountability](#)
- [4.8 A New Decision-Making Framework](#)
  - [4.8.1](#)
  - [4.8.2](#)
- [4.9 Designing a New Funding Policy](#)
- [5.4 Transportation Demand Management](#)
  - [5.5.2 Approach to Ranking](#)
  - [5.5.3 Recommendations](#)
- [6.5 Two Major Downtown Areas](#)
  - [6.5.1 Downtown Winnipeg](#)
  - [6.5.2 Centre-ville de Saint-Boniface](#)
- [Appendix A: Plan Winnipeg...Toward 2010, Chapter 5C \(Transportation section\)](#)
- [Appendix B: Advisory Committee and City — Province Management Team](#)
- [Appendix C: The Community Workshop Process](#)
- [Appendix D: Presenters/Submitters to TransPlan 2010](#)
- [Appendix E: TransPlan Publications and Other References](#)
- [Appendix F: Summary of Transportation Network Simulations Developed for TransPlan 2010](#)
- [Appendix G: Exerpt from Winnipeg Transit Strategic Plan, 1996](#)

## 1.0 Introduction

The transportation needs of an urban area are constantly changing. As the population increases and transforms demographically, technological change continues at an ever accelerating rate, and new economic development takes place. The City of Winnipeg and its surrounding municipalities are undergoing such changes, but in a different way from other cities in Canada, for a number of reasons that are characteristically Manitoban. A transportation plan must reflect these distinct characteristics and also

meet the challenges that all urbanized areas face. It must reflect the values of this community and its economic potential while recognizing the global nature of today's society.

The last comprehensive transportation plan for this urban area was developed almost 20 years ago (in 1980) as the transportation component of the first version of Plan Winnipeg. The needs of the next millennium now require a fresh look at all aspects of urban transportation for this community.

TransPlan 2010 was initiated by the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba to develop a transportation plan for the Winnipeg Region. The Winnipeg Region, as it will be called in this report, consists of the City of Winnipeg, the adjacent 13 rural municipalities and the towns of Stonewall and Selkirk, and is often referred to as the Capital Region by the Province.

### **1.1 Plan Winnipeg...Toward 2010**

The need for a revised transportation and related land-use plan for the City of Winnipeg was identified in Plan Winnipeg...Toward 2010 (referred to hereinafter as Plan Winnipeg) as approved by the *City of Winnipeg (By-law No. 5915/92)* and the Province in 1993. It states, in Chapter 5C, as a matter of principle:

The City seeks to provide effective regional service and facilities, and to reduce the demand for expansion of these services and facilities...An efficient regional transportation system is vital to the continued well-being of the City. Winnipeg currently has an extensive system of regional streets, bridges and transit routes that serve its citizens. It is essential that the City continue its commitment through comprehensive transportation planning, to providing cost-effective and efficient mobility for people and goods in an environmentally-responsible manner. The approach must integrate the needs of pedestrians, bicycles, cars, transit vehicles, and trucks.

To achieve this objective, it is necessary to protect our investment in the existing infrastructure through effective maintenance practices and to implement improvements which are cost effective.

Following the statement of principle, Plan Winnipeg establishes three basic priorities and a series of related initiatives that are designed to accomplish the above. The three basic priorities are:

5C-01 Maintain Existing Infrastructure The City shall maintain the existing capacity of regional

street, bridge, and public transit systems as its highest priority item for expenditure of funds when developing the yearly and five year transportation capital program.

5C-02 Commit to Transit System Improvements The City shall commit to transit system improvements as a second priority in those areas where transit is considered to have a potential advantage over the private automobile, namely, within the Downtown, at major access points to the Downtown, along the major radial regional street system, and in areas of concentrated employment.

5C-03 Commit to Regional Street System Improvements The City shall commit to regional street system improvements, as a third priority, in those areas of Winnipeg where the private automobile is deemed to be the most effective mode of travel, namely, along the major crosstown and circumferential regional street system.

The related initiatives are:

**5C-04 Integrated Land Use, Urban Design and Transportation Planning;**

**5C-05 Consolidate Municipal and Provincial Transportation Policy;**

**5C-06 Encourage the Completion of the Perimeter Highway;**

**5C-07 Encourage Environmentally Responsible Transportation Measures.**

**5C-08 Provide Mobility for the Physically Handicapped;**

**5C-09 Prepare Bicycle and Pedestrian Pathway Plan; and**

**5C-10 Prepare a Comprehensive Transportation Study;**

The transportation section of Chapter 5C of Plan Winnipeg...Toward 2010 can be found in Appendix A.

## **1.2 The Mandate of TransPlan 2010**

Initiative 5C-10 in Plan Winnipeg directed the City to prepare a comprehensive transportation study. It states that the study should be "consistent with the policies outlined in this plan" and utilize "an

interdisciplinary planning approach." The Province later joined with the City to fund and broaden the study to develop a transportation plan that could serve the needs of not just the City of Winnipeg but also the entire Winnipeg Region. In a letter of January 1993 the Province requested that the following areas be examined within the scope of the TransPlan 2010 study:

1. **renewing emphasis on infrastructure;**
2. approaches to financing transportation infrastructure within the context of government restraint;
3. opportunities for inter-modal links; and
4. coordination of transportation planning and development functions among government, regulatory and private institutions within the Winnipeg Region.

The mandate of TransPlan 2010, therefore, was developed to encompass both a review of the principles established by Plan Winnipeg and consideration of the broader initiatives requested by the Province.

### **1.3 The Steering Committee**

To direct the study, the City and Province appointed an independent committee, the TransPlan 2010 Steering Committee, made up of five individuals who served in an unpaid, voluntary capacity. All are long-time residents of the City of Winnipeg, and among them the backgrounds cover: transport law, university transportation studies, business, organized labour, and the non-profit sector. They are: **Robert Gabor**, Q.C., partner in the law firm of Taylor McCaffrey (Chair); **Dr. Barry Prentice**, Director of the Transport Institute, University of Manitoba; **Mary Dixon**, owner of Peguis Publishers; **Al Cerilli**, retired Regional Vice President of Railway Transport and General Workers (now part of the Canadian Auto Workers Union); and **Susan Lewis**, Executive Director, United Way of Winnipeg. The Chair of the Steering Committee was appointed in mid-1993, and the other four members were appointed in September 1994.

The Steering Committee was supported throughout the process by City of Winnipeg Streets and Transportation Department staff; **Kenn Rosin**, Manager of Transportation Planning, and **Doug Hurl**, Transportation Systems Planner, acted as Executive Director and Assistant Executive Director, respectively. The Committee also received assistance from an advisory committee, representing a cross-section of groups, organizations and the community-at-large (see Appendix B), and an inter-governmental

committee, the City-Province Management Team (see Appendix B). The Committee also retained the services of a community consultant, **Helen Maupin and Associates /David Lettner and Associates**, and a transportation consultant, **DS-Lea Consultants Limited**.

#### **1.4 Steering Committee Ground Rules**

The Steering Committee held its first meeting in September 1994 and soon thereafter announced that the TransPlan process should proceed as follows:

- All aspects of urban transportation and related land-use planning within the Winnipeg Region, including funding, would be examined;
- The public would be continually involved in the development of the urban transportation plan;
- All information received by the Steering Committee would be on public record, and there would be no private meetings with any interest groups;
- The Steering Committee would commence its deliberations on recommendations only after completion of the community-involvement portion of the process; and
- The Steering Committee would attempt to reflect in its recommendations the general direction enunciated by the participants in the community-involvement process.

The structuring and empowering of the Steering Committee in this manner marked a clear departure from the standard transportation plan review process. Normally, the process is either conducted, or at the very least directed, from within government, with consultation occurring only with specific interest groups. The public may be asked to comment, but often not until recommendations have been developed and a report published. TransPlan 2010 was directed by a body independent of government, which made community involvement a prime focus of its process.

This report documents the findings of three years of concentrated work by the Steering Committee. It is unique in its reflection of the voice of the public. It is not just a report describing how a technical/professional analysis is used to develop transportation solutions. It does contain these elements, but it also reflects the direction given by the people of the Winnipeg Region on the approach they believe is needed for planning, programming and implementing urban transportation in the Region for the next 15 to 20 years.

## **2.0 From Process to Product: Community Involvement**

### **2.1 What is Different about TransPlan 2010?**

TransPlan 2010 is unique in its community-involvement component. Historically in Winnipeg most transportation planning had been done by technical experts. More recently, the public had occasionally been asked for its views on work that had already been completed, and on a few occasions had been given the opportunity to choose among various options. The approach taken by the TransPlan 2010 Steering Committee, however, was significantly different from these earlier approaches. The Committee asked the public, early in the process, to articulate their values and goals and to translate them into a transportation plan that they believed was appropriate for the community. Technical advice, as well as the Steering Committee's own thoughts, were added to the process only after the community had provided their perspective. The community-involvement component of the TransPlan 2010 process is shown in Figure 2.1.

### **2.2 Components of the Community-Involvement Process**

The Steering Committee was determined that the community was truly represented and that as many voices as possible were heard. A number of different tools were used to make this happen, as illustrated in Table 2.1.

Among the tools shown in Table 2.1, the community workshops and newsletters were a part of each phase of the TransPlan 2010 community-involvement process. The other tools were utilized selectively as required. Individuals, groups and organizations were encouraged to present their views to the Steering Committee in public presentations held in 1995 and 1996 and in writing at any time and also could present their concerns on a telephone "hot line."

### **2.3 The Public-Opinion Survey**

The consultation process began in December 1994 with a telephone survey undertaken by Western Opinion Research. It was designed generally to identify public concerns, values, aspirations and priorities, and specifically to establish:

- how the current transportation system affected the respondent;
- the respondent's concerns about this system; and
- upon what priorities a new transportation plan should be based.

The survey polled 1,004 individuals in the Winnipeg Region who were selected at random from the telephone directory; each respondent was asked 40 questions.

As part of the survey, respondents were asked to rate the three priorities for future spending identified in Plan Winnipeg (Section 1.1), and the results indicated that:

- 73% felt that maintenance and repair of existing streets and bridges was a high priority; 23% felt it was a medium priority;
- 49% felt that making the transit system more attractive to automobile users was a high priority; 32% felt that it was a medium priority;
- 47% felt that more crosstown street-system improvements so that people could move quickly from point to point without going through downtown was a high priority; 33% felt it was a medium priority.

## **2.4 Phase I: Inventory, Issues and Themes**

The most important tools used in Phase I of the community-involvement process were the five community workshops. (For a description of the community workshop process see Appendix C.) The Five workshops were held from February to April 1995, each in a different area of Winnipeg. Workshop sites were chosen to represent different areas of the Region. The workshops were advertised in each area by various means. Each workshop began with a discussion about what the participants liked and did not like about the current transportation system. The participants then began identifying future transportation needs and priorities.

The information gathered from the workshops was complemented in May and June of 1995 by eight written submissions, a number of letters and 15 presentations to the Steering Committee from a variety of individuals, groups and organizations, made in a public forum.

What emerged from the workshops, submissions, letters and presentations was a clear indication that areas

of concern were:

- decision-making and management
- transportation infrastructure
- funding
- land use and urban form
- land-use conflict/compatibility
- traffic operations
- travel behaviour
- people movement and access
- access for people with disabilities
- goods movement
- demographics
- community involvement
- sustainable development and environment

In addition, a number of themes were synthesized from Phase I of the community-involvement process. The participants established that a transportation plan for the Winnipeg Region should:

- provide a safe, convenient and accessible transportation system;
- provide safe, effective and efficient movement of goods and services in support of economic development;
- provide an inclusive and integrated decision-making process for land use and transportation planning;
- maintain the existing transportation infrastructure in a safe, effective and efficient manner;
- foster better use of the existing transportation system;
- develop funding alternatives for transportation system maintenance, improvements and additions; and
- provide a sustainable transportation system that is environmentally friendly.

Related to the issues and themes that emerged from Phase I of the community-involvement process were three areas that were constantly reiterated in later stages of TransPlan 2010:

- The participants felt that there were discrete and dispersed "pockets" of information that have made

decision-making on urban transportation and land-use planning extremely difficult (i.e., a number of stakeholders each have a "piece of the puzzle," but no central source of information exists).

- The participants demonstrated willingness to build agreement by sharing ideas and openly discussing urban transportation and land-use matters.
- The participants felt that there was no effective mechanism that would allow them to share information and make informed decisions regarding transportation and land-use matters.

Phase I of the community-involvement process was documented in a TransPlan 2010 report published in June 1995 entitled *What We Heard from the Public*.

### **2.5 Phase II A: Scenario Development**

Phase IIA began in September 1995 with an open house, which offered the public an opportunity to see the results of the Phase I activities and to get information on travel and demographic trends in the Winnipeg Region. In October, five community workshops were held, four in the City of Winnipeg and one in the Rural Municipality of East St. Paul. The goal of these workshops was to formulate a transportation plan for the future based on those characteristics of the existing system that participants thought should be kept and improved and those they felt should be significantly changed or deleted. Workshop participants produced a series of sketches of possible future urban transportation systems for the Winnipeg Region.

### **2.6 The TransPlanning Model**

The issues and themes generated by the public in Phase I as well as the priorities and images that emerged in Phase IIA were utilized by the transportation planning consultant to structure a model, or visual representation, of the complex entity that is a transportation system. The TransPlanning Model, as it came to be known, was meant to provide the public with a framework and language that would assist them in refining the many images that were generated from Phase IIA into a comprehensive scenario (see Figure 2.2).

### **3.0 Fundamental Considerations**

Developing a new regional transportation plan for such a geographic setting is a complex process. The future is always difficult to predict, for it is dependent on so many unknowns. The challenge is to establish

a plan that is based on what is known but is flexible enough to be adjusted effectively to unknowable events.

Formal planning began in various forms immediately after the Second World War and evolved into the present Plan Winnipeg process. They all assumed the type of residential development that now characterizes the Winnipeg Region and in turn established the dominance of the automobile as the major mode for the Region. None of these plans, however, dealt with both the City and the surrounding municipalities.

### **3.1 Description of the Winnipeg Region**

As described in Chapter 1 of this document, the City and the Province initiated TransPlan 2010 to develop a transportation plan that could serve the needs of the entire Winnipeg Region. The Winnipeg Region (see Figure 3.1) consists of the City of Winnipeg and the following towns and municipalities: Cartier, St. Clements, East St. Paul, St. Francis Xavier, Headingley, Town of Selkirk, MacDonald, Springfield, Richot, Town of Stonewall, Rockwood, Tache, Rosser, West St. Paul and St. Andrews. The existing major road network in the Region is depicted in Figure 3.2.

### **3.2 Population Profile and Projections**

While other cities in the country are dealing with rapidly growing populations, Winnipeg is a low-growth region. According to Statistics Canada, the Winnipeg Region has a population of approximately 706,000 and, of that number, 618,000 live in the City of Winnipeg. While the population of the City of Winnipeg increased by only 0.3% between 1991 and 1996, the Region population outside the City increased by 10%. The Winnipeg Region accounts for 63% of the total population of the Province (see Figure 3.3). In no other province is such a high proportion of the population concentrated in one large urban area.

Based on national and provincial trends, the Winnipeg Region population is expected to increase by approximately 70,000 (or 10%) to 776,000 by 2010. This projection is based on the following assumptions:

- Immigration into Canada will continue to average 200,000 per year, and Manitoba will continue to attract a similar percentage of immigrants as in the past;
- The fertility rate will stabilize (rather than decline);

- The mortality rate will rise as the population ages;
- The economic climate will be similar to the present situation in Manitoba.

This low-growth projection means, among other things, that the property tax base will not increase significantly. On the other hand, unlike cities such as Toronto and Vancouver, low growth means more manageable and predictable commuter travel patterns, resulting in less demand for immediate major system improvements to alleviate severe peak-hour traffic congestion.

### **3.3 Employment Profile and Projections**

Over 345,000 people are employed in the Winnipeg Region, more than 90% of whom are employed within the City of Winnipeg. The major employment concentrations in the City of Winnipeg are illustrated in Figure 3.4. The downtown area contains the highest percentage of employees (almost 27%), followed by the area immediately east and south of the Winnipeg International Airport (approximately 6%).

Owing to changing economic conditions, and streamlined and improved production technologies, the percentage of the workforce employed in the large industrial parks has been decreasing in recent years, while the percentage in the downtown area has been relatively stable. Recent trends indicate that a majority of new jobs are being generated by small business and the transportation industry, a trend that is expected to continue in the future. It would appear, therefore, that the new jobs being created are and will continue to be distributed throughout the City. While unforeseen circumstances may occur in the future, there are no new large concentrations of employment forecast for the Region.

### **3.4 Land-Use Planning Profile**

#### ***3.4.1 General Considerations***

There is a close, almost symbiotic, relationship between transportation planning and land-use planning. In rapidly growing communities there may be a substantial opportunity to direct land use to support transportation facilities and systems. In slow-growth communities such as the Winnipeg Region, opportunities to alter established land-use patterns are minimal, and, thus, there are limited opportunities, for example, to reduce our dependency on automobiles. If this reduction is considered important in an overall transportation plan, it will have to be accomplished primarily through means other than land-use

planning. The community perspective on this issue was to support the City initiative known as CentrePlan, a spin-off of the Plan Winnipeg process, which developed recommendations for downtown Winnipeg in 1994-95. Included in its recommendations was the position that zoning and land-use controls should be relaxed to permit more mixed-use development and promote downtown revitalization.

### **3.5 Commuting Travel Trends and Projections**

Although Winnipeg has been identified as a low-growth city in many respects, it is not so in terms of automobile use for commuting and other travel. In fact, the increase in automobile use in Winnipeg has been consistent with that in most other North American cities. While the population of Winnipeg grew by only 36% between 1962 and 1992, automobile registrations more than doubled, from 128,000 in 1962 to 264,000 in 1992, and the actual use of automobiles has been increasing even faster than registration of vehicles has. The number of vehicles crossing the Red and Assiniboine Rivers per day in Winnipeg increased by almost 130% between 1962 (259,000) and 1992 (590,000) (see Figure 3.5).

Some of the largest percentage increases in traffic have been noted on the routes leading into and out of the City. As is shown in Figure 3.6, the morning peak hour ("rush hour") traffic counts on the routes approaching the City increased by 140% between 1976 and 1992—from 3,700 to 9,000 vehicles. This is not surprising, considering that most of the people living in the faster-growing municipalities surrounding Winnipeg work in the City (see Figure 3.7).

While the increase in automobile ownership and use has come a significant decrease in transit ridership in the past 35 years. The percentage of people using the transit system to get to work in the morning hour declined from 28% in 1962 to 20% in 1992 (see Figure 3.8). Of the over 100,000 morning peak-hour work trips in 1992, 60% were made by automobile drivers, 20% by bus passengers, 12% by vehicle passengers, 7% by pedestrians, and less than 1% by cyclists.

One measure of congestion on the street system is indicated by the capacity of the signalized intersections to accommodate traffic. In 1962, only about 10% (or 30 of the 304) of signalized intersections were operating above capacity during peak hours; in 1992, 29% (or 156 of the 533) of signalized intersections were operating above capacity during peak hours (see Figure 3.9).

Given these historical trends, some of the questions that must be considered when developing a transportation plan for the Region are:

- What will be the future travel patterns?
- How many trips will be made on the transit system?
- What changes will take place in travel demand?
- What will be the levels of congestion and delay under various conditions?

While past trends cannot wholly predict future trends, they can provide valuable information and a starting point from which to develop projections.

Based on traffic-count and demographic data spanning more than 30 years, automobile use is expected to increase, but at a slower rate than in the past, particularly during the morning peak hour. The rate of growth from 1962 to 1984 was about 3% per year, the rate has dropped to less than 1% per year (see Figure 3.10, which shows the morning peak-hour traffic crossing the Red and Assiniboine Rivers). In addition, (as shown in Figure 3.11) the peak periods of traffic are not increasing substantially but are spreading over a longer period of time, and the non-peak traffic is increasing. Reasons for the peak spreading may include: increases in service-industry employment; more part-time employment; and, increase in home workplaces. Demographic trends that suggest that future growth in automobile use may be slower than in the past include:

- The number of persons per passenger-vehicle registration has stabilized at about 2.4 after a rapid decline from 3.67 in 1962 to 2.46 in 1981 (see Figure 3.12). Therefore, car ownership per person may have hit a maximum and future increases in car registrations may be more closely related to population increases.

The aging population represents a smaller work force and a resulting decrease in peak-hour travel, but will likely cause an increase in off-peak travel.

...

#### **4.0 A New Approach to Decision-Making and Funding**

Many concerns about the existing decision-making process were raised during the public consultation process. The public understands that decision-making is an ongoing process subject to different interests and constraints. But it considers the process to be inefficient with little direction, coordination or long-term planning; decisions appear appear to be based almost primarily on funding considerations. The public believes that governments use community consultation as a public relations exercise to sell its agenda or release the vitriol of objectors. There is no sense of a rational approach to setting priorities. Current funding decisions are making the situation worse. And the public does not believe that the necessary political will exists to change the structures of decision-making in order to deal with the source of the problems.

The Steering Committee concurs with the public view and has established a number of principles as a basis for improved future decision-making. There must be:

- **a Regional focus;**
- a shared vision with the community;
- better coordination within and between government authorities;
- more effective spending of existing and future funds; more specifically, there must be more efficiency in the delivery of the services and more transparency in spending;
- a guarantee of appropriate levels of funding to ensure that the priorities set forth by the decision-makers are implemented.

#### **4.1 A Regional Focus**

The current system used to administer transportation within the Winnipeg Region involves several level of government. Each has its own plans and priorities, and these often conflict. Yet, streets and highways do not stop at government imposed decision-making boundaries. Instead, urban transportation is multi-faceted and requires that the governmental structural impediment be understood and, whenever possible, streamlined. Otherwise, the transportation system will continue to suffer from splintered decision-making; a lack of shared strategic plans and priorities; conflict between municipalities and the Province; and, discrepancies in priorities.

#### **4.2 A Shared Vision**

There must be a shared vision for the future of a regional urban transportation system, and that vision

must encompass community consultation throughout the process. The frequent role of the public, either to comment on finished products or mobilize to oppose proposals, must change, especially now, when there are limited financial resources. There must be greater attempts to forge consensus among the different levels of government and the public in order to establish priorities that have a level of support that will make implementation more likely. Currently, other than in the electoral process, there is no mechanism that involves the public on an ongoing basis, and there is no regional vision among the levels of government for urban transportation. But the Steering Committee found that the community does have a shared vision for the future of urban transportation; this was reflected in the Emerging Scenario.

The public recognizes the fact that the long-term future of the City and the Region will be affected by the future transportation plan. Through its active participation in TransPlan 2010, the public has indicated that it wishes to be part of the process, that the time for short-term decisions based on shifting priorities and immediate funding requirements must end, and that a long-term planning process be instituted that will help build a collective vision for the future. As well, it is essential that some form of consensus building mechanism be put in place to create a vision for transportation issues within the Region. The Manitoba Round Table on Sustainable Development is an example of a group of individuals asked by the Province to provide input on important policy issues related to the environment. Recently, a subcommittee of the Round Table convinced the provincial government to reconsider a portion of the proposed Sustainable Development Act. Another example of community involvement is the "citizen jury" concept, which is used in some areas of the United States, including Minnesota, to facilitate consensus building. These juries are chosen from a cross-section of the public and are asked to evaluate a major issue or project to determine its viability based on a number of criteria or principles.

It is interesting to note that different levels of government appear to be able to share a vision on a project-by-project basis. For example, the Airport Vicinity Development Advisory Committee (ADVAC) included interests not only among the City of Winnipeg, but also the R.M. of Rosser, the Province of Manitoba, and key businesses and community groups. This process resulted in a by-law to control development around the Winnipeg International Airport to ensure the retention of its 24-hour operating status. It is being examined in Ottawa and Toronto as a model for promoting compatible development around their airports. The public-consultation process in ADVAC was also a precursor to TransPlan 2010's

public consultation process.

### **4.3 Better Coordination**

Decision-making in the future must be better coordinated among government departments and agencies, and between the different levels of government. The current system results in piece-meal decisions about regional transportation and often inconsistent and conflicting interests on such issues as urban and suburban development and zoning restrictions. Fostering better coordination and integration of activities appears more likely for specific projects than for overlapping policy issues. For example, a number of years ago the City did not consider construction of the Charleswood Bridge an immediate priority. At the same time, the Province indicated that it was willing to allocate funds, provided they be used for the Charleswood Bridge. The Province had a particular reason for its position, but its priority was not the same as that of the City, and the City was required to change its priorities in order to benefit from provincial funds.

### **4.6 Applying the Principles**

The Steering Committee does not believe that the principles outlined in Section 4.0 can effectively be applied under the current system.

An improved decision-making model is required. There are two options: *increase government cooperation* (i.e, between the City of Winnipeg, the Regional municipalities, and the Province of Manitoba); or, *create an independent agency* with responsibility for all urban transportation matters in the Winnipeg Region.

#### **4.6.1 Option 1: Increase Government Cooperation**

The Province and municipalities, including the City of Winnipeg, must commit to a new regional transportation plan, based upon the TransPlan 2010 recommendations, as a component of their municipal/district development plans. The Province would thereafter empower the municipalities to raise additional revenues and/or provide them with additional funding to permit implementation of the regional transportation plan. The Province would establish the following requirements before new revenue-generating powers would be created and/or additional funds generated:

- **The funds must be dedicated to the implementation of the TransPlan 2010 recommendations related to rehabilitation, reconstruction and repairs to existing transportation infrastructure;**
- **The principles for decision-making set out in Section 4.0 must be applied; and**
- **A process of ongoing community involvement must be established.**

In order to oversee the process, the Province would establish a new body, the InterGovernmental Coordinating Committee, which would be composed of elected officials, senior administrators from the two levels of government and selected individuals from the Winnipeg Region. Among the Committee's tasks would be the streamlining of the decision-making processes among the levels of government. The recommended timeframe to establish the Committee structure and implement these improvements to the current system is shown in Figure 4.1.

#### ***4.6.2 Option 2: Create an Independent Agency***

The concept of creating an independent transportation agency for the Winnipeg urban area is not new. The idea was first proposed in the report entitled *Traffic, Transit, and Parking* prepared by Wilbur Smith and Associates in 1959. However, this report was superseded with the establishment of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg (Metro) in 1960. Metro was given jurisdiction over transportation planning matters within the "old" City of Winnipeg and its then surrounding cities, towns and municipalities. This same jurisdiction exists today under the unified City of Winnipeg, which replaced Metro in 1972.

Under Option 2, the Province would create by statute a new agency, the Winnipeg Region Transportation Agency, which would have jurisdiction over urban transportation within the Winnipeg Region and would be given the responsibility to implement the TransPlan 2010 recommendations.

The new Agency could be similar to the Montreal Transportation Agency, which was created in 1996. Its mandate includes:

- **regional multi-modal planning;**
- **provision of stable, long-term financing;**
- **coordination between road network management and public transit;**
- **allocation of shared cost of regional facilities and infrastructure among all municipalities in the**

region.

**A five-member governing board is appointed by the Province of Quebec in consultation with local municipalities. Revenue sources for the Agency include:**

- a dedicated gas (fuel) tax;
- a vehicle licence surcharge;
- property levies.

**The enabling legislation for the new Winnipeg Region Transportation Agency would specify the powers of the Agency and its sources of revenue. It is proposed that the Agency would be responsible for:**

- **defining, construction, operating, repairing, and maintaining the major street and highway network;**
- **public transit;**
- **transportation planning;**
- **regulation of urban goods movement;**
- **economic regulation of private transit systems (e.g., taxis, airport shuttles);**
- **control of access to the major street and highway network;**
- **expenditure of funds for these purposes.**

The Agency would not be responsible for: defining, constructing, operating, repairing and maintaining local or residential municipal streets; motor vehicle registration; vehicle safety regulation; recreational bicycle facilities; land-use planning and control. The legislation should also include a mechanism for the appointment of a board of directors to oversee the operation of the Agency.

The government would use their respective procedures to review the two proposed options. In so doing, they should ensure that public consultation takes place, through hearings and/or presentations.

#### **4.7 Accountability**

In determining the appropriate level of accountability for a new decision-making framework whether it be based on Option 1 or Option 2 described above, we must reiterate the fact that the City has not followed

the principles and priorities set forth in its own document, Plan Winnipeg, and TransPlan 2010 must include measures to ensure implementation of its recommendations. Whether the new decision-making entity turns out to be an inter-governmental coordinating committee or a regional transportation agency, there are certain steps that should be taken to ensure greater accountability than has been the case in the past. This will be even more important if the new funding scheme involves dedicated user fees.

Even though decision-making under Option 1 would remain within government bodies, the structure crosses jurisdictional boundaries, and the focus would be activities financed through dedicated funds. The source and amount of revenues should be come more transparent, as should the expenditures. With a firm and easily-read budget available, it would be possible to produce an annual report. The coordinating committee could then encourage community involvement, for example by holding an annual public meeting to discuss the report and issues relating to it.

Under Option 2, the situation would be somewhat different, as the Agency would be a semi-autonomous body. The enabling legislation would specify the powers of the Agency, but the Agency would not likely have the power to implement new user fees or raise existing ones, except for transit fees. It would in this way have significantly less power than other existing bodies, such as crown corporations or airport authorities. Nevertheless, it would have responsibility over very significant matters relating to urban transportation within the Winnipeg Region and it must be governed in a manner that fosters accountability.

The enabling legislation must include a mechanism for the appointment of a board of directors to oversee the operation of the Agency, which would include the following criteria:

- **The first board chairperson would be appointed jointly by the City, municipalities and the Province;**
- **The chairperson would recommend the appointment of up to 11 other directors, with several restrictions. There would be no elected officials; no government employees in transportation-related Departments; broad community representation within the Region; staggered 3-year terms; and, the directors would have to reside within the Winnipeg Region.**
- **The Province and City would approve (or modify and approve) the recommended appointments;**
- **The board would recommend replacements for departing directors to the City, municipalities and**

the Province for approval;

- The board would be subject to conflict-of-interest guidelines.

There might also be a requirement for annual public meetings to review the audited financial statements of the Agency, the previous year's decisions and the business plan for the next year.

There are a number of points that should be emphasized in setting up a new decision-making process, whether it is based upon Option 1 or Option 2;

- Community involvement should be integral and ongoing;
- The transportation plan should be updated every 5 years on the basis of a rolling 20-year planning horizon, complete with community involvement and stakeholder-consultation programs of a scale and nature similar to those initiated for TransPlan 2010;
- Five-year capital programming for improvements to transportation infrastructure within the Winnipeg Region should be reviewed and adjusted annually.

#### **4.8 A New Decision-Making Framework**

Regarding decision-making process, the Steering Committee recommends that:

##### **4.8.1**

*An improved decision-making model be established for urban transportation in the Winnipeg Region. This model should bring a Regional focus to decisions that transcend existing jurisdictional boundaries, reflect a shared vision of the future priorities, and include a mechanism that promotes community involvement and better coordinates and integrates the activities related to urban transportation within government departments and among all levels of government.*

##### **4.8.2**

*The new decision-making model be in the form of an inter-governmental coordinating committee, (Option 1: the Committee), or a regional transportation agency (Option 2: the Agency). The TransPlan 2010 recommendations will provide the initial direction for urban transportation decisions, irrespective of the model chosen.*

**4.8.3 If the governments commit to proceed with Option 1 (the Committee), the Province empower the municipalities (including the City) to raise additional revenues and/or provide them with additional funding to permit the implementation of the regional transportation plan. All such revenues should be committed to a dedicated fund to implement the TransPlan 2010 recommendations related to maintenance, repairs, rehabilitation and reconstruction of existing infrastructure and may not be used for any other purpose. In addition, there must be a sufficient timeframe to establish the Committee and implement the improvements.**

**4.8.4 As well, if the governments commit to proceed with Option 1 (the Committee), the Province create a monitoring body that includes members of the community. The monitoring body would issue a report annually to the governments and public on the status of progress toward creation of the Committee based on the principles set forth in TransPlan 2010 and the implementation of the Committee's initiatives on the regional transportation plan within the timeframe set forth in this report. The governments would continue the activities of the Committee if the monitoring body determined that sufficient progress being achieved. However, if, in the view of the monitoring body, sufficient progress was not being made by the Committee within an initial 3-year period, the Province would introduce the necessary legislation to create the Agency.**

**4.8.5 Legislation to create the Agency include the areas for which the Agency would be delegated decision-making authority:**

- **defining, constructing , and operating, repairing and maintaining the major street and highway network;**
- **public transit;**
- **transportation planning;**
- **regulation of urban goods movement;**
- **economic regulation of private transit systems (e.g., taxis, airport shuttles);**
- **control of access to the major street and highway network;**
- **expending funds for these purposes.**

**4.8.6 The legislation creating the Agency specify designated sources of revenue for use by the Agency in carrying out its responsibilities.**

**4.8.7 The Agency be governed by a board of directors, which would be ratified by the governments; whose members could not be elected officials or government employees in transportation-related departments and must reside within the Winnipeg Region; and must include board community representation;**

**4.8.8 Specific measures to ensure accountability be implemented under either Option 1 (the Committee) or Option 2 (the Agency). These would include:**

- **an annual report;**
- **an annual public meeting;**
- **an annual preparation of a 5-year capital forecast;**
- **ongoing community involvement;**
- **review and assessment of TransPlan 2010 every 5 years based on a rolling 20-year planning timeframe, including community involvement and stakeholder consultations.**

#### **4.9 Designing a New Funding Policy**

With respect to funding, the Steering Committee recommends that:

**4.9.1 The decision-making model that is established, whether it be Option 1 (the Committee), or Option 2 (the Agency), initiate a budgetary process embodying greater efficiencies in planning and more transparency in decision-making, including a computer-based decision support model that permits project analysis and selection options.**

**4.9.2 An annual budget for street- and highway- system major repair and maintenance be established, and not be reduced to meet other budgetary shortfalls.**

**4.9.3 User fees re-allocated existing fuel tax revenue, rather than increased property taxes, be the primary sources for increased revenue for street- and highway-system major repair and maintenance within the Winnipeg Region, except for minor streets. Responsibility for minor streets, including revenue generation and expenditures, should remain within the municipalities.**

**4.9.4 Regardless of the decision-making option chosen, the Province:**

- increase taxes two cents per litre on gasoline, other than diesel fuel or "purple" gas, sold within the Winnipeg Region, as a user fee, and pay those additional revenues (estimated to be \$30 million annually) to a dedicated account for Region transportation purposes;
- re-allocate one cent per litre from existing gasoline taxes, other than diesel fuel or "purple" gas, sold within the Winnipeg Region (estimated to be \$15 million annually) to a dedicated account for Region transportation purposes; and
- increase registration fees by \$35 per vehicle within the Winnipeg Region as a user fee, and designate this amount (estimated to be \$20 million annually) to a dedicated account for Region transportation purposes.

**4.9.5 Regardless of the decision-making option chosen, new methods to fund major regional transportation projects be examined.**

## **5.4 Transportation Demand Management**

The Emerging Scenario identified a need to seriously examine efficient ways and means of reducing dependence on automobile travel, provided that the emphasis was on incentive rather than regulatory measures.

Transportation demand management (TDM) measures are to transportation planning what demand-side management techniques are to economic policy and environmental planning. In order to minimize public-sector infrastructure cost implications, the emphasis of TDM measures is on the consumer-driven aspects of choice between alternate modes of travel. The common primary objective of TDM measures is to reduce the dependence of the travelling public on automobiles, and in particular reduce the frequency of single-occupant automobile trips. In addition, there are certain measures (e.g., encouraging home-based employment) that may address the broader objective of greatly reducing travel demand.

In the view of the Steering Committee, the most significant potential benefit of TDM measures is to reduce growth of travel demand and congestion, thereby enabling deferral of major improvements or alternative systems (e.g., rapid-transit). To the extent that TDM measures tend to focus on reducing single-occupant automobile use, which is a contributing factor to environmental degradation, the shift to other, more environmentally friendly, modes of travel is a second potential benefit.

To date, there has been relatively little research or application of TDM measures in the Winnipeg Region and, accordingly, there is limited information on which to base specific program recommendations or estimates of potential benefits. A review of TDM experience elsewhere is difficult to relate to Winnipeg circumstances. TDM efforts to reduce congestion, for example, are a more urgent consideration in communities where massive investments in roadway and freeway infrastructure have been unable to reduce traffic gridlock. The significance of environmental benefits tends to be viewed much more positively in centres where air quality is a major concern.

The Steering Committee recommends that TDM measures considered for application in the Winnipeg Region:

- support the initiatives to revitalize downtown Winnipeg being undertaken by CentrePlan and other downtown associations;
- emphasize measures that might enable deferral of new infrastructure investment, focusing on reduction of peak-hour traffic congestion or its rate of increase;
- include both transit and automobile-oriented components as increased passenger use of automobiles may be as effective as increased transit ridership in reducing peak hour automobile traffic;
- provide for both public- and private-sector initiatives;
- focus on those road-users, and/or concentrated trip origins and destinations, that are most flexible in relation to automobile dependence and potentially most prone to shifts in travel behaviour.

It is further recommended that the Committee or Agency develop TDM initiatives that support the above criteria. Examples that could be considered are:

- downtown parking management;
- employer-based ride-sharing programs with preferential parking;
- flexible or staggered work hours;
- telecommuting;
- guaranteed rides home;
- shuttle-to-transit service;
- shower/locker facilities for cyclists.

## **5.5 Transit System Improvements**

### *5.5.1 Background*

TransPlan 2010 community input respecting the public transit system has generally confirmed the appropriateness of the "balanced" approach developed in Plan Winnipeg, that is, improvement of bus-transit services for radial travel between Downtown (Winnipeg) and the suburbs, and street-system improvements for suburb-to-suburb travel. Many of the comments from the public stressed the importance of the "public service" function of the transit system, that is the assurance of reasonable accessibility for those whose use of private automobiles is restricted by age, health, or income. Other comments favoured the use of public transit as an alternative to dependence on the private automobile. This view emphasized the potential environmental benefits of public-transit use and the assumption that transit can compete effectively with the private automobile. Still other comments questioned the appropriateness of the present level of government subsidy to the public transit system.

The Steering Committee believes that the public-service function of transit is entirely consistent with the goals and principles of TransPlan 2010 and should continue to be an integral feature of community transportation planning and programs. Although delivery of such services must be cost-effective, full cost recovery on the basis of fares will not be feasible, and public-operating subsidy at a level similar to that of today (\$40 million annually) will likely be necessary.

The Committee considers the improvement of transit services to reduce dependence on the private automobile desirable in theory. However, even in high-growth urban areas such as Calgary and Vancouver, where substantial costs are being incurred from providing faster and more convenient light-rail transit (LRT) services, it has proven difficult to substantially shift travel patterns away from dependence on the automobile. In the Winnipeg Region:

- Projected rates of growth and development are such that the great majority of home/work travel will continue to involve existing low-density residential neighborhoods and relatively dispersed employment areas -- a land-use pattern that, short of a significant increase in transit fares or subsidies and a reduction in the convenience enjoyed by automobile users, cannot be served effectively by public transit.
- Estimated levels of traffic congestion are expected to be manageable through strategic improvements

to the conventional network of major streets and highways.

Accordingly, there should be a balance between funding of transit-oriented and automobile-oriented infrastructure improvements. The funding balance should consider the preference for automobiles implicit in the present split between bus ridership and automobile use. Consideration should also be given to:

- the proportion of transit riders who are captive by virtue of disabilities of socio-economic circumstances (i.e., the core public-service requirements);
- the full cost accounting (including environmental costs) of the relative extent to which both bus and auto users rely on public funding of the arterial roadway network;
- the extent to which proposed transit improvements can be staged and designed to ensure that resultant increases in transit ridership are cost-effective and strategically matched to community-wide transportation planning goals.

It is anticipated that travel demand in the Region will continue to increase. However, unless recent trends can be reversed, transit ridership will continue to decline. Approximately 20% of all trips in the weekday morning peak hour are currently made by transit — approximately 25,000 bus-passenger trips out of a total of over 120,000 trips. By 2010, it is estimated that growth in travel demand will result in 130,000 trips in a typical weekday morning peak hour, an increase of 10,000 trips. Therefore, just to maintain the present 20% share of peak-hour travel, approximately 2 000 additional bus passengers would have to be attracted and accommodated in the morning peak hour.

Some portion of the additional transit ridership is expected to result from implementation of TDM (Travel Demand Management) programs (Section 5.4). The remainder will follow more directly from improvements in transit service.

Plan Winnipeg (see Appendix A) suggested such service improvements as the development of a system of downtown-oriented transit corridors (serving southwest, northwest, northeast, east and southeast Winnipeg respectively), each of which would entail acquisition and development of right-of-way to provide a two-lane roadway dedicated for bus use.

Most of these improvements have been subject only to conceptual planning and preliminary cost-benefit

analysis. However, preliminary design studies have been undertaken for the Southwest Transit Corridor, a facility that would link Downtown Winnipeg with the University of Manitoba, primarily utilizing leased rights-of-way from CN Rail. The cost of development of the Southwest Transit Corridor is estimated to be \$80 million. The benefits to southwest Winnipeg would include a reduction in on-the-bus travel time and a modest improvement in traffic capacity on Pembina Highway. These benefits translate into faster service for transit riders and the offer of a more competitive transit alternative for automobile users. To the extent that automobile dependence might be reduced, there should be some related environmental benefits (subject to allowance for any negative effects of the bus corridor on adjacent land use). However, the potential for a significant reduction in automobile dependence for any trip is uncertain. Automobile use would continue to offer greater flexibility in response to the increasing incidence of "linked," or multiple-destination, peak-hour trips (e.g., work-to-shop-to-home, as opposed to work-to-home).

### *5.5.2 Approach to Ranking*

Given the substantial cost and uncertain benefit of the transit corridor program, and the forecast traffic levels can be adequately managed through strategic investment in the major road and highway system (see Section 5.2.3), investments in transit infrastructure should be strategically selected and staged. Investments during the timeframe of TransPlan 2010 should be confined initially to improvement of existing bus-transit service. An example of such an improvement would be the use of emerging communications technology to provide information to passengers on the expected actual (vs. normally scheduled) time of bus arrivals at particular stops. This would require tracking of bus locations using transponders and processing of this data for interactive access from video screens installed at major stops or transfer terminals, or even from home televisions. Such a system would be comparable, albeit on a more detailed level, to the airport arrivals/departures information currently available on cable television.

Within the area bounded by the proposed Inner Ring Route, transit improvements should emphasize frequent and convenient bus service. The improved service area would affect most present transit users and fall comfortably within the 35-minute transit travel time threshold, which, according to Winnipeg Transit, appears to be the effective limit for bus competition with use of the private automobile. This service would rely principally on buses utilizing the existing major radial street system that serve Downtown Winnipeg.

Beyond the Inner Ring Route, transit service would be maintained generally at a level equivalent to that currently being provided and would be oriented primarily to the public-service function. Routes would be extended as required to service new development. However, service would not be as frequent as inside the Inner Ring Route, and access to service would continue to be limited by the greater walking distance to bus stops that is characteristic of low-density residential and employment development.

A major level of system improvement would be the development of strategically located major transfer stations to attract more suburban and ex-urban transit riders. These stations would be located along or near the Inner Ring Route, offering immediate access to the improved system of Downtown radial bus routes as well as to a system of crosstown routes designed to take advantage of the proposed Inner Ring Route development of dedicated Downtown-oriented transit corridors beyond the TransPlan 2010 timeframe. Stations would feature convenient facilities for transfer from other modes of travel (e.g., pedestrian or bicycle access, bicycle storage, Park & Ride lots, Kiss & Ride drop-off locations) and, wherever feasible, would serve as a terminal for existing suburban transit service.

Transfer station locations would also be selected and/or developed to maximize convenience for "linked" trips. Versions of such stations have already been successfully developed at the Polo Park and Kildonan Place Shopping Centres. A third facility is planned during expansion of the St. Vital Centre. Locations such as these cater to the convenience of transit passengers and automobile users alike and encourage private-sector participation in station development. Alternatively, where sites at existing major retail centres are not available, transfer station development could be extended to public/private partnerships providing convenience-level retail and services (e.g., daycare centres, coffee shops, newsstands, drycleaning outlets, drug stores). Variations of the concept (e.g., small Park & Ride facilities) could also be located at a number of sites along radial transit routes both inside and outside the Inner Ring Route.

Nine potential major transfer station locations of the type described above are shown on Map 6. Two other locations that are variations of the transfer station concept are also shown: at the University of Manitoba and at Winnipeg International Airport. More detailed planning studies would be required to identify and rank specific sites and development concepts, to explore potential public/private partnership arrangements, and to develop cost estimates. Six- to 8-bay bus transfer facilities of the type developed at Polo Park and Kildonan Place, where existing shopping centres offer the necessary space, parking and

convenience facilities, could be developed for less than \$0.5 million. Stations that required land and other amenities would be more costly but could be developed as public/private partnerships.

To further complement the suggested service area improvements within the Inner Ring Route and the development of transfer stations to encourage greater suburban use of transit service, supplementary transit service could be developed in the Downtown (Winnipeg) area. Section 6.5.1 of this report includes recommendations for development of a shuttle service that would facilitate access to the full variety of Downtown services and facilities.

### ***5.5.3 Recommendations***

With regard to improvements to the transit system, the Steering Committee recommends that:

**5.5.3.1 Transit service improvements be concentrate primarily along existing radial routes within the proposed Inner Ring Route and such improvements be coordinated with ongoing maintenance of the associated network of major radial roadways serving the Downtown area. Such improvements would include:**

- **the use of emerging communications technology to provide information to passengers on actual times of bus arrivals at particular stops;**
- **transit service improvement initiatives that emphasize improved passenger waiting and travelling comfort. (Improvements of this type are included in A Route to the Future, Winnipeg Transit Strategic Plan; see Appendix G).**

**5.5.3.2 Implementation of dedicated bus-only roadways such as the Southwest Transit Corridor be deferred for consideration beyond the timeframe of TransPlan 2010.**

**5.5.3.3 Rights-of-way (primarily existing rail lines) be protected for the potential long-term development of a system of Downtown-oriented dedicated busways or rail transit corridors serving southwest, northwest, northeast, east and southeast Winnipeg respectively (see Map 6).**

**5.5.3.4 Bus service to suburban and ex-urban areas emphasize development of conveniently located and comfortable transfer stations, which would:**

- cater to the broadest possible range of access by non-transit users, including pedestrians, cyclists, Park & Ride users and Kiss & Ride users;
- emphasize high-quality Downtown service, inclusive of bus diamond lanes and other bus priority measures but, wherever feasible, also cater to specific suburban-suburban movements (e.g., to major suburban employment centres or educational facilities);
- be sited with a view to also capturing peak or off-peak travel to retail and service commercial destinations, with particular attention to opportunities for public-private partnerships in terminal development and operation.

5.5.3.5 based on the criterion outlined above, detailed planning and design studies be undertaken to support a program of major transit transfer stations at strategic locations along or immediately accessible to the proposed Inner Ring Route, as conceptually illustrated on Map 6. In determining these locations, consideration should be given to linking with the protected rights-of-way for potential development of downtown-oriented transit corridors. Such strategic locations include:

- Bishop Grandin Blvd. and Pembina Hwy.
- Kenaston Blvd. and Grant Ave. (potentially in conjunction with redevelopment of federal government lands associated with Kapyong Barracks);
- Kenaston Blvd. and Portage Ave. (preferably an expansion of the existing Polo Park transit transfer facility);
- Inkster Blvd. and Keewatin St. (associated with potential routing of a northwest transit corridor along the CP Arbour line, and with an existing area of significant transit ridership);
- McPhillips St. and Leila (possibly within the Garden City Shopping Centre site);
- Chief Peguis Trail (Kildonan Blvd.) and Main St.
- Chief Peguis Trail (Kildonan Blvd.) and Henderson Hwy. (possibly within the River East Shopping Centre site);
- Lagimodiere Blvd. and Regent Ave. (preferably an expansion of the existing transit transfer facility at Kildonan Place);
- Bishop Grandin Blvd. and St. Mary's Rd. (preferably developed at St. Vital Centre).

5.5.3.6 Development of the transfer station concept also extends to an examination of sites on the University of Manitoba campus and at Winnipeg International Airport (Map 6).

## 6.5 Two Major Downtown Areas

### 6.5.1 Downtown Winnipeg

#### *Background*

The Downtown area of the City of Winnipeg (identified here as "downtown") has been in decline for many years. There are many reasons for this, related to economic and social factors as well as to the pattern of development in the City. This decline is of particular concern to the different levels of government and to the business community located within the area, and there is a series of efforts underway to attempt to revitalize the area, most notably under: CentrePlan; the 3-level government agreement called the Winnipeg Development Agreement; the Downtown and Exchange District BIZ's; and the Portage Avenue Property-Owners Association. The Steering Committee recognizes the efforts of these groups to regain the vitality of the downtown as the commercial, social and symbolic centre of Winnipeg.

The downtown street system often is required to accommodate a significant percentage of suburb-to-suburban automobile trips, because of the discontinuous nature of suburb-to-suburb connections. Construction of an inner ring route system (see Section 5.2.3), which would off-load suburb-to-suburb trips that currently utilize the downtown street system as through routes, particularly Portage Ave. and Main St., would allow for the qualities that many people associate with successful downtowns (e.g. a safe and attractive pedestrian environment, on-street parking).

#### *Portage Ave. and the Portage-and-Main Intersection*

Portage Ave. is a major carrier of cars, buses and trucks. The section between Main St. and Memorial Blvd. is also the site of many store closings, a fact that has not only an important commercial effect but also a major psychological effect on Winnipeggers. With its steady decline over the past 15 to 20 years, Portage Ave. has moved from its earlier status as a "grand boulevard" to that of a thoroughfare. For many, instead of a destination, it is an area that must be crossed as quickly as possible on the way to another location. The concrete barriers at Portage and Main ensure that traffic is not impeded by pedestrians, however the

Committee acknowledges that the closing was a negotiated term of agreement to develop the Trizec complex. The prohibition of parking on Portage Ave. from Memorial Blvd. to Main St. has certainly improved manoeuvrability for buses but has further reduced the "people presence".

The Steering Committee believes that the downtown area, and especially Portage Ave., must become a destination again, and that it requires more pedestrian traffic. This could be accomplished through physical changes such as selected sidewalk widenings and reinstatement of on-street parking. As well, one or more of the following could result in increased pedestrian activity: encouraging government to locate offices downtown; encouraging the establishment of new businesses; and instituting zoning changes that would create new residential areas from renovated old commercial dwellings. These proposals would be facilitated by the implementation of the Ring and Loop Route improvements and the downtown street system improvements (Ellice Ave. and York/St. Mary extension) described in Section 5.2. In the short term, until those improvements are completed, a higher level of traffic congestion and slower traffic movement may result.

### *Travel within Downtown*

The Steering Committee also believes that more environmentally appropriate means of travel (i.e., other than the private automobile) for trips made within the downtown could be facilitated.

The current 99 Downtown Flyer, operated by Winnipeg Transit, provides service within downtown but with limited operating hours. A distinctive, more extensive, more frequent and longer operating (e.g., from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.) service could cater specifically to intra-downtown travellers. Downtown employees, shoppers, visitors and residents, whether bus riders or automobile users, would be able to travel conveniently between office, shopping, dining, hotel, cultural and entertainment facilities. Both transit and automobile users, once in the downtown, would be encouraged to use a wider-variety of facilities and services. Automobile users would be able to leave their cars parked throughout the day. Bus users would not be limited by infrequent off-peak bus service or by the partial downtown coverage provided by present bus routes.

As illustrated in Figure 6.1, the shuttle concept could comprise a number of relatively short one-way loop

routes with the following characteristics:

- On each route, the maximum time between shuttle vehicles would be 5 minutes; average operating speed of the vehicles would be approximately 18 km/hr;
- Riders would have the option of flagging the vehicle or of boarding/alighting at designated stops;
- Transfers could occur at any point of overlap or crossing between the individual routes;
- Subject to a maximum walking distance of one to two blocks, to or from a route, the service coverage could include all of Downtown Winnipeg, and to centre-ville de St. Boniface.

Service could be provided daily between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM. Subject to possible sponsorship arrangements, service on select routes could be extended to cater to seasonal demand (e.g., tourism), special events (e.g., festivals), or late-night shopping. The extended hours of operation would contribute significantly to Downtown safety and security; drivers would be able to communicate directly with emergency service providers.

Other features of such a service could include:

- Vehicles designed to facilitate easy maneuvering on Downtown streets; to permit rapid loading and unloading (including access by people with disabilities); ensure high visibility and recognition (possibly including a "trolley" design and promotional and advertising displays); and, provide comfortable all-weather operation.
- Fare payment and transfer arrangements designed to facilitate use of passes and promotions in cooperation with Downtown businesses and parking facilities, as well as transfers between the shuttle and conventional bus service;
- Implementation of fares that are subject to public/private partnership arrangements involving both the Committee or Agency and other organizations, such as the affected Business Improvement Zones.

The additional cost of providing the downtown shuttle service could be offset by a combination of: fares, subsidy by Downtown business or promotional interests; replacing the Downtown Flyer service; and, possible related opportunities for simplification of existing conventional bus service.

*Regarding Downtown Winnipeg, the Steering Committee recommends that:*

**6.5.1.1 The sidewalks on Portage Ave., from Main St. to Spence St. (University of Winnipeg) be widened at selected locations (especially at intersections) to enhance pedestrian activity and allow for more "passenger friendly" transit stops.**

**6.5.1.2 As part of the Portage Avenue sidewalk widening project, metered parking be permitted in the curb lane on Portage Ave. from Memorial Blvd. to Main St.**

**6.5.1.4 A shuttle-bus service be established, utilizing smaller buses and operating throughout the day, which could provide frequent service to all areas of Downtown Winnipeg and centre-ville de St. Boniface. (see Figure 6.1).**

### ***6.5.2 Centre-ville de Saint-Boniface***

Centre-ville de Saint-Boniface (identified in this section as "centre-ville"), because of its proximity to downtown Winnipeg, is immediately affected by decisions involving traffic movement in that area. Blvd Provencher, the street that links centre-ville to downtown via the Provencher Bridge, is important to the commercial health of St. Boniface. There is great concern that the revitalization of centre-ville, which began several years ago, will be for naught if a new Provencher Bridge results in increased levels of traffic travelling through St. Boniface. There is related concern that existing commercial establishments on Boul. Provencher will re-locate, and new establishments will choose not to locate there. Furthermore, there is also concern that existing heavy-truck traffic is affecting the ability of commerce to develop and that a new bridge and access roadway system will result in even more such traffic.

For many years, opponents of the construction of a new bridge have stated that, rather than building a new bridge, the existing bridge should be maintained. The flood of 1997 and the resultant need to close the Provencher Bridge for repairs illustrated the importance of this crossing for centre-ville businesses, particularly those situated on or near blvd Provencher. It also further reinforced the decision by Winnipeg City Council to commence the initial steps of replacing the present bridge by including funds for a community-consultation process in the 1997 capital budget and in the 1998-99 component of the 1998 to 2002 Five-Year Capital Forecast.

The Steering Committee acknowledges the valid basis for concerns related to a new Provencher Bridge.

However, if the Marion/Goulet-Dugald Connection is implemented (see Section 5.2.3), much of the traffic from east-central Winnipeg destined for downtown, including trucks, will utilize this route and its direct connections to the new Main St./Norwood Bridge, which would result in less through traffic of all types and enable prohibition of heavy trucks on blvd Provencher. This new route would also allow for the replacement of the Provencher Bridge with a new structure and recommended connection to downtown via York–St. Mary that is more compatible with the revitalization of centre-ville de Saint-Boniface.

### **Appendix A: Plan Winnipeg...Toward 2010, Chapter 5C (Transportation section)**

The following excerpt is the full text of the portion of Chapter 5C in *Plan Winnipeg...Toward 2010* that refers to transportation.

#### **C. Regional Services and Facilities**

##### *Statement of Principle*

*The City seeks to provide effective and efficient regional services and facilities, and to reduce the demand for expansion of these services and facilities.*

Certain regional services and facilities are essential to the quality of urban life and must be maintained at an appropriate level. Either lack of maintenance or increased demand may cause deficiencies. Steps must be taken to address both of these issues.

Our regional services and facilities represent a major investment of public funds. It is important that this investment be protected. The overall cost of orderly maintenance and reconstruction programs is less than deferral which eventually requires expensive catch-up work. Yet it is important also to address the need for increased demand. In order to reduce costs, the City should counter increased capacity needs through strategies that reduce demand.

#### **Transportation**

An efficient regional transportation system is vital to the continued well-being of the City. Winnipeg currently has an extensive system of regional streets, bridges and transit routes that serve its citizens. It is

essential that the City continue its commitment, through comprehensive transportation planning, to providing cost-effective and efficient mobility for people and goods in an environmentally-responsible manner. The approach must integrate the needs of pedestrians, bicycles, cars, transit vehicles, and trucks.

To achieve this objective, it is necessary to protect our investment in the existing infrastructure through effective maintenance practices and to implement improvements which are cost-effective.

#### **5C-01 Maintain Existing Infrastructure**

The City shall maintain the existing capacity of regional street, bridge and public transit systems as its highest priority item for expenditure of funds when developing the yearly and five-year transportation capital programs.

#### **5C-02 Commit to Transit System Improvements**

The City shall commit to transit system improvements as a second priority in those areas where transit is considered to have a potential advantage over the private automobile, namely, within the Downtown, along the major radial regional street system, and in areas of concentrated employment, by:

- i. considering the improvement of transit travel times to levels competitive with private automobile travel to have priority for future investment in upgrading associated with repair or replacement of regional streets and bridges,
- ii. initiating a program of rapid transit development prior to the initiation of major extensions or new additions to the regional street system and requesting Provincial funding for such development, and
- iii. undertaking an ongoing program of transit operational improvement measures.

*See also: 3G-01, 3G-03, 5A-11, 5B-11, 5B-12.*

#### **5C-03 Commit to Regional Street System Improvements**

The City shall commit to regional street system improvements, as a third priority, in those areas of Winnipeg where the private automobile is deemed to be the most effective mode of travel, namely, along the major crosstown and circumferential regional street system, by:

- i. considering the improvement of traffic capacity to have priority for future investment in upgrading associated with repair or replacement of regional streets and bridges, and
- ii. considering extensions or new additions to the existing crosstown and circumferential regional street system to be of higher priority than extensions or new additions to the radial regional street system.

**5C-04 Integrate Land Use, Urban Design, and Transportation Planning**

The City shall integrate land use, urban design, and transportation planning by:

- i. ensuring that all residential development supports the provision of attractive and cost-effective transit service through appropriate design considerations,
- ii. managing the supply of long-term Downtown parking to encourage use of public transit to the Downtown,
- iii. continuing the development of the weather-protected pedestrian system in the Downtown and integrating the entry points to the system with the Downtown transit network,
- iv. considering urban design initiatives, aesthetics, and mitigation of traffic noise to be important elements ii the planning and design of urban transportation facilities, and
- v. integrating the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists into the planning and design of urban transportation facilities for both work trip and recreational use.

*See also: 3G-01, 3G-03, 3H-01, 5B-07, 5B-08, 5B-11, 5B-12, 5B-14, 5C-09, 6B-09.*

**Appendix B: Advisory Committee and City — Province Management Team**

*Members of the TransPlan 2010 Advisory Committee (1995-96)*

Bill Shead	Chief Executive Officer	Aboriginal Centre of Wininpeg
Howard Skrypnyk	Co-Chair	Ad Hoc Committee on Bicycle Facilities
Hilda Hildabrand	Chief Executive Officer	Age & Opportunity Centre
Dave Leitold	General Manager, Passenger Sales	Air Canada
George Fraser	Chair, Steering Committee	Airport Vicinity Development Plan
Max Melnyk	Citizen Representative	Assiniboia Community Committee

Elaine Madison	Executive Director	Association of Consulting Engineers of MB Inc.
Jerry Hawryluk	President	Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors
Carol Stewart	President	Association of Professional Engineers of MB
Marion Hodgins	President	Building Owners and Managers Association
Jerry Kruk	President	CAA Manitoba
Paul Barfood	Manager	Canadian Airlines International
Dan Kelly	Associate Director Provincial Affairs	Canadian Federation of Independent Business
Bob Decicco	Division Manager	Canadian Pacific Ltd.
Dave MacIntyre	Manager Public Affairs	Canadian National Railway
Jonas Samons	Vice President	Canadian Manufacturers Association
Steve Childerhouse	Chairman	CAPIT
Janice Penner	Chair	CentrePlan Steering Committee
A. L. Smith	Wing Logistics Officer	CFB Winnipeg
Lance Norman	Citizen Representative President	City Centre Committee and Manitoba Chamber of Commerce
Jeff Lowe	Citizen Representative	City Centre Community Committee
Bill Carrol	Commissioner of Works & Operations	City of Winnipeg
Tom Yauk	Commissioner of Planning & Community Services	City of Winnipeg
Michael Deegan	Manager Business Projects	Canadian National North America
Dean Cousins	Executive Director	Canadian National Institute for the Blind
Jacqueline Wasney	President	Consumers Association
Elizabeth Fleming	Chair, Urban and Regional Issues	Council of Women of Winnipeg

Harry Finnigan	Executive Director	Downtown Winnipeg BIZ
Cam Neirinck	Citizen Representative	Elmwood/Kildonan Transcona Community Committee
Andre Dimitrigeic	Co-ordinator	Emergency Measures Organization
Ron Hambley	Executive Director	Exchange District BIZ
Hubert Mesmen	Managing Partner	Industry Trade & Tourism
Bernard Foth	Tourism Development Consultant	Industry Trade & Tourism
Dennis Cleve	Managing Partner	Industry Trade & Tourism
Chris Lorenc	President	Infrastructure Council of Manitoba (ICM)
Roy Hartmann	President	Institute of Transportation Engineers MB Section
Tom Carter	Director	Institute of Urban Studies
Terry Smythe	Executive Director	International Association of Transport Regulators
Arthur Hanson	President and CEO	International Institute for Sustainable Development
Leslie Jacobson	President	Keystone Agricultural Producers
Bernice Marmel	Citizen Representative	Lord Selkirk - West Kildonan
David Palubeskie		Manitoba Association of Canadian Institute of Planners
Al Harris	General Manager	Manitoba Trucking Association
Don Hester	President	Manitoba Association of Landscape Architects
David Simpson	President	Manitoba Association of Architects
Vivian Schultz	VP of Recreation & Transportation	Manitoba Cycling Association
Nick Carter	Chairman	Manitoba Eco-Network
Rob Hilliard	President	Manitoba Federation of Labour

Colleen Munro	President	Manitoba Heavy Construction Association
Mike Basford	Policy Consultant	Manitoba Highways & Transportation
Andrew Horosko	Deputy Minister	Manitoba Highways & Transportation
Don Norquay	Assistant Deputy Minister	Manitoba Highways & Transportation
Leonard Sobie	President	Manitoba Home Builders Association
Les Parry	Director of Marketing	Manitoba Lotteries
Jack Zacharias	President	Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation
Ed Sawatzky	Planning Coordinator	Manitoba Rural Development
Kathleen Henderson	President	Manitoba Safety Council
Gordon Warren	Board of Directors	Manitoba Society of Seniors
Peter Holle	Provincial Director	Manitoba Taxpayers Association
S. Marcinyck	General Manager -- Operations	Manitoba Telephone System
W. J. (Bill) Kinnear	Deputy Minister	Manitoba Urban Affairs
David Borger	President	Manitoba Urban Development Institute
Arthur Dyck	President	MB Association of Urban Municipalities
Lloyd Terry	Provincial Co-ordinator	MB League of Persons with Disabilities
Theresa Ducharme	President	People in Equal Participation Inc.
Robert Kirkland	Citizen Representative	Riel Community Committee
Glen Hewitt	Citizen Representative	Riel Community Committee
David Dandeneau	Citizen Representative	Riel Community Committee
Darren Lezubski	Researcher/Planner	Social Planning Council of Winnipeg
David Steen	Executive Director	Society for Manitobans with Disabilities
Toby Chase	Manager of Planning	The Forks North Portage Partnership
Penny McMillan	Executive Director	Tourism Winnipeg

Gail Zahradnitzky	Regional Director of Policy & Coordination	Transport Canada
Andy Burgess	President	United Fire Fighters of Winnipeg
Steve Coppinger	Associate Vice President	University of Winnipeg
Ian Wight	Professor	Department of City Planning, University of Manitoba
John Callaghan	Director Western Services	Via Rail Canada Ltd.
Fred Fulcher	Executive Director	Winnipeg Airport Authority Inc.
Klaus Thiessen	President & CEO	Winnipeg 2000
Jake Enns	Director	Winnipeg Ambulance Service
Shelly Morris	President	Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce
Gervin Greasley	President	Winnipeg Construction Association
Barry Lough	Chief	Winnipeg Fire Department
Warren Thompson	Manager, Business Development	Winnipeg International Airport
Heather Grant	President	Winnipeg Labour Council
David Cassels	Chief of Police	Winnipeg Police Service
Peter Squire	Director	Winnipeg Real Estate Board
Rick Borland	Director	Winnipeg Transit
Gordon Johnstone	General Manager	Winnport Logistics Inc.

### **Appendix C: The Community Workshop Process**

#### **How a Consultation Workshop Generates Direction and Commitment to Strategic Change** *Results of a Consultation Workshop*

- Common ground — a shared understanding of a common history, the present environment and possible future scenarios
- Meaningful consultation — informed input and decision making at each stage of the process

- Participant-owned outcomes — people commit to recommendations they have developed themselves
- Quality decision making — participants' diverse perspectives increase the substance and speed of decisions
- Responsive to changing needs — a process design that has the flexibility to make mid-stream adjustments
- Ongoing and simultaneous linkages — stakeholders create the necessary linkages through interacting with each other
- Consensus among stakeholders — a shared vision and set of recommendations of the participants' preferred scenario
- Reduced implementation time — agreement has already been reached and stakeholders are on board

#### *How Does It Work?*

- A pilot workshop for leaders precedes each public workshop — familiarity with design, process, issues, linkages
- A series of five, task-specific workshops sequenced over four to six weeks. This cycle is repeated for each phase culminating in 20 public consultation workshops
- Small groups work on structured, self-managed tasks to produce desired outcomes
- Small-group tasks include silent generation of ideas, round-robin recording of ideas, discussion for clarification, agreement on priority ideas
- Large-group tasks include sorting and selecting the most desirable and most probable ideas
- Content is owned by the participants; process is managed by the resource people who design the sessions with input from stakeholders
- Bringing all the stakeholders into the room builds commitment necessary for implementation

#### *Who Participates?*

- People who have a stake in the community's future
- People important to implementing the strategies and action plans emerging from the sessions
- From eight to over 150 people

#### *Ground Rules*

- We are here to learn about our collective values, our opportunities, our constraints, our history, our different points of view and how we can mutually support each other

- Every idea is validated and recorded
- This is a task-focused meeting with each task having an output
- Participants manage their time; resource people manage the agenda and structure the tasks
- Participants generate data, analyse it, derive meaning, propose action steps, take responsibility for follow-up and output

## **Appendix D: Presenters/Submitters to TransPlan 2010**

### *June 1995 Public Presentations*

- Winnport Logistics (Gord Johnstone and Murray Brown)
- The Provincial Council of Women of Manitoba and the Council of Women of Winnipeg (Elizabeth Flemming and Valinda Morris)
- Rodger Sigurdson
- Manitoba Trucking Association (Al Harris)
- Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation (Darryl Hammond)
- The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce (Les Parry and Lynn Bishop)
- Manitoba Taxpayers Association (Peter Holle)
- Downtown Winnipeg Business Improvement Zone (Harry Finnigan and Michael Hill)
- Councillor Lilian Thomas (Elmwood Ward)
- Marianne Cerilli (MLA Radisson)
- Airport Vicinity Development Advisory Committee (George Fraser and Larry Loreth)
- Chambre de Commerce Francophone de Saint-Boniface (Guy Prefontaine)
- Transcom International (Ed Burgener)
- William Goddard
- Councillor Sandy Hyman (River Heights Ward)

### *Phase I Written Submissions*

- Association of Consulting Engineers of Manitoba
- Canadian National Institute for the Blind
- Manitoba Safety Council
- Riel Community – Old St. Boniface Association
- Councillor Rick Boychuk (Transcona Ward)
- Councillor Bill Clement (Charleswood-Fort Garry Ward)

- The Urban Development Institute — Manitoba Division
- Manitoba Association of Landscape Architects

*September 1996 Public Consultations*

- Acumen Consulting Group (Michael Shaen)
- Dave Cosby
- Don Montgomery
- Industrial Land Use Study — City of Winnipeg (Larry Loreth)
- Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce (Les Parry)
- St. Boniface Chamber of Commerce and rue Principales (Guy Prefontaine)
- Winnipeg Airport Authority (Warren Thompson)
- Winnport Logistics Ltd. (Murray Brown and Jim Slobodzian)
- Rodger Sigurdson
- Jeff Lowe
- Len van Roon
- The Forks North Portage Partnership (Kent Smith and Toby Chase)
- Councils of Women of Winnipeg and Manitoba (Carolyn Garlich and Valinda Morris)
- Winnipeg Downtown Business Improvement Zone (Harry Finnigan)
- People in Equal Participation (Theresa Ducharme)
- Airport Area Business Development Association (George Fraser)
- Infrastructure Council of Manitoba (Joe Barnsley and Chris Lorenc)
- Winnipeg Transit (Bill Menzies)
- Ad Hoc Committee on Bicycle Facilities (Howard Skrypnyk)
- Ken Klassen
- Old St. Boniface Resident's Association (Monique Moulaire)
- Transcom International Ltd. (Edward Burgener)
- Airport Vicinity Development Advisory Committee (Councillor Amaro Silva)
- Councillor Glen Murray (Ft. Rouge Ward)
- Access Advisory Committee City of Winnipeg
  
- Chris Wilcott
- Residents du Nord St. Boniface (Christian Benhamou)
- Kevin Miller

- Jim Jaworski
- Beaver Bus Lines (John Fehr)
- The Cambridge Street (north) Residents' Committee on Traffic
- William Goddard
- Manitoba Highways & Transportation (Amar Chadha)

*Other Letters Received*

- Dave Hardy
- Gordon Matthes
- Manitoba Taxpayers Association
- Linda Regey
- Nine letters from 214th Guide Group

## **Appendix E: TransPlan Publications and Other References**

### **TransPlan Publications**

- Phase I Report - What We Heard from the Public, 1995
- Phase II Report - Images of the Future, 1996
- Profile of Urban Goods Movement in Winnipeg, 1996
- Working Paper on Population, Housing and Employment; Growth and Distribution Projections, 1995
- Working Paper on Rapid Transit in the Winnipeg Context, 1996
- Working Paper on Transportation Demand Management, 1996
- TransPlanNews Volumes 1-5, 1995-1996
- TransPlan Survey Final Report, 1995

All of the above are available through:

***TransPlan 2010***

*c/o 3rd Floor, 100 Main St.*

*Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 1A4*

*Phone: 204-986-7019*

*Fax: 204-986-7020*

E-mail: [krosin@winnipeg.ca](mailto:krosin@winnipeg.ca)

## **Other References**

### *City of Winnipeg Documents*

- Plan Winnipeg, 1986
- Plan Winnipeg...Toward 2010, 1993
- CentrePlan, 1994
- Airport Vicinity Development Plan, 1994
- Winnipeg Area Transportation Study (WATS), 1968
- Metropolitan Development Plan, 1968
- Traffic, Transit and Parking, Wilbur Smith and Associates, 1959
- Planning Transit-Friendly Residential Subdivisions, Winnipeg Transit, 1992
- A Route to the Future, Winnipeg Transit Strategic Plan, 1996
- Winnipeg Bicycle Facilities Study, 1993
- Travel and Demographic Trends, 1962-1992, 1995

### *Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) Documents*

- Briefings
  - A New Vision for Urban Transportation, 1993
  - A Primer on Transportation Investment and Economic Development, 1994
  - Transportation Tax Trends, 1996
  - Urban Transportation Indicators, 1996
  - Financing Urban Transportation, 1997
- Proceedings from New Vision Symposium, 1994
- Summary of Proceedings, Transportation User Pay Symposium, 1995

### *Province of Manitoba Documents*

- Workbook on the Capital Region Strategy, 1995
- Applying Manitoba's Capital Region Policies, 1996
- The City of Winnipeg Act
- The Environment Act

## *Other References*

- Definition and Vision of Sustainable Transportation, Centre for Sustainable Transportation, 1997
- Building a Consensus for a Sustainable Future, an Initiative undertaken by the Canadian Roundtables, 1993
- Calgary Go Plan background studies, newsletters, final report, 1992-95
- A Medium Range Transportation Plan for Greater Vancouver, Greater Vancouver Regional District and Province of British Columbia, 1993
- Airport Area Plan, prepared by IDG Stanley Engineering for Airport Area Planning Committee, 1996
- Presentation to Transportation Association of Canada by agence metropolitaine de transport, Montreal, 1996
- City of Winnipeg Intermodal Terminal Relocation Study, prepared for Western Economic Diversification, Government of Canada by UMA Engineering Ltd., 1996
- Common Sense Paradigms for Public Transportation, Transportation Research News, August 1997
- Transportation Cost Analysis: Techniques, Estimates and Implications, Victoria Transportation Institute, 1995
- Reinventing Public Transportation, David F. Schulz, Contractors Management Journal, April 1995
- Institutional and Operational Implications of Electronic Vehicle Identification, Fred P. Nix, prepared for Canadian Trucking Research Institute, 1995
- A Broader Context for Transportation Planning, Hank Dittmar, Journal of the American Planning Association, Winter 1995
- Automobility, The Canadian Automobile Association, 1993
- Taming the Beast, The Economist, June 22, 1996
- The Transportation and Land Use Connection, American Planning Association, 1994
- Driving Forces: Motor Vehicle Trends and Their Implications for Global Warming, Energy Strategies, and Transportation Planning, World Resources Institute, 1990
- Greater Toronto, Report of the GTA Task Force, 1996
- Vision 2020 1995 Update, Growth, Management, Economic and Transportation Strategy for the Central Puget Sound Region, Puget Sound Regional Council, 1995
- Transit-Supportive Land Use Planning Guidelines, Ministry of Transportation/Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Province of Ontario, 1992
- Transportation Demand Management: A Policy Challenge, K. Morgan MacRae, Canadian Energy Research Institute, 1994

- Preliminary Feasibility Assessment of Intermodal Rail Container Facility for Winnipeg, Transport Institute, University of Manitoba, 1995
- Economic and Social Costs of Private Urban Transportation by Automobile, Joe Au, University of Toronto, 1994
- WIN Draft Transit Policy Initiative, Councillors Vandal, Thomas and Murray, 1995
- Review of Handi-Transit Issues, City of Winnipeg Task Force to Review Handi-Transit Issues, 1993

## **Appendix F: Summary of Transportation Network Simulations Developed for TransPlan 2010**

### **Background**

The City of Winnipeg has developed a computerized system of forecasting future traffic on the major street system, the Perimeter Highway and major highways leading into and out of the City. This modelling system (known as EMME) allows the City to look at various levels of development in terms of population and employment locations and densities; various transportation options, such as new roads and widened roads; and various travel behaviour scenarios, such as transit versus private auto use. The model will predict future traffic on the road network given these future conditions. The model is calibrated for the 1996 a.m. peak hour road network and travel demand is based on the 1992 origin/destination survey. A similar model does not exist for the Region outside of Winnipeg.

### **Simulation Results**

A series of model runs were undertaken by the City of Winnipeg, Streets & Transportation Department for DS-Lea and TransPlan 2010. The following are the variables which were tried in the model.

#### *1. Land Use*

There were four different scenarios developed:

- Scenario A: Year 2010 employment and population without the proposed Winnport development
- Scenario B: Year 2010 employment and population levels with 4,000 new Winnport development employment and no associated increase in population (increased participation rate).
- Scenario C: Year 2010 employment and population levels with 4,000 Winnport development

employment shifted from other areas and no associated increase in population

- Scenario D: Year 2010 employment and population levels with 4,000 new Winnport development employment and a corresponding increase in population.

## *2. Transit Mode Share*

As discussed in Section 3.5, one of the greatest uncertainties in predicting future travel is the future level of transit ridership. Rather than try to model transit ridership with mathematical formulae with limited variables and data, it was decided to assume different transit mode share levels. Three different transit mode splits were simulated:

- Continued decline in transit mode share from the existing 20% to 15%.
- Stable transit mode share - assumes the declining trend can be stabilized at 20% mode share through the use of transportation demand management initiatives and transit improvement strategies.
- Increased transit mode share to 25%, including 50% to Downtown. This was assumed to be the maximum achievable mode split with the extensive transportation demand management program and major transit improvements (e.g. park-n-ride, bus lanes, transit priority and exclusive busways).

These are hypothetical transit mode share projections to give an indication of how transit usage can affect congestion levels. The transit improvements mentioned are examples of how the increase in mode share might be achieved.

## *3. Road Networks*

Two alternative road networks were compared:

- The "do nothing" network, the base year (1997) network, including projects now underway and/or scheduled for 1998 construction.
- The "road improvement" network, containing those improvements recommended for implementation by 2010 (Section 5.2.3).

To present the model output, maps have been designed which illustrate the levels of congestion in different colours. These maps are intended to give an indication of system-wide performance. Individual links are subject to a more detailed analysis. Three of these maps (Figures F.1 to F.3) are included in this Appendix.

Observations from the analysis include:

- Congestion will increase substantially if transit mode share decreases and no improvements are made to the road network.
- Increasing the transit mode share or improving the road network will reduce congestion, but it will still be higher than existing conditions.
- Only the combination of road improvements and increased transit mode share will keep congestion at current levels.
- Variations in the land-use scenarios produced very little difference in the level of congestion in 2010.

### **Appendix G: Excerpt from Winnipeg Transit Strategic Plan, 1996**

The table on the following page is taken from *A Route to Our Future, Winnipeg Transit Strategic Plan, 1996*, the strategic planning document prepared by Winnipeg Transit in 1996, and summarizes the specific future initiatives that they identified to "improve quality customer service".