

Transit

Transportation is a major source of Winnipeg's community GHG emissions. According to the *City of Winnipeg Community 2011 GHG Inventory and Forecast*, residential vehicle emissions contributed 32 per cent of Winnipeg's total emissions in 2011. Personal vehicle travel was the predominant mode of transportation in the City of Winnipeg, representing 81 per cent of total weekday trips.¹

The trend in emissions from transportation in Winnipeg has been increasing at a rate much faster than our population. Although there may have been some differences in annual methodologies, that same *2011 GHG Inventory and Forecast* report estimates that emissions from Road Vehicles increased by 72 per cent in the 17 years from 1994 to 2011. Meanwhile, the population in that period increased by less than 8 per cent.²

Winnipeg has not been giving people a viable alternative to their cars. This budget provides suggestions for ways to reverse that trend.

New Planning / Planning Integration

This Alternative Municipal Budget (AMB) is being introduced at a time when the city is preparing to renew its *Our Winnipeg*³ series of planning documents. Our overarching recommendation in this document is that the city integrate the different areas of planning for urban growth and development, climate change, and the implementation of the pedestrian and cycling strategy. Further, we recommend a complete review and redesign of the Transit network to incorporate public transportation service principles,⁴ provision for electrification, and proper integration of the Rapid Transit corridors with the complete network.

Provincial Climate Plan

On October 27, 2017 the Manitoba government released its *Made-in-Manitoba Climate and*

Green Plan.⁵ Although the government's intentions are not specific, page 21 of that document says "Options to support greater use of active or public transportation are being considered including more bike paths and lanes." The "Electrification of Winnipeg Transit" section on page 12 expresses an intention to pursue electrification of Transit.

Despite these good intentions, the 2018 provincial budget provided no concrete plans to advance these goals. Furthermore, contrary to what transit advocates were anticipating, the carbon tax which will come into effect in 2018 will not contribute funding for transit improvements. In fact the province has stuck to the much criticized elimination of the 50/50 funding (with the city). These budgetary challenges imposed by the province mean that the AMB must look for other sources of funding (see Revenue section).

Our Winnipeg Review & Update

Winnipeg's department of City Planning has begun the process of review and update of the *Our Winnipeg* plan. Documents updating *Our Winnipeg*⁶ have much aspirational language and sentiment but lack clear directives for how to ensure that those aspirations are met. In contrast, this AMB offer clear directives for improving transit in Winnipeg.

Public Transit

There is currently about \$3.2 million allocated for Rapid Transit planning.⁷ We understand that this funding will be used for development of a coordinated and integrated transit plan that includes a Frequent Service Transit Network, Rapid Transit, and electrification. We support and expect such an integrated approach to Transit planning. The Transit plan should also integrate with Winnipeg's Pedestrian & Cycling Strategies (as discussed in our Active Transportation section) to encourage inter-modal travel. A significant portion of this budget needs to be allo-

cated to outreach and for the public to engage in meaningful dialogue with the planners and provide input before implementation.

Frequent Service Transit Network

As noted above, in 2011, 82 per cent of weekday trips were made in cars and only 10 per cent using Transit.

We recommend that Transit press forward with the development of a Frequent Service Transit Network⁸ as set out in a Winnipeg City Council motion on Transit Route Planning on June 21, 2017. On July 19, 2017 Council adopted the motion and directed Winnipeg Public Service to report to the Standing Committee within 18 months.

A Frequent Service Transit Network would cover a portion of the overall transit service network. Buses on these routes would be guaranteed to arrive in something less than 15-minute intervals over the majority of the day (not just rush hour). Montreal has such service in their 10-Minutes Max network.⁹

A Frequent Service Transit Network will fundamentally change the way Winnipeggers perceive and use Transit. It will give people a viable alternative to owning a car. The system will be simpler and therefore more useable. Since the service is available beyond rush hour, people can use the bus for more things like shopping or going to appointments without having to spend a lot of time pouring over schedules and bus connection times.

This is a fundamental shift in how Transit operates on these routes. Instead of operating to schedule, the buses will be working to achieve a consistent interval. In snowstorms and other such disruptive events, buses currently bunch up or “convoy” as each tries to catch up to a schedule which is unachievable under the circumstance. In such a convoy, the first bus is often overcrowded and the next (closely following) bus is empty. If these buses were working to frequency instead of schedule, they could use the GPS system to

maintain interval regardless of the average speed each bus is maintaining.

Buses on the network will be distinguishable from “scheduled service” routes by some visible means. In some cities, the frequent service buses are a different colour but some form of signage may suffice.

Many people on lower incomes work shift work or in service industries which require them to work on weekends. Therefore, the Frequent Service Network should include weekend service that may not be as frequent as weekday but must be better than what is provided today.

We understand that establishment of such a Frequent Service Transit Network will require adjustments to existing remotes. Often, this means reducing service through areas with lower population densities. We recommend that consideration be given to the income levels of people in those affected areas. Service should not be cut to areas of the city where people do not have alternative transportation solutions. Instead, City Planning should concentrate their efforts on ways to build housing and densify the population along these routes.

Finally, consideration must also be given to those who need transit for grocery shopping, medical appointments, childcare, education and to reach recreation destinations. Any design changes should increase access to these destinations, thereby decreasing the social exclusion low income Winnipeggers currently face.

Network Redesign

To make the Frequent Service Transit Network feasible, the network of routes would need to be redesigned — the Frequent Service Transit Network routes should be as straight and as long as possible. An example of such a network is the Montreal 10-Minutes Max Network. This network has long, simple, frequent east-west routes and long, simple, frequent north-south routes. Riders do not have far to walk to reach a network route and can reach most destinations with one



Shuheng Zhu

connection. Since the network is frequent, connections are not seen as an impediment.

Also, with only one bus route per street the network has almost no redundancy, making the system simpler and less confusing. It also reduces cost.

Intrinsic within the redesign effort must be a commitment to continuation of service to existing riders — especially in areas where riders are likely to have limited alternatives to transit (e.g. income, age)

Rapid Transit

Transit is currently involved in the planning of the Eastern Rapid Transit Corridor. We recommend that the design of this corridor and all Rapid Transit planning be integrated into the

Frequent Service Transit Network. This includes designing the stations for ease of connection to perpendicular feeder and frequent service routes.

Public Encouragement & Involvement

Targeted Marketing/Individualized Marketing Campaigns

Providing new infrastructure and new or improved services is a proven way to increase the number people walking, biking, or taking transit for their day to day travel, but new infrastructure or services shouldn't be considered as standalone investments. To gain the most from our investments in sustainable transportation, we also need to reach out to people who live, work, and play in the areas served by those services/ infrastructure and encourage them to use it.

Targeted marketing campaigns, or individualized marketing provide tailored outreach to educate people about their travel choices. This customized information allows each marketing program to focus on the unique travel needs of an individual neighbourhood, institution, or audience. It's an effective way to bridge the information gap and support a change in travel behaviour — driving less and using alternative travel options more. In fact, it's been shown to decrease the number of kilometers being travelled, especially when initiated alongside major transit service and/or infrastructure projects that make it easier to walk, bike, or bus. For instance, a Portland study showed that areas targeted for individualized marketing after installation of a new rapid transit line saw four times the reduction in driving trips compared to areas that were not targeted by individualized travel marketing.¹⁰

The 2009 WinSmart Community Based Travel Marketing Pilot program (based on targeted/individualized marketing) showed that this type of program could be quite successful in Winnipeg. Results from the project showed an 11.7 per cent reduction in drive-alone and an 18.2 per cent reduction in trip-related CO₂ emissions. This was supported by a 54.3 per cent relative increase in cycling, 3.4 per cent increase in walking and 8 per cent increase in carpooling. There was also a 5.4 per cent reduction in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT).¹¹

In Winnipeg, we are suggesting that the city launch an individualized marketing program that will reach 20,000 to 30,000 households per year, starting in 2020 with the opening of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. Program planning would need to begin in 2018.

New Expenditure:

- Implement marketing program: \$.5M/year

Low-Income Bus Pass

A low-income bus pass such as available in other Canadian cities would go a long way to making

Winnipeg Transit available to all. Calgary, for example, was able to shift attitudes about what causes people to live in poverty and what keeps them there. Transportation came to be seen as an important component in social and economic inclusion.¹² This policy is particularly meaningful to low-income single mothers who have to balance work and daycare or school.

A low-income bus pass such as available in other Canadian cities would go a long way to making Winnipeg Transit available to all.

The AMB allocates \$500,000 to the implementation of a low-income bus pass program which would also increase the number of buses that can accommodate strollers, wheelchairs, and people with multiple bags of groceries. These improvements dovetail with the recommendations in our Food Security section, and in the 2018 “Winnipeg without Poverty” report.¹³

New Expenditure:

- Implement low income bus pass policy: \$.5M

Transit Security

The brutal slaying of an operator in February, 2017¹⁴ still haunts Transit employees and the public, yet little has been done to help operators deal with the escalation in violence. The AMB recognizes that most crime originates in poverty and adverse living conditions, and many of the policies recommended in this document aim to ameliorate those conditions. Nonetheless, until conditions improve, no worker should have to put up with unsafe working conditions. Steps could be taken to protect operators and passengers and to train employees how to best react to violent passengers.

New Expenditure:

- Hire consultant to compile report on improving transit security: \$.025M

Handi-Transit

Those who rely on Handi-Transit often experience poor, unreliable, and sometimes unsafe service and onerous rules. The consequences are severe, and include lost job opportunities, missed appointments, and isolation. Many people living with intellectual disabilities do not qualify for Handi-Transit, even though they may be in great need of its services.

Handi-Transit lacks proper governance and is not accountable to its clients. Handi-Transit must be considered an integral part of Winnipeg's overall transit policy to ensure equitable access to mobility for seniors and people with physical and intellectual disabilities.¹⁵

There are a number of community-based organizations that provide essential transportation services for low-income people whose transportation needs are not met by Winnipeg Transit and Handi-Transit services (e.g. seniors and persons with disabilities). For example, some organizations provide low-cost escorted door to door transportation options for low-income seniors. The City of Winnipeg should support these programs that are filling the gaps in Winnipeg's transportation services. But a more sustainable solution that does not depend on resource-strapped community organizations needs to be found.

The result is a patch-work system that lacks control, standards and accountability.

Concerns about reliable and safe service are compounded by reports of onerous working conditions and low pay for Handi-Transit operators, who do not work directly for Winnipeg Transit. Handi-Transit contracts out the work to various private companies that compete for contracts with the City.¹⁶ As with other instances of contracting out (waste collection and snow removal, for example¹⁷) customer service suffers while working conditions, including pay, deteriorate.

Carving out Handi-Transit and subjecting it to the pressures of the highly-competitive

world of private contractors effectively creates a two-tier transit system where people with disabilities receive poorer service than others, and causes them to rely on ad-hoc community services. The result is a patch-work system that lacks control, standards and accountability. In order to remedy this unacceptable situation, the AMB supports bringing the Handi-Transit service back in-house, making drivers employees of Winnipeg Transit. This process could unfold on a contract-by-contract basis, as contracts expire, or begin immediately by expanding the service to those currently outside the catchment area for transit.

New Expenditure:

- Handi-Transit insourcing pilot project: \$.5M

Transit Investment Priority

We need to find more funding for Transit from other sources but we also must give Transit a higher budgetary priority. Winnipeg lost some operational funding from the province in the 2017 provincial budget. However, even before this, Winnipeg had not been investing in Transit at a rate consistent with Edmonton or Ottawa — Canadian cities of comparable size.¹⁸ We are not making the investments in service that would encourage people to use Transit instead of their cars. In very rough figures, over the past few years:

- Winnipeg has been spending about \$200 per person on Transit
- Ottawa more than \$400
- Edmonton about \$330
- Greater Edmonton about \$300

This paucity in funding Winnipeg Transit amounts to an operational funding deficit that must be dealt with. Given the enormity of the investment required to reach parity with other systems, we recommend a four-year plan to increase spending by a total of \$100M.

TABLE 1 Per Capital Expenditure by City 2013–15

Per Capita Expenditure	2013	2014	2015
Winnipeg	\$ 196.11	\$ 206.78	\$ 205.09
Ottawa	\$ 402.72	\$ 407.63	\$ 425.69
Edmonton	\$ 336.58	\$ 323.37	\$ 334.92
Greater Edmonton	\$ 300.60	\$ 291.93	\$ 300.66

SOURCE: CUTA Canadian Transit Fleet and On-Board Equipment Fact Book

TABLE 2 Total Operating Expenditure by City 2013–15

Total Expenditure	2013	2014	2015
Winnipeg	\$ 130,453,362	\$ 139,637,691	\$ 140,303,379
Ottawa	\$ 342,349,975	\$ 349,699,432	\$ 368,917,126
Edmonton	\$ 281,040,462	\$ 283,890,963	\$ 299,749,512
Greater Edmonton	\$ 306,369,390	\$ 310,828,681	\$ 327,236,820

SOURCE: CUTA Canadian Transit Fleet and On-Board Equipment Fact Book

Winnipeg had not been investing in Transit at a rate consistent with Edmonton or Ottawa — Canadian cities of comparable size

New Expenditures:

- Increase Transit operating budget – first of 4 installments: \$25M

Total New Expenditures:

- Marketing program: \$.5M
- Low-income bus pass policy: \$.5M
- Transit safety report: \$.025M
- Handi Transit insourcing pilot project: \$.5M
- Operating budget increase: \$.25M

Total: **\$26.525M**

Revenue Sources

Here are some suggestions for funding sources besides the above increase in operating spending, and which go beyond the traditional municipal mill rate. Some of these sources are not

in the control of the city and the AMB is including them to show readers the difficulties cities face in funding municipal services. The AMB believes that the provincial government should be doing much more to support public transit. These recommendations come under the heading “Provincial Holdouts”.

Other suggestions offer more hope and the AMB strongly urges the city to pursue the funding possibilities available with the federal government and Federation of Canadian Municipalities. These suggestions are in the “Lobby Hard” category.

The other revenues sources we will discuss are under the control of the city and would, if implemented, greatly increase the amount it could invest in transit. They are under the heading: “Bold but Workable”. The AMB includes these revenues in its financial framework.

Provincial Holdouts

Provincial Operational Matching

We recommend that the provincial 50–50 funding be restored. For decades, the Manitoba government guaranteed a 50–50 share of the operating expenses of Winnipeg Transit. In the 2017 pro-

vincial budget, the provincial contribution was frozen at 2016 levels. This resulted in the city receiving between \$5 million and \$10 million less revenue contribution than they had budgeted for. These revenues are desperately needed to lower the operational spending deficit noted above.

Provincial Carbon Revenue

The provincial government's "Made-in-Manitoba Climate and Green Plan" includes a levy of \$25 per tonne on carbon pollution. This is estimated to result in about \$260 million in annual revenue to the province. We submit that it is fair and proper that a reasonable percentage of this revenue be turned over to the City of Winnipeg and that the city use this money to enhance Transit service. Part of the intention of a carbon levy is to encourage people to burn less fossil fuel and

The failure of the province to use carbon tax revenue to electrify the system is even more short-sighted when options such as pay-as-you-save financing is available.

reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Much of the carbon revenue will come from gasoline and diesel fuel sales. If we want to encourage people out of their cars, we need to offer an attractive alternative. This means using money from the carbon tax to improve Transit — it should be more frequent, more reliable, and simpler. (See Frequent Service Transit Network).

The failure of the province to use carbon tax revenue to electrify the system is even more short-sighted when options such as pay-as-you-save financing is available. Such a program, as explained by the Amalgamated Transit Union,¹⁹ could allow the province to re-coup the upfront investment in electric buses through the future operating savings they generate.

The potential for regional economic expansion is further enhanced by having an electric bus manufacturer in our own backyard. New

Flyer Industries supplies electric buses to municipalities throughout Canada and the US.²⁰ Purchase from this local company would create decent jobs in Winnipeg, while allowing the city and province to lead the way in the transition to a greener economy.

Until the province decides to meaningfully support municipalities as they struggle with climate change, the following options are all that remain.

Lobby Hard

Federal Infrastructure Revenue

The Canadian government is pursuing programs related to its Paris Climate Accord commitment to greenhouse gas reduction. To this end, the Public Transit Infrastructure Fund announced in Federal Budget 2016 focused on making immediate investments of \$3.4 billion over three years, to upgrade and improve public transit systems across Canada.²¹ Winnipeg needs to take full advantage of its share of this funding.

It is worth noting that Federal Transit funding was linked to ridership in the 2016 Transit Funding Program.²² So actions that increase ridership — such as the ones the AMB recommends — will increase funding opportunities. Winnipeg did not take full advantage of the funding that was offered as part of this program.

FCM-MCIP Funding

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) Municipalities for Climate Innovation Program (MCIP) is a five-year, \$75-million program that helps municipalities prepare for, and adapt to, climate change, and to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs). Funding is available to encourage residents to use less polluting forms of transportation by encouraging cycling, walking and transit. Winnipeg needs to take full advantage of its share of this funding.

It should also apply for funding through the FCM's Green Municipal Fund²³ which is available for all municipal governments and their partners. The program could cover \$5 million,

or up to \$10 million for a loan — and/or a grant of 10 per cent of the cost of the project.

Bold But Doable

Mobility Pricing and Parking Lot Fees

People who use city services like roads and road maintenance should contribute to pay-

ing for those services. The Introduction and Environment sections outline the principals of sustainable budgeting and mobility pricing. Our Revenue section shows how mobility pricing and parking lot fees could significantly boost revenues that could help pay for transit infrastructure.

1 <http://clkapps.winnipeg.ca/DMIS/ViewPdf.asp?SectionId=450311> (page 12; 32).

2 Ibid.

3 <http://winnipeg.ca/interhom/CityHall/OurWinnipeg/>

4 Jarrett Walker, 2011. *Human Transit: How clearer thinking about public transit can enrich our communities and our lives*. Island Press.

5 https://www.gov.mb.ca/asset_library/en/climatechange/climategreenlanddiscussionpaper.pdf

6 <http://winnipeg.ca/interhom/CityHall/OurWinnipeg/>

7 Public Transit Infrastructure Fund (PTIF) & Clean Water and Wastewater Fund (CWWF) Project information – September 1, 2017

8 <http://jarrettwalker.com/consulting-services/policy/>

9 <http://www.stm.info/en/info/networks/bus/local/10-minutes-max>

10 http://greenactioncentre.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/WinSmart_CBTM_Project_Report_reducedsize.pdf Section 7

11 Ibid.

12 Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2012. Available at <https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/Manitoba%20Office/2012/02/Bus%20Fare.pdf>

13 <https://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/reports/winnipeg-without-poverty>

14 <https://globalnews.ca/news/4025615/one-year-after-drivers-death-little-change-made-transit-union/>

15 <https://www.winnipegfreepress.com/opinion/analysis/handi-transit-failing-winnepeg-disabled-citizens-333153891.html>

16 <http://winnipegtransit.com/en/handi-transit/handi-transit/>

17 http://www.civicgovernance.ca/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Columbia_Back_in_House_May_16_2016_English_web.pdf

18 Data from: “CUTA *Canadian Transit Fleet and On-Board Equipment Fact Book*

19 <https://www.winnipegfreepress.com/opinion/analysis/a-local-solution-to-citys-transit-woes-480210633.html>

20 <https://www.winnipegfreepress.com/local/transit-union-wants-province-to-use-carbon-tax-to-convert-buses-to-electric-480278223.html>

21 Public Transit Infrastructure Fund (PTIF) Proposed Project Listing – September 1, 2017: Project number PTIF1101.

22 <http://www.infrastructure.gc.ca/plan/ptic-fitc-table-tableau-eng.html>

23 <https://fcm.ca/home/programs/green-municipal-fund.htm>