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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In May 2013, the City of Winnipeg engaged MNP to develop and manage a public consultation process for the City of Winnipeg 2014 budget that would encourage widespread citizen engagement. The desired outcomes were a more informed public about the budget and the challenges and opportunities the City faces. The City of Winnipeg also sought input and feedback from citizens about budget and services priorities to inform future City Council decisions.

There were several principles that guided the development of the process including the desire to engage as many people as possible within the timelines and budget. It was determined that it was better to provide as much opportunity as possible at the time rather than wait for the next budget cycle. It was also important that input was solicited about a desired future budget consultation process and that recommendations for improvement be provided to the City of Winnipeg.

Consultation Process

MNP developed a web-site and prepared an on-line survey, telephone survey, invitation for written submissions, and focus group guides to support public and stakeholder workshops. These instruments were developed by MNP with input from City of Winnipeg senior staff as well as City Councillors to identify the type of information to be gathered through the consultation process. The telephone survey was developed in collaboration with NRG Research Group. All workshops and the telephone survey were conducted June 11 - June 28, 2013. The budget simulator, on-line survey and invitations for written submissions remained active from June 11 to September 30, 2013.

All combined consultation methods achieved participation from over 1,720 individuals and organizations. The profile of participants in the consultation process reasonably represented the demographic profile of Winnipeg in terms of age, income and area of the city. A significant majority of respondents to both surveys and the budget simulator are long-time residents of Winnipeg.

What Citizens Value About Living in Winnipeg

When asked what they value about living in Winnipeg, respondents indicated the feel/size of the community; the arts, culture, and entertainment available in the city; green spaces and amenities; friendly people; and an affordable cost of living. Community involvement and volunteerism, cultural diversity and tolerance, architectural heritage, stable economy, and the recent increase in major developments such as the football stadium, airport, Assiniboine Park, convention centre, and Canadian Museum of Human Rights were also identified.

Spending Priorities

Developing and maintaining the infrastructure, particularly the repair of roads and streets, was identified as a high priority in all components of consultation. Approximately 80% of all survey respondents identified repair and maintenance of streets as one of the top priorities. Other top priorities for capital investment identified in the surveys included reducing crime, public / rapid transit and reducing taxes and spending.

Not surprisingly, infrastructure repair, particularly roads and streets and sewer and water systems were identified as high priorities for capital investment. Other top priorities included rapid transit, police stations and fire paramedic facilities, community centres and city parks.

The weight of responses for the on-line survey indicated a higher portion of the general operational budget should be spent on roads and bridges maintenance, crime prevention, and transportation planning. There was also strong support for increased spending in neighbourhood revitalization, public transit, and City planning.
Survey responses indicated a smaller portion of the general revenue budget should be spent on the parking authority, golf services, City administration, and arts, entertainment & culture.

Telephone survey respondents were asked about spending adjustments at a higher level. The responses indicate a similar pattern, with increased spending in infrastructure, community services, and property and development. The majority of respondents would keep spending the same for transit, public works, safety and security.

Roads and Streets stands out as the only area that spending was increased (on average) in the budget simulator. All other areas were reduced to balance the budget.

Revenue Adjustments

When asked about increasing revenue, respondents strongly indicated that the City should look first to more efficient operations, and more effective relationships with other levels of government to achieve higher portions of provincial sales tax and other funding. It is perceived that the City is not competitive at existing levels of taxation, and that citizens are already at the limit of what they can pay.

If increases are required, the majority of respondents would prefer increases in permits, licenses and fines, user fees or business taxes. A majority of respondents did not want property taxes, frontage levies or other taxes to increase. Athletic facility rentals and sports registration, fines for violations of building and property by-laws, traffic tickets / parking fines and golf fees were examples of potential areas for increased revenue identified by respondents.

Respondents that indicated property taxes could be tolerated in small, steady amounts, emphasized that it will be important for citizens to see that the money is being used wisely to address the priority challenges such as infrastructure.

Other opportunities to increase revenue included taxes on tickets for major events, tolls for bridges and regional connector roads, naming rights or sponsorship of city facilities, increasing the costs of developments on the outskirts of the City, and finding ways to generate revenue from residents in surrounding municipalities that use City infrastructure and resources. Providing services to other municipalities in the capital region was also identified as a way to generate more revenue from existing infrastructure (e.g., water treatment). Respondents commonly suggested looking to practices used by other cities.

The Process Itself

Participants in this consultation process identified opportunities for improving future budget consultations. It is commonly believed that more information is needed to allow for enhanced and meaningful consultation, including expectations/targets, benchmarks, and actual performance in each area. Comparisons to spending and performance in other cities would also be helpful to understand the relative efficiency of City of Winnipeg operations in achieving target objectives.

Workshop participants emphasized that the City’s consultation processes overall need to be improved on an ongoing basis. It was recognized that this process is more comprehensive than has been conducted in the past. There is an opportunity to increase the credibility of the City’s interest in citizen input if the input is visibly and meaningfully reflected in resulting plans and budget decisions.

Recommendations

MNP made the following recommendations for further improvements in future consultations:

1. Incorporate a structured, regular consultation process within a comprehensive budgeting process.
2. Align the budget process to long-term strategic plans and desired results and outcomes.
3. Build on the approaches and techniques of this consultation process by introducing additional innovative approaches that will engage even more citizens. Some of these may include:
   - Engaging community organizations to mobilize participation
   - Organizing and implementing issue or service specific consultation sessions that will offer more extensive and intensive discussion of services, service levels and funding
   - Utilize prominent figures in social and / or other media to disseminate information and encourage participation

4. Create budget tool kits.
1.0 BACKGROUND & INTRODUCTION

All across Canada, municipalities are facing an infrastructure crisis. The list of items needing repair includes streets, bridges, sidewalks, community centers, libraries, and sewer and water systems. Under the City of Winnipeg Charter, the City must balance its budget. Given this challenge, the City of Winnipeg engaged MNP to conduct a public consultation process to understand what the citizens of Winnipeg want and expect from its civic government.

The overarching goal for the City of Winnipeg is a vibrant, diverse, inclusive and healthy city that is positioned well for sustainable growth and future competitiveness. The objectives of the consultation were to:

- Establish an inclusive and representative budget consultation process that would encourage widespread citizen engagement;
- Increase public understanding about the City’s budget, and the challenges and opportunities the City faces; and
- Gain input and feedback from citizens about budget and service priorities to inform City Council decisions for the 2014 budget process and beyond.

This report outlines the methodology used and the results of the consultation process.

2.0 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Principles

This budget consultation was planned as a significant expansion on previous years’ activity, but in a compressed period of time. The basic principles on which it was conducted included:

- A partial process is still a good start: While the approach and amount of activity was limited by time, it was considered better to start now than wait another budget year. Concentrated publicity and intensive efforts in June would provide early information that would be complemented with additional information from on-line participation offered over an extended period of time (survey, simulator, written submissions).
- A learning opportunity: As with any initiative, there will be lessons learned. Input from the 2013 budget consultation process regarding desired changes and improvements will inform future efforts.
- Traditional and innovative methods: Different generations, cultures, and areas in the City have their own preferences for how they want to engage. A range of methods, from tech-savvy to traditional personal contact, is important to reach a broad sector of the Winnipeg population.

2.2 Consultation Instruments

MNP developed a web-site and prepared an on-line survey, telephone survey, invitation for written submissions, and focus group guides to support public and stakeholder workshops. These instruments were developed by MNP with input from City of Winnipeg senior staff as well as City Councillors to identify the type of information to be gathered through the consultation process. The telephone survey was developed in collaboration with NRG Research Group. A brief description of each is provided below.

All workshops and the telephone survey were conducted June 11 - June 28, 2013. The budget simulator, on-line survey and invitations for written submissions remained active from June 11 to September 30, 2013.
Web-site

A web-site was developed to host information on the City of Winnipeg’s budget process, and to provide access to consultation tools, including the on-line survey, budget simulator, and invitation for written submissions. The web-site received 7,463 total views.

Background Information

Information on the City of Winnipeg’s budget process, authority under the City of Winnipeg Charter, and sources of revenue and spending in the 2013 adopted budget was prepared. This information was used as a reference tool during workshop discussions and was made available via the web-site.

On-Line Survey

The on-line survey was posted on the web-site on June 11 and was promoted through communications activities. NRG Research Group also arranged direct email invitations to participate in the survey through a reputable national online panel sample provider (Research Now). Research Now randomly identified Winnipeg panelists from their overall list to send the survey invitation with the link. There were 868 respondents to the on-line survey.

Budget Simulator

This interactive tool allows participants to read background information on specified budget areas, adjust budgets up or down and see the consequences of their allocations on taxes and service areas and submit their proposed budget. The budget simulator had 640 views, resulting in 172 responses.

Telephone Survey

MNP contracted NRG Research Group (NRG) to conduct a representative and statistically reliable survey of adult Winnipeg residents. The survey was administered via computer-assisted telephone interviewing from June 18 to June 23, 2013 resulting in 600 completed interviews.
Invitation for Written Submissions

An invitation for written submissions was posted on the web-site and emailed to over 450 stakeholders that had been involved in previous consultations. The invitation was also available at public workshops. Fourteen (14) written submissions were received.

Public Workshops

MNP hosted six (6) public workshops; one in each of the community committee areas and an additional workshop in the downtown area. Five of these workshops were conducted in the evening; one on Saturday. The workshops were conducted in an open-house format. Background information was displayed on poster boards, and access was provided to the budget consultation web-site at these workshops. Focus-group style discussions were held to gather input from the 34 individuals that attended the public workshops.

Stakeholder Workshops

MNP hosted seven (7) discussion sessions with stakeholders. Invitations were sent by email to a list of 461 stakeholders that had previously participated in consultations with the City of Winnipeg, or were identified for inclusion by City Councillors or senior City of Winnipeg staff. Thirty-three (33) stakeholders participated in these discussions.

Comment Line

MNP hosted a toll free comment line to both respond to questions and receive input. In addition to some queries, comments were received from five (5) individuals through this telephone line.
2.3 Communication Plan

A communications plan was prepared to outline the methods, timing and vehicles for the City’s budget consultation process to inform and engage the citizens of Winnipeg in the process. Communication channels included the following:

**Web-site:** The budget consultation web-site provided information and access to consultation tools. Public communications drove access to the site via the City of Winnipeg official web-site home page, with a banner and a link in the Highlights sidebar (winnipeg.ca/budgetconsultations).

**Publicity:** A series of press releases were issued to announce the budget consultation process, provide information on the web-site and public workshops, and provide a reminder of ongoing access and public workshop dates. MNP also appeared on guest spots on the morning shows of three local radio stations.

**Social Media:** MNP used Twitter to create awareness and dialogue regarding the budget consultation process. A schedule of tweets was issued by MNP, with complementary activity by the City of Winnipeg communications department to push current followers to the Budget Consultation web page and tweets.

**Advertising:** Paid print and radio advertising for the campaign took place from June 11th to the 28th across five radio stations, the Winnipeg Free Press, Winnipeg Sun and Community Newspapers.

3.0 CONSULTATION PARTICIPANTS

Approximately 1,726 individuals and organizations participated in the consultation process. Given that one of the objectives of this process was to inform and educate Winnipeg citizens, individuals who explored the budget information on the web-site but did not engage by completing the surveys or simulators as well as the listening audience for the radio station programs would have been reached through these methods. These have not been quantified in this report.

3.1 Respondent Characteristics

**Telephone Survey Respondent Characteristics**

**Figure 1 – Telephone Survey Characteristics – Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% (n=600)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2 – Telephone Survey Characteristics – Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>% (n=600)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 – Telephone Survey Characteristics - Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>% (n=600)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to less than $40,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to less than $75,000</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to less than $100,000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or more than</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Region of Winnipeg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% (n=600)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Region of Winnipeg Pie Chart](chart1.png)

### 5. Lived in Winnipeg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>% (n=600)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 years</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Length of Residency Pie Chart](chart2.png)
On-Line Survey and Budget Simulator Respondents

While respondents were reasonably distributed across age groups, respondents in the 18 – 29 age category were under represented in the on-line survey. This age group makes up approximately 22% of the Winnipeg population and fewer than 11% of the respondents. The pattern is reversed for the simulator, with a higher representation of respondents 18 – 29 years than in the general population. Two (2) percent of respondents to the Budget Simulator were under 18. Seniors are under represented in the Budget Simulator results.

Figure 6 - Age Distribution of On-Line Survey and Budget Simulator Respondents

Please note: Approximately 12% of respondents to the budget simulator did not report their age.

Respondents to the on-line survey were also reasonably representative of the income distribution in Winnipeg. The lower income population is less represented in the Budget Simulator Results.

Figure 7 – Family Income Distribution of On-Line Survey and Budget Simulator Respondents

Please note: Approximately 14% of respondents to the budget simulator did not report their income range.

1 Population data based on 2011 Census, Statistics Canada
NOTE: Reference to family income distribution for the population is approximate only, as Statistics Canada family income groupings for the population are somewhat different (Under $40,000; $40,000-69,000; $70,000 to under $100,000; over $100,000), and are drawn from the 2006 Census as 2011 data is not yet available.

While responses to the on-line survey were reasonably distributed across the City, the populations of the north and east sections of the City are somewhat under-represented in the responses, with the most significant gap in the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan community area. This gap is balanced by a higher proportion of results from this area in the telephone survey.

Figure 8 – On-Line Survey and Budget Simulator Respondent Distribution by Community Committee

Please note: Approximately 10% of respondents to the budget simulator did not report their community area.

An overwhelming majority of respondents to both surveys and the budget simulator are long-time residents of Winnipeg.

Figure 9 – On-Line Survey and Budget Simulator Respondent Distribution by Length of Residence in Winnipeg

Please note: Approximately 14% of respondents to the budget simulator did not report their length of residence.

$^2$ Community Committee populations are based on ward populations from the 2009 Winnipeg Wards Boundaries Commission Report.
Written Submissions

Fourteen (14) written submissions were received, ranging from brief emails to position papers. This includes seven (7) organizations that wished to be identified, as follows:

- The Assiniboia Chamber of Commerce
- Canadian Community Economic Development Network - Manitoba
- Canadian Federation of Students – Manitoba Chapter
- Canadian Taxpayers Federation
- General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres
- University of Winnipeg
- Winnipeg Arts Council

Full copies of these seven submissions are included in Appendix A. Comments from other participants have been incorporated within the general results.
4.0 CONSULTATION RESULTS

The following sections provides a summary of the feedback and input received from citizens and community organizations.

4.1 What Citizens Value

Telephone survey respondents were asked to identify what they particularly value about living in the City of Winnipeg. The most frequent responses related to the feel/size of the community, the ‘things to do’ in the City (arts, culture, entertainment), green spaces and amenities, friendly people, and affordable cost of living.

Figure 10 - What Respondents Value About Winnipeg (Telephone Survey)

Public and stakeholder workshop respondents identified a similar list, also citing community involvement and volunteerism, cultural diversity and tolerance, architectural heritage, stable economy, and recent major developments such as the football stadium, airport, Assiniboine Park, convention centre, and Canadian Museum of Human Rights.
4.2 Priorities

Infrastructure, particularly the repair of roads and streets, was identified as a high priority in all areas of consultation. It was consistently among the top priorities for all surveys and in public and stakeholder workshops. Eighty-five (85%) percent of on-line respondents and 73% of telephone survey respondents identified repair and maintenance of streets as one of the top priorities. Other top priorities identified in the surveys included reducing crime, public / rapid transit and reducing taxes and spending. Safer streets / reduced crime was the second most often cited priority in the telephone survey, representing over a quarter of the total mentions.

Figure 11 - Survey Respondent Top Priorities

The following priorities were identified by workshop participants and in written submissions:

- **Address the crumbling infrastructure.** The critical state of disrepair of the infrastructure both above and below ground in mature areas of the city was frequently identified. Concerns about crumbling buildings and sewage spilling into the river were also expressed. Improving traffic flow was often combined with comments related to infrastructure as a priority to enable better movement throughout the city. Participants perceive that the City should have ongoing scheduled maintenance plans to prevent this level of decay and to improve the appearance and functionality of the city. The current state affects the City’s ability to attract both business and visitors and limits the investments citizens and existing business are willing to make.

- **Re-investment in Community Centres.** Community centres are considered an important piece of the social fabric of the community as they are places where people can go and be engaged in a
positive way. Funding for infrastructure and a commitment to invest in ongoing maintenance is desired.

- **Long-term planning with structured implementation.** Participants perceive that there is a lack of vision of what kind of city Winnipeg should be and the key strategies necessary to achieve that vision. OurWinnipeg is believed to be a good start but strong implementation plans are needed to support it.

- **Minimization of urban sprawl.** Participants expressed concerns with development around the edges of the city while older areas are crumbling. It is believed that suburban development requires significant infrastructure investment and causes further strain on existing services such as Transit.

- **Improved transit system.** More highly utilized public transit was identified as a means of reducing the infrastructure challenge, minimizing the environmental impact of transportation in the city and as a support for densification.

### 4.3 How Citizens of Winnipeg Would Spend the Budget

#### Capital Budget Priorities

On-line survey respondents were provided a list of areas requiring capital investment, and asked to indicate whether investment in each area is a low, medium or high priority. Streets, bridges and sidewalks were identified as a high priority by a large majority of respondents as well as sewer and water infrastructure.

**Figure 12 - Capital Budget Priorities (On-Line Survey)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets, Bridges, Sidewalks</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer and Water Infrastructure</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit, including Rapid Transit</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Stations and Fire/Paramedic Facilities</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Parks</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey Arenas, Pools and Splash Pads</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrastructure renewal and rapid transit were also commonly identified priorities for capital investment by workshop participants and in written submissions.
Capital Budget Adjustments

A list of capital investment areas and the amount allocated to them in the 2013-2018 capital investment plans were provided to survey respondents. When asked whether investment should be less, about the same, or more, the most frequent response was “about the same” in almost all categories.

Roads and Bridges was the only area where a majority of respondents (72%) clearly indicated the current capital budget should be increased. Spending more (38%) was the most frequent response for the Transit System although the distribution (31% for the same and 31% for less) was more equal. A higher percentage of respondents would spend more on public safety infrastructure and the water system. A higher percentage of respondents would spend less on land drainage and flood control, solid waste disposal and sewage disposal.

Workshop participants indicated that while capital investments in major projects such as the airport and stadium are important, community level assets also need support (community centres and recreation facilities).

Figure 13 - Capital Investment Area Adjustments (On-Line Survey)

Operational Spending Adjustments

Many departments have some form of revenue generated by the specific services of the area. Costs that exceed this amount are funded by general revenue from taxes and other unconditional sources (e.g., interest, general grants, etc.). On-line survey respondents were provided a list of budget areas; the percentage of general revenue used to fund them, and asked whether the City should spend less, the same, or more of the budget in each area.

With a few clear exceptions, the most frequent response was “about the same”. This was also the most frequent response from telephone survey respondents when asked about the level of public funds that support the aspects of the City that they value. Public and stakeholder workshop participants commented that it is a difficult question to answer without a fuller understanding of the expectations and performance in each area. Specific information requested included comparisons to spending and performance in other cities, and
performance reports against desired outcomes. Workshop participants also expressed concern that ‘robbing’ one service area to support another is not a sustainable strategy.

Workshop participants identified a need to spend more on road repairs and maintenance, community policing including downtown foot patrols, public transportation, active transportation, community services, and development in mature areas of the city, including low-income housing. Tourism and economic development were also identified as important contributors to future revenue growth but are perceived to be underfunded in Winnipeg compared to other cities. While some participants felt areas like arts and culture should be left to private funders, others expressed a need for more investment in arts and culture, noting small amounts can have a large impact in this sector. Less could be spent on traditional policing, road expansion and development in new areas, consultants, and major capital projects (efficiencies need to be found).

The weight of responses for the on-line survey indicated a higher portion of the general revenue budget should be spent on roadway construction and maintenance (75%), crime prevention (54%) and transportation planning (44%). Strong support for increased spending was also indicated for Neighbourhood Revitalization (39%), Public Transit (36%), and City Planning (36%).

Figure 14 - Areas of Spending to Remain the Same or Increase (On-Line Survey)

The weight of responses indicated a smaller portion of the general revenue budget should be spent on the parking authority (57%), golf services (55%), support departments (51%) and council services (50%). A significant amount of support was also identified for reducing spending in Assessment, Taxation and Corporate (47%), Fleet Management (45%), and Arts, Entertainment & Culture (38%).
Telephone survey respondents were asked about spending adjustments at a higher level. The responses indicate a similar pattern, with increased spending in infrastructure, community services, and property and development. The majority of respondents would keep spending the same for transit, public works, safety and security.

Figure 16 - Operational Spending Adjustments (Telephone Survey)

Budget Simulator Results

The budget simulator allowed respondents to adjust the budget across the various spending areas. Within the simulator, respondents were also required to balance the budget, so that any spending increases needed to be matched by decreases in other areas, or by increases in revenue. The starting point for the budget simulator was the 2013 adopted budget, plus 3% inflation. Average adjustments by area of spending are shown below. Roads and Streets stands out as the only area that was increased.
Figure 17 – Adjustments to Infrastructure Spending (Budget simulator)

![Infrastructure Spending Chart]

- Roads & Streets: 4.9%
- Public Transit: -0.9%
- Garbage Collection: -3.4%
- Land Drainage & Flood Control: -3.1%
- Parks, Urban Forestry & City Beautification: -1.6%

Figure 18 - Adjustments to Property and Development Spending (Budget Simulator)

![Property and Development Spending Chart]

- City Planning, Development Approvals: -3.8%
- Neighbourhood Revitalization: -1.9%
- Heritage Conservation: -3.9%
- Economic Development: -4.1%
- Property Asset Management: -5.1%
- Cemeteries: -7.5%

City of Winnipeg Budget Consultations Final Report
Organizational Support Services and Council Services budgets were decreased by the largest amount.
In addition to greater investments in infrastructure, as identified above, themes from the budget simulator included the following:

- **Focus on crime prevention instead of enforcement.** This includes police prevention activities and relationship building, and increased funding for recreation, libraries, community services and neighbourhood revitalization in order to provide youth in lower income families with opportunities and alternative life choices and supports.

- **Increase funding for public transportation / Rapid Transit.** Increasing use of the public transportation system will reduce the wear and tear on our roads.

- **Libraries** – Respondents were split on this topic. Some felt funding for libraries should be maintained / increased to support youth (as above), while some felt that funding should be decreased as there is a perception that the internet has reduced utilization of library services.

**How to Reduce Spending**

Approximately 2/3 of on-line survey respondents suggested ways in which reduced spending could be achieved. Respondents most frequently (28%) suggested cuts to spending on City staff and Councillors, including reductions in the number of staff and reductions in salaries and benefits such as pensions and sick time payouts (11%). Some suggested implementing four day work weeks in order to reduce labour costs. While not all participants agreed, wages and benefits (pensions in particular), were identified as a concern. Moving to a defined contribution plan for new employees and more closely aligning civic employee compensation with the private sector were identified as opportunities to reduce costs.

Some concerns were expressed in workshops that staff reductions may create ‘false economies’. Examples included if reduced capacity to process development applications creates delays that slow down or discourage development, or if consultants are used to offset staff reductions, particularly where continuity and ongoing expertise are required (e.g. transportation planning).
Approximately 14 percent of on-line survey respondents felt that City and Councillor discretionary budgets should be reduced. Seven percent (7%) suggested contracting out/privatizing services or selling money-losing operations as viable alternatives.

Sixteen percent (16%) of respondents suggested savings should be gained through efficiencies in the delivery of Police, Fire, Paramedic and Healthcare services including reducing overtime and using civilians or technicians to complete paperwork and other routine duties. This was also expressed by participants in the stakeholder workshops, with particular comment that more police is not the answer to continuing challenges, and significant efficiencies could be gained by using civilians for administrative tasks.

Twelve percent (12%) of on-line survey respondents suggested decreased service levels and/or efficiencies for garbage collection and snow clearing.

Improving efficiency was also a common theme in workshops and written comments. Examples of what appeared to be poor coordination between departments (tearing up recently replaced pavements for sewer repair), and redundant activity (watering planters when the streets are wet with rain) were often cited. Political interference was also identified as a concern, as there is a perception that decisions may not be sufficiently informed on a cost-benefit or long term impact basis, and shifts in direction increase costs and lessen progress in priority areas.

An overall expectation was expressed that costs for the same services should not increase faster than the rate of inflation or population growth. Workshop participants identified public private partnership arrangements (P3s), alternate service delivery, or privatization where possible as opportunities to reduce costs. Reducing red-tape and unnecessary regulations were also identified as ways to reduce costs.

Comments from budget simulator respondents also indicate a belief that efficiencies can be found in the operations of many City departments, including administrative services, road maintenance / repairs, and Police, Fire, and Emergency Response. Further suggestions included increasing accountability of staff and contractors to achieving results and long-term value supported by performance metrics; more public scrutiny of expenses, reducing red-tape and paperwork; and reducing idle-time for emergency services (e.g. Paramedics waiting at hospitals.)

Additional Services

Survey respondents provided comments regarding a wide variety of concerns and/or suggestions regarding existing services, however, few noted any new services they felt the City should provide.

Participants in stakeholder and public workshops indicated that the set of services offered by the City is reasonably complete. Accessibility and awareness of what the City does offer could be improved, and better results are needed in some key areas of existing services. Some respondents would like to see more support for poverty reduction initiatives, including affordable housing; food security, particularly in the inner city, and more public engagement.

4.4 How Citizens of Winnipeg Would Adjust Revenue

Many participants in stakeholder workshops believe increased revenues should not be necessary, that sufficient gains should be available through more efficient operations, and more effective relationships with other levels of government to achieve higher portions of provincial sales tax and other funding. It is perceived that the City is not competitive at existing levels of taxation, and that citizens are already at the limit of what they can pay. The most frequent response from on-line survey respondents (18%) was also that the City should first reduce spending or find efficiencies in current operations.

If increases are required, the majority of respondents to the on-line survey would prefer increases in permits, licenses and fines, user fees or business taxes. The significant majority of respondents did not want property taxes, frontage levies or other taxes to increase.
Telephone survey responses showed a similar pattern, with business taxes, and permits / licenses / fines as preferred areas for increases.

Respondents to the budget simulator also elected to increase licenses / fees / fines and user fees. Business taxes and all other taxes were increased by a smaller amount to balance the budget. Those that agree with tax increases want to see transparency and improvements in core city functions as a result. Those that disagree with tax increases feel that the required funds can be realized through increased efficiencies in City operations.
Some workshop participants identified business taxes as an area that could be increased; others felt this would only serve to suppress economic activity and lessen the growth in the assessment base. Higher rates for water and sewer in the outskirts of the city, photo radar fines, and more user fees were also identified as areas that could be increased so that those creating demands on the services would bear more of the cost. Dedicated tax initiatives to fund areas such as tourism and the Arts were also identified.

Workshop participants identified concerns that the City is not maximizing the existing revenue opportunities. Delayed collection of assessments on new homes, and not imposing fines where there are clear violations were some examples. Increasing utilization of existing services, for example by opening up and coordinating scheduling for athletic fields, and creating a universal transit pass for students were also identified as opportunities to generate more revenue without increasing fees. Increasing development and converting derelict buildings to productive spaces were also identified as important to increasing the assessment base versus further burdening existing sources.

Some workshop respondents suggested there are opportunities to increase user fees where Winnipeg lags other cities. Tipping fees were particularly noted. Increases to tipping fees were also identified as a means to encourage waste diversion, which is also perceived to lag other cities. Workshop respondents consistently indicated that increases in user fees must be competitive with other cities and any increases justified by clear improvements in service.

Workshop participants that indicated property taxes could be tolerated in small, steady amounts, emphasized that it will be important for citizens to see that the money is being used wisely to address the priority challenges such as infrastructure.

Other opportunities to increase revenue include taxes on tickets for major events, tolls for bridges and regional connector roads, naming rights or sponsorship of city facilities, and a larger portion of gas taxes. Other opportunities include increasing the costs of developments on the outskirts of the City, and finding ways to generate revenue from residents in surrounding municipalities that use City infrastructure and resources, such as commuter tolls or a vehicle registry tax for ex-urban communities. Providing services to other municipalities in the capital region was also identified as a way to generate more revenue from the existing infrastructure (e.g. water treatment). This was also identified in the on-line survey. Workshop participants also suggested looking to practices used by other cities.
User Fees

Respondents to the telephone survey are equally split between support and opposition for introducing more user fees on City services.

Figure 25 - Respondent Support for Additional User Fees (Telephone Survey)

Approximately half of on-line survey respondents provided examples of areas in which they felt more user fees would be appropriate. Areas indicated by 10% or more of respondents to this question included:

- Athletic facility rentals and sports registration (30%)
- General fines (including for property maintenance, and other building and property by-laws) (24%)
- Traffic tickets/parking fines (23%)
- Building permits and other permits (16%)
- Golf fees (14%)

4.5 Participant Feedback on the Consultation Process

The short notice and overall brief period for public and stakeholder workshops was a common concern. Some community organizations offered to host discussions to improve access and enable a voice for those that otherwise may not be heard.

Participants also identified a need for more information to allow for enhanced and meaningful consultation. Budgeting for municipal government is complex, and participants found it difficult to provide input without a fuller understanding of the expectations/targets, benchmarks, and actual performance in each area. Comparisons to spending and performance in other cities would also be helpful to understand the relative efficiency of City of Winnipeg operations in achieving target objectives.

There is some confusion evident in consultation responses regarding the purpose of consultation and how it fits in the overall decision-making process and framework. For example, some participants expressed concern that City Councillors are abdicating their responsibility for making budget decisions by asking the
public what they should do. Others wanted to penetrate deep into departmental activity to provide input on specific budget choices.

Suggestions for alternate approaches include both a narrower and a broader perspective. Some participants felt it would be more effective to ‘go deeper’ on specific issues with the set of stakeholders knowledgeable on those issues. Others felt that public consultation is more appropriate on higher level long term plans and the results the City needs to achieve, versus how to allocate the budget to achieve those results, which was seen as an administrative responsibility.

Workshop participants emphasized that the City’s consultation processes overall need to be improved on an ongoing basis. It was recognized that this process is more comprehensive than has been conducted in the past. There is an opportunity to increase the credibility of the City’s interest in citizen input if this input is visibly and meaningfully reflected in resulting plans and budget decisions.
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on MNP’s observations and participant feedback:

1. **Incorporate a structured, regular consultation process within a comprehensive budgeting process.**

An ongoing annual (or bi-annual) consultation process that enables community input as a regular, reliable part of the City’s budget planning processes will encourage citizen engagement and promote credibility of the civic government.

2. **Align the budget process to long-term strategic plans and desired results and outcomes.**

The City of Winnipeg has some performance measures and comparative data in the posted information on the 2013 adopted budget. There is a lot of information and data but a limited understanding of its significance. Target performance and service levels are only sometimes defined and not connected to long-term plans. There was significant feedback during the consultation process that there is not enough information or understanding for citizens to evaluate the effectiveness of financial investments in specific areas or determine the ‘value’ of the services being provided. MNP is recommending the development of a planning and budgeting process that clearly identifies the results the City wants to achieve in each service area to support long-term plans, incorporates a concise set of measures to evaluate progress and allows for benchmarking to understand progress relative to what can be achieved.

3. **Build on the approaches and techniques of this consultation process by introducing additional innovative approaches that will engage even more citizens. Some of these may include:**
   - Engaging community organizations to mobilize participation
   - Organizing and implementing issue or service specific consultation sessions that will offer more extensive and intensive discussion of services, service levels and funding
   - Utilize prominent figures in social and / or other media to disseminate information and encourage participation

Generally, open public workshops are often poorly attended regardless of notice time. Community organizations that regularly engage their members on issues can help the City of Winnipeg reach deeper in the community. MNP is recommending hosted workshops by one or more community organizations in each of the following sectors: business, economic development, sport / recreation, community organizations and arts and culture. These workshops could be used to solicit general budget input or engage in discussions once preliminary directions for spending are determined.

Often citizens will have greater interest in topics that are more specific and allow for deeper and more extensive information sharing and discussion. MNP is recommending facilitated sessions around the areas of greatest spend such as public works and / or protective services. These sessions would involve detailed presentations about services, service levels, costs and results as well as opportunities for questions and feedback.

The power of social media is in its ability to connect with wider and more diverse audiences. Using prominent figures with large followings to provide information, encourage participation and engage citizens in discussion will more effectively use social media as a tool.

4. **Create budget tool kits.**

Citizen understanding of how its municipal government is funded, the cost of the services provided and the results of this investment are critical for engagement and support for challenging decisions. A practical, easy to use tool kit that can be provided to City Councillors and community leaders and used in ongoing discussions with citizens would go a long way in facilitating effective consultation.
Appendix A

Written Submissions
June 25, 2013

City of Winnipeg 2014 Budget Consultation Process
c/o Linda Stupack
MNP LLP, 2500-201 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, MB R3K 3K6

Dear Linda,

As I have discussed with you via email, the Executive and Board of Directors of the Assiniboia Chamber of Commerce, which represents the over 4000 businesses and over 400 members in our West Winnipeg Chamber area, is pleased to submit the following themes and suggestions we feel should be considered by the members of City Council in making their decisions about the City of Winnipeg 2014 budget.

Our comments and 4 theme suggestions are contained in the attached Assiniboia Chamber of Commerce Input document that accompanies this letter.

Our Chamber of Commerce Executive and Board of Directors appreciate this opportunity to provide our input and comments for this 2014 Pre-Budget Consultation process.

We would be available at any time in the future and appreciate meeting with Councillors Scott Fielding (St. James Brooklands-Weston Ward), Grant Nordman (St. Charles Ward) and Paula Havixbeck (Tuxedo Ward)), who were elected to represent our West Winnipeg Chamber area, to expand and add additional comments regarding our Chamber region which is currently enjoying much of the economic growth happening in the city.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
Ernest Nairn
Executive Director
Assiniboia Chamber of Commerce
Serving West Winnipeg since 1930

Attachment Enclosed

West Winnipeg’s Chamber Since 1930
City of Winnipeg pre-budget 2014: Assiniboia Chamber of Commerce input

The City of Winnipeg pre-budget 2014 consultations will hear from the Assiniboia Chamber of Commerce on these 4 themes supporting our West Winnipeg Chamber region:

Infrastructure
The city’s needs for infrastructure (particularly roads, sewer and water) are of prime concern and of great importance to the business community in the west end of the city and should be urgently addressed by council and executive policy committee; this is of significance for many aspects of the growth in the west Winnipeg development plans.

The tiring delays and positioning on CentrePort Canada services is looking like it may be closer to getting agreements and plans finalized but this needs to be vigilantly pursued by the city until the actual waste water and domestic water solutions are in place for the lands including south (in the City limits), the north (through connection to City services for waste water and sewer) and the shared services agreements for the majority of the lands.

Planning
The City of Winnipeg has conducted several major planning exercises over the past few years that have provided a blueprint for the community and its growth and infrastructure priorities. Stick to the plan. The shifting priorities that have an optic of alignment with the political whims of some elected officials are not productive for the city or its relations with other levels of government. A high profile example of a dramatic change in priorities was the redirecting of funds from rapid transit to community centre improvements.

There also has to be a much higher profile placed on certain strategic routes and address of beautification efforts budgeted for and implemented. The first priority is in the west end of the city and especially the airport route to downtown. This has been talked about for several years but little action has been taken to improve and beautify this route to the downtown area.

Accountability
The City of Winnipeg must do better at ensuring its spending and contracting is done in a manner that is value based and consistent in its application for the citizens of Winnipeg. The lowest cost does not always provide the best value but there has to be both accountability in the administration’s ability to demonstrate value and also transparency in its transactions. This has slipped into a less than confident environment this past couple of years.

Services
The City must continue to improve city services and the operating efficiencies of the city operations - the garbage and recycling efforts are an excellent example of sticking to the plan and getting it right. There are other areas where equally difficult decisions are needed and shifts in approach will be necessary to change the current performance. The services need to focus on the end user and all means of service delivery should be evaluated.
Thank you for your invitation to attend a pre-budget meeting. Over the years the Canadian Taxpayers Federation (CTF) has provided many constructive ideas in terms of initiatives the city could pursue to save taxpayers money or raise revenues through legitimate means (rather than raising taxes). Those recommendations are reflected in the Economic Opportunity Commission report and past pre-budget documents provided to city hall.

In addition to those ideas, here are a few recommendations we would suggest pursuing:

1) Salaries and Benefits
- Cap salary and benefit costs to private sector wage growth for services that can't be contracted out. This will likely require the city to begin by pushing the province - perhaps publicly - to change labour laws and guidelines for arbitrators.
- Begin putting new employees in defined contribution pension plans; the benefits down the road will be immense. Continuing to ask taxpayers to pay more and more for rich city pensions is not ethical (Stats Can data shows the majority of private sector workers have no workplace pension whatsoever)
- Phase out retirement bonuses and sick leave payouts; again, the benefits down the road will be significant

2) Contract Out Services
- Continue to explore contracting out city services
- Look at partnerships to run city pools; they lose $10 million+ per year
- Revisit contracting out golf course management on a course-by-course basis

3) Core Services
- Instead of spending money on things like water parks and giving money to people that sing outside the remand centre, stick to core services like road repair and policing.

4) Lead By Example/Various
- Reverse the $40,000 increase to ward budgets and eliminate the new EPC secretariat. If bureaucrats aren't providing good advice, replace them with people that will; no need for creating the EPC secretariat all over again
- Instead of the elitist approach whereby the city decides which organizations receive grants and subsidies, pursue more taxpayer-driven culture. In other words, leave the money in taxpayers' pockets and let them decide which groups to fund.
- Look at removing restrictions in labour agreements that prevent certain volunteering activities

5) Other
- Continue to look at city land that could be sold off and developed; this could yield more property tax revenue.
- Consider some kind of treasury board model whereby expenses are scrutinized more publicly.

I hope that helps.

Colin Craig,
Prairie Director - Canadian Taxpayers Federation
General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres

Submission on City Budget, June 2013

Introduction

General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC) is the organization representing the interests of the sixty four community centres in Winnipeg. Our city is unique in that all Centres are run by volunteer boards. Centres provide sport, recreation and leisure activities to the citizens of Winnipeg. Many provide social services required in their community, including child care, after school or lunch programs aimed at children as well as a range of other programming. Much of the sport programming for children in Winnipeg is provided by Centres offering both summer and winter sports.

Community Centres receive an annual operating grant from the City. The Universal Funding Formula (UFF) provides a grant to each Centre. The grant formula takes into account the heated square footage of the facility, the number of residents in the catchment area and the number of rinks maintained through the winter. The total 2013 UFF grants are $4,936,703. The City also provides additional grants to centres for; programming, a subsidy for program registration fees, janitorial services (these grants are administered by the GCWCC), and a renovation grant which is administered by the City.

Our submission is that the value of Community Centres to the residents of Winnipeg far exceeds the cost. The programming provided is worth millions of dollars more than the cost paid.

Volunteers

No other large city in Canada provides services through volunteer-run community centres where so many activities in a neighbourhood are under one roof. The Boards of Centres are responsible for most of the care and maintenance of these City owned buildings. They also run all programming; registrations, evaluations, recruiting coaches and instructors, providing uniforms and equipment, providing the facility or venue and keeping things safe.

The contribution of the volunteers is hard to quantify. No complete record is kept, since they are not being paid, but the estimate is that about 10,000 people volunteer at the 64 Centres. They work on the Boards, run the canteens, set up for activities, flood the rinks, coach, fundraise, clean and paint, organize winter and summer community festivals, and a hundred other things. A few years ago, we asked Centres to track the volunteer hours spent in a year. The total was 1,216,861 hours; a staggering amount; or about 121 hours, on average, per volunteer, per year. This is entirely unpaid work. At the minimum wage, the cost would be
$12,777,040.50. Add in holiday pay at the rate of 4% and employer contributions for EI and CPP and the cost is over $14,000,000 per year.

Some of that work is not core to the functioning of the centre or is repeated by successive volunteers. Some could be done more efficiently by trained, paid staff. But, consider the cost. If any of the work was moved to City staff, it would certainly not be at minimum wage. All City benefits would apply. The inherent flexibility of having dedicated volunteers prepared to do what needs to be done, often outside “office hours” would be lost.

A Comparison of Service

Most of what is done at Centres is not directly comparable with City run services, for a variety of reasons. However, look at arenas. The City is actively looking to get out of providing indoor ice facilities. They have asked for an expression of interest on the existing facilities. Every one of the City arenas loses money on an annual basis. While we do not have an accurate figure for 2012, the estimate given to us is that they lose about $130,000 per arena per year on average.

In comparison, thirteen Centres operate seventeen sheets of ice; all at a profit. Some are new and quite efficient, but even the old facilities make money. Why? Several reasons exist. There is flexibility in hours of operation. Centres will stay open late to accommodate adult leagues. In contrast, the City arenas cut hours of operation years ago and lost industrial leagues where the players wanted to play after getting off evening shifts at work. Centres actively look for business through the summer months and during the school day. They are flexible in negotiating fees for off hours. They will provide a quick response to inquiries. They do everything that they can to make money, which is then used for other Centre activities. The City pays nothing for the community centre arenas as they do not come under the funding formula.

A Comparison of Cost

For years, the City ran a program to provide janitors to some Centres. The program started as a means of moving recipients of social assistance in to the work force. It also proved to be very helpful to Centres. The program provided $300,000 in wages, but had an overall cost well in excess of $500,000. By agreement, the City ended the program and instead provides GCWCC with an annual $300,000 grant. Of that, $285,000 is spent on wages and $15,000 on all other costs. The number of janitors provided is decreasing as the minimum wage rises and the size of the grant remains fixed.

Community Centre Programs

Programming varies from one Centre to another, based on community needs as well as other demographic factors. A comprehensive review and listing of programming at each centre was
undertaken in the last three years. The purpose was to allow easy access to information about availability, as well as identifying and filling gaps. The individual centre’s profiles are posted on the GCWCC website. The last full review determined that Centres offered a total of 1145 programs and that the total hours offered per year were 213,865 hours. Some are quite structured programs; others, such as drop in programs, are unstructured. All are designed to fill a need in the community. In some areas, family resources are quite limited and private programs may be inaccessible. In those areas, many of the programs are designed to assist families by giving young children a safe place to go at lunch or after school. All Centres strive to keep fees as low as possible. Breaking even is the normal goal. In many Centres, programming is essentially free to users.

**Sports Programs**

Sport programs are the main type of programming at most Centres. Nine separate sports are played through the various sport organizations organized in Winnipeg. About 8600 volunteers provide services to about 127,000 participants. Many children play more than one sport per season. Most will participate in both a summer and winter sport. GCWCC has been actively involved as a partner in the development of the City of Winnipeg Sport Policy. Our goal is to provide programs to encourage healthy, active citizens of all ages. Participation in sport or other programs is important to children. It encourages fitness, teamwork and builds skills. Importantly, it helps build friendships and encourages self esteem. Kids who are busy with recreation activities are less likely to get into mischief. They are part of a team; and part of their community.

Centres are committed to allowing everyone to play, regardless of financial ability. Our Registration Fee Subsidy Program pays up to 90% of the cost of registration for financially qualifying children. That fee goes entirely to the sport organization. We receive $85,750 from the City and $50,000 from the Province of Manitoba. Last year, we paid out about $200,000 to allow kids to play who otherwise been unable to. We raise the balance of the money from the private sector, including a very successful partnership with Canadian Tire Jumpstart.

**Community Centre Infrastructure Fund**

This program provided $2,000,000 per year, from 2006 to 2010, for rebuilding Centres. It was highly successful. GCWCC was able to provide expertise on designing and building new Centres. As well, we were able to assist in grant applications, with great results. The $10,000,000 total from the City was leveraged to provide about $27,750,000 in construction or related costs. The result was brand new or substantially renovated Centres: Bronx Park, Valour, Sturgeon Heights, Norberry Glenlee, Sinclair Park, Winakwa and Lindenwoods.
The CCIF Grant was not continued after the initial five year period. To some extent, the renovation grant of up to $965,000 per year has replaced it. This is limited to $50,000 per year per centre, so needed renovations are getting done, but no new buildings can be built. Many centres are old buildings, often at the end of their economically useful existence. The CCIF allowed new buildings to replace old ones. There are cost savings from efficiencies in use, size and energy. The City contribution was almost tripled, with the City owning the buildings. This is a very efficient use of city funds.

A program to replace the CCIF should be given serious consideration. Plan 2025, a blueprint for the future of Centres in Winnipeg, was developed after significant deliberation by all districts in Winnipeg. It was approved by Council and the City and all of the new Centres had been identified in the plan. Without a replacement to CCIF, the City will end up with no clear plan or timeframe to renew or replace centres. An unfortunate consequence is that new Centres may only be developed in areas of affluence and growth. Those may not be the areas of need.

**Long Term Issues**

Volunteers may be dedicated, but they are not limitless. Many Centres have experienced a ‘burnout’ in long term volunteers. Part of the problem is the continual need to deal with problems in the facilities. The agreements with the City make the Centres responsible for maintenance and much of the repair work required. Some Centres have hired staff or had janitors provided through our grant program. That lets the volunteers concentrate on activities. But, the grind of constantly being short of money is tough on volunteers. When they quit, there are few low cost options to replace what they give.

The City budget needs to reflect the value of Centres to this City by maintaining the current grants and looking at options to replace the CCIF. The Mayor and Council have consistently shown how much they value the effort of volunteers and the services which Centres provide. The citizens of Winnipeg benefit tremendously by what Centres do. We need to keep providing the Centres with adequate resources to strengthen them as we move into the future.

Thank you for your consideration.

Timothy Killeen, President
General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres
265 Osborne St. South, Winnipeg, R3L 1Z7, 204 475 5008
Submission to City of Winnipeg 2014 Budget Consultations

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the City of Winnipeg's budget process. As one of the largest cohorts of people in downtown Winnipeg, and a driver of downtown development and renewal, The University of Winnipeg appreciates our active partnership with the City of Winnipeg over the years in a number of strategic areas.

The City's financial support of the United RecPlex and Wellness Centre currently being constructed at the University is perhaps our largest collaboration, and the facility will provide a meaningful way to further engage inner-city children and youth in sport and recreational activities, as well as benefiting the greater community.

1. What do you believe should be the top three (3) priorities for the City of Winnipeg in the next few years and why?

The University would like to highlight the following civic priorities for the next few years:

i. Further Improve Focus on Sustainable Transportation

- Expanding rapid transit and improving its reach would make a significant impact on ridership. Reducing the number of vehicles on the road would have the additional benefits of saving money on street repair and improvement, decreasing traffic congestion with the ensuing environmental benefits.

- Supporting reduced transit fares for students and the UPass initiative will encourage young people to develop the habit of utilizing transit, and encourage that behavior later in life, while reducing the number of vehicles on the road.

- Improved bike lanes, particularly on main thoroughfares in the downtown and core area, will encourage an additional mode of sustainable environmentally friendly transportation.

ii. Continue and Expand Funding for Inner-City Youth Programs

- It is generally acknowledged that monies spent on providing youth with quality programming in a safe place during the evenings, weekends and summer months is an effective way to reduce crime and ultimately improve educational outcomes. Continued and expanded investment in community recreational programs and spaces is a wise investment, and one that should continue to be a priority of our City.
iii. Continue to Expand Incentives for Development and Renewal in the Downtown

- Downtown is the heart of our city. As our recent experience has demonstrated, the renewal of downtown spaces can have a transformative impact on neighbourhoods and the city in a much broader way. Incentives for the construction of housing in the downtown and its immediate surrounding areas brings people downtown on a permanent basis and further builds on the momentum achieved with the MTS Centre, Hydro building and University of Winnipeg renewal.

- Inclusion of the University within the downtown for program application. Many program boundaries cut through the middle of the campus, so programs on the east side are eligible but programs on the west side are not e.g. downtown residential development grant program.

- Sidewalk and infrastructure repair and street beautification initiatives are also critical to creating a downtown that is well maintained and provides a feeling of safety and security.

2. What kinds of new or improvement projects should the City of Winnipeg be targeting for capital investment?

i. Rapid Transit – The only way to improve ridership on transit is to make it as convenient as possible. Extending rapid transit would go a long way towards achieving this goal.

ii. Continued Investment in Inner-City Recreational Spaces – Youth require both the facilities and the programs to engage them in evenings and over summer holidays. The University of Winnipeg has proven through the Wii Chiiwaakanak Learning Centre and its Community Learning programming that positive spaces and programs can change lives, providing futures for children and youth that they may never have imagined. We need to provide more of these opportunities for the most at-risk segment of our population, inner-city and Aboriginal youth.

For additional information please contact:
Mr. Mike Emslie
Associate Vice-President Financial Services and Operations
The University of Winnipeg
m.emslie@uwinnipeg.ca

Mr. Sherman Kreiner
Vice-President Student Life and Managing Director UWinnepeg Community Renewal Corporation
The University of Winnipeg
s.kreiner@uwinnipeg.ca

Ms. Jennifer Rattray
Associate Vice-President Indigenous, Government and Community Affairs
The University of Winnipeg
j.rattray@uwinnipeg.ca (after August 19, 2012)

Dr. Jino Distasio
Associate Vice-President Research and Innovation and former Director of the Institute of Urban Studies
The University of Winnipeg
j.distasio@uwinnipeg.ca
U-PASS

Submission to Winnipeg City Budget Consultations

July 2013

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA STUDENTS’ UNION (UMSU)
THE UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG STUDENTS’ ASSOCIATION (UWSA)
CANADIAN FEDERATION OF STUDENTS – MANITOBA (CFS-MB)
INTRODUCTION

The universal transit pass (U-Pass) is a transit pass that would give eligible students unlimited access to Winnipeg Transit services for fall and winter academic terms (September – April) for a set price. In addition to providing a cost-effective transit option for students, a U-Pass would assist universities in managing transportation demand and provide Winnipeg Transit with a consistent, predictable revenue stream for future planning and development purposes.

The University of Manitoba Students’ Union (UMSU) and the University of Winnipeg Students’ Association (UWSA) are moving forward with the adoption of a U-Pass for their respective members. Both student associations have held student referendums last fall and both referendums passed with overwhelming support from students. The president of the University of Manitoba, David Barnard and the president of the University of Winnipeg, Lloyd Axorthy, have written letters to Mayor Sam Katz and Premier Greg Selinger in support of a U-Pass. Students and universities are united in advancing the U-Pass and it is time for the City of Winnipeg to invest in affordable and efficient transit services for its students.

A RECORD OF SUCCESS

Students, university and college administrations, and municipalities across North America are recognizing the benefits of the U-Pass and are continuing to work together to provide a better public transit system for their communities. Students from Halifax, Nova Scotia to Victoria, British Columbia are benefiting from the U-Pass, making post-secondary education institutions and the cities they are located in desirable places to study, work, and live.

With an affordable U-Pass program, institutions and cities across Canada have experienced significant increases to transit ridership. For example, the adoption of the U-Pass in 2003 at the University of British Columbia (UBC) and Simon Fraser University (SFU) saw or experienced an increased student ridership of 63%.

Similar results are seen in other cities such as Edmonton, Alberta where student ridership doubled after the U-Pass was implemented at the University of Alberta. The U-Pass programs have remained popular among students with agreements consistently been renewed by all stakeholders (students, institutions, cities) after initial 3-5 year program implementations.

---

THE BENEFITS OF THE U-PASS

The implementation of the U-Pass program would provide a number of direct and in-direct benefits for all stakeholders. For the purposes of this submission, it is important to highlight the benefits of the City of Winnipeg investing in the U-Pass program. The potential return on investment has both altruistic and fiscal benefits. According to a recent evaluation by the City of Edmonton, the relative monetary value of a U-Pass is estimated at $3.4 million and reflects the cost-effective advantages of said program.³ The City of Winnipeg would experience the following benefits through an investment in the U-Pass program:

- **Consistent and Sustained Fare Revenue - $9.9 Million**
  Winnipeg Transit calculated the cost of the U-Pass, for students attending the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg, at $283 per student for an academic year (September – April). Based on current enrolment figures for both institutions, it is estimated that Winnipeg Transit would receive $9.9 million in revenue each academic year. In contrast to the current process (susceptible to variations in student funding, weather changes, and course scheduling) the U-Pass ensures a predictable, consistent revenue stream for Winnipeg Transit that would be invaluable for future planning and budgeting purposes. Research indicates students who use a U-Pass during their post-secondary education are more likely to continue using public transit after graduation. For example, 50% of recent graduates from the University of Alberta and Grant MacEwan University continued to use public transit.⁴

- **Increased Ridership – 50% Increases**
  According to surveys conducted by Winnipeg Transit, approximately 34% of students at the University of Manitoba and 43-47% of students at the University of Winnipeg use transit as their primary mode of travel to school. With the implementation of the U-Pass, the City of Winnipeg would experience a projected 50% increase in student ridership similar to British Columbia and Alberta. This is likely to result in increased ridership in poor-performing bus routes and maximization of bus usage.

- **Environmental Benefits**
  With the adoption of the U-Pass, students are more likely to leave their vehicles at home in favour of transit. With fewer single occupancy vehicles on the road, the City of Winnipeg is able to reduce the overall carbon footprint associated with travel to and from the major post-secondary institutions. In 2008, students at the University of Alberta and Grant MacEwan University reported replacing 5.5 million car trips per

³ [http://www.edmonton.ca/transportation/Report_on_U-Pass_Performance_during_the_3_year_Pilot_Program.pdf](http://www.edmonton.ca/transportation/Report_on_U-Pass_Performance_during_the_3_year_Pilot_Program.pdf) at page 2
⁴ Ibid. Attachment 1
academic year with transit due to the availability of the U-Pass. The reduction in car trips represents 1,981 tonnes of Carbon Dioxide Equivalents (CDE) which is calculated at a carbon trade market value of over $49,536.5

- **Reduced Road Maintenance/Improved Parking**
  In the span of two years, the U-Pass program saved the City of Edmonton approximately $1.3 million in road maintenance. These savings are based on Todd Littman’s report, *Evaluating Public Transit Benefits and Costs*, wherein he notes that “research has shown that 30 automobile drivers shifting to transit can provide savings worth between $0.15 and $1.73 per kilometer.”6 Therefore, with more students opting to take transit, the more the City of Winnipeg will save on road maintenance costs. In addition to these monetary savings, more students opting to take transit will result in a reduction of traffic congestion and reduced parking demands in communities surrounding both universities.

**REQUIRED INVESTMENT**

The current estimated cost per student for the U-Pass at the University of Manitoba and University of Winnipeg is $283. Thus, UMSU and the UWSA are seeking investment for this program from the City of Winnipeg for fully publicly funded program, such as those currently enjoyed by students in the cities of Ottawa, Edmonton and Vancouver to name a few.

**CONCLUSION**

After years of research and analysis, UMSU and the UWSA have decided to move forward with the U-Pass program to address increasing student need and demand for transit services. However, the success of this program requires an investment and support from the City of Winnipeg. Based on the success of similar programs in cities across Canada, the City of Winnipeg will realize significant returns on its investment through consistent, sustained fare revenues, reductions in carbon emissions, and savings in road maintenance.

---

5 Ibid. Attachment 1  
6 Ibid. Attachment 1
RESPONSE TO THE CITY OF WINNIPEG’S 2014 BUDGET CONSULTATION PROCESS

Priority: Funding to Arts and Culture

The Importance of Municipal Funding for Arts and Culture in Winnipeg

The Winnipeg Arts Council is a not-for-profit public benefit agency with charitable status, charged by the City of Winnipeg to distribute funding to arts organizations and artists, to manage the City’s Public Art Policy, and to foster development of the arts for the people of Winnipeg. The Winnipeg Arts Council currently receives $4.1 million for this purpose along with another $500,000 designated for the public art program. This funding has flat-lined since 2007. The Arts Council has recommended a new funding formula to the City of Winnipeg that increases the annual allocation from approximately $6 per capita to $12 per capita, doubling funding over the course of five years. Other cities have increased funding to the arts through the introduction of a Billboard/Commercial signage tax, and through a designated mill rate attached to Property Tax to add to current allocation.

The great distinguishing factor from any other organization listed on the City’s “Grants” list is the fact that the Winnipeg Arts Council functions as an investor on behalf of the City and these funds are thereby distributed to over 200 arts organizations and artists each year at a lower administration cost than any other public funder in the country.

As a pre-eminent city-building organization, the Winnipeg Arts Council is concerned with the quality of life in the city and how arts and culture has determined Winnipeg’s reputation as a City of the Arts, both nationally and internationally. In 2010, the Winnipeg Arts Council initiated and won the bid to be designated Canada’s Cultural Capital by
the federal government and invested an additional $3.5 million dollars into the City’s arts economy.

As an Economic Driver!

Arts and culture are powerful drivers of the quality of life in Winnipeg and of the local economy. The not-for-profit arts organizations along with film, music and computer graphics and other creative initiatives, interact with and support investments in other sectors such as high technology, the service sector, and the myriad of small and large businesses operating in the city. The larger the municipal investment in arts and culture, the greater the returns as demonstrated in the following. In no other sector are the yields proportionately as high.

In 2009, through the economic activities study *Ticket to the Future*, Prairie Research Associates determined the following:

- The arts and creative industries account for $1 billion in economic activity in Winnipeg and employ 6.3% of the city’s labour force or approximately 25,000 citizens
- More than 3 million visitors attend Winnipeg’s concert hall, performances, art galleries and museums annually; 1.9 million seats are filled each year by 12 professional local arts and cultural organizations
- Cultural activities are the third most popular activity for tourists visiting Winnipeg, ahead of both sightseeing and outdoor sports and activities; tourists spent $87 million in 2007 that included enjoying arts and culture in the city
- Every dollar of municipal funding attracts another $18.23 in support to local arts and culture organizations from other levels of government and from the private sector. By investing in arts and culture, municipal governments provide assurance to other prospective funders and demonstrate leadership.

Arts, Community and Young People!
Through its Public Art community programs, for example WithART and YouthWithART, projects are created to engage communities and most importantly, young people, in art projects that allow their creative voices to emerge. The results are community transformation. Young people are given opportunities to make positive social choices, choices that can affect their lives and allow for preventative intervention. Many of these programs are focussed in the inner city.

**Building a City of Character!**

The Public Art Program managed by the Winnipeg Arts Council has become a model for the rest of the country and is often called upon by other municipalities for advice. Projects in Winnipeg have transformed public space adding character and often creative utility. Whether the impressive new light and mist fountain in the Library’s redesigned park now an iconic marker in the centre of the city, or art works that enliven neighbourhoods, or artists’ designs integrated into infrastructure like the Osborne Bridge or in the new Transcona Park, the Winnipeg Arts Council provides the initiative and administrative integrity needed in Winnipeg for all aspects of public art throughout the entire city.

Funding for Winnipeg’s Public Art Policy is derived from the City’s Capital Budget. **Public Art should be a priority for capital funding** and be calculated as 2% of the total City Capital Budget annually, the typical formula used in cities throughout North America. The City could source dedicated funds for Public Art through implementing incentive-based contribution or levies from developers to build the fund.

**Creating Opportunities for Access to the Arts for All!**

A priority for the Winnipeg Arts Council is to make the arts available for everyone. Free events like the Barge Festival or the Big Dance on Broadway, appeal to one and all. Families can experience wonderful performers at no cost.

**The Winnipeg Arts Council delivers on priorities set by the municipal plan, OurWinnipeg:**
a) _helps_ the City maximize the value it derives from the arts for purposes of the economy, tourism, employment and quality of life;

b) _gives_ the City a coherent, civic-wide policy on culture based in efficiency and best practice;

c) _brings_ Winnipeg in step with progressive cities around the world that use arts, culture and creative industries to enhance the quality of life, fortify the local economies, enhance city reputations, and generate positive social benefits for all of Winnipeg’s diverse communities.
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Background

This brief has been prepared by the Canadian CED Network – Manitoba as part of the City of Winnipeg 2014 Budget Consultations.

The Canadian CED Network – Manitoba promotes community economic development (CED) as a comprehensive and integrated approach to improving economic, social, and environmental conditions in communities. This approach understands that solutions to complex community challenges will be most successful and sustainable when they are community-led.

Across Manitoba, CED initiatives foster economic revitalization, access to capital, local ownership of resources, labour market development, poverty reduction, social development, and environmental stewardship. Despite the proven impact of the CED approach, communities (urban, rural, northern, newcomer, Aboriginal, etc.) continue to lack the level of support they need from all levels of government to take innovative, sustained, and strategic action through a comprehensive approach. We believe the City of Winnipeg must take an active role in providing that support.

More than one hundred members are represented by the Canadian CED Network – Manitoba including the Aboriginal Council of Winnipeg, Food Matters Manitoba, Manitoba Cooperative Association, Health in Common, Neighbourhood Renewal Corporations throughout the province, CCPA-Manitoba, Assiniboine Credit Union, SEED Winnipeg, and other social enterprise and CED organizations. Our members represent hundreds of community organizations that are working with thousands of community members across the Province. The Canadian CED Network – MB is also an active participant in many coalitions and working groups including Make Poverty History Manitoba, Right to Housing Coalition, Rural Team Manitoba, the Manitoba Co-op Vision Strategy, and the Social Enterprise Council of Canada.
Recommendations

1. HOUSING

Affordable housing is a key piece of a neighbourhood renewal strategy and a necessary foundation for neighbourhood and family stabilization. Families are the building blocks of complete communities and stable families create contributing citizens.

Winnipeg’s rental housing vacancy rate is hovering around one percent. Our existing social and affordable rental housing stock is aging and is not being adequately replaced with new construction. At the same time, rental stock is being lost through demolition and conversion to condominium.

These factors have escalated rents to make them unaffordable to a growing number of people, especially the most vulnerable (persons on fixed income, persons with disabilities, newcomers, seniors, and Aboriginal people). In fact, one third of Winnipeggers who rent, live in core housing need. This means that they are spending more than one third of their income on rent, and/or are living in inadequate or overcrowded homes. This puts them at significant risk of losing their housing, their health, and their spirit.

When housing costs increase, children are forced to move from school to school which can negatively impact educational outcomes. Furthermore, parents do not have the stability required to access employment opportunities and provide the necessities for their families (food, winter clothing, transportation, school supplies etc.). These circumstances make personal debt and food banks sad necessities for survival.

All three levels of government need to work closely together to ensure an adequate supply of affordable housing across the country. The City of Winnipeg must do its part by demonstrating concrete steps to increase the supply of affordable rental housing city-wide and ensure Winnipeggers can access those units. This will result in improved emotional and physical health, better educational and employment outcomes, a reduction in poverty and greater social inclusion.

A. The City of Winnipeg should use the planning tools and powers at its disposal to encourage the creation and preservation of affordable rental housing including by providing incentives to the private and social enterprise sectors to create and maintain affordable rental housing.

One of CCEDNet’s member organizations, the Right to Housing coalition, has outlined several mechanisms to encourage the construction and maintenance of affordable rental housing such as through:
i. An incentive package for purpose-built rental housing that has a range of measures such as financial and land grants, tax rebates, increased density, expedited permit processing and waiver of development fees.

ii. A specific plan to work with the Province of Manitoba regarding the new units of affordable housing that will be developed in Winnipeg as a result of the Province’s commitment to build 500 units of affordable housing in Manitoba over the next three years.

iii. The removal of barriers in procedures and processes that impede the development of affordable housing including the complicated permit process for small developers and the community committee process which allows a small number of people to prevent the development of rental housing (both affordable and market housing).

iv. Inclusionary zoning regulations

v. Increasing the inspection and enforcement of property standards and codes for rental property

vi. The Mayor signing on as a charter member of the Canadian Rental Housing Coalition

vii. Formally advocating for increased federal involvement in affordable housing

viii. Mounting a public education and engagement campaign regarding the benefits of affordable housing

ix. The allocation of sufficient funding and personnel to carry out increased housing work both through a separate housing agency like the Winnipeg Housing and Rehabilitation Corporation and through prioritizing affordable housing development with permit and planning staff.

B. The City of Winnipeg should establish an “Affordable Housing First” land use policy for all municipal surplus land disposal and ensure non-profit and cooperative housing providers are prioritized for receiving surplus land for the purpose of creating affordable housing.

A significant constraint for the development of additional affordable housing is the availability of reasonably priced residential land. Current efforts to access surplus government land for affordable housing development are often resolved through labour-intensive, time-consuming, and unpredictable case-by-case determinations. An “Affordable Housing First” land use policy, such as that outlined in the City of Brandon’s Roadmap for Growth 2014, would ensure that any time government land was determined to be surplus
and considered for disposal, full priority would be given to mobilizing potential partners (i.e. non-profit and cooperative housing providers) for the creation of affordable housing on that property. Only when all possible avenues for affordable housing were exhausted without resolve would the property be disposed of through traditional market means.

C. The City of Winnipeg should continue to fund the Housing Rehabilitation and Investment Reserve or subsequent relevant budget reserve and develop a regular and transparent process for reviewing and adjusting its size to ensure it adequately meets housing needs in Winnipeg.

The City of Winnipeg is currently committed to the creation of affordable housing through its maintenance of the Housing Rehabilitation Investment Reserve (HRIR), however, the HRIR budget allocation of $1.448 million is not sufficient to address the current situation given the severity of Winnipeg's affordable rental housing shortage.

D. The City of Winnipeg should regulate the conversion of rental stock to condominium when vacancy rates are too low. For example, by putting a freeze on condominium conversions until the rental vacancy rate exceeds 4 percent.

2. PROCUREMENT

Ethical enterprises use a business model that creates jobs and important community services, builds fairer and stronger local economies, reduces poverty, renews communities, and creates more sustainable environments. Strategic government purchasing from ethical enterprises would scale up these social, economic, and environmental outcomes and allow the City to achieve a greater return on investment in the long-run.

The City of Winnipeg's Call to Action for OurWinnipeg states that the civic government needs to lead by example, promoting sustainable practices throughout the organization and the community. The document acknowledges that a balanced, sustainable approach to decision-making recognizes the full costs of decisions by supporting long-term financial, environmental and community wellbeing, viewing these issues and the community as a whole, as interwoven and as part of an integrated system.

The Call to Action for OurWinnipeg also states that establishing a sustainable procurement community network and updating the City of Winnipeg's sustainable procurement policy will create balance for purchasing decisions at both the community and civic government level. This will provide the framework for purchasing decisions that consider the full impact of any purchased goods and services including lifecycle costs and ethical production.

A. The City of Winnipeg's new and progressive sustainable procurement policy should include a mechanism to ensure procurement practices recognize and take into account the added social and economic value of ethical purchasing, and create an accountability
mechanism to ensure the City’s procurement strategy reflects the principles of Community Economic Development (see below).

By implementing a procurement strategy that prioritizes purchasing from social enterprises, the City of Winnipeg can, for example, ensure that the creation, maintenance, and renovation of affordable housing is done in tandem with comprehensive employment development strategies that target training and hiring at local low-income people with barriers to employment. A particular focus should be placed on addressing the employment and training deficits experienced by Aboriginal communities, which have an especially young population. There are existing social enterprises in the Winnipeg housing construction industry that are fully dedicated to training and hiring these individuals, and that have the capacity to take on City housing contracts.

Principles of Community Economic Development

- Use of locally produced goods and services
- Production of goods and services for local use
- Local re-investment of profits
- Long-term employment of local residents
- Local skill development
- Local decision-making
- Public health
- Physical environment
- Neighbourhood stability
- Human dignity
- Support for other Community Economic Development initiatives

3. POVERTY REDUCTION

Citizens living in Winnipeg’s poorest neighbourhoods have been working together through community-based organizations to deliver innovative and community-owned initiatives that effectively reduce poverty and improve social wellbeing. They need all levels of government to play their part and contribute to their efforts in making poverty reduction a reality in Winnipeg.

The City of Winnipeg is represented on the Winnipeg Poverty Reduction Council and considers this entity to be the lead organization in Winnipeg that will be responsible for the development of an inclusive, integrated, cross-sectoral and collaborative approach towards the reduction of poverty in our community.

Directions 3 and 4 under Opportunity in OurWinnipeg commit the City to work with community partners to foster an inclusive and equitable community, and to work within its service areas as a collaborator on poverty reduction. To effectively carry out this direction the City must look beyond its involvement with the Winnipeg Poverty Reduction Council.
A. The City of Winnipeg should take the lead in developing and implementing a comprehensive Winnipeg Poverty Reduction Strategy with targets and timelines, in partnership with relevant stakeholders including community-based organizations working most closely with people who live in poverty.

The City could examine the Province’s All Aboard poverty reduction strategy, identify areas where it can develop actions to implement the strategy, and incorporate those actions into its own Poverty Reduction Strategy. This strategy would build upon the City's existing poverty reduction initiatives, including those that have been identified in the City’s OurWinnipeg Report to the Community, 2012. For example, the OurWinnipeg Report to the Community, 2012 provides policy direction to foster opportunities for Aboriginal Winnipeggers to access programs and supports related to employment, literacy, and recreation. There is also policy direction to provide opportunities for newcomers and support community-led initiatives that foster equity and inclusion. This creates potential to reduce poverty and increase social inclusion for some of our city’s most vulnerable populations.

4. FOOD

The City of Winnipeg should take advantage of the significant opportunities that exist to enhance food security in Winnipeg and create economic opportunities, improved health and environmental outcomes, and increased neighbourhood vitality through our local food system.

In OurWinnipeg the City committed to work through community partnerships in order to respond to food needs as identified by communities. The City would benefit from having a hub to foster cooperation and coordination between municipal departments on food issues, encourage citizen involvement in the improvement of our food system, and provide key knowledge and expertise to improve food security in Winnipeg.

A. The City of Winnipeg should create a Food Policy Council, a mechanism through which the City can work through community partnerships to respond to food needs as identified by communities.

A Food Policy Council would be able to advise and assist the City throughout the development and implementation of a municipal food security strategy that builds upon existing initiatives the City has undertaken to address food security.
Appendix B

Ward and Community Committee Populations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Committee</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>2006 Population by Ward*</th>
<th>2006 Population by Community Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lord Selkirk – West Kildonan | Old Kildonan  
Mynarski  
Point Douglas | 41290  
39800  
39780 | 120870 |
| St. James - Assiniboia   | St. James – Brooklands  
St. Charles  
Charleswood - Tuxedo | 35040  
31430  
42180 | 108650 |
| City Centre               | River Heights – Fort Garry  
Fort Rouge – East Fort Garry  
Daniel McIntyre Ward | 48465  
45150  
43995 | 137610 |
| Riel                      | St. Norbert  
St. Vital  
St. Boniface | 47650  
50080  
49160 | 146890 |
| East Kildonan - Transcona | Transcona  
Elmood – East Kildonan  
North Kildonan | 32910  
42135  
36630 | 111675 |

Source: 2009 Winnipeg Wards Boundary Commission Report
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