January 17, 2018

Re: Your request for access to information under Part 2 of The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act: Request Number 17 12 1070

On December 18, 2017, the City of Winnipeg City Clerk’s Department received your request for access to the following information:

All emails, documents, minutes, reports, note, text messages, faxes,
To and From
Lester Dean
Regarding Wilkes Avenue Alignment to William R Clement Parkway Extension
Between Jan 13, 2016 – present day.

Our search returned 100 pages of responsive email records, to which access is granted in part. In particular, access is granted with severing under s. 17(2)(e), 17(3)(e) and 17(3)(i) of the Act. Subsection 17(1) of the Act is a general, mandatory provision designed to protect the privacy of third parties. It is used in conjunction with 17(2)(e) of the Act which specifically protects information which relates to a third party’s employment. Additionally, subsection 17(1) is used with 17(3)(e) and 17(3)(i) of the Act, which protects information which has been provided in confidence and disclosure would be inconsistent with the purpose for which it was obtained. Information has been severed where personal identifiers, such as names and employment history are present. This information has been severed to protect the personal information of individuals, as required under the Act.

Disclosure harmful to a third party’s privacy

17(1) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose personal information to an applicant if the disclosure would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party’s privacy.
Disclosures deemed to be an unreasonable invasion of privacy

17(2) A disclosure of personal information about a third party is deemed to be an unreasonable invasion of the third party’s privacy if

(e) the personal information relates to the third party’s employment, occupational or educational history;

Determining unreasonable invasion of privacy

17(3) In determining under subsection (1) whether a disclosure of personal information not described in subsection (2) would unreasonably invade a third party’s privacy, the head of a public body shall consider all the relevant circumstances including, but not limited to, whether

(e) the personal information has been provided, explicitly or implicitly, in confidence;

(i) the disclosure would be inconsistent with the purpose for which the personal information was obtained.

Additionally, access to a portion of the record has been severed under s. 23(1)(a) of the Act, which specifically protects information that was provided as advice, opinions, proposals, recommendations, analyses, or policy options developed for the public body.

Advice to a public body

23(1) The head of a public body may refuse to disclose information to an applicant if disclosure could reasonably be expected to reveal

(a) advice, opinions, proposals, recommendations, analyses or policy options developed by or for the public body or a minister;

Portions of the record have been severed under s. 26 of the Act, which specifically protects information that, if disclosed, could harm or threaten the security of the City of Winnipeg’s water infrastructure.

Disclosure harmful to security of property

26 The head of a public body may refuse to disclose information to an applicant if disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm or threaten the security of any property or system, including a building, a vehicle, an electronic information system or a communications system.

Subsequently, portions of this document contained information not responsive to this request. As such, these areas of the record were severed as ‘Non-Responsive Information’.

As required by subsection 7(2) of The Act, we have severed information that is protected from disclosure and have provided you with as much information as possible.
7(2) - The right of access to a record does not extend to information that is excepted from disclosure under Division 3 or 4 of this Part, but if that information can reasonably be severed from the record, an applicant has a right of access to the remainder of the record.

As you requested a copy of these records, and as they can be reasonably reproduced, in accordance with clause 14(1)(a) of The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, a copy of the records is enclosed.

14(1) - Subject to subsection 7(2), the right of access is met under this Part (a) if the applicant has asked for a copy and the record can reasonably be reproduced, by giving the applicant a copy of the record.

Subsection 59(1) of The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act provides that you may make a complaint to the Manitoba Ombudsman about this decision. You have 60 days from the receipt of this letter to make a complaint on the prescribed form to:

Manitoba Ombudsman
750 – 500 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, MB R3C 3X1
(204) 982-9130 or 1-800-665-0531

If you have any questions, please contact me at (204) 986-3041, by email at ssmith@winnipeg.ca, or by mail at the address below.

Sincerely,

Shelly Smith
Records and Information Management Coordinator
Public Works Department

c.c. K. Krahn, Corporate Access and Privacy Officer
Dropbox’d worked.

Thanks.

Erin

---

**From:** Dubeau, Ruth  
**Sent:** Monday, November 28, 2016 11:59 AM  
**To:** McNeil, Doug  
**Cc:** Thomas, Janet; MacDonald, Erin; Neirinck, Brad; Ross, Kathy  
**Subject:** BN - BN- (WRCP) William R Clement Parkway Preliminary Design Study and Public Engagement

The attached BN is forwarded for your review and appropriate action. I have downloaded the attachments to the CAO Shared Dropbox under Folder named:

**BN – William R Clement Parkway (Attachments)**

If you have any problems, let me know as this is the first time I have put files in Dropbox this way, so hopefully it worked.

Thank you,
This communication is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is confidential. Any other use, distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by phone (204.986.2740) or reply to the message and then delete and destroy any copies of it.
Confidential Briefing Note

To: Chief Administrative Officer
From: Director of Public Works
Date: November 28, 2016

Re: William R Clement Parkway Preliminary Design Study and Public Engagement

Recommendation

- That this briefing note be received as information.
- That the Department be directed to move forward with impacted property owner meetings and a final public open house to present the recommended alignment.

Background:

- On November 16, 2011, Council approved the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) which included the William R. Clement Parkway (WRCP) – between Grant Avenue and Wilkes Avenue, as a medium term (by 2021) priority.
- On April 25, 2012, Council approved an amendment to the TMP, which resulted in the WRCP between Grant Avenue and Wilkes Avenue becoming a short term (by 2016) priority.
- On December 17, 2013, Council approved the 2014 Capital Budget that included $800,000 in 2014 for William R. Clement Parkway – Grant Avenue to Wilkes Avenue.
- On June 25, 2014, Council endorsed the WRCP project as one of the City of Winnipeg priorities for inter-governmental funding through the Building Canada Fund.
- On December 10, 2014, Council approved an amendment to the WRCP Capital Budget to include funding from the Charleswood Transportation Levy and that the project include a rail grade separation of the CN mainline and associated improvements to Wilkes Avenue.
- On December 16, 2014, RFP No. 732-2014 was awarded to MMM Group to undertake the WRCP study. The identified contract completion date was March 22, 2016.
- On March 24, 2015, Council set the priorities for the top four projects for Building Canada Fund applications. The list did not include the WRCP project.

Project Description:

- The WRCP study included:
  - A functional/preliminary design and public engagement of William R. Clement Parkway extension from Grant Avenue to Wilkes Avenue/Sterling Lyon Parkway including an overpass grade separation of the CN Mainline.
  - A functional/preliminary design and public engagement of a Sterling Lyon Parkway extension from Shaftsbury Boulevard to the west Charleswood Road to replace Wilkes Avenue.
  - A functional design of William R. Clement Parkway from Wilkes Avenue/Sterling Lyon Parkway to connect with Bishop Grandin Boulevard through the R.M. of MacDonald. This phase of the project is for high level planning purposes and we were directed to not include public engagement.

Project Status:

- On November 1, 2016, draft display materials for the third and final Open House were submitted to the Office of Public Engagement for review.
- On November 15, 2016, a draft final report was received from MMM Group which is currently being reviewed by the Administration.
In addition, Public Works is looking for concurrence to undertake targeted stakeholder meetings with impacted property owners in a series of four meetings ahead of the final Open House. The Study has identified 87 properties that require a partial taking and 13 properties that require a full taking. Included in that count is three partial takings and five full takings of City-owned land. Therefore, the targeted stakeholder meetings are to meet with 92 private property owners.

Summary of Public Engagement:

- Two previous open houses have been conducted:
  - On March 19, 2015, an open house was conducted to introduce the project and collect issues and opportunities that could be studied.
  - On January 19, 2016, a second open house was conducted to display conceptual and functional options for both William R. Clement Parkway and Sterling Lyon Parkway realignment. Possible property impacts for all options were presented.

- At the second open house the public was advised that the City would meet with only impacted property owners prior to the final Open House. As noted above there are 92 impacted properties.

- The impacted property owner meetings should be ideally scheduled about two weeks ahead of the final open house. The key messages for the impact property owner meetings are:
  - Identify that this is a planning study only and that the project has not been approved by Council to move forward to construction.
  - The plans are preliminary in nature and show the preferred road alignment based on technical requirements and past consultation.
  - If the project moves forward in the future, each property owner will be contacted at that time. Real Estate would be able to answer questions about future appraisals and acquisition. The general message is we would not actively pursue property until there is an approved construction project.

- The final open house will present the recommended alternative and alignments for William R. Clement Parkway and Sterling Lyon Parkway.

Key Issues:

- We have already been delayed by more than half a year, partially due to waiting for approvals on previous open house materials; therefore we need to complete this project soon to bring stability to the area and the neighborhood. Delaying further can bring sentiment/mistrust with the public that we are hiding something by not presenting the final solution to public/impacted property owners.

- Impacted property owners have been contacting the City and the consultant asking for updates because they want closure to their situation as people are waiting to make decisions on their properties including the fact that we continue to issue building permits in the general area. By extending the planned schedule to a later time, it leaves them wondering what’s happening. We were very clear to all people that we would meet directly with impacted land owners prior to the last open house.

- The City needs to complete this project and proceed to seek Council endorsement for the recommended road alignments so that the City can plan the area and move forward on various initiatives in an informed way.

- With an approved alignment, the land owners have the opportunity to sell their properties to the City in an accommodating and reduced stress manner, which can occur over a longer time similar to the Kenaston Widening project.

- The delays have resulted in requests for additional consulting fees.

- The targeted property owner meetings that were tentatively scheduled to occur in November 2016 (well ahead of Christmas) are not possible because we missed the deadline for delivering notices in early November.

- We need to finish existing studies in a timely fashion as we have other significant studies coming online in the new year including Eastern Corridor/Louise Bridge Study, Chief Peguis Trail, Marion rework, Arlington Overpass, and St. James Bridges/Kenaston Widening.
• 17(1), 17(3)(i) has raised their concerns on recommended Sterling Lyon Parkway realignment alternative presented at OH #2. We cannot disclose the final Recommended Preliminary Design Alternatives to impacted property owners/public because materials are not reviewed and approved by the Office of Public Engagement.

Cautionary Notes

• The impacted stakeholder meetings will now have to occur in January 2017 pushing the final Open House into February 2017. The final report cannot be finalized until after the open house feedback has been reviewed.
• A final report to Council will be approximately three months after the final report is received.
• The delay in the project has resulted in additional consulting fees and further cost increases.

Current Status/Next Steps:

• Obtain approvals to proceed with impacted property owners meetings and the final Open House to complete the project.
• Councillor Morantz has been kept in the loop throughout the project by the Project Manager, and we want to set up a meeting with him in advance of the Impacted Property Owner Meetings to brief him on both IPO and Open House materials in advance of the two meetings/events.
• Set up meetings with the owners of the 92 impacted properties. We intend to set up four meetings with the owners of up to 30 impacted properties invited to each meeting to keep the size of the meetings manageable.
• Arrange and execute the final open house.
• Finalize the Study report from MMM Group.
• Prepare an Administrative Report for Council.

Attachments:

• Draft functional/preliminary design report.
• Draft open house materials.
• Drawing of impacted properties
• Draft communication to affected property owners.

Prepared by:  B. Neirinck, P. Eng., Public Works Department
Date:  November 25, 2016
Foster, Gisele

From: Morantz, Marty
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2016 9:22 PM
To: Deane, Lester
Subject: William Clement Parkway

Hi Lester,

Tonight at a rotary dinner a fellow from Charleswood asked me whatever happened to the residential development that was supposed to go along side the Parkway from the river south to Grant. He told me that when it was built services were all put in the ground to allow for housing along the East and West sides.

I told him I had never heard that. Do you have any knowledge of this issue being discussed in the past?

Marty

Sent from my iPhone
Brad,

I still have not heard back from the CAO’s office but we met with the local councilor yesterday and I suggested we would/should not be speaking with any owners until I receive the green light from the CAO.

The local councilor said they would be speaking with the CAO on this matter to clear up the matter.
Hi Lester:

I’m enquiring about the status of this briefing note.

We are waiting for a response to schedule the remainder of our public engagement including stakeholder meetings with affected property owners in January and the final open house in February.

Brad Neirinck, P. Eng.
Manager of Engineering
Engineering, Public Works
City of Winnipeg
Phone: 204-986-7950
Mobile: 204-794-4311
Email: BNeirinck@winnipeg.ca
Website: winnipeg.ca
Address: 106, 1155 Pacific Avenue Winnipeg, MB R3E 3P1

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.

From: Dubeau, Ruth
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2016 11:59 AM
To: McNeil, Doug
Cc: Thomas, Janet; MacDonald, Erin; Neirinck, Brad; Ross, Kathy
Subject: BN - BN- (WRCP) William R Clement Parkway Preliminary Design Study and Public Engagement

The attached BN is forwarded for your review and appropriate action. I have down loaded the attachments to the CAO Shared Dropbox under Folder named:

BN – William R Clement Parkway (Attachments)

If you have any problems, let me know as this is the first time I have put files in Dropbox this way, so hopefully it worked.

Thank you,
This communication is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is confidential. Any other use, distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by phone (204.986.2740) or reply to the message and then delete and destroy any copies of it.
Hi Gisele,

Last week’s meeting was cancelled, and Janet is away until Thursday. As per the below, Janet will check her notes upon her return and one of us will update you.

Many thanks,

Erin

Erin MacDonald  
Executive Assistant to the Chief Administrative Officer  
& Chief Corporate Services Officer  
City of Winnipeg

From: Thomas, Janet  
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 3:23 PM  
To: MacDonald, Erin  
Subject: Re: BN - BN- (WRCP) William R Clement Parkway Preliminary Design Study and Public Engagement

I'll have to check notes on Thursday. Thx  

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 13, 2016, at 8:19 AM, MacDonald, Erin <EMacDonald@winnipeg.ca> wrote:

Hi Janet,

Gisele is asking about this BN. It was on the December 8th Exec/CAO agenda, but now moved to the December 15th agenda. Was it already discussed? What update may I provide to Gisele?

Thank you,
From: Foster, Gisele  
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2016 3:58 PM  
To: MacDonald, Erin  
Cc: Dubeau, Ruth  
Subject: FW: BN - BN- (WRCP) William R Clement Parkway Preliminary Design Study and Public Engagement

Good afternoon Erin,

We are following up on this BN.

We are waiting for a response to schedule the remainder of our public engagement including stakeholder meetings with affected property owners in January and the final open house in February.

Thank you,

Gisele Foster, Executive Assistant  
Office of the Director || Public Works Department  
103-1155 Pacific Avenue || tel(204) 986-7997  
gfoster@winnipeg.ca

CONFEIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.

From: Neirinck, Brad  
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2016 3:03 PM  
To: Deane, Lester  
Cc: Dubeau, Ruth; Foster, Gisele; Rezazadeh, Shima  
Subject: FW: BN - BN- (WRCP) William R Clement Parkway Preliminary Design Study and Public Engagement

Hi Lester:

I’m enquiring about the status of this briefing note.
We are waiting for a response to schedule the remainder of our public engagement including stakeholder meetings with affected property owners in January and the final open house in February.

Brad Neirinck, P. Eng.
Manager of Engineering
Engineering, Public Works
City of Winnipeg

Phone: 204-986-7950
Mobile: 204-794-4311
Email: BNeirinck@winnipeg.ca
Website: winnipeg.ca
Address: 106, 1155 Pacific Avenue Winnipeg, MB R3E 3P1

Connect with us: <image003.jpg>

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.

From: Dubeau, Ruth
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2016 11:59 AM
To: McNeil,Doug
Cc: Thomas, Janet; MacDonald, Erin; Neirinck, Brad; Ross, Kathy
Subject: BN - BN- (WRCP) William R Clement Parkway Preliminary Design Study and Public Engagement

The attached BN is forwarded for your review and appropriate action. I have downloaded the attachments to the CAO Shared Dropbox under Folder named:

BN – William R Clement Parkway (Attachments)

If you have any problems, let me know as this is the first time I have put files in Dropbox this way, so hopefully it worked.

Thank you,
This communication is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is confidential. Any other use, distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by phone (204.986.2740) or reply to the message and then delete and destroy any copies of it.

<BN- (WRCP) William R Clement Parkway Preliminary Design Study and Public Engagement.doc>
FIPPA Request 17 12 1070 - Responsive Records

Foster, Gisele

From: Patton, Geoffrey
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 1:04 PM
To: Morantz, Marty
Cc: Foster, Gisele; Deane, Lester; Geer, Moira; Towse, Tamara
Subject: RE: William Clement Parkway

Councillor Morantz

There is no water or wastewater infrastructure installed within the William R Clement Parkway right of way between Grant and Roblin. There is some local land drainage infrastructure that services the Parkway itself between Grant and Roblin.

There is a large diameter water Feeder Main in west Winnipeg. This Feeder Main and services neighborhoods in west Winnipeg. The Feeder Main existed prior to the Parkway and Charleswood Bridge construction. At the time the Feeder Main needed to be relocated to accommodate the Bridge / Parkway construction.

If there is a specific property address that can be provided please let me know. We can then review our records for available information.

Regards

Geoffrey Patton, P.Eng
Manager of Engineering Services
Engineering Services, Water and Waste
City of Winnipeg
Phone: 204-986-4477
Email: gpatton@winnipeg.ca
Website: winnipeg.ca
Address: Unit 110, 1199 Pacific Avenue, Winnipeg, MB R3E 3S8

2016 YEAR OF RECONCILIATION
2016, ANNÉE DE LA RÉCONCILIATION

Connect with us: Facebook Twitter

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.

----Original Message----
From: Deane, Lester
Sent: December 20, 2016 12:42 PM
To: Morantz, Marty
Cc: Patton, Geoffrey; Foster, Gisele
Subject: RE: William Clement Parkway
Councillor Morantz,

The infrastructure you may be referring to would fall under our Water and Waste Departments.

As all of this would have been undertaken prior to my tenure with the City I am not in a position to comment on whether additional capacity was included in the project scope.

I have copied Geoff Patton, Manager of Engineering, Water and Waste who may be better able to comment.

Lester P. Deane
Director
Public Works
City of Winnipeg

Phone: 204-986-5285
Mobile: 204-470-7206
Email: Ideane@winnipeg.ca

Website: winnipeg.ca
Address: 103-1155 Pacific Avenue, Winnipeg, MB R3E 3P1

---Original Message---
From: Morantz, Marty
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 10:24 AM
To: Deane, Lester
Subject: William Clement Parkway

Hi Lester,

I had an inquiry from a Charleswood resident about if when the Parkway was built there was underground servicing installed along the East and West sides in anticipation of potential future residential development between the Assiniboine river and Grant. Is it possible to check and see in our records if these services were actually installed?

I said I would get back to him.

Marty

Sent from my iPhone
Thank you Geoff.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 20, 2016, at 1:04 PM, Patton, Geoffrey <GPatton@winnipeg.ca> wrote:

Councillor Morantz

There is no water or wastewater infrastructure installed within the William R Clement Parkway right of way between Grant and Roblin. There is some local land drainage infrastructure that services the Parkway itself between Grant and Roblin.

There is a large diameter water Feeder Main in Grant and Roblin. This Feeder Main and services neighborhoods in west Winnipeg. The Feeder Main existed prior to the Parkway and Charleswood Bridge construction. At the time the Feeder Main needed to be relocated to accommodate the Bridge / Parkway construction.

If there is a specific property address that can be provided please let me know. We can then review our records for available information.

Regards

Geoffrey Patton, P.Eng
Manager of Engineering Services
Engineering Services, Water and Waste
City of Winnipeg

Phone: 204-986-4477
Email: gpatton@winnipeg.ca
Website: winnipeg.ca
Address: Unit 110, 1199 Pacific Avenue, Winnipeg, MB R3E 3S8

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.
Councillor Morantz,

The infrastructure you may be referring to would fall under our Water and Waste Departments.

As all of this would have been undertaken prior to my tenure with the City I am not in a position to comment on whether additional capacity was included in the project scope.

I have copied Geoff Patton, Manager of Engineering, Water and Waste who may be better able to comment.

Lester P. Deane
Director
Public Works
City of Winnipeg

Phone: 204-986-5285
Mobile: 204-470-7206
Email: Ideane@winnipeg.ca

Website: winnipeg.ca
Address: 103-1155 Pacific Avenue, Winnipeg, MB R3E 3P1

Connect with us:

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.

Hi Lester,

I had an inquiry from a Charleswood resident about if when the Parkway was built there was underground servicing installed along the East and West sides in anticipation of potential future residential development between the Assiniboine river and Grant. Is it possible to check and see in our records if these services were actually installed?

I said I would get back to him.
Marty

Sent from my iPhone
Thank you Lester. Geoff has now replied.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Dec 20, 2016, at 12:41 PM, Deane, Lester <lDeane@winnipeg.ca> wrote:
> Councillor Morantz,
> The infrastructure you may be referring to would fall under our Water and Waste Departments.
> As all of this would have been undertaken prior to my tenure with the City I am not in a position to comment on whether additional capacity was included in the project scope.
> I have copied Geoff Patton, Manager of Engineering, Water and Waste who may be better able to comment.
> Lester P. Deane
> Director
> Public Works
> City of Winnipeg
> Phone: 204-986-5285
> Mobile: 204-470-7206
> Email: ldeane@winnipeg.ca
> Website: winnipeg.ca
> Address: 103-1155 Pacific Avenue, Winnipeg, MB R3E 3P1
> Connect with us:
> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Morantz, Marty

FIPPA Request 17 12 1070 - Responsive Records
> Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 10:24 AM
> To: Deane, Lester
> Subject: William Clement Parkway
>
> > Hi Lester,
>
> > I had an inquiry from a Charleswood resident about if when the Parkway was built there was underground servicing installed along the East and West sides in anticipation of potential future residential development between the Assiniboine river and Grant. Is it possible to check and see in our records if these services were actually installed?
>
> > I said I would get back to him.
>
> > Marty
>
> > Sent from my iPhone
Foster, Gisele

From: Patton, Geoffrey  
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 2:10 PM  
To: Deane, Lester  
Subject: RE: William Clement Parkway

No problem. The question was an easy answer.

Geoff

From: Deane, Lester  
Sent: December 20, 2016 1:49 PM  
To: Patton, Geoffrey  
Subject: RE: William Clement Parkway

Geoff,

Thank you.
Sorry to bring you into the conversation but I had no idea what we was really looking for.

Lester P. Deane  
Director  
Public Works  
City of Winnipeg

Phone: 204-986-5285  
Mobile: 204-470-7206  
Email: ideane@winnipeg.ca  
Website: winnipeg.ca  
Address: 103-1155 Pacific Avenue, Winnipeg, MB R3E 3P1

2016 YEAR OF RECONCILIATION  
2016, ANNÉE DE LA RÉCONCILIATION

Connect with us:  

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.

From: Patton, Geoffrey  
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 1:04 PM  
To: Morantz, Marty  
Cc: Foster, Gisele; Deane, Lester; Geer, Moira; Towse, Tamara  
Subject: RE: William Clement Parkway

Councillor Morantz
There is no water or wastewater infrastructure installed within the William R Clement Parkway right of way between Grant and Roblin. There is some local land drainage infrastructure that services the Parkway itself between Grant and Roblin.

There is a large diameter water Feeder Main in This Feeder Main and services neighborhoods in west Winnipeg. The Feeder Main existed prior to the Parkway and Charleswood Bridge construction. At the time the Feeder Main needed to be relocated to accommodate the Bridge / Parkway construction.

If there is a specific property address that can be provided please let me know. We can then review our records for available information.

Regards

Geoffrey Patton, P.Eng
Manager of Engineering Services
Engineering Services, Water and Waste
City of Winnipeg

Phone: 204-986-4477
Email: gpatton@winnipeg.ca
Website: winnipeg.ca
Address: Unit 110, 1199 Pacific Avenue, Winnipeg, MB R3E 3S8

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.

----Original Message----
From: Deane, Lester
Sent: December 20, 2016 12:42 PM
To: Morantz, Marty
Cc: Patton, Geoffrey; Foster, Gisele
Subject: RE: William Clement Parkway

Councillor Morantz,

The infrastructure you may be referring to would fall under our Water and Waste Departments.

As all of this would have been undertaken prior to my tenure with the City I am not in a position to comment on whether additional capacity was included in the project scope.

I have copied Geoff Patton, Manager of Engineering, Water and Waste who may be better able to comment.

Lester P. Deane
Director
Public Works
City of Winnipeg

Phone: 204-986-5285
Mobile: 204-470-7206
Email: Ideane@winnipeg.ca

Website: winnipeg.ca
Address: 103-1155 Pacific Avenue, Winnipeg, MB R3E 3P1

Connect with us:

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.

-----Original Message-----
From: Morantz, Marty  
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 10:24 AM  
To: Deane, Lester  
Subject: William Clement Parkway

Hi Lester,

I had an inquiry from a Charleswood resident about if when the Parkway was built there was underground servicing installed along the East and West sides in anticipation of potential future residential development between the Assiniboine river and Grant. Is it possible to check and see in our records if these services were actually installed?

I said I would get back to him.

Marty

Sent from my iPhone
Foster, Gisele

From: Suderman, Scott
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 7:36 AM
To: Deane, Lester
Cc: Escobar, Luis; Rezazadeh, Shima; Foster, Gisele
Subject: Re: William Clement Parkway Extension Open House

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good morning Lester,

We received the go ahead from the Office of Public Engagement who report to the COO. To my knowledge PWD had not communicated directly with the Mayor on this project.

Should I respond with the above?

Thank-you,
Scott

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 18, 2015, at 4:40 PM, "Morantz, Marty" <MMorantz@winnipeg.ca> wrote:

Is the Mayor ok with our proceeding at this time?

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 18, 2015, at 11:16 AM, Suderman, Scott <ssuderman@winnipeg.ca> wrote:

Hello Councillor Morantz,

We wanted to provide you with an update on the public engagement component for the WRCP Extension Study. In the spring of this year we had held some stakeholder meetings, including CCHP, and we had met with you beforehand to review the stakeholder materials and the Open House boards. We addressed your comments and concerns that you had identified in the meeting.

We are now preparing to have a few more additional stakeholder meetings, which we will extend the invite to you if you wish to attend, as well as an Open House. Enclosed is the newsletter for the Open House, which will be distributed within and around the project area. The Open House is scheduled for January 19th, 2016.

As it has been a long time since we last met, please advise if you would require any further information or have any questions.

Regards,
Scott Suderman, C.E.T., P.Eng.
Transportation Facilities Planning Engineer
Transportation Division
Public Works Department
101-1155 Pacific Ave.
Winnipeg, MB.
R3E 3P1
Office: 204.986.6963
Cell: 204.782.7189

Privacy Statement: This communication is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is confidential. Any other use, distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by phone 204.986.6963 or reply to the message and then delete and destroy any copies of it.

⚠️ Please consider the environment before printing this email.

<5514150 Newsletter_OH2_20151209.pdf>
Hello Councillor Morantz,

The Mayor's Office is aware that we are proceeding and they will be provided a package of the materials.

Thank-you,

Scott

---

From: Morantz, Marty  
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2015 4:40 PM  
To: Suderman, Scott  
Cc: Deane, Lester; Escobar, Luis; Rezazadeh, Shima  
Subject: Re: William Clement Parkway Extension Open House

Is the Mayor ok with our proceeding at this time?

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 18, 2015, at 11:16 AM, Suderman, Scott <ssuderman@winnipeg.ca> wrote:

Hello Councillor Morantz,

We wanted to provide you with an update on the public engagement component for the WRCP Extension Study. In the spring of this year we had held some stakeholder meetings, including CCHP, and we had met with you beforehand to review the stakeholder materials and the Open House boards. We addressed your comments and concerns that you had identified in the meeting.

We are now preparing to have a few more additional stakeholder meetings, which we will extend the invite to you if you wish to attend, as well as an Open House. Enclosed is the newsletter for the Open House, which will be distributed within and around the project area. The Open House is scheduled for January 19th, 2016.

As it has been a long time since we last met, please advise if you would require any further information or have any questions.

Regards,

Scott Suderman, C.E.T., P.Eng.  
Transportation Facilities Planning Engineer  
Transportation Division  
Public Works Department  
101-1155 Pacific Ave.
Winnipeg, MB.
R3E 3P1
Office: 204.986.6963
Cell: 204.782.7189

Privacy Statement: This communication is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is confidential. Any other use, distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by phone 204.986.6963 or reply to the message and then delete and destroy any copies of it.

🌐 Please consider the environment before printing this email.

<5514150 Newsletter_OH2_20151209.pdf>
Foster, Gisele

From: Suderman, Scott
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2016 11:39 AM
To: Morantz, Marty
Cc: Rezazadeh, Shima; Escobar, Luis; Deane, Lester
Subject: William Clement Parkway Open House Follow-up

Hello Councillor,

The open house was very well attended and we got a lot of great feedback from the attendees. The boards are available online at:

http://www.winnipeg.ca/publicworks/construction/studies/williamclement.stm

As discussed, the dog park option north of Grant Avenue was not desired by the public, and we will likely not further pursue this option.

For Wilkes Alignment, Option 2 was the most desirable option from the public and also the most desirable from and engineering perspective.

As mentioned the options presented were very conceptual and the next steps will be detail the preferred alignment, that will be chosen based on technical analysis and public feedback. From that point we would have detailed information to determine the actual impact to private lands. We will be hosting small group meetings with impacted land owners to talk about why are doing this work, what it means, and what the next steps are. Our Real Estate branch will be there to explain the process. This is the typical process for projects of this nature and worked well, one example was the Route 90 Study – Kenaston six laneing from Ness to Taylor. We will meet with you first prior to meeting with the public in regards to property acquisition. This will happen this year.

As mentioned, the alignments of the road and the authority to negotiate property acquisition will all have to be approved by Council. Identifying property requirements far in advance of any possible construction is proactive, is much more manageable financially, more predictable and less stressful for the public.

If you have any further questions or require a meeting please let us know.

Regards,

Scott Suderman, C.E.T., P.Eng.
Transportation Facilities Planning Engineer
Transportation Division
Public Works Department
101-1155 Pacific Ave.
Winnipeg, MB.
R3E 3P1
Office: 204.986.6963
Cell: 204.782.7189

Privacy Statement: This communication is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is confidential. Any other use, distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by phone 204.986.6963 or reply to the message and then delete and destroy any copies of it.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
William R. Clement Parkway and Sterling Lyon Parkway Extensions

Functional and Preliminary Design Study

Update August 2017

Due to project prioritization, the original timeline for this study was extended. The project team is currently updating stakeholders and residents with the revised project timeline. Landowner meetings and an open house will be held in the Fall of 2017 to discuss the draft preliminary design.

The William R. Clement Parkway (WRCP) and Sterling Lyon Parkway (SLP) Extensions are important components of the City's future transportation system, providing north-south and east-west links in west Winnipeg. The City's Transportation Master Plan, which guides transportation planning in Winnipeg, includes the WRCP Extension as a major transportation facility, to accommodate future travel demand in the area. In March 2015, a public information display session introduced the public to the WRCP Extension study. Feedback from this event was considered in the development of alignment options for the study. In January 2016, an open house was held to share phase 1 design options and feedback from that event is being considered in the recommendation of the preliminary design.

Engage

Landowner meetings and a public open house will be held in the Fall of 2017. Invitations will be sent to residents in addition to notification through advertisements and social media.

Thank you to those who have participated in the project so far through the information session, open house, and online surveys.

For more information, please contact:

Dave Jopling, Manager Planning and Design, MMM Group Limited
Email: joplingd@mmm.ca
Phone: 204-943-3178

If you would like to stay updated on City of Winnipeg public engagement events, follow the City on Facebook and Twitter or sign up for the City of Winnipeg public engagement newsletter.

Project Timeline

http://www.winnipeg.ca/publicworks/construction/projects/WRCP-Extension.stm
Background

The City's Transportation Master Plan approved by City Council in November 2011 includes the WRCP Extension as a major transportation facility. The WRCP Extension is identified in the Transportation Master Plan as an important component of the City's strategic road network to accommodate the travel demand associated with future residential, commercial, and industrial growth in west Winnipeg.

http://www.winnipeg.ca/publicworks/construction/projects/WRCP-Extension.stm
The City's Transportation Master Plan identifies the extension of the WRCP between Grant Avenue and Wilkes Avenue as a medium-term project. However, on April 25, 2012, Council approved an amendment to the Transportation Master Plan resulting in this portion of the WRCP Extension becoming a short-term project. The future extension of the WRCP between a signalized intersection with the extension of SLP and McGillivray Boulevard is defined as a long-term project.

In December of 2013, the 2014 Capital Budget was approved by Council to include the Functional Design Study of WRCP Extension. In December of 2014, the Capital budget was amended to include funding from the Charleswood Transportation Levy to expand the scope of work to include studying twinning and realignment options for Wilkes Avenue.

Phase I - Shorter-term
  - The recommended road network includes the extension of WRCP from Grant Avenue to a signalized intersection with the extension of SLP.

Phase II* - Longer-term
  - Future extension of WRCP from SLP to McGillivray Boulevard.

*(as per Transportation Master Plan)

**Study Scope:**

- Conduct functional and preliminary design studies for the WRCP and SLP extensions
- Develop alignment options for an east-west connection south of the CN Mainline
- Develop grade separation options at the CN Mainline
- Develop alternatives for the Harte Trail crossing
- Identify potential dog park location(s)
- Obtain Environmental Act Licensing for Phase 1
- Conceptual Environmental Assessment Study for Phase 2

**Documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Public Engagement Phase Two Functional and Preliminary Design Study</td>
<td>2016-09-30</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 19, 2016 Open House Boards</td>
<td>2016-01-19</td>
<td>Storyboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 19, 2016 Open House Invitation</td>
<td>2016-01-19</td>
<td>Invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19, 2015 Public Information Session Display Boards</td>
<td>2015-03-19</td>
<td>Storyboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19, 2015 Public Information Session Invitation</td>
<td>2015-03-19</td>
<td>Invitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequently Asked Questions**

1. What are some of the key components of the WRCP Study? Tell me about this project.

http://www.winnipeg.ca/publicworks/construction/projects/WRCP-Extension.stm
The William R. Clement Parkway (WRCP) Extension is an important component of the City of Winnipeg’s future transportation system, providing a north-south link in west Winnipeg. The City’s Transportation Master Plan, which guides transportation planning in Winnipeg, includes the WRCP Extension as a major transportation facility, intended to accommodate future travel demand in the area.

The WRCP Extension will include an overpass of the CN mainline, a bridge for the Harte Trail, an environmental assessment, and integration of recreational opportunities such as parks and pathways. The study will not only look at improving the north-south movement of people, goods and services but will also look at improvement to Wilkes Avenue.

2. Why are we spending money on new roads instead of fixing our existing infrastructure?

The City needs to proactively plan for future growth. The William R. Clement Parkway extension will support economic development, create recreational opportunities and will take us one step closer to the completion of the Strategic Inner Ring Road to reduce traffic on neighborhood streets.

This transportation corridor is intended to support local and regional economic growth for the City; the grade separation of the WRCP Extension at the CN Rail Line at Wilkes Ave., along with many other improvements, will provide more efficient movement of goods and services in the City.

This study is partially funded by the Charleswood Transportation Levy which was developed to support the improvement and development of transportation facilities for that area.

3. What is the budget for this project? Where is funding going to come from for this project?

This project does not have a construction budget yet. Council has only approved the funding to conduct an engineering study.

4. How will this new facility impact existing properties?

There are a small number of privately owned properties that will need to be acquired should the William R. Clement Parkway (WRCP) Extension and Re-alignment of Wilkes Avenue construction project receive Council approval in the future.

The City will be in touch with the affected property owners directly and will meet one-on-one with them in the fall of 2017 ahead of a public open house.

5. Will the dog park be shut down?

The Dog Park area was always intended to be a temporary use of that property, as the City purchased that property many years ago with the intention of using it for a transportation corridor. The City understands the importance of the Charleswood Dog Park to area residents, and has identified a number of alternate locations within the area.

6. Why are we going to build a road through the heavily treed area, what are we going to do to protect environmentally sensitive areas?

The project team includes a team of environmental and biology professionals who are performing an Environmental Assessment that includes the identification of environmentally sensitive areas. We will take measures to mitigate negative impacts where possible.

7. Are there traffic signals planned for this new roadway at all the intersections?

A key component of the study is to look at current and future traffic to adequately address traffic needs and to ensure public safety. We have considered a number of options for intersections along the extension including an underpass, overpass and signalized intersection.

8. When will the public have an opportunity to review the completed Preliminary Design Study and preferred alignment information?

http://www.winnipeg.ca/publicworks/construction/projects/WRCP-Extension.stm

12/19/2017
The City is planning an open house for fall 2017. The preferred alignment will be available to view at this event as well as online prior to the event. The open house will also provide an opportunity for the public to provide feedback to the project team. The Preliminary Design Study report will be finalized following this open house and the study will be completed in winter 2018.

There are a small number of privately owned properties that will need to be acquired as part of the preferred alignment. The City will be in touch with the affected property owners directly and will meet with them in the fall 2017. These meetings will occur ahead of a public open house and the preferred alignment will be reviewed at the meetings with property owners.

9. **What are the next steps?**

Once the study is complete, it will be presented to Council for their approval of the suggested alignment and understanding of the costs associated to aid the City in seeking funding opportunities.

**Maps**
Area Map

Related Links

- Transportation Master Plan
- Active Transportation Network
- Pedestrian and Cycling Strategies and Action Plan
- OurWinnipeg

Last update: August 8, 2017

http://www.winnipeg.ca/publicworks/construction/projects/WRCP-Extension.stm
Welcome

City of Winnipeg
William R. Clement Parkway Extension Functional & Preliminary Design Study
GRANT AVENUE TO McGILLIVRAY BOULEVARD - PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE

January 2016
PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE FORMAT

Please review the boards and maps
Project staff are happy to answer your questions

Please complete and submit a comment form prior to leaving
STUDY BACKGROUND

The City of Winnipeg Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Recommends William R. Clement Parkway (WRCP) Extension

- "The purpose of the TMP is to present a long-term strategy to guide the planning, development, renewal and maintenance of a multi-modal transportation system in a manner that is consistent with project needs, and aligned with the City's growth and the overall vision for a sustainable Winnipeg and region"

- The WRCP Extension Study is identified as part of the TMP's future Strategic Road Network

- On April 25, 2012 Winnipeg City Council approved an amendment to the TMP to change the WRCP Extension between Grant Avenue and Wilkes Avenue from a medium-term project to a short-term project
STUDY PURPOSE

» The WRCP is an important component of the City's Strategic Road Network to accommodate the north-south travel demand in west Winnipeg

» The City's TMP recommends Phase 1 of the WRCP extension as a short-term project and Phase 2 as a long-term project as described in the figure on the left

» Funding for construction of the WRCP extension is currently not in place

Today's meeting is presenting material for Phase 1
STUDY SCOPE

» Conduct functional and preliminary design studies for the WRCP extension

» Develop alignment options for an east-west connection south of the CN Mainline

» Develop grade separation options at the CN Mainline

» Develop alternatives for the Harte Trail crossing

» Identify potential dog park location(s)

» Obtain Environmental Act Licensing for Phase 1

» Conceptual Environmental Assessment Study for Phase 2
STUDY TIMELINE

WINTER 2015
- Study Commencement
- Begin Environmental Reviews
- Stakeholder Meetings
- Public Information Display Session (March 19, CMU)

SPRING/SUMMER 2015
- Develop Options
- Develop Evaluation Criteria

WINTER 2015/2016
- Stakeholder Meetings
- Public Open House #1
- Determine the Recommended Option(s)
- Conclude Functional Design Including Alignments (Grant Ave. to McGillivray Blvd.)

SPRING 2016
- Begin Preliminary Design Study (Phase 1*)
- Completion of Environmental Reviews

SUMMER 2016
- Stakeholder Meetings
- Public Open House #2
- Finalize the Preliminary Design (Phase 1*)
- Prepare Final Report

FALL 2016
- Study Completion

* Phase 1 - Grant Avenue to Wilkes Avenue (or an alternative east-west connection)
PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND ENGAGEMENT

How we communicated and reached out to the public:

» Public Information Display Session held on March 19, 2015
  » Over 300 people signed in at the event
  » Over 175 comment forms were received (hard copy and online)

» Emails to all stakeholders and meeting attendees

» Newspaper ads in the Winnipeg Free Press, Winnipeg Sun, Canstar Sou’Wester and Metro

» Information on the City of Winnipeg project website winnipeg.ca/WRCP-Extension

» City of Winnipeg social media (Facebook and Twitter)

» Media release

» Notification flyers sent to 2,700 properties in study area
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT FEEDBACK

Key Messages from the Community:

- Where will the new road go and what will it look like?
- Improve Wilkes Avenue
- Safety for all users
- Maintain Harte Trail
- Protect R.M. industrial land use
- Limit impact on wildlife
- Mitigate traffic noise / vibration
- Need for dog park amenities
- Loss of natural habitat and green space
- Provide adequate lighting
- Eldridge Avenue connection
- Safety for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Key Concerns for the Study Area include:

» Habitat fragmentation/loss of natural wildlife corridors
» Preservation of Harte Trail
» How wildlife will safely cross the WRCP extension
» Deer-vehicle collisions

Assessments Conducted To Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Surveys:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>» Amphibian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options to prevent deer-vehicle collisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ключа:  

Увиннег  

WSP MMM GROUP
STUDY ALIGNMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- Accommodate emergency vehicle and truck access
- Accommodate access for local businesses
- Enhance safety for all users
- Address environmental considerations
- Identify potential dog park locations
- Grade separate the CN Mainline
- Accommodate the Harte Trail
- Link to Wilkes Avenue (or an alternative east-west connection)
- Meet the design criteria requirements
- Accommodate Transit
WRCP PROPOSED RIGHT-OF-WAY

Typical 80 m Right-of-Way Looking North

Typical 60 m Right-of-Way Looking North

Typical 70 m Right-of-Way Looking North

* Traffic noise reduction method and height to be determined during preliminary design.
CONCEPTUAL OPTIONS FOR THE WRCP EXTENSION
CONCEPTUAL EAST-WEST ALIGNMENT OPTIONS

There are three proposed options for the east-west alignment to the WRCP extension. The alignment of the WRCP extension from Grant Avenue to the CN Mainline is the same in each of the three proposed options.

CONCEPTUAL OPTION 1:
Wilkes Avenue Alignment

CONCEPTUAL OPTION 2:
Sterling Lyon Parkway North Alignment

CONCEPTUAL OPTION 3:
Sterling Lyon Parkway South Alignment
OPTION 1: CONCEPTUAL WILKES AVENUE ALIGNMENT

**Pros**
- Maintains Wilkes Avenue as the east-west connection to WRCP
- Less property required south of Wilkes Avenue/Sterling Lyon Parkway than other options
- Potential for development of property on relocated section of Wilkes Avenue from Elmhurst Road west

**Cons**
- Due to proximity of CN Mainline, will require frontage property on south side of Wilkes Avenue from Shaftesbury Boulevard to Elmhurst Road for widening to 4 lane divided
- Direct all-way access will not be possible to all properties fronting on Wilkes Avenue
- Widening to 4 lane divided will require total reconstruction of Wilkes Avenue and major disruption to east west traffic
- Spacing between realigned Wilkes Avenue and the existing CN Mainline is undesirable given the forecast in traffic volumes on WRCP
OPTION 2: CONCEPTUAL STERLING LYON PARKWAY NORTH ALIGNMENT

**Pros:**
- Maintains access to existing businesses fronting on Wilkes Avenue
- Construction of Sterling Lyon Parkway extension can occur with minimal traffic disruption
- Potential for development of property between Sterling Lyon Parkway extension and Wilkes Avenue
- Wilkes Avenue will remain in its current location from Shaftesbury Boulevard west as a collector street
- Will become the major east-west route in the area; offers improved spacing between Sterling Lyon Parkway and the CN Mainline compared to Wilkes Avenue alternative

**Cons:**
- Property for Sterling Lyon Parkway extension required south of Wilkes Avenue
- Short term traffic disruption may occur at the east end of the Sterling Lyon Parkway extension
- The section of existing Sterling Lyon Parkway immediately east of Shaftesbury Boulevard will require realignment
OPTION 3: CONCEPTUAL STERLING LYON PARKWAY SOUTH ALIGNMENT

- Maintains access to existing businesses fronting on Wilkes Avenue
- Construction of Sterling Lyon Parkway extension can occur with minimal traffic disruption
- Potential for development of property between Sterling Lyon Parkway extension and Wilkes Avenue
- Wilkes Ave will remain in its current location from Shaftesbury Boulevard west as a collector street
- Best supports the Capital Region Road Network plan

Pros

- Property for Sterling Lyon Parkway extension required south of Wilkes Avenue
- Short term traffic disruption may occur at the east end of the Sterling Lyon Parkway extension
- The section of existing Sterling Lyon Parkway immediately east of Shaftesbury Boulevard will require realignment
- Construction costs will be highest due to the increased length
- Additional traffic short-cutting on Ridgewood and Elmhurst would be anticipated due to the more southerly location of the Sterling Lyon Parkway extension

Winnipeg
WRCP GRADE SEPARATION AT CN MAINLINE OPTIONS

There are three proposed options for the grade separation of the WRCP Extension at the CN Mainline:

**OPTION A:**
WRCP RAIL LINE OVERPASS

**OPTION B:**
WRCP RAIL LINE UNDERPASS

**OPTION C:**
WRCP RAIL LINE OVERPASS WITH RAIL LINE RELOCATION
OPTION A: WRCP RAIL LINE OVERPASS

- CN Mainline does not require relocation or short term detouring
- Drainage would be much less costly than for an underpass
- Minimal utility relocations would be required
- Construction cost would be lower than Options B or C
- Existing Wilkes Avenue alignment can be accommodated under structure
- Allows for two grade separation options for the Harte Trail at WRCP, an overpass, or a throughpass

- Ridgewood Avenue from east of Oakdale Road to east of Laxdal Road would need to be realigned to the north and raised to allow it to intersect WRCP
- May require traffic noise reduction due to height of structure
OPTION B: WRCP RAIL LINE UNDERPASS

Pros:
- Less intrusive – no traffic noise reduction required
- Does not require relocation of Ridgewood Avenue

Cons:
- The highest cost for a grade separation of the CN Mainline due to the below items
- CN Mainline will require detouring during construction
- Lift station and retention pond would be required for drainage
- A number of underground utility relocations would be required
- Wilkes Avenue will require detouring or closure during construction

Harte Trail options shown on board 24
OPTION C: WRCP RAIL LINE OVERPASS WITH RAIL LINE RELOCATION

- Does not require relocation of Ridgewood Avenue
- Existing Wilkes Avenue alignment can be accommodated under structure

Pros:
- CN Mainline will require relocation to the south
- CN Mainline will require detouring during construction
- May require traffic noise reduction due to height of structure
- Wilkes Avenue may require detouring during construction
- Increased project cost due to relocation of the CN Mainline
- Property required for relocation of CN Mainline

Cons:

Harte Trail options shown on board 24
### EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF PREFERRED OPTION

The alignment and grade separation options will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (10%)</td>
<td>How well does the option safely accommodate all users of the facility, including vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property (10%)</td>
<td>What are the property acquisition impacts of the option?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Cycle Facilities (10%)</td>
<td>How well does the option serve pedestrians and cyclists?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Impacts (15%)</td>
<td>Does the option have significant impacts on existing commercial or residential developments and neighbourhoods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What impact does the option have on the surrounding environment (i.e., surface water, air, noise, etc.) and what level of approvals would be required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage (15%)</td>
<td>How does the option affect the drainage of the surrounding area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Impacts (10%)</td>
<td>What are the impact of the option on the CN Mainline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (10%)</td>
<td>What are the impacts of the option on major utilities in the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Construction and Staging (10%)</td>
<td>What extent of staging and detour works are required for the option?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How easy or difficult is the option to construct and stage?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (10%)</td>
<td>What is the construction cost (order of magnitude) of each option?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELDRIDGE AVENUE AT WRCP INTERSECTION OPTIONS

ELDRIDGE CLOSURE OPTION

ELDRIDGE FLY-OVER OPTION

ELDRIDGE RIGHT-IN/RIGHT-OUT OPTION

ELDRIDGE SIGNALIZED OPTION
## ELDRIDGE AVENUE AT WRCP INTERSECTION OPTIONS PROS AND CONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closure</th>
<th>Fly-over</th>
<th>Right-In/Right-Out</th>
<th>Signalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Reduces risk of collisions  
- Limited property impact  
- Minimal physical environmental impact  
- Minimal costs  
- Easiest to construct | - Reduces risk of collisions  
- No traffic impact on WRCP  
- No impact on neighbourhood connectivity and transit service  
- Pedestrians/cyclists do not need to cross a busy intersection — this is a safer option for all Eldridge Avenue users | - Reduces risk of collisions  
- Limited property impact  
- Minimal traffic impact on WRCP due to limited access  
- Minimal physical environmental impact | - Full access for emergency vehicles  
- Limited property impact  
- Signal will accommodate projected traffic volumes  
- Maintains neighborhood connectivity and transit service  
- Minimal physical environmental impact  
- Accommodates all pedestrians/cycle movements  
- Short-cutting on adjacent north/south streets minimized |
| - No access for emergency vehicles from WRCP  
- No intersection  
- May increase short-cutting on adjacent streets  
- Impact on neighborhood connectivity and transit service  
- No pedestrian/cyclist crossing | - No access for emergency vehicles from WRCP  
- Property impacts  
- No intersection  
- Traffic noise impact  
- East/west pedestrian/cyclist movements only  
- Significant costs  
- Most complicated to construct | - Limited access for emergency vehicles from WRCP  
- Impact on neighborhood connectivity and transit service  
- Limited pedestrian/cyclist crossing | - Greater risk of collisions  
- Additional signalized intersection on WRCP |
HARTE TRAIL OPTIONS

Pedestrian & Cycling Overpass Example
(Chief Peguis at Northeast Pioneer's Greenway)

Pedestrian & Cycling Through Pass

Option 1: Overpass
- A: Harte Trail Overpass Route (X+Y: 0.9 km)
- B: Harte Trail At Grade Route

Option 2: Through Pass
- A: Harte Trail Through Pass Route (X+Y: 1.5 km)
- B: Harte Trail At Grade Crossing
- Through Pass Structure
- WRCP Pedestrian and Cycling Facility
POTENTIAL DOG PARK LOCATIONS

» The existing temporary dog park land is reserved for a future street as outlined in the Winnipeg Area Transportation Study (1968), Plan Winnipeg (1981), Winnipeg TransPlan 2010 (1998) and the City of Winnipeg Transportation Master Plan (2011).

» A potential permanent dog park may be located in the remaining land of the existing temporary dog park, and/or additional lands within the project Corridor.

» Four possible permanent dog park locations and sizes are shown on this map.
PUBLIC FEEDBACK

WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU!

Please complete a comment form and provide feedback on:

1. WRCP Phase 1 Design
2. East-west Alignment Options
3. Grade Separation of CN Mainline Crossing Options
4. Eldridge Avenue at WRCP Intersection Options
5. Harte Trail Options
6. Potential Dog Park Locations
7. Overall Project Comments

Your feedback will assist in the design of the recommended option for the WRCP extension
THANK YOU

On behalf of the Project Team, thank you for your attendance and participation.

For more information, contact:

Chris Baker, MMM Group | bakerc@mmm.ca | 204.943.3178

Public Engagement Lead:
David Jopling, MMM Group | joplingd@mmm.ca | 204.943.3178

Project website: winnipeg.ca/WRCP-Extension
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Foster, Gisele

From: Martin Morantz <mmorantz@me.com>
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2017 9:48 AM
To: Escobar, Luis
Cc: Morantz, Marty; Neirinck, Brad; Deane, Lester
Subject: Re: Wilkes re alignment

Thanks you Luis.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 13, 2017, at 9:06 AM, Escobar, Luis <LEscobar@winnipeg.ca> wrote:

Councillor Morantz
The reason why they didn’t use the current alignment of Wilkes is because we requested that they investigate a grade separation at the CN Mainline. Because of this, it is not possible to use the current alignment of Wilkes because there is not enough space to go either down/up and then back up/down to the proper grade along the alignment of the WRC Parkway. Please see section D4.3 of the request for proposals issued for this study.


thank you
luis

Luis Escobar, P.Eng., PTOE, Manager of Transportation || Public Works Department
tel(204) 986-5895 || fax(204) 986-7020 || lesobar@winnipeg.ca

The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.

From: Martin Morantz [mailto:mmorantz@me.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 12, 2017 3:00 PM
To: Escobar, Luis; Neirinck, Brad
Subject: Wilkes re alignment

Hi Luis and Brad,

I just wanted to get some clarification regarding the potential three options for Wilkes. My main question is why didn’t MMM consider utilizing the current alignment of Wilkes as opposed to the three possibilities set out in the attachment?

Marty
Sent from my iPad
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

RFP NO. 732-2014

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE FUNCTIONAL DESIGN OF THE WILLIAM R. CLEMENT PARKWAY EXTENSION FROM GRANT AVENUE TO MCGILLIVRAY BOULEVARD

Proposals shall be submitted to:

The City of Winnipeg
Corporate Finance Department
Materials Management Division
185 King Street, Main Floor
Winnipeg MB R3B 1J1
TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART A - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION
  Form A: Proposal 1

PART B - BIDDING PROCEDURES
  B1. Contract Title 1
  B2. Submission Deadline 1
  B3. Enquiries 1
  B4. Confidentiality 1
  B5. Addenda 2
  B6. Proposal Submission 2
  B7. Proposal (Section A) 3
  B8. Fees (Section B) 4
  B9. Experience of Proponent and Subconsultants (Section C) 4
  B10. Experience of Key Personnel Assigned to the Project (Section D) 5
  B11. Project Understanding and Methodology (Section E) 5
  B12. Project Schedule (Section F) 6
  B13. Qualification 6
  B14. Eligibility 7
  B15. Opening of Proposals and Release of Information 7
  B16. Irrevocable Offer 8
  B17. Withdrawal of Offers 8
  B18. Interviews 8
  B19. Negotiations 8
  B20. Evaluation of Proposals 9
  B21. Award of Contract 9

PART C - GENERAL CONDITIONS
  C0. General Conditions 1

PART D - SUPPLEMENTAL CONDITIONS
  General 1
  D1. General Conditions 1
  D2. Project Manager 1
  D3. Background 1
  D4. Scope of Services 2
  D5. Functional and Preliminary Engineering Study 4
  D6. Definitions 9
  D7. Ownership of Information, Confidentiality and Non Disclosure 9

Submissions Prior to Start of Services
  D8. Authority to Carry on Business 9
  D9. Insurance 9

Schedule of Services
  D10. Commencement 11
  D11. Critical Stages 11

PART E - SPECIFICATIONS
  E1. Sewer Televising Guidelines 1
  E2. Pump House Design Elements 1
  E3. Specifications for Structures 2

PART F - SECURITY CLEARANCE
  F1. Security Clearance 1
Appendix A – Definition of Professional Consulting Services - Engineering
Appendix B – Study Overview
PART B - BIDDING PROCEDURES

B1. CONTRACT TITLE

B1.1 REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE FUNCTIONAL DESIGN OF THE WILLIAM R. CLEMENT PARKWAY EXTENSION FROM GRANT AVENUE TO MCGILLIVRAY BOULEVARD

B2. SUBMISSION DEADLINE

B2.1 The Submission Deadline is 4:00 p.m. Winnipeg time, October 17, 2014.

B2.2 Proposals determined by the Manager of Materials to have been received later than the Submission Deadline will not be accepted and will be returned upon request.

B2.3 The Project Manager or the Manager of Materials may extend the Submission Deadline by issuing an addendum at any time prior to the time and date specified in B2.1.

B3. ENQUIRIES

B3.1 All enquiries shall be directed to the Project Manager identified in D2.

B3.2 If the Proponent finds errors, discrepancies or omissions in the Request for Proposal (RFP), or is unsure of the meaning or intent of any provision therein, the Proponent shall promptly notify the Project Manager of the error, discrepancy or omission at least five (5) Business Days prior to the Submission Deadline.

B3.3 If the Proponent is unsure of the meaning or intent of any provision therein, the Proponent should request clarification as to the meaning or intent prior to the Submission Deadline.

B3.4 Responses to enquiries which, in the sole judgment of the Project Manager, require a correction to or a clarification of the RFP will be provided by the Project Manager to all Proponents by issuing an addendum.

B3.5 Responses to enquiries which, in the sole judgment of the Project Manager, do not require a correction to or a clarification of the RFP will be provided by the Project Manager only to the Proponent who made the enquiry.

B3.6 All correspondence or contact by Proponents with the City in respect of this RFP must be directly and only with the City’s Project Manager. Failure to restrict correspondence and contact to the Project Manager may result in the rejection of the Proponents Proposal Submission.

B3.7 The Proponent shall not be entitled to rely on any response or interpretation received pursuant to B3 unless that response or interpretation is provided by the Project Manager in writing.

B4. CONFIDENTIALITY

B4.1 Information provided to a Proponent by the City or acquired by a Proponent by way of further enquiries or through investigation is confidential. Such information shall not be used or disclosed in any way without the prior written authorization of the Project Manager. The use and disclosure of the confidential information shall not apply to information which:

(a) was known to the Proponent before receipt hereof; or
(b) becomes publicly known other than through the Proponent; or
(c) is disclosed pursuant to the requirements of a governmental authority or judicial order.
B4.2 The Proponent shall not make any statement of fact or opinion regarding any aspect of the Request for Proposals to the media or any member of the public without the prior written authorization of the Project Manager.

B5. ADDENDA

B5.1 The Project Manager may, at any time prior to the Submission Deadline, issue Addenda correcting errors, discrepancies or omissions in the Request for Proposal, or clarifying the meaning or intent of any provision therein.

B5.2 The Project Manager will issue each addendum at least two (2) Business Days prior to the Submission Deadline, or provide at least two (2) Business Days by extending the Submission Deadline.

B5.2.1 Addenda will be available on the Bid Opportunities page at The City of Winnipeg, Corporate Finance, Materials Management Division website at http://www.winnipeg.ca/matmgmt/bidopp.asp

B5.2.2 The Bidder is responsible for ensuring that it has received all Addenda and is advised to check the Materials Management Division website for Addenda regularly and shortly before the Submission Deadline, as may be amended by addendum.

B5.3 The Bidder shall acknowledge receipt of each addendum in Paragraph 9 of Form A: Proposal. Failure to acknowledge receipt of an addendum may render a Proposal non-responsive.

B6. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

B6.1 The Proposal shall consist of the following components:
(a) Form A: Proposal (Section A) in accordance with B7;
(b) Fees (Section B) in accordance with B8;

B6.2 The Proposal should also consist of the following components:
(a) Experience of Proponent and Subconsultants (Section C) in accordance with B9;
(b) Experience of Key Personnel Assigned to the Project (Section D), in accordance with B10;
(c) Project Understanding and Methodology (Section E) in accordance with B11; and
(d) Project Schedule (Section F) in accordance with B12.

B6.3 Further to B6.1, all components of the Proposal shall be fully completed or provided in the order indicated, and submitted by the Proponent no later than the Submission Deadline, with all required entries made clearly and completely, to constitute a responsive Proposal.

B6.4 Further to B6.2, all components of the Proposal should be fully completed or provided in the order indicated, and submitted by the Proponent no later than the Submission Deadline, with all required entries made clearly and completely, to constitute a responsive Proposal.

B6.5 Proponents should submit one (1) unbound 8.5" x 11" original (marked "original") including tables, charts, drawings and schedule and six (6) bound 8.5" x 11" copies (tables, charts, drawings and schedule in copies only may fold out but be 11" high) for sections identified in B6.1 and B6.2.

B6.6 Further to B6.5, the Proposal shall be no more than 30 pages, exclusive of the required forms, cover page, table of contents, tables, charts, drawings and schedule. Failure to adhere to the page limitation may render the Proposal non-responsive.

B6.7 Further to B6.6, the minimum font height shall be 10pt.
B6.8 The Proposal should be presented in the Sections identified above. Proponents are encouraged to use their creativity to submit a Proposal which provides the requested information for evaluation and other information which illustrates the strength of their team.

B6.9 Proponents are advised that inclusion of terms and conditions inconsistent with the Request for Proposal, will be evaluated in accordance with B20.1(a).

B6.10 The Proposal shall be submitted enclosed and sealed in an envelope/package clearly marked with the RFP number and the Proponent's name and address.

B6.11 Proposals submitted by facsimile transmission (fax) or internet electronic mail (e-mail) will not be accepted.

B6.12 Proposals shall be submitted to:
The City of Winnipeg
Corporate Finance Department
Materials Management Division
185 King Street, Main Floor
Winnipeg MB R3B 1J1

B6.13 Any cost or expense incurred by the Proponent that is associated with the preparation of the Proposal shall be borne solely by the Proponent.

B7. PROPOSAL (SECTION A)

B7.1 The Proponent shall complete Form A: Proposal, making all required entries.

B7.2 Paragraph 2 of Form A: Proposal shall be completed in accordance with the following requirements:
(a) if the Proponent is a sole proprietor carrying on business in his/her own name, his/her name shall be inserted;
(b) if the Proponent is a partnership, the full name of the partnership shall be inserted;
(c) if the Proponent is a corporation, the full name of the corporation shall be inserted;
(d) if the Proponent is carrying on business under a name other than his/her own, the business name and the name of every partner or corporation who is the owner of such business name shall be inserted.

B7.2.1 If a Proposal is submitted jointly by two or more persons, each and all such persons shall identify themselves in accordance with B7.2.

B7.3 In Paragraph 3 of Form A: Proposal, the Proponent shall identify a contact person who is authorized to represent the Proponent for purposes of the Proposal.

B7.4 Paragraph 11 of Form A: Proposal shall be signed in accordance with the following requirements:
(a) if the Proponent is a sole proprietor carrying on business in his/her own name, it shall be signed by the Proponent;
(b) if the Proponent is a partnership, it shall be signed by the partner or partners who have authority to sign for the partnership;
(c) if the Proponent is a corporation, it shall be signed by its duly authorized officer or officers and the corporate seal, if the corporation has one, should be affixed;
(d) if the Proponent is carrying on business under a name other than its own, it shall be signed by the registered owner of the business name, or by the registered owner's authorized officials if the owner is a partnership or a corporation.

B7.4.1 The name and official capacity of all individuals signing Form A: Proposal should be printed below such signatures.
B7.5 If a Proposal is submitted jointly by two or more persons, the word "Proponent" shall mean each and all such persons, and the undertakings, covenants and obligations of such joint Proponents in the Proposal and the Contract, when awarded, shall be both joint and several.

B8. FEES (SECTION B)

B8.1 The Proposal shall include a Fixed Fee for all disciplines and/or phases identified in D4 Scope of Services.

B8.2 Adjustments to Fees will only be considered based on increases to the Scope of Services.

B8.2.1 The City will not consider an adjustment to the Fees based on changes in the Project budget or the Final Total Construction Cost.

B8.3 The City, at its discretion, may negotiate fees for Detailed Design, Contract Administration and Post Construction Services for sections or for all of the work with the successful proponent when the Preliminary Design phase is complete. This scope change would be subject to a satisfactory offer and approval of the Award Authority.

B8.4 Notwithstanding C1.1(b), Fees shall include costs for out of town travel, related meals and accommodations for the duration of the Project and shall not be considered an Allowable Disbursement.

B8.5 Fees shall include an allowance of up to 8% for Allowable Disbursements as defined in C1.1(b), but shall exclude the costs of any site investigation (geotechnical) services, Underground Structures drawing acquisitions, public open house logistics, closed circuit television (CCTV) sewer inspection, and/or hazardous materials investigation, or those included in B8.3. No other disbursements will be permitted.

B8.5.1 Further to B8.4, the Contract Award shall include, in addition to the Total Bid Price, an allowance for the costs of any site investigation (geotechnical) services, Underground Structures acquisitions, public open house logistics, closed circuit television (CCTV) sewer inspection, and/or hazardous materials investigation in the amount of up to 15% of the Total Bid Price;

B8.5.2 Further to B8.5.1, consultant fees developing, monitoring and interpreting geotechnical and environmental investigations must be included in the submitted fees of this Proposal.

B8.6 Notwithstanding C10.1, Fees submitted shall not include the Goods and Services Tax (GST) or Manitoba Retail Sales Tax (MRST, also known as PST), which shall be extra where applicable.

B8.7 Payments to Non-Resident Consultants are subject to Non-Resident Withholding Tax pursuant to the Income Tax Act (Canada).

B9. EXPERIENCE OF PROponent AND SUBCONSULTANTS (SECTION C)

B9.1 Proposals should include:

(a) details demonstrating the history and experience of the Proponent and Subconsultants in providing planning and design, management of construction and contract administration services on at least two projects of similar complexity, scope and value.

B9.2 For each project listed in B9.1(a), the Proponent should submit the description of the project, the role of the consultant, the project’s original contracted construction cost and final construction cost, the design and construction schedule (anticipated Project schedule and actual project delivery schedule, showing design and construction separately), the project owner and upon request of the Project Manager reference information (one current name with telephone number per project).

B9.2.1 Where applicable, information should be separated into Proponent and Subconsultant project listings.
B9.3 The Proposal should include general firm profile information, including years in business, average volume of work, number of employees and other pertinent information for the Proponent and all Subconsultants.

B10. EXPERIENCE OF KEY PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO THE PROJECT (SECTION D)

B10.1 Proposals should include, in tabular form:

(a) Names of key personnel assigned to the Project, who shall not be substituted without written permission from the Project Manager;
   (i) Any professional whose charge out rate equals or exceeds one hundred dollars per hour shall also be considered key personnel.
   (ii) Substitutes or back-up personal shall not be listed in the proposal.

(b) The experience and qualifications of the key personnel assigned to the Project is to include: job title, educational background and degrees, professional affiliation, years of experience on projects administered for the City of Winnipeg, years of experience in current position, years of experience in planning and design and years of experience in contract administration services.

B10.2 Roles of each of the key personnel in the Project should be identified in an organizational chart. Identify the lead person for each discipline or work unit.

B10.3 Proponents are to demonstrate successful experience coordinating design projects and subsequent construction of grade separations with CN Rail. Proponents must have demonstrated positive working relationships with the rail company and are expected to provide liaison support for the success of this project.

B10.4 For each person identified, list the percentage of their overall and available time to be dedicated to this Project with respect to their workload on other projects internal and external to the City of Winnipeg.

B10.5 Proposals should include, for each person identified in B10.1 a list of at least two projects comparable in complexity, scope and value; in which the person listed did comparable work and played a comparable role. Provide the following: description of the project, role of the person, project owner, and upon request of the Project Manager reference information (one current name and telephone number per project).

B11. PROJECT UNDERSTANDING AND METHODOLOGY (SECTION E)

B11.1 Describe your firm’s project management approach and team organization during the performance of Services, so that the evaluation committee has a clear understanding of the methods the Proponent will use in the delivery of this Project.

   (i) Describe the job function for each person and group of people so identified;
   (ii) Provide a Responsibility Assignment Task Matrix that provides time estimates by work activity and in total, including hourly rates for each person identified in B10.1(a). The matrix is to summate each person’s total labour cost and hours at the bottom of the matrix. The matrix is to summate the labour costs for each task and allowable disbursements. This matrix will demonstrate the Proponent’s understanding of the levels of effort required to successfully complete the project.
   (iii) Describe the methods of control to monitor and complete the assignment within budget and on time. As a minimum, monthly reports, in a format acceptable to the City, shall be submitted with all invoices. These reports shall clearly identify any current or anticipated budget or scheduling issues.
   (iv) All monthly reports shall include a list of each person charging time to the Project and the percentage of those people’s efforts relative to the current monthly statement and overall project to date.
   (iv) The method of quality assurance and controls to ensure the City receives a quality project that meets our expectations.
B11.2 Methodology should be presented in accordance with the Scope of Services identified in D4 and D5.

B11.3 Describe the collaborative process/method to be used by the Key Personnel of the team in the various phases of the Project.

B11.4 Proposals should address the team’s understanding of the broad functional and technical requirements, the team’s understanding of the urban design issues, the team’s understanding of transportation corridor planning and design issues, any innovation to be used for perform the Scope of Services identified, all activities and services to be provided by the City, the deliverables of the project, any assumptions made with respect to the deliverables and the Scope of Services, the City’s Project methodology with respect to the information provided within this RFP and any other issue that conveys your team’s understanding of the Project requirements.

B12. PROJECT SCHEDULE (SECTION F)

B12.1 Proponents should present a carefully considered Critical Path Method schedule using Microsoft Project or similar project management software, complete with resource assignments (key designers), durations (weekly timescale) and milestone dates or events. The schedule should address each requirement of the Scope of Services.

B12.2 The Proponent’s schedule should include critical dates for review and approval processes by the City and other organizations anticipated during the Project. Reasonable times should be allowed for completion of these processes.

B12.3 The Proponent’s schedule shall demonstrate the following:
(a) The Proponent’s schedules shall demonstrate the total completion of the final engineering report and associated drawings within approximately 16 months of Award or sooner.

B13. QUALIFICATION

B13.1 The Proponent shall:
(a) undertake to be in good standing under The Corporations Act (Manitoba), or properly registered under The Business Names Registration Act (Manitoba), or otherwise properly registered, licensed or permitted by law to carry on business in Manitoba, or if the Proponent does not carry on business in Manitoba, in the jurisdiction where the Proponent does carry on business; and
(b) be financially capable of carrying out the terms of the Contract;
(c) have all the necessary experience, capital, organization, and equipment to perform the Services in strict accordance with the terms and provisions of the Contract;
(d) have or establish and staff an office in Winnipeg for the duration of the Project.

B13.2 The Proponent and any proposed Subconsultant (for the portion of the Services proposed to be subcontracted to them) shall:
(a) be responsible and not be suspended, debarred or in default of any obligations to the City. A list of suspended or debarred individuals and companies is available on the Information Connection page at The City of Winnipeg, Corporate Finance, Materials Management Division website at http://www.winnipeg.ca/matmgd/debar.stm

B13.3 The Proponent and/or any proposed Subconsultant (for the portion of the Services proposed to be subcontracted to them) shall:
(a) have successfully carried out services for the programming; design, management of construction and contract administration for architectural and/or engineering projects of similar complexity, scope and value; and to those required for this Project; and
(b) be fully capable of performing the Services required to be in strict accordance with the terms and provisions of the Contract; and

(c) have a written workplace safety and health program, if required, pursuant to The Workplace Safety and Health Act (Manitoba);

(d) have the knowledge and resources to administer the requirements of The Workplace Safety and Health Act (Manitoba) during the construction works associated with this Contract;

(e) undertake to meet all licensing and regulatory requirements of the appropriate governing authorities and associations in the Province of Manitoba; and

(f) upon request of the Project Manager, the Security Clearances as identified in F1

B13.4 The Proponent shall submit, within three (3) Business Days of a request by the Project Manager, further proof satisfactory to the Project Manager of the qualifications of the Proponent and of any proposed Subconsultant.

B13.5 The Proponent shall provide, on the request of the Project Manager, full access to any of the Proponent's or Subconsultant's equipment and facilities to confirm, to the Project Manager's satisfaction, that the Proponent's or Subconsultant's equipment and facilities are adequate to perform the Services.

B14. ELIGIBILITY

B14.1 Various organizations provided investigative services with respect to this Project. In the City's opinion, this relationship or association does not create a conflict of interest or will not likely create a perception of conflict of interest because of this full disclosure and related information. The organizations are:

(a) MMM Group Ltd. – Charleswood Area Transportation Study

(b) Stantec Consulting Ltd. – Ridgewood South Mixed-Use Subdivision Traffic Impact Assessment

(c) AECOM Canada Ltd. – Charleswood Land Drainage Study

(d) Landmark Planning/Stantec Consulting Ltd. – Ridgewood Precinct Plan

(e) Landmark Planning/Native Plant Solutions – Ridgewood South Precinct Biological Inventory

B15. OPENING OF PROPOSALS AND RELEASE OF INFORMATION

B15.1 Proposals will not be opened publicly.

B15.2 After award of Contract, the names of the Bidders and the Contract amount of the successful Bidder will be available on the Closed Bid Opportunities (or Public/Posted Opening & Award Results) page at The City of Winnipeg, Corporate Finance, Materials Management Division website at http://www.winnipeg.ca/matmgmt/.

B15.3 To the extent permitted, the City shall treat all Proposal Submissions as confidential. However, the Proponent is advised that any information contained in any Proposal may be released if required by City policy or procedures, by The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (Manitoba), by other authorities having jurisdiction, or by law.

B15.4 Following the award of Contract, a Proponent will be provided with information related to the evaluation of its submission upon written request to the Project Manager.
B16. IRREVOCABLE OFFER

B16.1 The Proposal(s) submitted by the Proponent shall be irrevocable for the time period specified in Paragraph 10 of Form A: Proposal.

B16.2 The acceptance by the City of any Proposal shall not release the Proposals of the other responsive Proponents and these Proponents shall be bound by their offers on such Services until a Contract for the Services has been duly executed as herein provided, but any offer shall be deemed to have lapsed unless accepted within the time period specified in Paragraph 10 of Form A: Proposal.

B17. WITHDRAWAL OF OFFERS

B17.1 A Proponent may withdraw its Proposal without penalty by giving written notice to the Manager of Materials at any time prior to the Submission Deadline.

B17.1.1 The time and date of receipt of any notice withdrawing a Proposal shall be the time and date of receipt as determined by the Manager of Materials.

B17.1.2 The City will assume that any one of the contact persons named in Paragraph 3 of Form A: Proposal or the Proponent's authorized representatives named in Paragraph 11 of Form A: Proposal, and only such person, has authority to give notice of withdrawal.

B17.1.3 If a Proponent gives notice of withdrawal prior to the Submission Deadline, the Manager of Materials will:

(a) retain the Proposal until after the Submission Deadline has elapsed;

(b) open the Proposal to identify the contact person named in Paragraph 3 of Form A: Proposal and the Proponent's authorized representatives named in Paragraph 11 of Form A: Proposal; and

(c) if the notice has been given by any one of the persons specified in B17.1.3(b), declare the Proposal withdrawn.

B17.2 A Proponent who withdraws its Proposal after the Submission Deadline but before its offer has been released or has lapsed as provided for in B16.2 shall be liable for such damages as are imposed upon the Proponent by law and subject to such sanctions as the Chief Administrative Officer considers appropriate in the circumstances. The City, in such event, shall be entitled to all rights and remedies available to it at law.

B18. INTERVIEWS

B18.1 The Project Manager may, in his/her sole discretion, interview Proponents during the evaluation process.

B19. NEGOTIATIONS

B19.1 The City reserves the right to negotiate details of the Contract with any Proponent. Proponents are advised to present their best offer, not a starting point for negotiations in their Proposal Submission.

B19.2 The City may negotiate with the Proponents submitting, in the City's opinion, the most advantageous Proposals. The City may enter into negotiations with one or more Proponents without being obligated to offer the same opportunity to any other Proponents. Negotiations may be concurrent and will involve each Proponent individually. The City shall incur no liability to any Proponent as a result of such negotiations.

B19.3 If, in the course of negotiations pursuant to B19.2 or otherwise, the Proponent amends or modifies a Proposal after the Submission Deadline, the City may consider the amended Proposal as an alternative to the Proposal already submitted without releasing the Proponent from the Proposal as originally submitted.
B20. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

B20.1 Award of the Contract shall be based on the following evaluation criteria:

(a) compliance by the Proponent with the requirements of the Request for Proposal or 
    acceptable deviation therefrom: (pass/fail)
(b) qualifications of the Proponent and the Subconsultants, if any, pursuant to B13: 
    (pass/fail)
(c) Fees; (Section B) 40%
(d) Experience of Proponent and Subconsultants; (Section C) 10%
(e) Experience of Key Personnel Assigned to the Project; (Section D) 25%
(f) Project Understanding and Methodology (Section E) 20%
(g) Project Schedule. (Section F) 5%

B20.2 Further to B20.1(a), the Award Authority may reject a Proposal as being non-responsive if the 
Proposal Submission is incomplete, obscure or conditional, or contains additions, deletions, 
alterations or other irregularities. The Award Authority may reject all or any part of any 
Proposal, or waive technical requirements or minor informalities or irregularities if the interests 
of the City so require.

B20.3 Further to B20.1(b), the Award Authority shall reject any Proposal submitted by a Proponent 
who does not demonstrate, in its Proposal or in other information required to be submitted, that 
it is responsible and qualified.

B20.4 Further to B20.1(c), Fees will be evaluated based on Fees submitted in accordance with B8.

B20.5 Further to B20.1(d), Experience of Proponent and Subconsultants will be evaluated considering 
the experience of the organization on projects of similar size and complexity as well as other 
information requested.

B20.6 Further to B20.1(e), Experience of Key Personnel Assigned to the Project will be evaluated 
considering the experience and qualifications of the Proponent’s and Subconsultant’s Key 
Personnel on Projects of comparable size and complexity.

B20.7 Further to B20.1(f), Project Understanding and Methodology will be evaluated considering your 
firm’s understanding of the City’s Project, project management approach and team organization.

B20.8 Further to B20.1(g), Project Schedule will be evaluated considering the Proponent’s ability to 
comply with the requirements of the Project.

B20.9 Notwithstanding B20.1(d) to B20.1(g), where Proponents fail to provide a response to B6.2(a) to 
B6.2(d), the score of zero may be assigned to the incomplete part of the response.

B21. AWARD OF CONTRACT

B21.1 The City will give notice of the award of the Contract, or will give notice that no award will be 
made.

B21.2 The City will have no obligation to award a Contract to a Proponent, even though one or all of 
the Proponents are determined to be responsible and qualified, and the Proposals are 
determined to be responsive.

B21.2.1 Without limiting the generality of B21.2, the City will have no obligation to award a Contract 
where:

(a) the prices exceed the available City funds for the Services;
(b) the prices are materially in excess of the prices received for similar services in the past;
(c) the prices are materially in excess of the City’s cost to perform the Services, or a significant portion thereof, with its own forces;

(d) only one Proposal is received; or

(e) in the judgment of the Award Authority, the interests of the City would best be served by not awarding a Contract.

B21.3 Where an award of Contract is made by the City, the award shall be made to the responsible and qualified Proponent submitting the most advantageous offer.

B21.4 Notwithstanding Paragraph 6 of Form A: Proposal and C4, the City will issue a Letter of Intent to the successful Bidder in lieu of execution of a Contract.

B21.4.1 The Contract documents as defined in C1.1(n)(ii) in their entirety shall be deemed to be incorporated in and to form a part of the Letter of Intent notwithstanding that they are not necessarily attached to or accompany said Letter of Intent.

B22.6 The form of Contract with the City of Winnipeg will be based on the Contract as defined in C1.1(n).

B21.5 Following the award of Contract, a Proponent will be provided with information related to the evaluation of its Proposal upon written request to the Project Manager.

B21.6 If, after the award of Contract, the Project is cancelled, the City reserves the right to terminate the Contract. The Consultant will be paid for all Services rendered up to time of termination.
PART C - GENERAL CONDITIONS

C0. GENERAL CONDITIONS

C0.1 The General Conditions for Consultant Services (Revision 2010-10-01) are applicable to the Services of the Contract.

C0.1.1 The General Conditions for Consultant Services are available on the Information Connection page at The City of Winnipeg, Corporate Finance, Materials Management Division website at http://www.winnipeg.ca/matmgmt/gen_cond.stm.

C0.2 A reference in the Request for Proposal to a section, clause or subclause with the prefix "C" designates a section, clause or subclause in the General Conditions for Consultant Services.
PART D - SUPPLEMENTAL CONDITIONS

GENERAL

D1. GENERAL CONDITIONS

D1.1 In addition to the General Conditions for Consultant Services, these Supplemental Conditions are applicable to the Services of the Contract.

D2. PROJECT MANAGER

D2.1 The Project Manager is:
Scott Suderman, C.E.T., P.Eng.
Transportation Facilities Planning Engineer
Email: ssuderman@winnipeg.ca
Telephone No.  204 986-6963
Facsimile No.  204 986-7020

D2.2 At the pre-commencement meeting, the Project Manager will identify additional personnel representing the Project Manager and their respective roles and responsibilities for the Services.

D2.3 Proposal Submissions must be submitted to the address in B6.12

D3. BACKGROUND

D3.1 In October 2011, City of Winnipeg Council approved the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) which identified the extension of the William R. Clement Parkway (WRCP) between Grant Avenue and Wilkes Avenue as a medium term project and the extension of the WRCP between Wilkes Avenue and McGillivray Boulevard (and to Bishop Grandin Boulevard) as a long term project. The WRCP is identified as part of the Strategic Road Network.

D3.2 On April 25, 2012, City of Winnipeg Council approved an amendment to the TMP by moving the WRCP between Grant Avenue and Wilkes Avenue to a short term project with completion by 2016.

D3.3 In January 1988, DS-Lea Consultants prepared a Preliminary Design Study for the Charleswood Corridor which included the section of WRCP between Grant Avenue and Ridgewood Avenue. Due to changes in design standards, new developments and enhancements to other modes of transportation this Study will supersede the 1988 study.

D3.4 In March 2006 ND Lea prepared a Functional Design and Access Management Study for PTH3 – PTH 100 to Brady Road. This identified a location and preserved space for a junction with McGillivray Boulevard. The R.M. of MacDonald has developed a zoning and land use plan by-law based on this report.

D3.5 In 2002, the William R. Clement Parkway (formally the Charleswood Parkway) was constructed between Roblin Avenue and Grant Avenue.

D3.6 The Ridgewood Precinct Plan is complete and was approved on October 23, 2013.

D3.7 In anticipation of the WRCP extension to Wilkes Avenue, the City of Winnipeg has reserved land for the future alignment where possible. No land has been reserved to date from the WRCP south of Wilkes Avenue.

D3.8 WRCP is classified as an access protected expressway.
D3.9 Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship have advised that this project is considered a Class 3 Development under The Environment Act and environmental assessment and licensing under the Act is required.

D3.10 A higher resolution electronic drawing of the study area that includes aerial photos, existing City of Winnipeg concepts, and additional information are available upon request from the Project Manager identified in D2. The proponent may be required to enter into a confidentiality and sharing agreement with the City of Winnipeg prior to release of that drawing and related information.

D4. SCOPE OF SERVICES

D4.1 The Services required under this Contract shall consist of an engineering design study for the extension of the WRCP between Grant Avenue and McGillivray Boulevard, and required improvements to, or realignment of, Wilkes Avenue as outlined in D4 and D5.

D4.2 Project Objectives:

(a) To determine the short term and long term infrastructure requirements and develop designs that that value-orientated.

(b) To determine and rationalize the costing (Class 3 for all components) and infrastructure requirements and sequencing to extend the William R. Clement Parkway and determine the alignment, and connection to an east-west arterial south of the CN Rail Rivers line through an engineering study that is transparent to the public and elected officials.

(c) To determine the required rights-of-way to preserve existing lands, establish required property and support future development.

(d) To engage and include the public and relevant stakeholders throughout the project process in a meaningful way.

(e) To identify all related risks and technical issues and develop associated mitigation strategies and solutions to ensure the physical project can be implemented efficiently.

D4.3 The Services required under this Contract shall consist of the following major components:

(a) Functional Design Phase – WRCP between Grant Avenue and McGillivray Boulevard and improvement to, or realignment of, Wilkes Avenue. Major solutions required include, but are not limited to:

(i) Wilkes Avenue needs to be investigated to determine the optimal alignment whether it be further south of the existing alignment or improved on the existing alignment. The realignment could commence at the eastern limit either east or west of Shaftsbury Boulevard/McCreary Boulevard. The western most could be as far as Charleswood Road. Potential options could have implications in terms of:

- The ability to grade separate Shaftsbury Boulevard from the CN Rivers mainline in the future.
- The type and configuration of intersection/grade separation between Wilkes Avenue and WRCP.
- The configuration and operation of the connection of Wilkes Avenue, Sterling Lyon Parkway, Shaftsbury Boulevard and McCreary Road.
- The type and configuration of grade separation of the WRCP and CN Rivers mainline.
- Existing and future access and potential for development
- The extent of required twinning and intersection improvements on Wilkes Avenue
- Property Acquisition

(ii) Developing a grade separation of the WRCP and the CN Rail Rivers mainline. The functional design of this grade separation has to be done in unison with evaluating
Wilkes Avenue alignment options, therefore multiple structure options will need to be evaluated for various scenarios, potential examples include, but are not limited to:

- A structure could span both the rail line and Wilkes Avenue with return loop(s) to Wilkes Avenue on the existing alignment.
- Wilkes Avenue could be realigned south, only in the proximity of the WRCP with a structure spanning only the rail line with WRCP tieing into Wilkes with a signal.
- Same as previous, but Wilkes Avenue could be realigned for a longer stretch, somewhere between Sterling Lyon Parkway and Charleswood Road.

Major considerations shall be given to:

- The choice between underpass and overpass alternatives.
- Developing drainage solutions for any underpass options.

(iii) Determining the optimal location for connecting the WRCP to McGillivray Boulevard. The City of Winnipeg’s current Traffic Model anticipates increased traffic utilization of this section the closer it gets to the City. The R.M. of MacDonald is currently reserving land as identified in the 2006 ND Lea report which has WRCP tieing in straight south from Wilkes Avenue along its current alignment.

(iv) The inclusion of a pedestrian and cycling overpass over the WRCP that connects the Harte Trail. The Harte Trail is a significant trail and part of the City’s Active Transportation Network and the Trans Canada Trail. This could be sited at various locations and would impact the road and intersection design and the functionality of the Trail.

(v) An Environmental Assessment is required for this project and ensuring that the design of any road, structure, drainage or trail components mitigate any identified environmental issues and consider ecologically sensitive areas.

(vi) A construction and implementation plan is to be developed with supportive engineering analysis to determine when and what infrastructure the City should construct, mainly through traffic requirements, value and cost benefit ratios.

(b) Preliminary Design Phase – further develop the design of the WRCP between Grant Avenue to Wilkes Avenue to develop preliminary engineered drawings for this section of WRCP and a Class 3 costs estimate for the works in accordance as outlined in D4 and D5. This shall also include preliminary design services associated with:

(i) WRCP between Grant Avenue and Wilkes Avenue
(ii) Wilkes Avenue as determined through the functional phase
(iii) A pedestrian and cycling overpass
(iv) A grade separation of the CN Rivers mainline
(v) A potential grade separation of Wilkes Avenue
(vi) All associated drainage requirements
(vii) Landscaping
(viii) Required sound attenuation devices

D4.4 The proposed study area is shown in Appendix B. As part of the RFP submission the Proponents are asked to confirm or provide commentary or confirmation to the study area as required. As it is anticipated with most projects study limits, the study area may evolve based on findings of the traffic study and associated geometric improvements.

D4.5 Confirm the scope of work required using professional engineering judgement as part of the proposal submission.

D4.6 Further to B8.3, Detailed Design, Contract Administration, and Post Construction Services are not currently within the scope of services. The City at its discretion may develop terms of reference following the completion of Preliminary Design and negotiate fees for these services with the successful proponent. The scope change would be subject to a satisfactory offer and
approval from the Award Authority. The scope change may also be for a section of the route or its entirety.

D4.7 Professional Engineering Services applicable to the work are defined in Appendix A.

D4.8 Where applicable and at a minimum, designs must address:

(a) Appropriate geometric standards set by the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC);

(b) The draft 2012 update to the City of Winnipeg’s *Transportation Standards Manual*

(Previous version February 1991);

(c) City of Winnipeg’s *Accessibility Design Standards* (May 2010);

(d) City of Winnipeg’s *Universal Design Policy* (October 16, 2001);

(e) The City of Winnipeg Cycling Map latest edition;

(f) The City of Winnipeg Motor Vehicle Noise Policies and Guidelines (1982);

(g) City of Winnipeg’s Tree Planting Details and Specifications Downtown Area and Regional Streets (May 2009);

(h) City of Winnipeg’s Tree Removal Guidelines;

(i) The current edition of The City of Winnipeg Standard Construction Specifications;

(j) Transport Canada Draft RTD 10 Road/Railway Grade Crossings (October 2002);

(k) Transport Canada Canadian Railway-Roadway Grade Crossing Standards, latest edition;


(m) AREMA Manual for Railway Engineering;

(n) CN Guidelines for Design of Railway Structures (January 2006);

(o) CNR Temporary Shoring Guidelines (November 2011);

(p) CAN/CSA-S6-06 Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code plus interims.

D4.9 Where applicable, other structures must address:

(a) The current edition of the *Manitoba Building Code*;

(b) AASHTO Standard Specifications for Structural Supports for Highway Signs, Luminaires and Traffic Signals;


D4.10 The following documents are to be considered where applicable.

(a) OurWinnipeg (adopted July 12, 2011);

(b) OurWinnipeg Sustainable Transportation Strategy (adopted July 12, 2011);

(c) Winnipeg Transportation Master Plan (adopted November 16, 2011).

D5. FUNCTIONAL AND PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING STUDY

D5.1 This section is a summary of minimum tasks and information that the proponent is required to perform if successful as part of the Contract. Proponents are to ensure their proposal describes how they will achieve the objectives and successful completion of the functional and preliminary design components to the satisfaction of the City of Winnipeg.

D5.2 The Services required under this Contract shall consist of Professional Engineering Services - Preliminary Design in accordance with Appendix A and in accordance with the following:

(a) Collect relevant information from all utilities, as well as review record drawings, reports and other information that will be provided by the City, including but not limited to (all documents are available at *www.winnipeg.ca*):

(i) OurWinnipeg (adopted July 12, 2011);
(ii) OurWinnipeg Sustainable Transportation Strategy (adopted July 12, 2011);
(iii) Winnipeg Transportation Master Plan (adopted November 16, 2011);

(b) Develop an engineering definition of the project requirements and a needs assessment with input from the project Technical Steering Committee.

(c) Design and implement a logical and transparent Public Consultation Program to ensure appropriate input from, and communication with the community and other stakeholders. Reference should be made to the publications of the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) in developing the public engagement process.

(d) Prepare a Project Schedule (schedule of goals, objectives, activities and milestones) for the project broken down to an acceptable measurable level to be able to provide comprehensive management of the project. Monitor and maintain the same in a manner acceptable to the City.

(e) Conduct an on-site survey and visual inspection of relevant existing infrastructure within the project limits to establish the condition and confirm location of existing roadways, railways, structures, sewers and major drains, utilities, etc.

(f) Review available sub-surface investigations. Identify need for additional testing, and implement and supervise a testing program. The geotechnical program is to consider at least:

(i) Groundwater analysis
(ii) Pavement design
(iii) Environmental sampling
(iv) Slope stability and requirements for any structures

(g) Compile and analyse existing City traffic data and publicly available traffic studies in the area to determine base year and 2034 design year turning movement volumes. Identify locations for City to conduct additional traffic counts, if necessary, to confirm base year traffic conditions. Projections for all roadways within the subject area can be made by the City using the TransCAD based transportation planning model developed for the Winnipeg Transportation Master Plan. The model incorporates anticipated traffic generation from the development of surrounding land. The City will conduct the model runs and provide the output in the form of link volumes to the Consultant. The base year of the model is 2006 and runs can be made in five year increments to 2031. The Consultant will need to project model runs to the design year. The Consultant will need to determine if any adjustments are needed to the model results to better replicate base year volumes and project future year volumes and determine turning movement volumes based on the link volumes provided by the City. Some adjustments may be made to the base year model to improve assignment results (e.g. turn penalties). The model does not include truck traffic. The Consultant should determine how truck traffic should be evaluated as part of the project.

(h) Review the operation and safety of all intersections within the subject area, and recommend modifications, realignments, closures or other improvements.

(i) Review vehicular access management issues within the study section and investigate alternatives for local street and private approach realignments or closures.

(j) Determine opening day and ultimate number of lanes for each section of WRCP and Wilkes Avenue with consideration to the developed project sequencing.

(k) Develop a Synchro based model of the study area to identify and evaluate signal timing/capacity issues of the alignments.

(l) WRCP and Wilkes Avenue Functional design shall also include at a minimum:

(i) Evaluate alignments for WRCP between Grant Avenue and Wilkes Avenue as required.

(ii) Evaluate alignments for WRCP between Wilkes Avenue, or the realigned Wilkes Avenue, and McGillivray Boulevard to determine optimal alignment and tie-in location with McGillivray.
(iii) A review of the existing Wilkes Avenue alignment to determine the extent of twinning or intersection improvements required the opening day of WRCP to address operational and capacity needs.

(iv) Review and evaluate overpass and underpass alternatives for the grade separation with CN Rail River mainline.

(v) Realignment of Wilkes Avenue between Sterling Lyon Parkway and Charleswood Road at a location south of its existing alignment. Evaluate the realigned alternatives versus widening of the existing Wilkes Avenue right-of-way as outlined in the Charleswood Area Transportation Study. Evaluation considerations will include at a minimum how the options:
- Affect traffic safety
- Affect intersection operations
- Support land development
- Accommodate the required grade separation with the CN Rail mainline and the intersection with WRCP
- Compatibility with a future service interchange between WRCP and Wilkes Avenue if required
- Impact to private properties
- Compare is capital costs
- Ability to stage (or sequence) the whole project for several years if required
- Access to existing properties

(vi) Evaluation and comparison of the various Wilkes Avenue alternatives.
- Drawings of the improvements for the existing Wilkes Avenue developed as part of the Charleswood Area Transportation Study will be made available to the successful proponent for comparing against developed alternatives.

(m) Provide recommendations for pedestrian and cycling facilities within or adjacent to the study area, including connections to established and proposed cycling routes and active transportation facilities.

(i) Community impacts and connectivity shall be considered.

(ii) Includes pedestrian and cycling accommodation along and across the WRCP and Wilkes corridor.

(n) Consider existing and future transit operations

(o) Determine Right-Of-Way requirements for the WRCP and Wilkes alignment and various minor and major cross streets.

(p) Prepare property requirement drawings and provide associated costs estimates for the required properties. Cost estimates are to be prepared by an appraisal professional as part of the consultant team.

(q) Perform a drainage study for the WRCP corridor that is compatible with the regional drainage plan. Review available land drainage studies, determine the impact of proposed improvements upon existing capacity, and identify any additional drainage facility requirements of the proposed alignments. Provide recommendations to existing precinct plans and those under development in regards to integrated drainage requirements, if required.

(i) The drainage study is to determine how to drain all right-of-way corridors with consideration to future development and land drainage sewer catchment areas with respect to supporting future development.

(r) Determine potential locations for a pump station and sizing of pumps and forcemains. It is assumed at this time that a pump station would be required for the underpass options. Additional requirements for design of lift station/pump house requirements are included in E3.
(s) Develop structural pavement cross-section alternatives and evaluate based upon life cycle cost, maintenance requirements and other relevant factors. Perform pavement design to include two options, for various segments if necessary and for cross streets. Best and current practices in pavement design are expected. This task is to be performed by a pavement design Specialist.

(t) Project aesthetics are to be performed by a qualified Landscape Architectural Professionals with proven successful experience in the development of preliminary aesthetic plans for greenway corridors.

(u) Incorporate Universal Design Principles into the functional design.

(v) Recommendations for siting the locations, access, and parking for public recreational canine facilities.

(w) In consultation with CN Rail, determine all requirements for temporary or permanent realignment/relocation of railway infrastructure consistent with viable grade separation alternatives.

(x) Develop a preliminary design of temporary and permanent railway alignments including documenting specification requirements for materials and performance.

(y) In consultation with CN Rail determine acceptable railway bridge types and requirements including vertical clearances. At-grade rail crossings will not be considered.

(z) Includes a construction staging plan for any grade separations.

(aa) Develop preliminary bridge/structure designs consistent with viable alternatives. Additional structural requirements are included in E4.

(bb) A Work Permit will need to be obtained from CN Rail for any work undertaken on their property. It will be the responsibility of the Consultant to obtain a current work permit and abide by all CN Rail safety regulations when working on their property.

(cc) Utilize transportation cost-benefit analysis for the corridors major components to aid in project sequencing and alternative selection. Examples of utilizing the comparison of developed cost-benefit ratios as part of the decision making process could include:

(a) Bridge types
(b) Wilkes Avenue alignment options
(c) WRCP alignments between Grant Avenue and Wilkes
(d) WRCP alignments between Wilkes and McGillivray Boulevard

(dd) Develop a project implementation plan that determines the sequencing of major components of the work. The plan should be broken down into manageable phases or projects. Use developed cost benefit ratios to use in conjunction with technical details and design aspects to determine how the project should be constructed initially and when appropriate extensions or upgrades are required.

(ee) Develop a Class 3 cost estimate for each major infrastructure component as well as a total Project Estimate.

(ff) Perform an Environmental Assessment on the selected alignment. Includes all tasks necessary for the preparation and support of an Environment Act Proposal for the William Clement Parkway Extension Project from Grant Avenue to McGillivray for submission to the Province of Manitoba and the obtainment of an Environment Act License for this project.

(gg) Investigate and identify any additional environmental and regulatory approval requirements for the recommended alternative to proceed to construction.

(hh) Perform a risk assessment - identify significant risks and appropriate mitigative strategies as they relate to the successful completion of the projects implementation.

(ii) Provide draft webpages and regular updates for the Public Works project website including appropriately formatted images and PDF copies of meeting notices, advertisements, drawings and other relevant documents during the study period.
(jj) Produce full colored plan, profile and perspective views of key features of the proposed design for presentation purposes.

(kk) Chair and record minutes of Technical Steering Committee meetings.

(ll) Prepare Working Papers for key elements, provide progress updates to the City’s Project Steering Committee and record minutes.

(mm) Design and participate in a Value Engineering exercise. Review and respond to the Value Engineering recommendations. Incorporation of the recommendations shall be included in the Proponents fees. Appropriate allowances shall be included in the Proponents fees for the participation of industry professionals. The Consultant is to bring in expert level staff that are independent to the key personnel identified on the team. The project team shall consist of a Value Engineering Professional to design and facilitate the exercise. The consultant is expected to provide the appropriate timing for this function to optimize its use.

(nn) No safety audit will be performed as part of this work. The safety audit will occur during the detailed design phase.

(oo) Identify locations and types of overheads signs and crash protection. This includes WRCP, Grant Avenue, Wilkes Avenue, and McGillivray Avenue. The structural design of the signage will occur during the detailed design phase.

(pp) Review all above ground and below ground utilities and identify necessary improvements, upgrades, relocations or required condition assessments and associated estimates. Coordinate and consult with all utilities to include planned system upgrade and new plants.

(qq) Determine the extent of sewer CCTV inspections required and undertake the inspections in accordance with E2 Sewer Televising Guidelines. Fees associated with undertaking the televising shall not be included in the Proposal Submission but will be negotiated when the extent of CCTV inspections has been determined.

(rr) Perform a sound study where required. Provide recommendations and associated cost estimates for type of sound mitigation methods. This task is to be performed by a sound study Specialist.

(ss) Present to and/or meet with Community Committees, Committees of City Council, City Departments, and Stakeholder groups. Assume one presentation to City Council.

(tt) Prepare a Sealed and Signed Final Report documenting the Functional and Preliminary Design/Public Consultation process and the recommended preliminary design. Summarize the study in an Executive Summary. Provide 8 bound copies of each and 8 copies of all project reports, working papers, meeting minutes and images on CD or DVD in bookmarked, searchable PDF format. Include preliminary design engineering drawings of the recommended alternative in both AutoCAD and PDF format.

(uu) Provide any and all associated ancillary services required to successfully complete the functional design to the satisfaction of The City of Winnipeg.

D5.3 The City will provide the following items and support:

(a) Services provided by the City shall include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:

(i) TransCAD Transportation planning model output or an executable version of the model will be provided to assist in the development of future traffic projections for the various alternatives.

(b) The following information will be provided:

(i) Charleswood Area Transportation Study.
(ii) Construction record and utility drawings.
(iii) Aerial photography.
(iv) Right-of-Way base (AutoCAD LBIS) with available utility layers.
(v) Draft version of the proposed Cycling Network.
(vi) Traffic counts – historical counts and additional counts as required.
(vii) Historical collision data.
(viii) Existing engineering studies – structural, sewer district, sound, traffic impact etc.
(ix) 2007 Household Travel Survey data for Winnipeg.
(x) Additional items if available and deemed appropriate and beneficial to the successful completion of the project.

D6. DEFINITIONS

D6.1 When used in this Request for Proposal:
(a) "WRCP" means William R. Clement Parkway
(b) "Class 3 Estimate" means an estimate with an expected accuracy within +30% to -20%.
(c) "TMP" means Transportation Master Plan

D7. OWNERSHIP OF INFORMATION, CONFIDENTIALITY AND NON DISCLOSURE

D7.1 The Contract, all deliverables produced or developed, and information provided to or acquired by the Consultant are the property of the City and shall not be appropriated for the Consultants own use, or for the use of any third party.

D7.2 The Consultant shall not make any public announcements or press releases regarding the Contract, without the prior written authorization of the Project Manager.

D7.3 The following shall be confidential and shall not be disclosed by the Consultant to the media or any member of the public without the prior written authorization of the Project Manager;
(a) information provided to the Consultant by the City or acquired by the Consultant during the course of the Work;
(b) the Contract, all deliverables produced or developed; and
(c) any statement of fact or opinion regarding any aspect of the Contract.

D7.4 A Consultant who violates any provision of D7 may be determined to be in breach of Contract.

SUBMISSIONS PRIOR TO START OF SERVICES

D8. AUTHORITY TO CARRY ON BUSINESS

D8.1 The Consultant shall be in good standing under The Corporations Act (Manitoba), or properly registered under The Business Names Registration Act (Manitoba), or otherwise properly registered, licensed or permitted by law to carry on business in Manitoba, or if the Consultant does not carry on business in Manitoba, in the jurisdiction where the Consultant does carry on business, throughout the term of the Contract, and shall provide the Project Manager with evidence thereof upon request.

D9. INSURANCE

D9.1 The Consultant shall procure and maintain, at its own expense and cost, insurance policies with limits no less than those shown below.

D9.2 As a minimum, the Consultant shall, without limiting its obligations or liabilities under any other contract with the City, procure and maintain, at its own expense and cost, the following insurance policies:
(a) Comprehensive or Commercial General Liability Insurance including:
   (i) an inclusive limit of not less than $2,000,000 for each occurrence or accident with a minimum $2,000,000 Products and Completed Operations aggregate and $5,000,000 general aggregate;
   (ii) all sums which the Consultant shall become legally obligated to pay for damages because of bodily injury (including death at any time resulting therefrom) sustained
by any person or persons or because of damage to or destruction of property caused by an occurrence or accident arising out of or related to the Services or any operations carried on in connection with this Contract;

(iii) coverage for Products/Completed Operations, Blanket Contractual, Consultant’s Protective, Personal Injury, Contingent Employer’s Liability, Broad Form Property Damage, Employees as Additional Insureds, and Non-Owned Automobile Liability;

(iv) a Cross Liability clause and/or Severability of Interest Clause providing that the inclusion of more than one Insured shall not in any way affect the rights of any other Insured hereunder in respect to any claim, demand, suit or judgment made against any other Insured;

(b) if applicable, Automobile Liability Insurance covering all motor vehicles, owned and operated and used or to be used by the Consultant directly or indirectly in the performance of the Service. The Limit of Liability shall not be less than $2,000,000 inclusive for loss or damage including personal injuries and death resulting from any one accident or occurrence.

(c) Professional Errors and Omissions Liability Insurance including:

(i) an amount not less than $5,000,000 per claim and $5,000,000 in the aggregate.

D9.2.1 The Consultant’s Professional Errors and Omissions Liability Insurance shall remain in force for the duration of the Project and for twelve (12) months after total performance.

D9.3 The policies required in D9.2(a) shall provide that the City is named as an Additional Insured thereunder and that said policies are primary without any right of contribution from any insurance otherwise maintained by the City.

D9.4 The Consultant shall require each of its Subconsultants to provide comparable insurance to that set forth under D9.2(a).

D9.5 The Consultant shall provide the Project Manager with a certificate(s) of insurance for itself and for all of its Subconsultants, in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, at least two (2) Business Days prior to the commencement of any Services, but in no event later than the date specified in C4.1 for the return of the executed Contract. Such Certificates shall state the exact description of the Services and provide for written notice in accordance with D9.10.

D9.6 The Consultant may take out such additional insurance as it may consider necessary and desirable. All such additional insurance shall be at no expense to the City.

D9.7 All insurance, which the Consultant is required to obtain with respect to this Contract, shall be with insurance companies registered in and licensed to underwrite such insurance in the Province of Manitoba.

D9.8 If the Consultant fails to do all or anything which is required of it with regard to insurance, the City may do all that is necessary to affect and maintain such insurance, and any monies expended by the City shall be repayable by and recovered from the Consultant.

D9.9 The failure or refusal to pay losses by any insurance company providing insurance on behalf of the Consultant or any Subconsultants shall not be held to waive or release the Consultant or Subconsultants from any of the provisions of the insurance requirements or this Contract. Any insurance deductible maintained by the Consultant or any Subconsultants under any of the insurance policies is solely for their account and any such amount incurred by the City will be recovered from the Consultant as stated in D9.8.

D9.10 The Consultant shall not cancel, materially alter, or cause any policy to lapse without providing at least thirty (30) Calendar Days prior written notice to the City.
SCHEDULE OF SERVICES

D10. COMMENCEMENT

D10.1 The Consultant shall not commence any Services until it is in receipt of a notice of award from the City authorizing the commencement of the Services.

D10.2 The Consultant shall not commence any Services until:
   (a) the Project Manager has confirmed receipt and approval of:
       (i) evidence of authority to carry on business specified in D8;
       (ii) evidence of the insurance specified in D9;
   (b) the Consultant has attended a meeting with the Project Manager, or the Project Manager has waived the requirement for a meeting.

D10.3 The City intends to award this Contract by November 21, 2014.

D11. CRITICAL STAGES

D11.1 The Consultant shall achieve critical stages of the Services for this Contract in accordance with the following requirements:
   (a) Total completion of the final engineering report and associated drawings within approximately 16 months of Award.
PART E - SPECIFICATIONS

E1. SEWER TELEVISING GUIDELINES

E1.1 The Consultant is required to assess the extent of Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) inspection for all combined, wastewater, land drainage and storm relief sewers to confirm any sewer repairs required in the right-of-way within the limits of the Project.

E1.2 The criteria provided are general guidelines and are not intended to replace sound municipal engineering judgement specific to the individual Project scope and/or location.

E1.3 The available sewer televising information is contained within the City of Winnipeg’s Sewer Management System (SMS) application.

E1.4 Confirm televising requirements with Project Manager.

E1.5 CCTV inspection general guidelines:

(a) Confirm CCTV requirements with Water & Waste Department for sewers 1050 mm and larger in diameter;
(b) Televide if no previous CCTV inspections have been completed;
(c) Re-televide sewers in Categories A/B/C/X with a Structural Performance Grade (SPG) of 3 or higher that have not been televised in the previous 5 years;
(d) Sewers located more than two metres from the curb line (i.e. not located under pavement) do not need to be re-televised if previous CCTV inspection data exist. If a sewer repair or renewal requiring excavation is noted, contact the WWD;
(e) On all street reconstructions, regardless of location of the sewer (within the right-of-way);
(f) If the street exhibits obvious distress at/along the underground plant;
(g) Of all CB leads to be reused, as part of a street reconstruction or major rehabilitation.

E1.6 For any uncertain situations and/or locations, contact the Project Manager.

E1.7 The Consultant is required to coordinate the sewer-televisioning contract and communicate the results to the Water & Waste Department. Any repairs or other activities deemed necessary from these inspections must be coordinated with the Water & Waste Department.

E2. PUMP HOUSE DESIGN ELEMENTS

E2.1 The proposed pumping station will consist of a wet well design utilizing suitable centrifugal type pumps and the following design elements:

(a) Handle anticipated storm water runoff area appropriately sized;
(b) Provide a firm capacity and total capacity to accommodate a 25-year design and a 50-year design summer rainfall event;
(c) Vertical submersible pumps to be Flygt, ABS or equivalent;
(d) Provide high water alarm Flygt ball in wet well;
(e) Low maintenance – Graffiti resistant building exterior;
(f) “Sloped metal roof;
(g) External building access to pumps with lockable hatch covers;
(h) Primary and standby power supplies (by means of one Manitoba Hydro service, and one natural gas powered generator complete with transfer switch);
(i) Provide Arch Flash Ratings for all electrical panels and switches;
(j) Provide spare space on electrical panels for future upgrades;
(k) Three phase / 600 volt / 60 Hz electrical distribution;
(l) Provide three phase to single phase transformer complete with single phase distribution panel;

(m) External access to wet well for clean out purposes with lockable hatch covers;

(n) Dual metal doors;

(o) Security lighting on exterior building entrance;

(p) Heating and ventilation to suit;

(q) Soft start with separate across-the-line bypass contractors;

(r) Sediment trap;

(s) Floor in wet well shall slope towards pump intakes;

(t) Rigid pipe in wet well to facilitate cleaning by vactor equipment;

(u) Explosion proof lighting;

(v) De-watering pump in wet well sump;

(w) Wet well to be designed to match pump operations;

(x) Ventilation (heated) shall be minimum 6 ACH. Ventilation system shall provide fresh air when occupied and can use up to 75% recirculated air when unoccupied;

(y) Pump operation controls to be either Bubblers or Ultrasonic;

(z) Pump starts to be alternated;

(aa) Emergency back up lighting;

(bb) Emergency exit lights to turn on and remain on for three minutes after interior station lights are turned off;

(cc) Rising stem intake sluice gate;

(dd) Structurally rated lifting beam;

(ee) Gas detectors and environmental spill controls (if required);

(ff) Superstructure to be insulated and heated;

(gg) Metered domestic water supply equipped with backflow prevention device located above grade;

(hh) Internal hose bibs;

(ii) Paved access to site with hard surfaced parking area;

(jj) Pump operation to be metered by hourly usage and amperage draws;

(kk) Local shut off switches (unless using submersible pumps);

(ll) Pump discharge to be capable of being metered and telemetered to City’s SCADA system;

(mm) Telephone land line required suitable for data transmission;

(nn) Operating manual.

E3. SPECIFICATIONS FOR STRUCTURES

E3.1 All structures are to be designed for a minimum service life of 75 years.

E3.2 Railway structures shall be designed in accordance with the latest edition of the AREMA Manual for Railway Engineering and the January 2006 revision of the CNR Guidelines for Design of Railway Structures.

E3.3 Design and construction of shoring for any underpass options shall be carried out in accordance with CNR Guidelines dated November 2011.

E3.4 Highway structures shall be designed in accordance with CAN/CSA-S6-06 Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code.
E3.5 Overhead sign structure requirements will be based on current Public Works standards using AASHTO Standard Specifications for Structural Supports for Highway Signs, Luminaries and Traffic Signals, latest edition plus interims and the following additional criteria:

(i) Equation 3-1 of AASHTO Clause 3.8.1 shall be modified as follows:

- $P_z = 2.7 q K_z C_d$
- Where $q$ shall be taken from CAN/CSA S6-06, Table A3.1.1 for a return period of 50 years
- The design ice thickness for ice accretion shall be the value given in CAN/CSA S6-06, Figure A3.1.4.

E3.6 Earth retaining structures that are not part of an underpass, overpass or drainage structures shall be designed in accordance with the latest edition of the Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code.

E3.7 Building structures shall be designed in accordance with the Manitoba Building Code.
PART F - SECURITY CLEARANCE

F1. SECURITY CLEARANCE

F1.1 Each individual proposed to perform the following portions of the Work:
(a) any Work on private property;
(b) any Work within City facilities other than:
   (i) an underground structure such as a manhole;
   (ii) in areas and at times normally open to the public;
(c) communicating with residents and homeowners in person or by telephone.

F1.1.1 Each Individual shall be required to obtain a Criminal Record Search Certificate from the police service having jurisdiction at his/her place of residence. Or
(a) BackCheck, forms to be completed can be found on the website at: http://www.backcheck.net/; or
(b) Commissionaires (Manitoba Division), forms to be completed can be found on the website at: http://www.commissionaires.mb.ca/.

F1.1.2 The original Criminal Record Search Certificate (Form P–253) will be provided by the Winnipeg Police Service to the individual applicant. The original has a validation sticker from the Winnipeg Police Service in the top right hand corner. The applicant shall:
(a) Provide the original Criminal Record Search Certificate (Form P–253) to the Contract Administrator.

F1.2 Prior to the commencement of any Work specified in F1.1, and during the term of the Contract if additional or replacement individuals are proposed to perform Work, the Consultant shall supply the Contract Administrator with a Criminal Record Search Certificate obtained not earlier than one (1) year prior to the Submission Deadline, or a certified true copy thereof, for each individual proposed to perform such Work.

F1.3 Any individual for whom a Criminal Record Search Certificate is not provided, or for whom a Criminal Record Search Certificate indicates any convictions or pending charges related to property offences or crimes against another person will not be permitted to perform any Work specified in F1.1.

F1.4 Any Criminal Record Search Certificate obtained thereby will be deemed valid for the duration of the Contract subject to a repeated records search as hereinafter specified.

F1.5 Notwithstanding the foregoing, at any time during the term of the Contract, the City may, at its sole discretion and acting reasonably, require an updated criminal records search. Any individual who fails to provide a satisfactory Criminal Record Search Certificate as a result of a repeated criminal records search will not be permitted to continue to perform any Work specified in F1.1.
Foster, Gisele

From: Morantz, Marty
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:02 PM
To: Otaguro, Jacqueline; McNeil, Doug
Subject: Fwd: Varsity View Community Centre Redevelopment Committee & City of Winnipeg Discussion Points
Attachments:
Picture (Device Independent Bitmap) 1.jpg; ATT00001.htm; Review Points for Discussion with City of Winnipeg.docx; ATT00002.htm

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Doug please review this attachment prior to my meeting with you on Varsity View.

Thanks

Marty

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Chambers, Shawn" <shawn.chambers@rbc.com>
Date: April 6, 2017 at 9:53:28 AM PDT
To: "Marty Morantz (City of Winnipeg)" <mmorantz@winnipeg.ca>
Cc: 17(1), 17(3)(i)

Subject: Varsity View Community Centre Redevelopment Committee & City of Winnipeg Discussion Points

Good morning Marty. I hope all is well with you today.

As a follow up to our meeting (Marty, Randy & Shawn), please find attached our points that we would like to engage the City in discussion.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

I look forward to reviewing the attached at our meeting scheduled for 11:00 am on April 25th at your office.

Thank you.

Shawn R. Chambers, PFP, CFA | Vice President & Investment Counsellor - RBC PH&N Investment Counsel Inc. | Suite 1605 - 220 Portage Ave. | Winnipeg, MB R3C 0A5 | Transit # 03667 | T. 204.988.6742 | Toll Free. 1.800.207.7267 | F. 204.949.9114 | shawn.chambers@rbc.com |

⚠️ Please consider the environment before printing this email
Review Points for Discussion with City of Winnipeg

Varsity View Redevelopment Committee (April 6/2017)

Non-Responsive
William Clement Parkway extension:

- In order to preserve as much land as possible for use by Varsity View for the community, the club would like to see retaining walls used for the underpass/overpass extension at the railway tracks as opposed to the “slope” option being considered.
- If possible, it would be beneficial for the Parkway to track as far east as possible on the land reserve set aside for the extension. This would maximize the land available for the community.
Hi Gisele/Brad

I believe there is a meeting with Felicia coming up to talk about how to proceed with those meetings with the public before going forward with public events—this is the meeting Brad and others are to attend on Friday May 19th (however I have a conflict with that date/time so we are looking at rescheduling it). As I indicated to the CAO and Councillor Morantz when we met about this project, we will have a meeting with Varsity View C.C. before the end of June, but the rest of meetings with property owners would likely happen in the fall, and the project would have to have a revised schedule—which will include having no public events during the summer months. They (the CAO and Councillor Morantz) were in concurrence with this understanding.

Thanks

luis

---

Luis Escobar, P.Eng., PTOE, Manager of Transportation || Public Works Department
tel (204) 986-5895 || fax (204) 986-7020 || lescobar@winnipeg.ca

The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.

---

From: Deane, Lester
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2017 11:05 AM
To: Escobar, Luis; Neirinck, Brad
Subject: FW: William R Clement Parkway Preliminary Design Study and Public Engagement

Good morning Luis and Brad,

Where are we with this? Was a meeting held to determine the steps to proceed and who will take the lead with the Consultant?
Thank you,

Gisele Foster, Executive Assistant
Office of the Director || Public Works Department
103-1155 Pacific Avenue || tel(204) 986-7997
gfoster@winnipeg.ca

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.

From: Neirinck, Brad
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 4:51 PM
To: Escobar, Luis; Deane, Lester; Suderman, Scott
Cc: Wiltshire, Felicia
Subject: RE: William R Clement Parkway Preliminary Design Study and Public Engagement

Hi Luis:

My understanding is that all the potentially affected property owners require consultation prior to a public open house. I believe these individual consultations would be led by MMM with input from the City.

As Shima was basically seconded to the project, the person with the most knowledge on the sensitivities would be Scott.

Please send a meeting invite so we can determine the steps to proceed and who will take the lead with the Consultant.

Brad Neirinck, P. Eng.
Manager of Engineering
Public Works
P: 204-986-7950
M: 204-794-4311

From: Escobar, Luis
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 3:20 PM
To: Deane, Lester; Neirinck, Brad
Cc: Wiltshire, Felicia
Subject: RE: William R Clement Parkway Preliminary Design Study and Public Engagement
Hi Lester/Brad

I am not sure who’s looking after the study while Shima is on leave, however I am thinking that it would not be possible to initiate any sustained meetings with affected property owners other than VVCC at this time. Maybe once resources are less stretched in the fall, we could resume to a more sustained process. As Doug alluded below, we also need to make sure we include Donna Beaton and Ken McKim as part of the discussion because of the variety of questions that have been brought forward to the table (many are not related to the WRCP study, but the CAO wants those questions to be addressed as best possible when we meet with VVCC). Devin Clark and James Platt should be part of the discussion as well.

Thank you and maybe this is something that Brad, Lester and I need to discuss before we consider arranging a meeting with VVCC.

luis

Luis Escobar, P.Eng., PTOE, Manager of Transportation || Public Works Department
tel(204) 986-5895 || fax(204) 986-7020 || lescobar@winnipeg.ca

The information contained in this message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any use, dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message and attachments, in whole or in part, by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the complete message and any attachments. Thank you.

Hi Gentlemen,

Earlier this afternoon, Luis and I joined a couple of the PP&D Planners (Devin Clark and James Platt) in a meeting with Councillor Morantz in a discussion about the Varsity View Redevelopment Plans in Marj Edey Park.

The Varsity View Community Centre (VVCC) has a keen interest in this project and the extension of Ridgewood Corridor as well, as they relate to VVCC redevelopment plans. Given this and that the public has yet to see the concept plans, I authorize you to proceed with your public engagement plan for this project. I understand that meetings with the impacted property owners will be done in advance of the third and final Public Open House and I recommend that the Board members of the Varsity View Community Centre be amongst the first that you meet with.
Although your meeting will be focused on the Parkway, the VVCC has a number of other plans (see e-mail attached) which they will likely raise and which will need input from other departments such as Planning, Parks and Community Services, you should invite reps from those departments as well.

Doug

Doug McNeil, P.Eng.
Chief Administrative Officer
P: 204-986-5104
M: 204-390-0600