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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Taxicab Board (TCB) is responsible for oversight of the taxicab industry in Winnipeg. Its mandate is to ensure access to quality, safe and efficient taxicab service. ‘Taxicab’ in Winnipeg is used to refer to all forms of vehicle for hire. The TCB establishes the number and classes of vehicle for hire, fares, and licensing requirements. The TCB is also responsible for enforcement of The Taxicab Act and Regulations.

Recent developments in the industry and a need for an evidence-based approach to evaluating licence applications and fare adjustments prompted the TCB to commission a review of the Winnipeg taxicab industry. This report details the findings and recommendations of this review.

The specific objectives of this study are:

- To describe the taxicab industry in Winnipeg
- To evaluate the current system and structures
- To examine changes in the global taxicab industry including new and emerging technologies and programs
- To understand leading policies and practices in other jurisdictions, and
- To provide specific recommendations regarding:
  - The number of taxicabs by class required to provide satisfactory service to the public in the city of Winnipeg today
  - A model to maintain an adequate supply of taxicabs in future
  - A method and criteria for updating fares and charges in the long-term that supports a healthy, viable taxicab industry while being affordable to the taxicab user
  - Improvements to make the licensing structure more fair, open and transparent
  - Opportunities to improve safety and security of both drivers and passengers
  - Opportunities and requirements to enhance accessible and assisted services
  - Possible policy or regulatory changes to address emerging programs and technologies

Consultation with key stakeholders of the taxicab industry was a critical component of this review. These stakeholders included taxicab owners and drivers, the general public, businesses and organizations that rely on taxicabs and associations representing people dependent on vehicles for hire.

MNP conducted in-depth primary and secondary research of models in select jurisdictions, including legislation and regulatory frameworks, supply and demand, fare structures, customer service processes as well as how other jurisdictions are adapting to emerging trends and issues. This information was used to identify leading practices as well as policy and implementation options.

1.1 Industry Overview

The vehicle for hire industry tends to grow with the population. Improved vehicle manufacturing and widespread use of GPS enabled systems have improved efficiency and helped reduce environmental
impact. There is an increasing trend across Canada to establish accessibility standards legislation, and to require improved access to accessible vehicles for hire.

The introduction of transportation network companies (TNCs), often called ‘ride-sharing’, has been a significant disruptor in this industry on a global basis. Uber is the most well-known of these companies. Edmonton was the first city in Canada to pass a by-law enabling TNC activity, followed by Calgary and Ottawa in April, Toronto in May, and the Waterloo Region in August 2016. Reviews are underway in other cities in southern Ontario, including Hamilton and Mississauga. The new regulatory frameworks generally treat TNCs as a separate class of service provider, while establishing some safety and consumer protection rules similar to those that apply to taxicabs.

The Winnipeg taxicab industry is regulated by The Taxicab Act, Taxicab Regulation 209/91, Taxicab Fees Regulation, and Taxicab Board Rules of Procedure Regulation. A taxicab business licence is required for each vehicle for hire, and a taxicab driver’s licence is required to operate the vehicle. There are twelve classes of vehicles, including standard taxicabs, accessible taxicabs, handicap vans, and several classes of limousines. As of December 2016, there are 756 taxicab business licences across all classes, including seasonal licences, and 2,402 licensed drivers.

Taxicab customers may access the service for a variety of purposes, including transportation to work, to the airport, for personal needs (e.g., groceries, appointments) and for social outings or entertainment, whether as residents or visitors to Winnipeg. Generally, more frequent users tend to include the elderly, persons with mobility challenges, those with low income and people without access to a vehicle. The consumer survey conducted as part of this study indicated that while 62 per cent of Winnipeggers use a taxicab at least once per year, only 15 per cent use taxicabs on a monthly basis or more. The most frequent use is for travel to and from the airport or for a night out.

An estimated total of over 4.1 million trips were taken in 2015. Approximately 70 per cent of trips were originated through a dispatch service; 30 per cent through street hails and taxi stands, including the airport.

### 1.2 Findings

#### 1.2.1 Supply and Demand

The number of annual licences issued for standard taxicabs has remained flat since 2008. The population has increased by 7 per cent, and airport passengers have increased by 12 per cent since 2010. Seasonal taxicab licences, active from November through March, provide additional capacity. In 2015, seasonal taxicabs increased the total fleet by 16 per cent. A 52 per cent increase in the number of accessible taxicabs and handicap vans has increased total supply by 9 per cent since 2008.

Consultation findings indicate the public feels more supply is needed, particularly during winter months, peak periods of the day/evening and after special events. Taxicab drivers and owners feel there are enough taxicabs to meet demand, with summer periods generally quiet and seasonal licences to help
meet demand in winter. Longer wait times during rush hour and in the winter are believed to be due to more to traffic congestion and winter driving conditions.

At one taxicab for every 1,252 people in the busy winter period, Winnipeg has significantly fewer taxicabs than all other compared cities, which average one taxicab for every 860 people.

1.2.2 Licensing Structure

Each of the 12 sub-categories of taxicab have specific requirements for size, seating capacity, use of taximeter, safety equipment, and age restriction, and licences must be renewed every year. Certain taxicab business licences are transferable, meaning the licence holder may sell the licence to a third party, subject to Taxicab Board approval. All classes of taxicab in Winnipeg are required to be registered as a commercial vehicle with Manitoba Public Insurance (MPI) and carry a minimum of $2 million third party liability and property damage insurance.

The Taxicab Board accepts applications for new or additional taxicab business licences on an ongoing basis. The applicant must demonstrate need and present their application at a public hearing of the Taxicab Board. The number of seasonal taxicab licences is determined every year in consultation with the industry. These licences are largely distributed to existing business licence holders. While a large majority of current standard taxicab owners (82%) feel the process for setting the number of taxicab licences is fair, only half of standard taxicab drivers agree.

Hearings are not required in the five compared jurisdictions or for the Motor Transport Board of Manitoba which regulates the taxicab industry outside of Winnipeg. New applications, transfers, seasonal and temporary permits (if applicable) are assessed and approved based on a standard application and supporting documentation. Four of the five cities determine the number of taxicab licences required each year, pre-qualify applicants and issue new taxicab licences through a lottery or in the order of an established list.

The taxicab driver’s licence is issued by the TCB and is renewable annually. Taxicab drivers must hold a Class 4 drivers licence. Taxicab drivers must also undergo a criminal record check with a vulnerable sector search, a child abuse registry check, pass an English Language Assessment, and successfully complete the Taxicab Driver Training program and Accessibility Transportation Training. There is no limit on the number of taxicab driver licences.

Licensing requirements for taxicab drivers are similar in most of the compared cities. Vehicle for hire drivers in Ontario require only the general class of licence. Training requirements vary. Most jurisdictions require a drivers abstract upon initial application for a taxicab driver’s licence and for annual renewal. Winnipeg does not.

While the Taxicab Board does not license dispatch services, taxicab business licence holders may only operate or be affiliated with a dispatch service that conforms to a number of requirements. Of the compared cities, Calgary, Edmonton, Hamilton and Ottawa license dispatch companies (commonly referred to as brokers). Vancouver does not license dispatch companies.
The operating budget for the Taxicab Board in 2015/16 was $728,000. Licensing and related fees were projected at $260,000, or 36 per cent of regulatory costs. Fees become part of general revenues of the Government of Manitoba.

1.2.3 Fares

The Taxicab Board regulates fares for taxicabs, limousines and handicab vans in the city of Winnipeg in accordance with its mandate to ensure the availability of quality taxicab services that meet the needs of the public at a reasonable cost. The TCB adjusts rates based on hearing applications from industry.

Winnipeg fares were last adjusted in 2012, making permanent a temporary rate established in 2010. Owners and drivers consulted feel the rates charged are reasonable, and expressed some concern that increasing rates might drive some consumers to seek other modes of public transportation.

Winnipeg has the lowest standard taxicab rates of all compared cities. Normalized for a 10 km trip, Winnipeg is 15 per cent below the average of $20.28 at $17.20. Limousine rates in the comparison cities are within range of Winnipeg’s minimum and maximum rates.

The taxicab cost index, an objective tool used by many taxicab regulators to adjust rates as required, is used in Mississauga, Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton, and all municipalities in British Columbia. The index is made up of established cost categories, weighted for their influence on the overall business cost structure (wages, fuel, insurance, etc.) Published sources are used as a reference to determine when adjustments are warranted.

1.2.4 Safety and Security

Safety equipment for taxicabs such as in-car cameras, panic buttons, roof top strobe lights and driver shields are mandated by the Taxicab Board. Winnipeg appears to have the most vigorous safety equipment requirements of all compared cities. Taxicab owners and drivers generally support in-car safety equipment. Driving a taxicab is a risky occupation, not fully made secure with current safety provisions. Stakeholders indicate that drivers face significant safety risks associated with violent or intoxicated passengers, discrimination, and fare disputes.

To protect the safety of passengers, the TCB requires drivers to undergo criminal record checks, mandatory training for driving safety and safe equipment handling for passengers, as well as regular vehicle inspections.

Passenger safety is a concern for the majority of stakeholders; 58 per cent of survey respondents reported feeling safe while travelling in a taxicab. Less than half agree they felt safe waiting at a taxicab stand.

Vulnerable groups tend to have higher concern. Of persons with disabilities, safety was the most frequently identified priority for change, and the second most frequently identified priority of Indigenous survey participants. Indigenous respondents were less likely than overall respondents to feel safe
travelling in the taxicab. Representatives for vulnerable populations in Winnipeg report that excessive speed can create fear for Indigenous and elderly taxicab passengers, while language barriers or a perceived lack of awareness regarding Indigenous culture may contribute to misunderstandings between drivers and passengers. Representatives from seniors’ organizations indicate that many elderly passengers feel somewhat unsafe in taxicabs, preferring to share taxicab rides for ‘safety in numbers’.

To ensure passengers are treated fairly, Taxicab Regulation 209/91 stipulates requirements for receipts, working taximeters, that the driver has adequate knowledge of Winnipeg streets, and takes the most direct route to the passenger’s destination. Industry and public consultations suggest some concern with taximeters not always being turned on.

### 1.2.5 Customer Service

A representative public telephone survey rated overall satisfaction with their taxicab experience at 7.1 out of 10. The higher users that responded to the online survey tended to be less satisfied. Only 27 per cent feel their entire experience was as good as or better than in other cities.

The top three priorities for change from online survey respondents include customer service on the part of drivers, taxicab condition and available technology. Many respondents felt that increased market competition would improve overall customer service and satisfaction. Respondents also indicated concerns regarding dispatch companies and the current complaint process.

Taxicab drivers and owners indicated customer service would be improved if taxicabs were permitted use of diamond lanes to reduce travel time and fares during rush hour. Additional taxi stands throughout the city would provide another opportunity to improve customer service. There is currently no obligation for owners, drivers or dispatch companies of standard taxicabs to monitor, respond to or report complaints.

### 1.2.6 Compliance and Enforcement

The TCB is responsible for enforcement of *The Taxicab Act* and regulations. Enforcement activities include scheduled general inspections, road inspections, commonly referred to as ‘check stops’, and responding to complaints. Semi-annual mechanical safety inspections, in-car camera and taximeter inspections are conducted by authorized third parties and must be submitted to the TCB. While the TCB manually tracks inspection activity, it does not regularly analyze, monitor or report inspection activity or outcomes.

A Show Cause hearing is a quasi-judicial hearing before the Taxicab Board to deal with serious issues or breach of licence conditions involving licensed taxicab drivers and taxicab business licence holders. A Show Cause Hearing may result in fines and penalties including the suspension, cancellation or refusal to renew a taxicab business licence or taxicab driver’s licence.
Industry stakeholders expressed concerns with the fairness of the inspections, and resulting orders that are considered to be keeping cars out of service longer than necessary. The industry is also concerned about un-licensed vehicles for hire going unchecked and presenting safety concerns for passengers.

Prior to 2016, the TCB required that all complaints be submitted in writing. From 2011 to 2015, 50 to 60 per cent of all complaints could not be pursued, mostly because the complainant did not submit a written statement of the complaint. In 2016 the TCB revised their process and no longer requires a statement for each complaint. The most frequent complaint is related to driver conduct, which can range from something relatively minor to very serious accusations. The second largest complaint category is road safety.

All of the other jurisdictions studied accept customer complaints about taxi service via telephone (311 line or consumer protection office); some use web forms where customers can submit complaint details directly and even upload supporting photographs.

The TCB tracks some data but analysis is limited. TCB activity, including inspection documentation, is handled manually and involves duplication of effort.

1.2.7 Summary Findings

Overall, the system in Winnipeg has been disadvantaged by a lack of data on which to base informed decisions regarding supply and demand, customer service, safety, and compliance. Processes for considering licence applications have led to an overly restricted supply and limited choice in the market, as well as a significant administrative burden for the regulator. There are opportunities to modernize the regulations, streamline the activities of the Taxicab Board office, improve consumer choice, and focus regulatory resources more efficiently on risk-based enforcement.

1.3 Recommendations

A series of 40 detailed recommendations, with accompanying rationale and impact, are provided throughout the report and summarized in the final section. The following provides an overview of the recommendations, sorted according to the complexity, time and effort required for implementation. Many of the recommendations require change to the regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Supply and Demand</th>
<th>Licensing Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply and Demand</td>
<td>- Support ongoing access to diamond lanes for standard and accessible taxicabs.</td>
<td>- Create a waiting list of qualified applicants who wish to obtain a business licence, with a fee to qualify for and maintain a position on the list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Structure</td>
<td>- Eliminate TCB involvement in training for drivers of taxicabs. Require proof of completion of driving skills and accessible training as part of a driver licence application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Require driver’s abstract for taxicab driver’s licence application and renewal.</td>
<td>9(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fares</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish zone fares for on demand airport limousine service.</td>
<td>10(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage consistent voluntary industry practice of standard advance payment or automated pay procedures.</td>
<td>10(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mandate in-car posted photo identification including taxicab driver number.</td>
<td>11(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mandate signage within all taxicab and limousine vehicle types, ensuring clear notices of cameras, and audio recording.</td>
<td>11(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase collaborative contact with Winnipeg Police Service and maintain an active role with Safe Cities Initiative.</td>
<td>11(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publish customer and driver ‘bill of rights’ on the TCB website and post in taxicabs.</td>
<td>12(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage dispatch companies and business licence holders to undertake hospitality / tourism training offered by Tourism Winnipeg.</td>
<td>12(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Term</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Require dispatch companies and business licence holders to collect, maintain and report trip data on a not-less-than monthly basis.</td>
<td>8(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop internal data management capabilities.</td>
<td>8(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish a maximum total number of metered taxicab licences based on population ratio, with a phased implementation plan.</td>
<td>8(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discontinue use of seasonal licences, and allow licence holders to adjust use of the taxicab according to demand.</td>
<td>8(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue the practice of issuing new licences only for accessible taxicabs until similar service levels are achieved, then apportion future licences.</td>
<td>8(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eliminate limits on limousine licences, allow flexible use of and eliminate temporary limousine licences.</td>
<td>8(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Licensing Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eliminate the redundant sub-categories of taxicabs and standardize or remove vehicle age restrictions.</td>
<td>9(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allow transferability of all classes of taxicab licences, or phase out all licence transferability over a period of ten years.</td>
<td>9(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish a licence category and require a licence to operate as a vehicle for hire broker (dispatch company), with obligations for trip reporting and customer service standards. Enable brokers to process driver’s licence applications and renewals.</td>
<td>9(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish a licence category for shuttles. Do not limit the number of licences.</td>
<td>9(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Long Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Structure</th>
<th>7(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplify and minimize the regulations to only those elements necessary to serve the public interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the regulatory structure to determine whether it is best served at the municipal or provincial level, including consultations with CMA municipalities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create incentives to offset the higher cost to provide accessible service, to ensure accessible taxicabs are available for this service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Transportation Network Companies entrance into the market, licensed as a separate category, and require they meet standards for safety and consumer protection similar to the requirements for standard taxicabs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fares</th>
<th>10(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate mandated fares for pre-arranged trips where fare estimates are provided and accepted in advance of booking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate an accessibility surcharge in licensing fees and/or fares to enable subsidization and encourage accessible service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Service</th>
<th>12(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage, rather than regulate, details of customer service requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 Implementation

The recommendations of this report, if implemented, will have a significant impact on the taxicab industry in Winnipeg. These recommendations are also interrelated and interdependent. It is crucial to successful execution that a comprehensive implementation plan, including a strong change management and communication strategy be developed.
Part I – Background and Approach

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Sufficient, affordable and varied methods of transportation are a necessary part of a vibrant, thriving city. Vehicle for hire services are a key component of the transportation framework and are highly regulated in most major North American cities. The industry consists of a variety of operating structures and includes fleet dispatchers (brokers), owners that hold a vehicle for hire business licence, and drivers that operate the vehicles for business licence holders. Owners may also be drivers.

Established by the Government of Manitoba in 1935, the Taxicab Board (TCB) is a quasi-judicial administrative tribunal which operates under the authority of The Taxicab Act. The mandate of the TCB is to ensure all persons in Winnipeg have access to quality, safe and efficient taxicab service. ‘Taxicab’ in Winnipeg is used to refer to all forms of vehicle for hire. The Taxicab Board establishes the number and classes of vehicle for hire, fares, and licensing requirements.

Recent developments in the industry and a need for an evidence-based approach to the consideration of licence applications and fare adjustments prompted the TCB to commission a review of the Winnipeg taxicab industry. MNP was retained to conduct this review through a competitive process. The study was conducted from January to November 2016. This report details the findings and recommendations of this review.

2.1 Project Scope and Objectives

The overarching goal of this work is a financially viable, safe and modern industry that meets acceptable service levels. The specific objectives of the study are:

- To describe the taxicab industry in Winnipeg
  - Groups involved and their roles
  - Supply and demand for taxicab services by taxicab class, service area, season, time of day
  - Customer profile (users of taxicab services)
- To evaluate the current system and structures
  - Driver and consumer safety policies and compliance
  - Licensing structure and supply management system including policies, application process and method of issuing licences
  - Fare and charges structure by class based on the needs of the industry and consumers, and compared to fares in other cities
  - Quality of customer service and the level of customer satisfaction
  - Effectiveness of consumer protection for taxicab users
• To examine changes in the global taxicab industry including new and emerging technologies and programs
• To understand leading policies and practices in other jurisdictions
• To provide specific recommendations regarding:
  - The number of taxicab by class required to provide satisfactory service to the public in the city of Winnipeg today
  - A model to maintain an adequate supply of taxicabs in future
  - A method and criteria for updating fares and charges in the long-term that supports a healthy, viable taxicab industry while being affordable to the taxicab user
  - Improvements to make the licensing structure more fair, open and transparent
  - Opportunities to improve safety and security of both drivers and passengers
  - Opportunities and requirements to enhance accessible and assisted services
  - Possible policy or regulatory changes to address emerging programs and technologies

MNP conducted broad research to ensure a comprehensive, well-supported review. This included:

• Review of Taxicab Board documentation and data
• Primary research:
  - Surveys of taxicab owners, drivers, consumers
  - Stakeholder interviews
• Other jurisdiction research, including interviews with representatives of regulatory functions, reviews of by-laws, and prior research
• Secondary research of legislation, published data and reports
• Development of an environmental scan and an associated summary discussion document, made available to stakeholders and the public to help inform the consultation process
• Validation through review, follow up where responses were outside the expected range, review of voluntarily submitted financial statements, and comparison with industry benchmarks
• Validation session with the TCB and project steering committee to present consultation findings
• A comprehensive final report of findings and recommendations

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Document Review

MNP was provided with and/or independently sourced documents that provided the context for this review and were considered in the development of findings and recommendations. These documents included:

• *The Taxicab Act and Regulations*
• *The Accessibility for Manitobans Act*
• *The Highway Traffic Act*
• *The Drivers and Vehicles Act*
• The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act and Regulations
• Motor Transport Board Regulations
• City of Winnipeg Taxicab Licence Fee By-Law 6123-93
• Taxicab business owner financial data
• Dispatch company trip and wait time data
• TCB complaint and enforcement data
• Winnipeg Airports Authority trip and airport passenger volume data
• Statistics Canada; Economic Development Winnipeg data

3.2 Interviews

Interviews were conducted with relevant industry and other key stakeholders to provide insight and context for the public consultations. The topics explored in these interviews were trends in the industry, supply and demand, financial performance, safety, accessibility, and challenges that may impact the findings and/or completion of the study. Interviews were also conducted with the current and former members of the Taxicab Board, Director of the Taxicab Board, Taxicab Board Compliance Unit inspectors and administrative staff; dispatch company board members and senior staff; representatives of the Winnipeg Police Service (WPS) and Manitoba Public Insurance (MPI); and the taxicab industry training provider St. James-Assiniboia School Division.

3.3 Stakeholder Consultation

Consultation with key stakeholders of the taxicab industry was a critical component of this review. These stakeholders included taxicab owners, drivers, and dispatch companies, the general public, businesses and organizations that rely on taxicabs and associations representing people dependent on vehicles for hire.

The consultation process was designed to ensure all stakeholders had the opportunity to participate. MNP made several options available to industry stakeholders and the public to provide input. These included:
• Online surveys – owner and driver, consumer
• Telephone survey – consumer, conducted by NRG Research
• Interviews
• Focus groups
• Written submissions

A variety of methods were also used to create awareness and dialogue regarding the consultation process:
• Direct email invitations to taxicab and limousine owners, drivers, dispatch companies and representative organizations
• Notice of the survey posted on the Taxicab Board website
- Postcard invitations with QRL code and website link to the online surveys were distributed by taxicab drivers to passengers
- Poster and postcard distribution to the Manitoba Hotel Association, Manitoba Restaurant and Food Services Association, Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, Winnipeg Airport Authority, Manitoba Liquor Marts and Casinos
- Social Media – Twitter notice of consultation period
- Government of Manitoba Press Release
- MNP landing page (website)

Stakeholder consultation was conducted during the period August 22 to October 28, 2016 with a total of 10,427 participants. Stakeholder groups along with the communication channel used for each group, the method of consultation and number of participants are listed in the table below.

*Table 1 Stakeholder Consultation by Method and Communication Channel*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Communication Channel</th>
<th>Method of Consultation</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owners and Drivers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standard Taxicab</td>
<td>• Direct Invitation</td>
<td>• Online Survey</td>
<td>• 675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accessible Taxicab and Handicab Van</td>
<td>• Postings on Websites</td>
<td>• Focus Group</td>
<td>• 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limousine and Executive Sedan</td>
<td>• Social Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Postings on Websites</td>
<td>• Online Survey</td>
<td>• Telephone Survey</td>
<td>• 9,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taxicab Postcards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representative Organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aboriginal Council of Winnipeg</td>
<td>• Direct Invitation</td>
<td>• Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City of Winnipeg Committee for Safety</td>
<td>• Posters and Postcards</td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independent Living Resource Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Written Submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manitoba Association of Seniors Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manitoba Hotel Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manitoba League of Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manitoba Public Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manitoba Restaurant and Foodservices Assoc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Society for Manitobans with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Southern Chiefs’ Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• St. James Assiniboia School Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tourism Winnipeg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Options Network for Seniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Winnipeg Airports Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Winnipeg Police Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations of Data

Limousine, accessible taxicab and handicab van drivers and owners are under-represented in the consultation findings. There was low participation in both online surveys and focus group discussions. Paper copies of the online industry and public surveys were submitted to MNP in bulk by a dispatch company and were analyzed separately from the online data. There was evident duplication in the submitted paper responses. Due to concerns with the integrity of the data, MNP determined the dataset to be unreliable. As a result, this response set has not been included in the findings of this report. An analysis of a large sample of these surveys has been provided to the Taxicab Board.

3.3.1 Telephone Survey – Consumer

NRG Research Group (NRG) developed a dual sample frame for the study consisting of both a landline and wireless sample. A total of 500 interviews were conducted from August 25 to September 1, 2016. The results were weighted by gender and age using 2011 census data to ensure the resulting sample was demographically and regionally representative of Winnipeg. The responses received from 500 participants resulted in data that has a margin of error of +/-4.1 per cent 19 times out of 20. The consumer survey solicited information and opinion on:

- Usage of vehicles for hire and public transportation providers
- Importance of safety and service aspects
- Satisfaction with taxicab services received
- Priorities for change within the industry

3.3.2 Online Surveys

MNP provided and administered an online consumer survey on a dedicated website. The online survey mirrored the general topics of the telephone survey but included more in-depth questions and allowed qualitative responses. Consumers were invited to complete the online survey through a press release, postcard invitations distributed in taxicabs, Twitter, and email notices to consumer and representative organizations. The survey requested opinion and perception about:

- Usage of vehicles for hire and public transportation providers
- Importance of safety and service aspects
- Satisfaction with taxicab services
- Priorities for change within the industry

A total of 9,215 consumers completed the online public survey. Respondents to this survey tended to be higher users of vehicle for hire services, and represent a sub-set of the Winnipeg population.

Driver and Owner Survey

Industry participants were notified of the survey through direct email invitations to taxicab owners, drivers, dispatch companies and representative organizations. Notice of the survey was posted on the Taxicab Board website, the MNP website, and a Press Release distributed by the Government of
Manitoba. The Taxicab Board also provided information and encouraged participation in regular meetings with industry.

A total of 675 drivers and owners completed the online survey:

- Standard taxicab driver (208 responses), with margin of error +/-6.5 per cent 19 times out of 20
- Owner standard taxicab (355 responses), with a margin of error +/-4.8 per cent 19 times out of 20

### 3.3.3 Written Submissions

An invitation to provide a written submission was sent directly to external industry stakeholders including chambers of commerce, consumer organizations, hospitality and tourism industry organizations, as well as organizations that represent vulnerable populations. The written submission guide was also available on the MNP website for those who wanted a digital copy. A total of 15 written submissions were received:

- Southern Chiefs’ Organization
- Tourism Winnipeg
- Individual drivers/owners (5)
- Individual consumers (8)

### 3.4 Other Jurisdictional Research

MNP conducted in-depth primary and secondary research of models in select jurisdictions. Through interviews as well as document review, MNP explored legislation and regulatory frameworks, supply and demand, fare structures, customer service processes as well as how other jurisdictions are adapting to emerging trends and issues. This information was used to identify leading practices as well as policy and implementation options. The following jurisdictions were included:

- Calgary, Alberta
- Edmonton, Alberta
- Hamilton, Ontario
- Ottawa, Ontario
- Vancouver, British Columbia

Further research on select topics was conducted about models in:

- Toronto, Ontario
- Mississauga, Ontario
- The Waterloo Region
- Portland, Oregon
- Melbourne, Australia

Secondary research also involved a review of industry benchmarks and analyses, Statistics Canada population and economic data, and relevant published reports.
Part II – Vehicle for Hire Industry Profile

4.0 CANADIAN VEHICLE FOR HIRE INDUSTRY

IBIS World publishes an annual analysis of the industry in Canada, and was the source of information about the Canadian industry (IBISWorld, 2015). The vehicle for hire industry in Canada achieved revenue of $2.7 billion in 2015. The industry is made up of over 18,725 businesses. The major industry segments are depicted in the graphic below.

The largest segment in the industry is traditional, metered taxi services, at almost two thirds of total revenue. Taxi income is derived from the fares earned after a taxi is hailed or booked. In many cases, the customer does not choose a particular taxi, but retains the first in a taxi line-up or hails the first taxi that passes. Transportation Networks, commonly referred to as ride-sharing services, were not authorized to operate in Canada at the time of the IBISWorld report. While known to be operating in some markets, they are not reflected in the above data.

Business structures vary by market and reflect the regulatory structure. In some markets, owners must operate their own taxis, resulting in a large number of independent owners. These operators may contract with a broker or dispatch service to connect with customers. In other markets, companies may own multiple business licences, operate a fleet of vehicles, and provide their own dispatch services.

Vehicle for hire owners employ drivers, most often as independent contractors, who earn their income from retained fares and tips minus leasing charges and fuel. A company may own multiple vehicle licences and provide its own dispatch services. Dispatch companies, often referred to as brokers, provide the benefit of a brand and a centralized dispatch system for licence holders that may own one or a small number of licenced vehicles. Most drivers and owners obtain nearly all of their revenue from private taxi fares. Some may secure earnings through preferred supplier contracts and corporate accounts. This often puts them in direct competition with luxury and corporate sedan services.

Luxury and corporate sedan travel is the industry’s second-largest earning product segment at 17 per cent of industry revenue. This service is particularly popular with business and corporate travellers. Limousines are often hired during special events such as weddings and group functions. Limousines do
not generally attract the same clients as metered taxis. The proportion of industry revenue received from the limousine segment has decreased in recent years, due to increased competition from the slightly less expensive luxury sedan and taxicab segments.

The major customer market segments in Canada are shown in the graphic below.

Domestic private consumers contribute more than half of the industry’s annual revenue in Canada. Private consumers use taxicabs for a range of reasons including travel for employment, groceries or personal appointments. Use of these services during evenings and weekends tends to be related to social activity. As such, demand from private consumers is closely linked to disposable income. Individuals use limousines and luxury vehicles for special occasions such as weddings, anniversaries, birthdays, graduations and holiday sightseeing. Private consumers may also be business travellers who use these services when travelling in other cities.

Corporations are the industry’s second largest market segment in Canada, accounting for about one-third of total industry revenues. Corporations use limousine and luxury sedan services to provide executives and other employees with comfortable and reliable transportation between home and work. In some cases, corporations have preferred supplier relationships with vehicle for hire companies, reducing customer waiting time and allowing for cashless transactions and easy payment of expenses. Corporations also use limousine services to transport company clients to offices or to and from airports.

Tourists, particularly air travellers, are another major consumer of taxi services. Visitors often have limited knowledge of locations, destinations and how to travel around various cities, and rely on the knowledge of taxi drivers. Cities and associated tourism associations view the taxi industry as important ambassadors for the city and/or province.

As a service-based industry, the vehicle for hire industry closely mirrors Canada’s population distribution. Larger cities, where population densities are high and disposable incomes are higher than average, support more efficient use of taxis and limousines. The following chart depicts the national distribution of establishments.
5.0 TRENDS AND ISSUES IN THE VEHICLE FOR HIRE INDUSTRY

5.1 Growth

The vehicle for hire industry is highly influenced by, and tends to fluctuate with, economic conditions. A 2009 survey of the industry by Statistics Canada indicated 27 per cent growth in revenue from $1.5 billion in 2003 to $1.9 billion in 2007. There was only a nine per cent growth in carriers, resulting in a five per cent increase in operating margins. This annual survey has not been repeated since 2007 (Statistics Canada, 2009).

Increased consumer spending and corporate growth in the past five years have been generally favourable for the vehicle for hire industry in Canada. IBISWorld reported national industry revenue somewhat higher than Statistics Canada at $2.2 billion in 2007, and 23 per cent growth to $2.7 billion in the industry by 2015 or an average annual growth rate of just under three per cent (IBISWorld, 2015).

Strict regulation limits the industry’s growth as the number of taxis is fixed in most metropolitan areas. Increased consumer spending also tends to result in new vehicle sales, which can reduce demand on taxicabs. Non-essential segments of the industry, such as luxury limousine and town car services, tend to be the most affected.
5.2 Technology

Over the past decade, changes in technology impacting the vehicle for hire industry have included improved automobile manufacturing, particularly fuel systems and widespread use of GPS enabled systems (IBISWorld, 2015).

Many Canadian taxicab companies have increased the number of hybrid vehicles in their fleets. High gasoline prices and greater concern for the environment have been the driving forces behind this trend. The most apparent operational advantage has been fuel savings. Fuel costs can account for over 20 per cent of an operator’s revenue, so investing in hybrid vehicles is in the best interest of vehicle owners.

While taximeters have long been required, many jurisdictions are now requiring taximeters to be GPS enabled, with automatic uploads so that enhanced trip data can be collected easily and reliably. While not yet in the market, driverless car technology is in various stages of development at automobile manufacturing and technology companies and may have a significant impact on the vehicle for hire industry in the coming decade. As this technology gains acceptance, it may fundamentally change the way the industry operates as it reduces reliance on labour (IBISWorld, 2015).

The biggest technological impact on the industry over the past five years has been the introduction of Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) that connect passengers with drivers of private vehicles for hire using mobile applications. Taxicab companies have responded with development of mobile applications, however generally have not reached the same level of sophistication as the leading TNC, Uber. Taxicab dispatch systems, traditionally managed by centralized radio operators, have largely evolved to automated systems based on GPS. A live dispatcher answers the telephone and enters the pick-up location in the computer system, which automatically routes the call to the nearest available driver.

5.3 Environmental

About 96 per cent of vehicles on the road in Canada run on gasoline. Hybrid car sales peaked in 2012, and are now in a decline (Flavelle, 2015). As noted above, over the past decade, many Canadian taxicab companies have increased the number of hybrid vehicles in their fleets as a result of high gasoline prices and greater concern for the environment. Almost the entire standard taxicab fleet in Winnipeg uses hybrid vehicles with lower emissions and greater fuel economy. As a result, the extent to which people use taxicab services instead of their own car helps to reduce the impact of traffic congestion and road transportation on the environment. Increased use of taxicab services has also been correlated with increased use of public transit, contributing to a decrease in demand for and use of personal vehicles and the associated environmental impact.

5.4 Accessibility

An aging population has generally increased demand for accessible services and is also relevant for the vehicle for hire industry. While less than 7 per cent of the Canadian population under age 44 has a disability, this increases to over 26 per cent by age 65 and 43 per cent for people 75 years of age or older.
Manitoba has a slightly higher population with a disability at 15.6 per cent compared to the national average of 13.7 per cent. Nationally, mobility represents about half of the reported disabilities.

There is an increasing trend across Canada to establish accessibility standards legislation. Ontario has had the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* since 2005, Manitoba established *The Accessibility for Manitobans Act* in 2013, British Columbia launched a ten-year action plan “Accessibility 2024” in 2014, and the Government of Canada is currently conducting public consultations to inform the development of national accessibility legislation (Employment and Social Development Canada, 2016).

In Winnipeg, Taxicab Regulation 209/91 establishes standards for accessible taxicab service as well as vehicle requirements aligned with the Canadian Standards Association, Motor Vehicles for the Transportation of Persons with Physical Disabilities D409-16. Many jurisdictions mandate training for taxicab drivers regarding service to passengers with disabilities, including disabilities awareness, customer service and the proper securement of mobility equipment.

### 5.5 Regulating Supply

Globally, the vehicle for hire industry has gone through historical phases of regulation and de-regulation. Access to on-demand, door-to-door transportation is generally recognized as an essential service, that when coupled with public transit, contributes to a thriving city. The Competition Bureau of Canada has stated that certain segments of the population, including seniors, persons with a disability, stay at home parents, and low income groups account for a higher share of taxicab trips than their representation in the population (Competition Bureau, 2014). This is to say that some groups are reliant on this form of transportation in their day-to-day lives.

The major reasons cited in support of regulation of this industry are to ensure:

- Accessible and timely service through all areas of the community
- Quality service standards are established and met
- Consumers and those working in the industry are safe
- The industry remains viable

While recognizing that limited regulations may be justified to protect public safety, many economists argue that unregulated entry and fares will produce lower fares, a higher level of service to customers, and service innovations (Schaller, 2007). The Competition Bureau of Canada tends to agree with this position, while recognizing it must be balanced with other policy objectives intended to serve legitimate public interests. Its position is that regulations should be limited to what is needed to protect the public and taxicab operators from harm (Competition Bureau, 2014).

Regulation or de-regulation in this industry has been studied repeatedly in the last few decades. Much of this research has indicated that, for the taxicab industry, de-regulation has had the opposite effect to what economists might expect (Schaller, 2007). This is explained by the nature of this industry, which
lacks the conditions necessary for perfect competition. Some of the rationale for government regulation has been to correct these market imperfections.

Challenges to a perfect competitive environment include the following:

- Taxis in regulated markets are generally required to provide service to an entire geographic area with the same fare rates. Dense markets with frequent short trips cross-subsidize low density areas; peak traffic cross-subsidizes off-peak service. Without regulation, service to low density and off-peak trips may decline or not be available at all (Dempsey, 1996).

- Consumer choice is limited by imperfect information. Full information on rates and service offerings may not be available on a telephone order without significant effort. Information and choice is limited in the taxi stand and street hail market where the customer generally takes the first available vehicle (Teal & Berglund, 1987).

- Open entry may cause an influx of independent operators, with drivers attracted by low entry costs, the opportunity to service ‘guaranteed’ trips at a taxi stand, and the opportunity to work for oneself. These individuals may not have knowledge of true market conditions, and a lack of alternative employment may lead to persistent oversupply (Teal & Berglund, 1987).

5.5.1 **Impacts of Regulation**

Market regulation, particularly the extent to which the municipal authority issues new licences, can also have undesired consequences. Some municipalities issue licences every year according to a pre-defined formula that considers various factors such as population growth, economic growth and transit ridership. Other municipalities have few if any new licences over time. The value of a taxicab licence in the secondary market is influenced by the extent to which the municipality restricts the supply of new licences. The table below provides the range of estimated value of taxi licences in Canadian jurisdictions (Hara Associates, 2010). While the regulator may indirectly influence the price on the secondary market by limiting supply, and generally must authorize the transfer, it does not have any direct input or control over the value which is a private transaction between two individuals.

*Table 2 Taxicabs and Estimated Transfer Values of Standard Taxicab Business Licences 2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population (Statistics Canada, 2011)</th>
<th>Standard Taxicab Licences *</th>
<th>Accessible Taxicab Licences</th>
<th>All Taxicabs Per 10,000 Population (calculated)</th>
<th>Licence Transfer Value 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver (City)</td>
<td>603,502</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>1,096,833</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>812,201</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>193,100</td>
<td>120 + 44 seasonal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg (City)</td>
<td>663,617</td>
<td>410 + 73 seasonal</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>713,443</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In its 2014 submission, the Competition Bureau noted that prices for taxi licences in Toronto had increased sharply to between $300,000 – $400,000 (Competition Bureau, 2014). The high capitalized value of licences in areas where the number of licences is restricted results in the need to generate sufficient income and profitability to warrant investment in the cost of the licence. Too few licences can also result in poor service in less dense areas, particularly during peak hours when large numbers of taxis are responding to the demand in entertainment districts.

There is also an argument that restrictions about where passengers can be picked up, such as in neighbouring municipalities, results in empty taxi miles. This results in a need for higher fares, negatively impacting the environment and increases traffic congestion. The Conference Board of Canada concluded that higher fares will reduce demand for taxis and encourage the use of more private vehicles (The Conference Board of Canada, 2013). This may have further negative impacts on the environment, increase incidents of impaired driving, and result in greater traffic congestion and more parking demand.

### 5.5.2 Impact of De-Regulation

The impact of de-regulation, particularly entry controls, has a different impact on the two market segments of the industry – taxi stands/street hails and dispatch.

#### Oversupply

When implemented in the taxi stand/street hail market, open entry has led to an oversupply of taxis. Oversupply has resulted in fare revenues too low per driver to support quality vehicles, acceptable driver incomes and industry accountability for service. These impacts have been documented in detail for cities such as San Diego, Seattle, Sacramento, Phoenix, Tucson, Kansas City, Cincinnati and Indianapolis (Schaller, 2007). The arrival of additional drivers did not improve taxicab availability as there had been no shortage of service at these stands. The oversupply tended to persist, and did not return to a market balance even over time. Low entry costs, lack of information, low skill levels of drivers and a lack of other employment opportunities encouraged drivers to accept these circumstances.

#### Dispatch Service Viability

Removing entry controls can negatively affect dispatch service if allowed for both dispatch and street hail markets. The taxi stand / street hail customer provides a high volume of short trips and higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population (Statistics Canada, 2011)</th>
<th>Standard Taxicab Licences *</th>
<th>Accessible Taxicab Licences</th>
<th>All Taxicabs Per 10,000 Population (calculated)</th>
<th>Licence Transfer Value 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>2,615,000</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>883,391</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal (GMA)</td>
<td>3,824,221</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes seasonal licences

In its 2014 submission, the Competition Bureau noted that prices for taxi licences in Toronto had increased sharply to between $300,000 – $400,000 (Competition Bureau, 2014). The high capitalized value of licences in areas where the number of licences is restricted results in the need to generate sufficient income and profitability to warrant investment in the cost of the licence. Too few licences can also result in poor service in less dense areas, particularly during peak hours when large numbers of taxis are responding to the demand in entertainment districts.

There is also an argument that restrictions about where passengers can be picked up, such as in neighbouring municipalities, results in empty taxi miles. This results in a need for higher fares, negatively impacting the environment and increases traffic congestion. The Conference Board of Canada concluded that higher fares will reduce demand for taxis and encourage the use of more private vehicles (The Conference Board of Canada, 2013). This may have further negative impacts on the environment, increase incidents of impaired driving, and result in greater traffic congestion and more parking demand.

### 5.5.2 Impact of De-Regulation

The impact of de-regulation, particularly entry controls, has a different impact on the two market segments of the industry – taxi stands/street hails and dispatch.

#### Oversupply

When implemented in the taxi stand/street hail market, open entry has led to an oversupply of taxis. Oversupply has resulted in fare revenues too low per driver to support quality vehicles, acceptable driver incomes and industry accountability for service. These impacts have been documented in detail for cities such as San Diego, Seattle, Sacramento, Phoenix, Tucson, Kansas City, Cincinnati and Indianapolis (Schaller, 2007). The arrival of additional drivers did not improve taxicab availability as there had been no shortage of service at these stands. The oversupply tended to persist, and did not return to a market balance even over time. Low entry costs, lack of information, low skill levels of drivers and a lack of other employment opportunities encouraged drivers to accept these circumstances.

#### Dispatch Service Viability

Removing entry controls can negatively affect dispatch service if allowed for both dispatch and street hail markets. The taxi stand / street hail customer provides a high volume of short trips and higher
revenue that balances the lower revenue opportunity that comes from serving outlying areas with fewer, longer trips. De-regulating access to street hail and taxi stand customers reduced business overall for dispatch drivers, weakening the financial viability of taxicab companies and drivers who provide this service. Dispatch companies also had difficulty attracting drivers due to otherwise easy access to walk-up business.

Jurisdictions that controlled access to street hail/taxi stands but not dispatch markets showed more positive results. This is particularly the case where ‘company level’ qualifications were required to operate in the dispatch market. Company level entry qualifications can involve requirements for fleet size, place of business (neighbourhood based) and dispatch systems. In some cases, companies were allowed to add or subtract from their fleet as demand required, without regulatory approval. Geographic restrictions have also been used to manage this issue in very large markets (New York, Los Angeles, Las Vegas) (Schaller, 2007).

In a submission to the City of Toronto, the Competition Bureau of Canada recommended that the regulatory framework for taxicab services facilitate new forms of competition that are likely to benefit consumers. In particular, it recommended consideration of increasing the number of taxicab licences issued and amending regulations that would allow the use of new cost-saving software applications designed to arrange and pay for passenger motor vehicle transportation services (Competition Bureau, 2014).

5.6 Transportation Networks – Driving Regulatory Change

Transportation Network Companies are organizations that provide prearranged transportation services for compensation using a mobile application (App) or platform to connect passengers with drivers using their personal vehicles. This service is commonly referred to as ‘ride-sharing. Some jurisdictions are using the term “Private Transportation Provider” (Edmonton) or “Private Transportation Company” (Ottawa, Toronto). The emergence of TNCs is the primary driver of regulatory reform on a global basis. There are also a variety of transportation service providers, such as designated driving services or services that provide rides to passengers for no charge or a donation that occupy a grey-area in the current vehicle for hire regulatory system.

While several TNCs have emerged including Lyft, Sidecar, and Split, Uber is the most well-known and pervasive. Uber was founded as a solution to frustration with the existing taxicab industry in San Francisco in 2010. Taxi service was added in 2012 (KPMG LLP, 2015). Other Uber services have arisen, including UberBLACK (limo), UberPOOL (car pool), and UberASSIST (accessible) etc. UberX is the basic service that has become the most popular, and is considered the backbone service that enables other offerings. As of November 2016, Uber’s website indicates a presence in 533 cities worldwide, including ten cities in Canada - Quebec City, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, London, Hamilton, Kingston, Kitchener-Waterloo, Windsor, and Edmonton (Uber, 2016).

By late 2015, Uber was estimated to be worth $68 billion (Chen, 2015) with over 1.1 million active drivers (Harris, 2015). Recent reports indicate Uber has seen significant losses, reported at over $4 billion in the
history of the company, with the largest loss reported in the second quarter of 2016. Bookings grew over 30 per cent to over $5 billion in the same quarter. Losses are attributed to investments (subsidies for drivers, low prices) in markets where Uber is trying to achieve a stronghold. A deal with the major competitor in China is expected to end the losses in that market, which are reported to total over $2 billion. Uber has been engaged in a fierce price war with Lyft Inc. in the US, where it is seeking to maintain the company’s estimated 84-87 per cent market share. Lyft believes its market share is over 20 per cent in major US cities (Newcomer, 2016). Lyft does not indicate a presence in any Canadian cities (Lyft, 2016).

Other companies are emerging in the newly opened markets in Canada. Edmonton-based TappCar launched its service in the spring of 2016, and offers rides in Calgary and Edmonton. OpenRide has indicated its intent to offer inter-city rides in the Greater Toronto Area.

Key features of the TNC business model include drivers using their own personal vehicles, who service trip requests on an ‘as-and-when’ basis. A mobile application for GPS enabled smartphones allows the passenger to order a ride and track its progress, pay automatically via a credit card number registered on the App, and receive an electronic receipt. The Uber App also allows passengers to see a picture of the vehicle and ratings for the driver. Both drivers and passengers rate each other on a five-star scale after a ride (Mowat Centre, 2015).

As indicated by the extraordinary growth in five years, TNC service is popular with both customers and drivers. The following are some of the reasons for this popularity:

- The convenience and functionality of the App
  - Customers are able to see the location of the car as it is on its way to them, they know in advance who the driver will be, and can follow the car’s progress on the App to know if it is on the most efficient route
  - Customers receive an advance estimate of the fare before confirming their request, payment is handled with a cashless, automated transaction at the end of the trip through pre-loaded credit card information in the App
- Quick response times
- Higher quality customer service
- Lower costs

Some advocate that TNCs reduce waiting times because there are increased numbers of vehicles for hire, the dispatch system is much better and there are incentives (driver rating) for drivers to provide prompt service. Uber reports in Chicago, New York and Boston that a high percentage of trips are in traditionally underserved neighbourhoods (Uber, 2016).

The Competition Bureau suggests that consumers perceive TNC drivers as offering a higher quality of customer service than traditional taxis, and that competitive pressure may be the reason for reduced complaints following entry by TNCs (Competition Bureau, 2015). It is important to note that once regulatory systems accommodate TNCs, other companies are likely to enter the marketplace that may not offer the same features and benefits of the Uber system.
The cost of TNC services are generally recognized to be lower than the regulated rates of licenced taxicabs. However, these services are subject to ‘surge’ pricing during periods of peak demand.

The taxicab industry has voiced significant concern that the unrestricted entry of TNCs into otherwise regulated markets has created unfair competition and presents a significant threat to the viability of the taxicab industry. TNCs may not be required to meet the same standards for taxis, such as requirements for a taxicab business licence or a taxicab driver licence, commercial driver’s licence and insurance, training and background checks, in-car equipment (camera, meter), vehicle standards and inspections, and prescribed fares. As part-time contractors, TNC drivers are also believed to ‘cherry pick’ during peak times/areas, whenever convenient for them, unlike taxicabs that are required to respond to all calls and be available 24 hours a day. Taxicab companies and drivers argue that not only does this create safety and liability concerns, the un-level playing field jeopardizes investments made by companies and drivers to establish themselves in the taxicab business (especially in the value on the secondary market of the taxicab plate or business licence). Essentially, TNC drivers are seen to be able to ‘skim the cream’ from the market without any of the public safety and consumer protection obligations that bind the licenced industry. Entire campaigns have been launched, including “Who’s Driving You” (www.whosdrivingyou.org), an initiative of the Taxicab, Limousine & Paratransit Association, and “TaxiTruths”, a website hosted by the Canadian Taxi Association. Recent events, including protests and intimidation of Uber drivers by members of the taxicab industry, illustrate the escalation of anger in the industry.

Uber’s response to questions of safety is that its technology enables the company to focus on rider and partner safety, by requiring end-to-end insurance, a code of conduct for both riders and drivers, anonymous phone numbers, safe pick-ups (the passenger can stay inside until driver arrives), partner-driver screening, driver ratings and profiles.

Uber has recently made efforts to make clear that drivers are not employees, but part-time independent contractors, in response to actions from drivers seeking to recover certain expenses or vacation pay and minimum wage protection (Harris, 2015). A recent ruling by a UK employment tribunal determined Uber drivers have the right to be classed as employees, entitled to holiday pay and minimum wage.

In Manitoba, The Taxicab Act and Regulations would not prevent Uber itself from operating as a dispatch service. The Act would require any Uber drivers in Winnipeg to have a taxicab driver’s licence and a taxicab business licence.

5.6.1 Regulatory Responses

Some jurisdictions, including several European countries and Canadian cities such as Vancouver, have enacted regulations or taken legal action to explicitly prevent the operation of TNCs. Others have treated TNCs as un-licenced ‘bandit’ taxis and have taken law enforcement action against them.

Regulatory frameworks for TNCs have been adopted by a number of US regulators, but are still in their relative infancy. These regulatory frameworks generally treat TNCs as a separate class of service provider in vehicle for hire legislation. They appear to be intended to ensure that TNCs and their drivers are subject
to safety and consumer protection rules similar to those that apply to taxicabs, particularly with respect to minimum insurance requirements, criminal and driving background checks on drivers, and vehicle inspections. Most propose fewer restrictions on vehicle size and age, accessibility requirements or number of vehicles, although also propose fewer privileges as TNC drivers are not allowed to accept street hails or use taxicab stands (Competition Bureau, 2015).

The Competition Bureau (Competition Bureau, 2015) has provided guiding principles for regulating the taxicab and ride-sharing industry, including:

- Provincial and municipal governments should limit regulations to those required to achieve legitimate policy goals, such as protecting passenger safety. This has been applied to elements of regulation such as driver licensing, insurance, vehicle inspections and training. The extent of background checks and required training should not exceed what is necessary for safety and knowledgeable service.
- Care should be taken to ensure that regulations do not restrict competition and innovation any more than is necessary to achieve legitimate policy goals.
- Regulations should be applied equally to taxicabs and ride-sharing services to ensure that one does not gain a competitive advantage over the other.
- Where possible, restrictions on traditional taxicabs should be relaxed rather than imposing additional regulations on ride-sharing services.

Key recommendations are:

- Ease price controls, such as regulated taxicab fares, to allow fares to be adjusted during periods of varying demand such as weekends, evenings and bad weather
- Eliminate restrictions on the number of taxicab plates issued and move to a system where additional qualified drivers may operate as vehicles for hire
- Allow all drivers to respond to street hails, regardless of whether they work for a taxicab company or ride-sharing service, unless there is a compelling policy reason not to do so
- Provide incentives to drivers to operate accessible vehicles in areas where consumers are underserved

The Competition Bureau also recommends an evidence-based approach to evaluate whether any regulation, new or existing, is achieving the intended result, whether it is necessary to do so, and to understand any unintended consequences including preventing desired changes.

_The views above are provided by the Commissioner of Competition pursuant to section 126 of The Competition Act, which provides authority for the Commissioner to make representations to provincial, and thus municipal, bodies.”_ (Competition Bureau, 2014). _Section 126 provides such authority only at the request or with the consent of the provincial body in question. The Taxicab Board of Manitoba has neither requested nor consented to the federal Commissioner of Competition making any representations on this matter._
Edmonton was the first city in Canada to pass a by-law authorizing and regulating TNC activity (called a Private Transportation Provider, or PTP) in March 2016. This was followed by Calgary and Ottawa in April, Toronto in May, and Waterloo Region in August 2016. Regulatory reviews are underway in other cities in southern Ontario, including Hamilton and Mississauga.

The new regulatory frameworks generally treat TNCs as a separate class of service provider, while establishing some safety and consumer protection rules similar to those that apply to taxicabs. These include minimum insurance requirements, criminal and driving background checks on drivers, and vehicle inspections. Most propose fewer restrictions on vehicle size and age, accessibility requirements or number of vehicles, although also propose fewer privileges, as TNC drivers are not allowed to accept street hails or use taxicab stands.

5.6.2 Impact on Taxicab Industry

Consumers and drivers clearly perceive benefits of TNCs, as indicated by the volumes that choose the option. The impact on the traditional taxi industry is typically where concerns arise. Allowing TNCs to operate in an otherwise limited market can be expected to impact both the volume of business for taxicabs and the value of the business licence or plate on the secondary market.

Whether TNCs are displacing taxicabs or attracting new business to the market has been debated. There is some evidence to suggest some of both. In New York, there was some redistribution of a fairly stable number of rides in Manhattan’s central business district, while the rest of the city saw an increase in the total rides and little impact to the business of licenced cabs (The Economist, 2015). Mississauga found that in the two years following the unregulated introduction of TNCs, total dispatched trips for taxicab brokerages increased by 6.8 per cent.

It is generally agreed that the value of a taxi plate or business licence will be affected. In New York City,
values of taxi medallions have seen a sharp decline since 2013, losing half their value. Medallion owners are no longer able to achieve the high ‘rents’ from drivers to run the car. While unfavourable to owners, this is not necessarily considered a bad thing, as profit from the traditional system was gained by the owners, with drivers typically ending up disadvantaged with low wages (Worstall, 2016). In Toronto, taxi licence values are reported to have declined from $360,000 in mid-2012 to below $100,000 in 2014 (Cain, 2015). In Edmonton, plate values were reported to have dropped from $180,000-$200,000 in 2013 to $70,000 in 2016 in anticipation of the proposed new by law (Querengesser, 2016). In Ottawa, the number of plates trading, and perhaps the value, has declined, although there are limited numbers of trades on which to base such a conclusion (Reevely, 2016).

6.0 THE TAXICAB INDUSTRY IN WINNIPEG

6.1 History

The regulated taxicab industry has a long history in Winnipeg. The following timeline provides information about significant points in its history.

Figure 6 Taxicab Industry Historical Timeline
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The Taxicab Act and Taxicab Board were established in 1935. At this time ‘Greater Winnipeg’ was comprised of 13 cities, towns and municipalities, each with its own government and by-laws, including for taxicabs. The Taxicab Act was enacted to standardize the regulatory framework for taxicabs operating in the municipalities of Greater Winnipeg and the Taxicab Board was created to administer The Act. In 1972, the unified city of Winnipeg was created by amalgamating the 13 municipalities, towns and cities.
6.2 Regulatory Framework

Almost all North American jurisdictions regulate the vehicle for hire industry to some degree. Regulation primarily falls under local government jurisdiction. In Winnipeg, the industry is regulated by a variety of legislation including: The Taxicab Act; Taxicab Regulation 209/91; Taxicab Fees Regulation 104/92; Taxicab Board Rules of Procedure Regulation 496/88R; The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act; The Highway Traffic Act; The Drivers and Vehicles Act; and The Accessibility for Manitobans Act.

6.2.1 The Taxicab Act

The Taxicab Act was enacted in 1935 and was last updated in 2005. The Act:

- Establishes the Taxicab Board composition and its power and authorities
- Stipulates the requirement to hold a taxicab business licence in order to operate a taxicab business
- Stipulates the requirement to hold a taxicab driver’s licence issued by the Taxicab Board in order to operate a taxicab
- Establishes the penalties for operating without the required licences
- Provides for the appointment of inspectors to enforce The Act and Regulations, as provided in The Civil Service Act and grants inspectors the power of a Peace Officer under The Highway Traffic Act

The Taxicab Act establishes the General Powers of the Taxicab Board, granting the Taxicab Board the authority to:

- Determine the types of licences and their respective terms and conditions, based on ‘public convenience and necessity’
- Determine the number of licences to be issued
- Determine taxicab business licence application criteria and fees
- Determine liability insurance requirements
- Issue taxicab business licences and taxicab driver licences
- Hold hearings and issue orders to licence holders who have contravened The Act or Regulations, licence terms or conditions, order or direction of the Taxicab Board, or who have acted in a manner that is contrary to the public interest
- Prescribe minimum and maximum penalties for licence holders
- Establish fares
- Prescribe vehicle and equipment standards
- Require taxicab business licence holders (owners) to submit financial records
- Establish regulations and rules governing practice and procedures

The Taxicab Board has authority to suspend, cancel or refuse to renew taxicab business licences and taxicab driver’s licences or order a fine or penalty. Taxicab Board inspectors have the authority to issue offence notices related to operating without a taxicab business licence, taxicab driver licence, and for
non-payment of fares or violations under The Highway Traffic Act. Offence notices must be filed with the courts and penalties are determined by a Provincial Justice of the Peace.

The Act sets out rules regarding board meetings, hearings, procedures and appealing board decisions or orders, and sets out the powers of inspectors and duties of the Winnipeg Police Service to enforce The Act.

6.2.2 Taxicab Regulation 209/91

Taxicab Regulation 209/91 was enacted in 1991 and was last updated in 2012. It stipulates:

- The types and classes of taxicabs
- The types of required licences and their conditions
- Vehicle equipment requirements and maintenance
  - Required, permitted and prohibited signs
  - Requirements of licence holders
- Fare restrictions and requirements
- Records requirements

Summary information about the content of Regulation 209/91 is provided below and on the next page. Detailed information has been referenced in relevant sections of this document.

Types and Classes of Taxicabs

Regulation 209/91 defines the types and classes of taxicabs and gives the Taxicab Board authority to specify makes and models for:

- Classic limousine
- Specialty vehicle limousine
- Executive car
- Premium taxicab
- Standard taxicab
- Accessible taxicab / handicab van

Taxicab Licences (Business and Driver)

The Regulation prescribes conditions for licences including ownership, renewal, suspension, cancellation and conversion. The owner of a taxicab is defined as a lessee of 12 months or more, or the actual purchaser. Requirements for taxicab driver’s licence holders are stipulated including training, drivers licence and criminal record/child abuse registry checks. The Regulation establishes requirements for vehicle inspections, customer service and communication systems. They also set requirements for drivers regarding use of alcohol or drugs, transport of dangerous goods, driving behaviour, maximum number of passengers, appearance, use of restraint systems, acceptance/refusal of customer, knowledge of the city of Winnipeg streets and destinations, conduct towards passengers and passenger property.
Vehicle and Equipment Specifications

Regulation 209/91 prescribes vehicle and equipment requirements and maintenance, including interior, exterior, trunk space, restraint systems and safety supplies. It prescribes age limitations for certain classes of vehicles and defines required and permitted interior and exterior signage for taxicabs.

The Regulation specifies equipment requirements for all accessible vehicles and also refers to CSA Safety Standard for Commercial Vehicles for the Transportation of Mobility-Challenged Passengers.

Fare Regulation

Regulation 209/91 establishes requirements for receipts, taximeters, fares, advance payment of fares and ability to accept gratuities for the different classes of taxicab.

Records

Regulation 209/91 establishes the requirement for completion and retention of trip records, and the requirement for taxicab business licence holders to complete and file with the Taxicab Board an Annual Return of Financial Information in prescribed form.

Inspections and Investigations

Regulation 209/91 addresses investigations, general and safety inspection requirements as well as what must happen if found non-compliant.

6.2.3 Taxicab Board Rules of Procedure Regulation No. 496/88R

The Rules of Procedure Regulation (Rules of Procedure), last updated in 1998, establishes:

- The frequency and location of Taxicab Board meetings – twice a month or as otherwise directed by the Chairman
- That applications for taxicab business licences are to be submitted in person
- That Taxicab business licence applications will be considered at special meetings of the Taxicab Board called for the purpose of considering these applications and that the applicant will be provided with 30-days’ notice of the date and time of the hearing
- That a quorum is considered three at meetings of the Taxicab Board

6.2.4 The Accessibility for Manitobans Act

The Accessibility for Manitobans Act, which was enacted in 2013, builds on the requirements of the Human Rights Code. There are five accessibility standards being developed under The Act, the first of which is the Accessibility Standard for Customer Service Regulation (2015). Private sector and non-profit organizations with at least one employee have until November 2018 to comply with this Regulation.
The purpose of *The Act* is to achieve accessibility by preventing and removing barriers that disable people with respect to employment, accommodation, the built environment, the delivery and receipt of goods, services and information, and a prescribed activity or undertaking.

In achieving accessibility, the following principles are reflected in *The Act*:

**Access** – Persons should have barrier-free access to places, events and other functions that are generally available in the community

**Equality** – Persons should have barrier-free access to those things that will give them equality of opportunity and outcome

**Universal Design** – Access should be provided in a manner that does not establish or perpetuate differences based on a person’s impairment

**Systematic Responsibility** – Responsibility to prevent and remove barriers rests with the person or organization that is responsible for establishing or perpetuating the barrier

**Accessibility Standards for Customer Service Regulation**

According to *The Accessibility for Manitobans Act*, Customer Service Standard Regulation, “accessible customer service is provided when all persons who are reasonably expected to seek to obtain, use or benefit from a good or service have the same opportunity to obtain, use or benefit from the good or service.” (Government of Manitoba, 2015)

The Regulation requires organizations to establish and implement measures, policies and practices respecting barrier-free access to the goods or services it provides.

To accomplish this, organizations are required to:

- Identify the barriers to providing accessible customer service in their business
- Implement initiatives to remove the existing barriers within its scope of responsibility, so that all persons can access the service using the same means
- If it is not possible to remove a barrier, take action to enable persons who are disadvantaged by the barrier to access the service by alternate means
- Ensure that there are no extra fees or charges relating to these accommodations unless reasonable and justifiable
- Seek to prevent new barriers from being created

The Customer Service Standard Regulation also addresses: requirements for communicating with those who self-identify as having a disability, accommodating assistive devices used by persons with disabilities, support persons accompanying persons with a disability as well as service animals, providing appropriate feedback mechanisms and documentation of actions taken in response to feedback received.
Organizations with 20 or more employees must document the measures, policies and practices established under the Regulation. The documentation must be available on request and a notice to this affect must be displayed on the organization’s website, on their premises and other locations as applicable.

Training must be provided to employees who provide direct service to the public such as taxicab drivers and dispatchers and to those who are responsible for developing and implementing policies and practices. Training refreshers/updates must be provided.

6.2.5 **The Highway Traffic Act**

*The Highway Traffic Act* establishes the Motor Transport Board, which regulates taxicabs in Manitoba that are not regulated by *The Taxicab Act* or a municipal by-law. It grants authority to municipalities in Manitoba to prohibit, limit, control and regulate taxicab businesses. Regulation includes the establishment of annual licences and licensing fees for persons who wish to operate a taxicab business; the rates to be charged by meters or zones; the creation of zones; and the location or use of taxicab ranks or stands. *The Act* also requires a taxicab owner to register his / her vehicle with an insurer or duly authorized agent for the protection of persons and property.

*The Taxicab Act* references the authority of taxicab inspectors, which coincide with the powers of a Peace Officer under *The Highway Traffic Act*. The powers of a taxicab inspector include the following:

- He/she has the authority to stop and inspect any equipment on a taxicab vehicle on a highway if any part of the equipment does not comply with regulations
- The driver must provide reasonable information as required by the inspector, who has the authority to compel the driver/owner to ensure the equipment is in compliance
- The inspector has the authority to remove the vehicle from the highway to be stored in a suitable place should the driver/owner not comply with the requisition of the inspector within a reasonable time

6.2.6 **Motor Transport Board Regulations**

The Motor Transport Board of *The Highway Traffic Act* is responsible for the issuance of operating authorities to inter-municipal taxicabs, their safety fitness and the fares charged. Generally, Winnipeg taxis that transport passengers across city of Winnipeg limits are subject to the Motor Transport Board Regulations for the portion of the trip that occurs outside the boundaries of the city of Winnipeg, with some exceptions noted below:

- The Motor Transport Board Exemption of Certain Passenger Service Vehicles Regulation 112/2015 allows Winnipeg taxicab companies to either pick-up or drop-off passengers outside the city of Winnipeg without obtaining a livery operator authority (licence) from the Motor Transport Board. The beginning or end of the trip must be in Winnipeg.
- The Tariff of Tolls for Transportation of Passengers by Inter-Municipal Liveries Regulation 46/2001 sets the rates that must be charged by taxicabs operating under *The Taxicab Act* or *The Highway Traffic Act* for trips or portions of trips outside the city of Winnipeg. It also states that
rural operators may charge no less than the rates set out in Taxicab Regulation 209/91 for the portion of a trip inside the city of Winnipeg.

6.2.7 The Drivers and Vehicles Act

The Drivers and Vehicles Act (DVA) and regulations stipulate that a motor vehicle cannot be registered as a taxicab unless the person holds a taxicab business licence under The Taxicab Act. Driver Licensing Regulation 47/2006 specifies a taxicab as a “Class 4” vehicle, which is a commercial category. A taxicab must have a number plate with the first letter X and have a registration class sticker of TX. The Motor Transport Board also licences taxicabs outside the city of Winnipeg. Motor Transport Board licences bear different registration class stickers such as LM, LV or CL. The DVA also establishes the registration period as one year beginning on the day that is four months after the individual's date of birth and expires on the day before the day that is four months after his/her birthday. Limited companies may select the annual insurance expiry date.

The Drivers and Vehicles Act requires taxicab registrars to provide the Taxicab Board with copies of or access to any records that relate to a driver, driver’s licence, vehicle, vehicle registration or vehicle owner required for the purpose of an appeal or matter before the Taxicab Board and/or carrying out the Taxicab Board’s responsibilities under The Highway Traffic Act or The Taxicab Act. Personal health information must be provided with the consent of the person the information pertains to, or another person authorized to give consent on their behalf. It is also limited to the restrictions and conditions imposed on a person who holds or has held a driver’s licence.

6.2.8 The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act and Regulations

Taxicab Regulation 209/91 requires all taxicabs to be insured with Manitoba Public Insurance and have Commercial Vehicle Insurance (Taxi/Livery). The Taxicab Act requires additional public liability and property insurance. The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act grants the Taxicab Board authority to require taxicab owners to maintain proof of financial responsibility beyond the limits of liability prescribed by The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act or Regulations.

MPI may suspend any driver’s licence, certificate of registration, registration card, taxicab licence or permit if the registered owner fails to pay the associated fees necessary to obtain each document, whether in full or by way of periodic payments. Should suspension, revocation, or cancellation of registration occur for any reason, the associated taxicab licence and permit are automatically suspended, revoked, or cancelled. MPI is required to provide notice to the Taxicab Board of the cancellation. Taxicab owners must keep their vehicles actively insured with MPI if they wish to maintain an active taxicab licence and permit.

The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act may require the Taxicab Board to provide MPI with access to information and records deemed necessary to carry out its function. It also stipulates that insured taxicabs cannot operate contrary to The Highway Traffic Act or The Drivers and Vehicles Act.
Taxicab owners must keep their vehicles actively insured with MPI if they wish to maintain an active taxicab licence and permit. Should MPI suspend or cancel a taxicab registration for any reason, the associated taxicab licence and permit are automatically suspended, revoked, or cancelled.

MPI has a dedicated location in downtown Winnipeg to handle commercial vehicle registrations, including taxicabs and works closely with the Taxicab Board to coordinate activities and share information regarding vehicle registrations, drivers licensing, suspensions, revocations or cancellations. There are eight Service Centres throughout the city of Winnipeg that handle insurance collision claims. Four Service Centres handle commercial insurance and registrations: Donald, Gateway, King Edward, and Bison.

6.2.9 City of Winnipeg By-laws

The City of Winnipeg has various by-laws that regulate parking, taxi stands and traffic control. There is also a requirement for taxicab business licence holders to pay an annual taxicab business licence fee to the City of Winnipeg. A scan of historical Winnipeg newspaper articles suggests that this fee originated at the time The Taxicab Act was enacted to offset the costs associated with enforcement of The Taxicab Act and Regulations by members of the Winnipeg Police Service.

6.2.10 CSA Motor Vehicles for the Transportation of Physically Disabled Persons (CAN/CSA3-D409-92)

The Taxicab Regulation 209/91 refers to and incorporates as Schedule I, a Manitoba Specialized Motor Vehicle Safety Standard for Commercial Vehicles for the Transportation of Mobility-Challenged Passengers. Schedule I specifies vehicle requirements for accessible taxicabs and handicab vans.

6.2.11 Employment Standards Code

The Employment Standards Code of Manitoba establishes requirements for minimum wages, hours of work, holidays and other workplace entitlements for employees. It does not apply to independent contractors. Taxicab drivers may be considered employees or self-employed contractors under Employment Standards legislation depending on their unique work situation.

6.2.12 The Workers Compensation Act

All operators of taxicab services, whether an employee or independent contractor, must be covered by workers compensation insurance according to The Workers Compensation Act.
6.3 **Taxicab Industry Participants**

The table below provides an overview of the taxicab industry participants in Winnipeg, followed by more detailed information on each.

*Table 3 Taxicab Industry Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxicab Industry Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Taxicab Board (TCB)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An independent quasi-judicial administrative tribunal established under authority of <em>The Taxicab Act</em> to licence and regulate all classes of taxicabs operating in the city of Winnipeg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Taxicab Board Office</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performs the activities required to fulfil the responsibilities of the TCB and provides administrative support to the TCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxicab and Limousine Owners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A taxicab business licence may only be held by the owner of the taxicab, or as otherwise permitted under regulation. The business licence holder (owner) is responsible for ensuring the vehicle meets the equipment requirements under <em>The Act</em>, including the necessary insurance and maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxicab drivers perform the actual service of transporting passengers and must hold a taxicab driver’s licence, issued by the TCB. Many business licence holders drive their vehicles, and hire additional drivers to maintain 24-7 operations of the vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dispatch Companies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out the business of dispatching taxicabs in response to requests for taxicab services. In Winnipeg the two major dispatch companies are cooperatives of taxicab owners and do not own any taxicabs or hold any taxicab business licences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training Providers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James-Assiniboia School Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops and delivers the mandatory Taxicab Driver Training Program for new taxicab drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Living Resource Centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops and delivers mandatory Accessibility Transportation Training for new and existing taxicab drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxicab / Limousine Customers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The users of taxicab services for business, tourism and personal needs. Certain businesses may also be considered indirect customers of taxicab services, such as hotels, airports, hospitals and other venues that seek to ensure access to taxicab services for their patrons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.1 **The Taxicab Board**

The Taxicab Board is an independent quasi-judicial administrative tribunal established under authority of *The Taxicab Act* in 1935 to licence and regulate all taxicabs, wheelchair vans and limousines operating in the city of Winnipeg.

It is governed by a seven-member board, composed of:

- A member of the Council of the City of Winnipeg
- The Chief Constable of the Winnipeg Police Service or an alternate
- Between one and five other persons appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of Manitoba

New appointments and re-appointments are made upon recommendations by the Minister to a committee comprised of Cabinet ministers and members of the legislative assembly. This committee considers the Minister’s recommendation and recommends to the Minister whether to submit the nominee to Cabinet for approval or whether to consider other candidates. The Lieutenant Governor appoints a chairperson and may appoint a vice-chairperson from among the members.

The mandate of the Taxicab Board is to ensure citizens in Winnipeg receive quality taxicab service that meets the public need at a reasonable cost through the administration of a system of economic regulation, and enforces regulations and policy that are in the best interest of public, passenger and driver safety (Taxicab Board, 2015).

The Taxicab Board conducts public hearings on matters relating to industry and taxicab users, establishes reviews and revises the number of taxicab business licences required for public convenience and necessity. The Board regulates rates charged by the industry, issues taxicab business licences, taxicab driver licences and regulates taxicab business licence transfers, determines training for taxicab drivers and establishes vehicle standards. The Taxicab Board conducts hearings regarding complaints and alleged contraventions of The Taxicab Act and Regulations, and determines appropriate disciplinary actions. The Taxicab Board Chair is responsible for media relations.

The Minister of Indigenous and Municipal Relations is responsible for oversight of The Taxicab Act. The Taxicab Board activity and expenditures are reported through the Department of Indigenous and Municipal Relations.

### 6.3.2 Taxicab Board Office

The Taxicab Board Office (TCBO) performs the activities required to fulfil the responsibilities outlined on the next page and provides administrative support to the Taxicab Board. The organization includes seven staff as shown in the Figure 7.

The Secretary to the Taxicab Board, responsible for maintaining TCB records and activity on the TCB’s behalf, is a combined position with the Director of the Taxicab Board Office. The Director is responsible to implement the decisions of the Taxicab Board and for the overall management and operation of the TCBO and staff.
This includes effective enforcement of *The Taxicab Act*, regulations and related policies, and media interactions and activities. The Director acts in an advisory role to the Chair and keeps the Chair and board members informed of current and emerging industry issues, obtains and provides legal opinions on matters, recommends regulatory policy for approval by the Taxicab Board, coordinates all board meetings / hearings and correspondence of Taxicab Board decisions and orders. The Director is responsible for the overall efficiency and effectiveness of office operations. The Director also acts as a liaison between the Taxicab Board and the taxicab industry, provincial and municipal governments and other interest groups. The Administrative Officer provides support for the office, prepares reports and supervises the Customer Service Representatives.

**Compliance Unit**

Taxicab inspectors monitor compliance with *The Taxicab Act* and Regulations and are considered Peace Officers under *The Highway Traffic Act*. They have the authority to issue tickets under both *The Taxicab Act* and *The Highway Traffic Act*.

Inspectors perform the following:

- General and random inspections and street patrol, which may include:
  - Checking the inside of a cab
  - Checking the exterior of a cab
  - Verifying licences and other required documentation
  - Inspection of in-car cameras
- Respond to customer complaints, conduct investigations as necessary and prepare Show Cause cases
- Chief Inspector presents Show Cause cases to the Taxicab Board
- Provide information to assist Winnipeg Police Service investigations

---

**Taxicab Board Office Responsibilities**

- Issue taxicab business licences as approved by the Board
- Issue taxicab driver licences
- Process applications
- Receive and process fees and fines
- Conduct vehicle inspections
- Conduct street patrol to ensure compliance (during and after regular work hours)
- Issue offence notices and out of service orders
- Conduct compliance investigations
- Liaise with the taxicab industry, user interest groups, other taxicab regulatory agencies and governments
- Investigate and resolve complaints against taxicab operators and drivers
- Coordinate and present Show Cause hearings for Board decisions
- Collect and analyze information and data and create reports
- Build and maintain relationships with industry
- Create awareness of legislative/regulatory compliance requirements
• Research and recommend taxicab equipment such as security cameras, and taximeters
• Monitor taxicab driver training program and make recommendations for improvements
• Perform interviews with new taxicab drivers as part of their application process

Customer Service Representatives

The Customer Service Representatives are responsible for processing licence applications and renewals, receiving and referring complaints, responding to office inquiries, preparing for Taxicab Board hearings and providing general administrative support.

6.3.3 Training Providers

The TCB contracts with external service providers to provide mandatory initial training for new taxicab drivers, re-certification training every two years, and remedial training as required for existing licensed taxicab drivers. The training provider develops the curriculum and materials for TCB approval.

The Taxicab Driver Training Program has been delivered by the St. James-Assiniboia School Division Continuing Education since 1998. The 40-hour taxicab driver training program includes a module on providing service to persons with disabilities comprising of approximately 6 hours (15 per cent of training program). Beginning in December 2016, a separate full day Accessibility Transportation Training program will be delivered by the Independent Living Resource Centre, a consumer organization that promotes and supports citizens with disabilities.

6.3.4 Taxicab / Limousine Owners

A taxicab business licence (TBL) may only be held by the owner of the taxicab, and an individual licence is required for each vehicle, or as otherwise provided in the Taxicab Regulations. As of December 2016, there were 756 taxicab business licences across all categories, including seasonal taxicab licences and excluding temporary limousine permits (Taxicab Board, 2016). The TBL holder (owner) is responsible for ensuring the vehicle meets the equipment requirements under The Taxicab Act, including the necessary insurance and maintenance.

The large majority of taxicab owners contract with one of the two main dispatch companies, Unicity Taxi and Duffy’s Taxi, for dispatch and marketing purposes. While a dispatch service is not directly regulated, a TBL holder is required to ensure that the dispatch service meets certain requirements (see Dispatch later in this section). Taxicab owners may employ one or more drivers to maintain 24/7 operations of the taxicab, and are responsible for ensuring that drivers they employ hold a taxicab driver’s licence and a Manitoba driver’s licence. A taxicab owner may be an individual or a corporation, and owners may also be taxicab drivers, if licensed as such. An owner may hold multiple TBLs.

The 410 standard taxicabs are affiliated with 5 dispatch companies, with the majority being individually owned. Owners affiliated with Unicity and Duffy’s own 99 per cent of standard taxis. Nine dispatch companies or independent operators provide service for the 44 accessible taxicabs that are not affiliated with Unicity or Duffy’s. Thirteen companies or independents operate 88 handicab vans in Winnipeg.
Twenty-two companies or independents operate 104 limousine and specialty vehicles that operate in Winnipeg.

The figures and table below show the distribution of the various types of taxicabs among shareholders of Unicity, Duffy’s and other taxicab businesses.

*Figure 8 Distribution of Standard and Accessible Taxicabs as at October 2016*

In the winter of 2015/2016 there were a total of 107 seasonal taxicabs, made up of 102 standard taxicabs and 5 accessible taxicabs. In 2016/2017 there are a total of 102 with only two accessible taxis. The large majority of seasonal taxicabs (95) are allotted to existing owners affiliated with either Unicity and Duffy’s.

*Figure 9 Distribution of Seasonal Taxicabs 2015/2016 and 2016/2017*

### 6.3.5 Drivers

Taxicab drivers perform the service of transporting passengers, and must hold a taxicab driver’s licence (TDL). Drivers must also hold a Class 4 driver’s licence issued by Manitoba Public Insurance. Drivers must undergo background checks, complete training, and pass an exam before being eligible for a TDL. As of October 2016 there were 2,201 licensed taxicab drivers in Winnipeg.
Many taxicab drivers do not own the vehicle that they drive or the taxicab business licence. There are a variety of methods by which drivers are compensated including:

- Hourly wage
- Percentage of revenue per shift driven less expenses (fuel, car wash)
- Revenue per shift less car rental paid to owner, less expenses (fuel, car wash). This is most common for standard taxicabs.

### 6.3.6 Dispatch Companies (Brokers)

A dispatch service carries out the business of dispatching taxicabs in response to requests for service. This service is often termed a “broker” in other jurisdictions. They provide branding and dispatch services to taxicab owners on a 24/7 basis for an administration fee. As noted previously, there are two major dispatch companies in Winnipeg, Duffy’s and Unicity. These companies are commonly referred to as taxi companies, however they are cooperatives of independent taxicab owners and do not directly own any taxicab business licences. Duffy’s and Unicity are affiliated with 99 per cent of the standard taxicabs, 89 per cent of seasonal taxicabs and 15 per cent of the accessible taxicabs in the city of Winnipeg, with fleets of 216 and 286 respectively. There are a number of independent owner operators and small companies that both own and dispatch their own fleet, and may provide a dispatch service for others. The large majority of these are accessible taxicabs and handicap vans. In addition to Duffy’s and Unicity, nine dispatch companies are affiliated with accessible taxicab fleets ranging from 1 to 10 vehicles. In addition to the companies that offer accessible taxicabs, there are 13 companies that offer handicap van services for the exclusive use of passengers with disabilities.

While *The Taxicab Act* and regulations do not specifically regulate dispatch services, taxicab business licence holders (owners) may only operate or be affiliated with a dispatch service that conforms to a number of requirements. These include accommodating requests for service in the order received to any person that requests service, carrying on business 24 hours a day, responding promptly to requests for service and complaints, compliance with the Human Rights Code, and dispatching only to valid licence holders. There are some additional requirements for dispatchers of premium taxicabs (Taxicab Regulation 209/91, section 37(3)) including requirements for computerized dispatch system, on-road supervisors, TCB approved standards of conduct, complaint systems, customer satisfaction monitoring, and accessible taxicab to standard taxicab ratios. Currently there are no premium taxicab services offered in Winnipeg.

The larger dispatch companies in Winnipeg require drivers under their banner to pay a fee and comply with company service standards. Unicity has a documented schedule of standards and penalties, while Duffy’s administers their standards and penalties more informally.

### 6.3.7 Taxicab Customers

Taxicab customers may access the service for a variety of purposes, including transportation to work, to the airport, for personal needs (e.g., groceries, appointments) and for social outings or entertainment, whether as residents or visitors to Winnipeg. The Taxicab Board does not collect data on customers, or
require taxicabs to do so. The 2009 Winnipeg Taxi Study estimated approximately 50 per cent of the general population would use taxicab services at least once during the year, with factors such as long winter months influencing demand. Other reports have indicated that more frequent users include the elderly, persons with mobility challenges, those with low income and people without access to a vehicle (Hara Associates, 2010), (Leger, 2014).

The representative public telephone survey resulted in a somewhat different taxicab user profile than other studies in terms of age and income as shown below. Online survey respondents report higher overall usage of services (except handicap van and Handi-Transit) as well as a higher frequency of use. They were also much more likely to have used Transportation Network Services.

**Figure 10 Winnipeg Taxicab Users Summary Profile**

**Who Uses Taxicabs in Winnipeg?**

- 62 per cent of Winnipeggers use a taxi at least once per year
- 15 per cent use taxis on a monthly basis or more
- 45 per cent of trips are for travel to or from the airport
- 38 per cent of trips are to get home from a night out
- Central Winnipeg uses taxis the most – 77 per cent use a taxi at least every few months
- Almost 2/3 of men have used a limousine in the past five years, compared to only 38 per cent of women

**Figure 11 Public Survey Respondent Taxicab Usage Past Five Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Telephone (N=500)</th>
<th>Online (N=9,215)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional taxi service</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg Transit Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limo or Town Car hired vehicle service</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible taxi service</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg Handi-Transit bus service</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Network service like Uber</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handi-cab van service</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Survey responses in Winnipeg showed higher use among those with a household income of $60,000 or more and those under the age of 55. Limousine and accessible taxicab/handicab van users are slightly older, with over 58 per cent being older than 55. However, due to the small sample size of these users, this data is less reliable than the data for standard taxicab users.

Source: Public telephone survey
Four per cent of telephone survey respondents (n=500) indicated that they have used accessible taxicab service and two (2) per cent indicated they have used handicab van service in the past 5 years. In the online survey conducted by MNP, 3.9 per cent of respondents indicated that they have used accessible taxicab service and 1.4 per cent indicated they have used handicab van service in the past five years. Consultation findings indicated there is a preference for accessible taxicab service over handicab vans due to the lower cost and increased booking flexibility.

When asked, “What are your reasons for using the service”, telephone survey respondents who had used a taxicab service in the past five years named Going to the airport and Getting home from a night out most frequently. It should be noted that respondents age 35 and over are significantly more likely to use a taxicab to travel to and from the airport (56%) than those under 35 years of age (10%). Respondents under the age of 55 are significantly more likely to use a taxicab to get home from a night out (50%) than those over age 55 (14%).
Certain businesses may also be considered indirect customers of taxicab services such as hotels, airports, hospitals and special events that seek to ensure effective access to taxicab services as part of their overall service experience and objectives (e.g., to avoid congestion at airports). The Winnipeg Airports Authority establishes exclusive contracts with a taxicab provider and executive car service to ensure a sufficient supply of vehicles for hire at the airport. Pickups at the airport are tracked by sensors attached to the vehicle. Dispatchers may compensate hotels to become the preferred service provider for hotel patrons, whether at the hotel taxicab stand or as may be contacted by the concierge.

6.4 Winnipeg Market Information

Demand for taxicab services is influenced by population growth, employment growth, airport trip volume, convention travel and transit ridership, cost of the service and cost of private vehicle ownership (City of Portland Revenue Bureau, 2012), (Taxi Research Partners, 2013), (Hara Associates, 2013).

Winnipeg’s Population and Projected Growth

As of July 2015, the city of Winnipeg had an estimated population of 718,400. This represents seven per cent growth since 2010. While the number of people living in Winnipeg has grown considerably, the physical boundaries of Winnipeg have not changed since 1993. Total street length grew from 3,207 in 2006 to 3,578 by 2014.
The surrounding census metropolitan area (CMA) was estimated to have a population of 75,000 for a total Winnipeg CMA of approximately 793,400 in 2015, eight per cent higher than in 2010. The CMA includes the city of Winnipeg and the municipalities of West St. Paul, East St. Paul, Headingley, MacDonald, Richot, Tache, Springfield, Rosser, St. François Xavier, St. Clements, and Brokenhead First Nation.

Winnipeg’s population is forecast to grow a further six per cent to 762,700 by 2020; with the total CMA reaching 845,700 by 2020. The CMA population is projected to exceed one million by 2035 (City of Winnipeg, 2016).

Winnipeg’s Indigenous population represents 10 per cent of the overall population. This is the highest percentage of all Canadian urban centres. Winnipeg’s Indigenous population has grown by almost 9,000 people since the mid-nineties and is expected to be more than 100,000 people by the year 2020.

**Growing Accessibility Needs & Aging Population**

Approximately 200,000 Manitobans (15.6 per cent) deal with barriers to accessibility. Nationally, 7.2 per cent have a mobility related disability (Statistics Canada, 2015). Applied to Winnipeg, this results in between 52,000 and 112,000 persons that may require accessible transportation.

The population of persons who require accessible services is expected to grow along with the aging population. While less than seven per cent of the population under age 44 has a disability, this increases to over 26 per cent by age 65 and 43 per cent for people 75 years of age or older (Statistics Canada, 2013). A senior may be affected by the same barriers as a person with a lifelong disability, but not identify him/herself as a person with a disability. Winnipeg’s 75+ population is expected to increase by 140 per cent, or 71,600 people by 2040 (City of Winnipeg, 2016). This would increase demand for accessible services by approximately 30,000 to bring the total to about 20 per cent of the population.

*The Accessibility for Manitobans Act* was enacted in 2013 and the Accessibility Standard for Customer Service Regulation became law in 2015. Private sector and non-profit organizations with at least one employee have until November 2018 to comply with this Regulation. The standard defines accessible customer service as “when all persons ...have the same opportunity to obtain, use or benefit from a service”. This could be interpreted to mean that passengers requiring accessible taxicab service should be able to obtain on-demand service with similar wait times as standard taxicab service. Additional standards are planned, including a Transportation Standard to address barriers in public transportation that may impose additional requirements on the taxicab industry.
6.4.1 Income

The median total family income for Winnipeg in 2014 was $79,850 and represents an 11 per cent increase from 2010 to 2014. The median family income for Canada was $78,870 (Statistics Canada, 2016). Wages in the province of Manitoba increased by 2.6 per cent per year on average from 2011 to 2015, slightly above the national average increase of 2.5 per cent (Suzuki, 2016). Winnipeg’s median individual income in 2014 was $34,090 (Statistics Canada, 2014).

Figure 17 Median Individual Total Income

In 2015, the low income cut off (LICO before tax) for one person living in a community with a population over 500,000 was $24,409 (Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, 2015). The percentage of people age 25 to 64 with income of less than $25,000 in Winnipeg ranges from 23 per cent to 29 per cent. The percentage increases to 43 per cent for people over age 65.

6.4.2 Employment

Economic Development Winnipeg reports that Winnipeg’s unemployment rate was 6 per cent compared to 6.9 per cent nationally in 2015. The number of people employed in the city grew by seven per cent or 29,538 positions between 2010 and 2015 (Suzuki, 2016). The proportion of the employed labour force that uses a taxicab to commute to work is slightly lower in Winnipeg than in the cities of Calgary and Edmonton; and higher than in the cities of Ottawa and Vancouver.

6.4.3 Transportation Expenditures

Average household expenditures increased in Manitoba from 2013 to 2014, including an increase in expenses allocated to transportation. While Manitoba’s average household expenditures are 94 per cent of the national average, Manitobans spend more than the national average on transportation.
Table 4 Transportation Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average transportation expenditures, Canada &amp; Manitoba</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total household expenditures - Canada</td>
<td>$79,098</td>
<td>$80,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation expenditures - Canada</td>
<td>$12,044</td>
<td>$11,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of total expenditure - Canada</strong></td>
<td>15.23%</td>
<td>14.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total household expenditures - Manitoba</td>
<td>$73,657</td>
<td>$76,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation expenditures - Manitoba</td>
<td>$11,803</td>
<td>$12,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of total expenditure - Manitoba</strong></td>
<td>16.02%</td>
<td>16.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Statistics Canada, 2016)

A lower proportion of the labour force in Winnipeg uses taxicabs for their commute than in other major cities in Canada.

Figure 18 Employed Labour Force using Taxicabs for Commute, 2006

![Employed Labour Force Using Taxicabs for Commute, 2006](image)

Source: Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population

**Travel and Tourism**

Tourism temporarily increases the city’s population as well as demand for vehicles for hire. Overnight person visits in Winnipeg were estimated at 1.5 million in 2014. Forecasted visits of 1.6 million in 2016 indicate an increase of seven per cent (Tourism Winnipeg, 2015).

The Winnipeg Airports Authority reports an increase in passenger volumes of 12 per cent from 2010 to 2015. Volumes to the end of September 2016 are up 6 per cent year over year. The highest passenger volumes are typically in July and August (WAA, 2016), however, taxicab usage at the airport is highest in the winter months. More information is included with the trip analysis below.
6.5  Taxicab Trips in Winnipeg

To understand current levels of activity, the Taxicab Board requested trip data from all taxicab business licence holders (standard, accessible, handicab van and limousine). Data was received from the two largest taxicab dispatch companies representing 99 per cent of standard taxicabs and 89 per cent of seasonal taxicabs. Due to changes in dispatch systems, one company provided ten months of data that bridged two calendar years. Data for the months of January through April 2015 should be considered estimates only, as extracted from the data provided.

Dispatched Taxicab Trips

A dispatched trip results from a request for service through a dispatch service, either by telephone, the dispatch service’s App or online booking. A request for service to the dispatch may be for immediate pick-up or it may be pre-booked for a scheduled pick-up time in the future.

Most of the time, a dispatched call will result in a completed trip when the taxicab picks up the customer and delivers the requested service. A call may also be cancelled after it has been dispatched or the taxicab may arrive and find out that the caller is gone, which is called a “no show”.

An estimated total of 2.8 million dispatched trips were completed by taxicabs affiliated with the two large dispatch companies in 2015. The number of dispatched taxicab trips in a month ranges from a low of 243,000 in August to a high of over 326,000 in December. The percentage of trips that are cancelled is lower in the summer (averaging 5.6 per cent) than in the winter (averaging 7 per cent). The percentage of “no shows” is fairly stable at around 7.6 per cent but is slightly higher in the winter. The pattern of dispatched trips is shown in the chart below.

Figure 19  Dispatched Taxicab Trips - 2015
**Completed Taxicab Trips**

In addition to dispatched trips, taxicabs will also pick up customers that hail them in the street, at designated taxi stands or at various locations where people tend to need a taxi, such as hotels, restaurants, bars, tourist attractions, sporting events or hospitals. All of these trips are considered “street hails”. Trips that originate from the airport are reported separately. The data on the number of airport trips is provided by the Winnipeg Airports Authority (WAA) which records all of the trips originating from the airport.

There were a combined total of approximately 4.1 million trips completed by the two large dispatch companies in 2015. Approximately 23.4 per cent of trips were street hails, with another 7.2 per cent from the airport. Street hail activity at public and private taxicab stands (excluding the airport), appears highest in October and November. There is believed to be a certain percentage of street hail activity for short trips that is not reported. The volume of trips originating from the airport is fairly consistent throughout the year.

*Figure 20 Completed Taxicab Trips 2015*

![Graph showing completed taxicab trips by month.]

**Trips by Hour of the Day**

There is a distinct pattern of the number of taxicab trips occurring at different times in the day. The number of taxicab trips ranges from a low of about 298 trips between 4 a.m. to 5 a.m. to a high of almost 620 trips between 2 p.m. and 3 p.m. In general, the volume of taxicab trips is highest in the afternoon and evening. Taxicab use is high again in the hours just before and after midnight.
Trips by Area of Winnipeg

Unicity and Duffy's each divide the city into over 20 different zones, and track the number of trips that originate from each zone. Although similar, the zones and the boundaries that the two companies have defined are not the same. For the purpose of this review, the zones were roughly combined to show the number of trips originating from general areas of the city as shown below.
In proportion to the size of the area, there is a much higher concentration of taxicab trips in the downtown area and the central area surrounding downtown.

**Airport Activity**

Taxicab and limousine trips combined from the airport represented 8.6 per cent of passenger volumes in 2015, up from 7.7 per cent in 2010. Taxicab trips increased by 24 per cent over this period from an average of 645 trips per day to 797 trips per day. Limousine trips increased 45 per cent from an average of 62 per day in 2010 to 89 per day in 2015. On average, limousines captured about 8 per cent of total trips over this period with a high of 10 per cent in 2015.

**Figure 24 Airport Passenger and Trip Volumes**

Source: Winnipeg Airports Authority
6.6 Financial Performance

The TCB collected financial data from Winnipeg taxicab business licence (TBL) holders to assess current financial performance in the industry. The TCB has authority to collect this data under Regulation 209/91. The TCB has an interest in financial performance as it sets the fares that drive industry revenue. If regulated fares are too low, the industry will not be sustainable. Financial data for 2014 was submitted for 429 of the 656 taxicab business licences issued. The percentage reporting, by licence type, is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxicab Business Licence Type</th>
<th>Licences Reporting Financial Data</th>
<th>Number of Licences in 2014</th>
<th>Percentage of Licences Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard*</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicab van</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limousine</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Transportation</td>
<td>(defunct category)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard category includes three Seasonal licences

The number of handicab vans and limousine licence holders that submitted financial data for this report was not sufficient to provide a reliable benchmark for these categories.

Data for only three seasonal taxicab licence holders was included with the TBL holders’ annual taxicab business licence information. While this may have the effect of lowering the overall average revenue per licence, the impact on the average of 373 licences was insignificant (0.05%), and made no change in cost categories.

The TCB also collected and tabulated data provided by licence holders for 2015. MNP was not able to segregate this data and perform the same detailed analysis, however, overall results and expense ratios for 2015 are similar to 2014.

Revenues

Revenue is the total of all fares and other income reported in the year. The graph beside shows the average revenue reported for each type of taxicab business licence and a combined average of all taxicab types.

Average revenue reported for standard taxicabs, at $70,080, was the largest among all types of taxicabs. Accessible taxicabs averaged only $46,628 in revenue. As the fare rate structure for accessible taxicabs is the same as for standard taxicabs, this indicates utilization of a standard taxicab is much higher than
an accessible taxicab. Only a small number of accessible taxicabs are affiliated with the two major dispatch companies.

The average annual revenue for handicab vans was $62,828, which is significantly better than for accessible taxis. Average revenue reported for limousines was only $21,813. Limousine fares are fixed amounts that typically exceed the cost of a taxicab for the same trip. This indicates that the utilization of limousines is fairly low, which is consistent with many limousines being used sparingly for special occasions. This may not be a reliable indication of all limousines due to the low response rate in this category.

Expenses

Reported expenses were grouped into major expense categories. The results for the average expenses and net income for each type of taxicab are presented below.
Expenses are illustrated as a percentage of the revenues in the figure below

Figure 27 Average Summary Expenses and Net Income as a Percentage of Revenue by Vehicle Type

Vehicle operating costs, including fuel, repairs and maintenance, insurance, etc. are between 32 per cent and 46 per cent of revenue. Salaries, wages and benefits (wages) are the next largest expense category. While wages as a percentage of revenue are quite low for accessible taxicabs, net income is higher. This may in part reflect how owners are paying themselves.

Management and administration includes, among other things, fees paid for affiliation with a taxicab dispatch company and fees for clerical, book-keeping and professional services. These costs are reduced or non-existent for more independent taxicab business licence holders who handle their own needs for dispatch and administrative support.

Compensation for Taxicab Business Licence Owners

The majority of the standard taxis are basically independent small businesses. The owners may also be drivers and pay themselves a wage for driving the taxicab. Most owners will hire one or more drivers and take shifts operating the taxi. Therefore, the salaries, wages and benefits may be paid to two or more drivers. Most often, drivers retain the fares earned during their shift less payments to the owner of the taxicab for:

- Rental of the vehicle ($85 to $100 per shift)
- Workers Compensation Board premiums
- Fuel consumed and car washes
- GST
A small number of standard taxicab drivers indicated they have an arrangement whereby they split the total day’s fares 50/50 with the owner of the taxicab, less fuel, car washes and GST. Generally, this arrangement is preferred, as the financial risks are shared with the owner of the taxicab, however, consultation feedback indicated that this option is not available to most Winnipeg standard taxicab drivers. It is a common practice for limousine drivers to receive a percentage of the fare (commission) as compensation. None of the standard taxicab drivers who participated in consultations indicated they received an hourly wage from the owner of the taxicab.

Based on the information collected, the annual average of *salaries, wages and benefits* for the standard taxicab business licence holder is approximately $21,000 (see Figure 26).

For these companies, the amount that they record as *net income* is another form of compensation for the owner. Not all of *net income* is available to the owner. The owner must pay taxes on the *net income* and must also repay any debt incurred by the company, typically for capital investment in the taxicab and taxicab business licence. The average total compensation per taxicab business licence is presented in the figure below.

*Figure 28 Total Compensation per Taxicab Licence*

Income reported by standard taxicab owners in the Driver/Owner survey was somewhat higher than the figures calculated above, with 59 per cent of owners reporting annual earnings of over $35,000, compared to 49 per cent of the Winnipeg population (Statistics Canada, 2014). Ninety-five per cent of standard taxicab owners reported they work full time, defined for the survey as more than 30 hours per week. It is not clear whether owners are reporting the rent paid to them by drivers, which would be approximately $30,000 - $35,000, as calculated, for one shift daily for the full year.
Figure 29 below illustrates owner income reported in the Driver/Owner survey.

**Figure 29 Owner Standard Taxicab Reported Income Range**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Standard Taxi - Reported Income Range</th>
<th>N=136</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under $20,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 – 34,999</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $64,999</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 – $99,999</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000- $149,999</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Driver/Owner survey

*Please note: There were not a sufficient number of limousine, accessible taxicab and handicab van owners who provided income information in the survey to report their results.*

**Capital Investment by Taxicab Owners**

There are three components of capital investment required to enter the taxicab industry. These are all purchases made privately, and do not involve the Taxicab Board. Estimated costs of these components for a standard taxicab are provided in the table below.

**Table 6 Capital Investment for Standard Taxicabs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Investment (Standard taxi)</th>
<th>Estimated Cost or Range</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>$6,000 - $35,000</td>
<td>The cost will range depending on the category, make and model of the vehicle and whether it is new or used. The amount shown is for a standard taxicab. Handicab vans, limousines or buses would typically be significantly more expensive ($60,000 to $85,000 or greater).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Equipment</td>
<td>$4,000 - $5,000</td>
<td>This would include outfitting the vehicle with all necessary equipment, such as taximeter, safety shield, security camera, etc. The cost would be significantly more for a handicab van that requires extra safety equipment and a wheelchair ramp or lift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxicab Business Licence (market price for private transaction)</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>This is an approximate amount based on recent sale transfer values as a private transaction between a licence holder and a person that wishes to acquire a licence. When acquired from the TCB, the licence fee is $200. The highest actual price for a standard taxicab licence transfer in Winnipeg in 2016 was $406,000 (Taxicab Board, 2016). In the three years previous, transfers ranged from $100,000 to $505,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Driver Income**

According to the Driver/Owner survey, 88 per cent of standard taxicab drivers reported earning under $35,000, compared to 51 per cent of the Winnipeg population (Statistics Canada, 2014). More than 50 per cent of standard taxicab drivers report earnings below the Low Income Cut Off (LICO) (2015:$24,409) (Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, 2015).

*Figure 30 Standard Taxicab Driver Reported Income Range*

![Standard Taxicab Driver - Reported Income Range](image)

Source: Driver/Owner survey

Standard taxicab drivers that responded to the Driver/Owner survey indicated their top priority as improved work conditions. Focus group and interview participants expanded on this topic, indicating that because of the high rental cost and other expenses they must pay per shift, many work 12-hour shifts without breaks to try and maximize their earning potential. Others indicated they are not offered enough shifts and must supplement their income with jobs outside the industry. Many drivers also commented that they are often assigned the less lucrative non-peak period shifts. The owner of the taxicab keeps the preferred shifts for themselves. Drivers must pay a fee and comply with service standards set by the dispatch companies and are subject to fines or other penalties for non-compliance. Some feel that penalties are issued unfairly. Drivers do not receive vacation pay or vacation time from the taxicab licence owner. Drivers who have been able to obtain ownership or part ownership of a vehicle reported being refused dispatch services by the large dispatch companies.

With the two large dispatch companies controlling the bulk of the driving opportunities in Winnipeg, drivers do not feel they have any choice but to comply with the less than ideal conditions to maintain standing with the owners.

The practice of taxicab drivers paying a rental fee to the owner of the taxicab is common in many North American cities. According to Manitoba Labour and Immigration, the status of taxicab drivers as an employee or an independent contractor is currently a grey area, dependent on how the contractual arrangement and the work to be performed lines up with certain factors listed in the table below the most important being how much influence a worker has over their own work. MNP reviewed the position of
of taxicab driver in the Winnipeg industry in relation to the identified standards. These comments are based on the information gathered for this study and general circumstances, not an individual case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors to consider</th>
<th>MNP Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of control over own activities (most important)</td>
<td>Generally, driver trips assigned by dispatch, customer service standards set by owner/dispatch, shifts directed by owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When, where, how will accomplish work</td>
<td>Low control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of tools/equipment</td>
<td>Drivers operate owners’ vehicles. Some pay daily lease fee as part of pay arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of financial risk taken</td>
<td>No financial investment in the enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for profit</td>
<td>Some possibility of increasing earnings through own practices (e.g., street hails / taxi stands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring own helpers</td>
<td>Drivers perform own work without helpers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of responsibility for investment and management</td>
<td>Drivers do not invest or manage the business (e.g., affiliation with dispatch)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above, a driver may reasonably be considered an employee. An individual driver may find it difficult to represent their interests to the Labour Board with the power imbalance and limited choice in the industry.

**Industry Benchmarks**

According to IBISWorld, wages make up about 44.8 per cent of revenue (IBIS World, 2015). Vehicle expenses represent a significant component of revenue including fuel (15%), depreciation (3.9%), financing costs for the purchase or lease of the taxicab business licence, and other costs associated with maintaining and operating the taxi.

While the cost categories cannot be directly related to the data collected from Winnipeg taxicabs, the information is comparable. The combination of profit and wages for all types of taxicabs in Winnipeg is 49.8 per cent as compared to the Canadian benchmark of 56.4 per cent. Total vehicle costs for Winnipeg taxicabs are estimated at 32.9 per cent of revenue. IBISWorld indicates that costs categorized in Purchases, Depreciation and components of Rent & Utilities and Other are vehicle costs. Combining these items would represent a similar component of revenue.
Part III – Findings and Recommendations

7.0 REGULATORY STRUCTURE

7.1 Effectiveness and Efficiency

Central to the effectiveness of a regulatory body is the effectiveness and efficiency of the regulations themselves. Some characteristics of effective regulation include:

- **Necessary and proportional** – Regulations intervene only to the extent necessary, where the result cannot be achieved through other means such as market forces and incentives, and with clear emphasis on serving the public interest.

- **Efficient and effective** – Regulations provide the greatest overall benefit by ensuring they are efficient and effective. Clear objectives are defined, the regulation achieves the desired outcome, at the lowest possible cost. This includes consistency and alignment with other related regulation.

- **Accountable** – Decisions are made on the basis of evidence and stand up to public scrutiny.

- **Transparent** – Processes and regulatory decisions are open. Affected parties are engaged to provide a voice, enable market certainty, reinforce credibility and engender public trust.

- **Adaptable and current** – Regulations are subject to regular review to ensure they are achieving the intended result, remain relevant, and reflect the current knowledge and environment.

- **Practical and enforceable** – Requirements that cannot be enforced do not serve the public interest, and diminish credibility of the regulatory system.

(Better Regulation Task Force, 2003; Boothe, 2013; Public Governance Dept., 2016)

The TCB Office reports that many clauses of the Taxicab Regulations are out of date and do not reflect current practice. The Taxicab Regulations contain procedural requirements that limit the ability to incorporate new technology or streamline processes, impacting efficiency and effectiveness. Other requirements can be vague or subjective and require additional policy to support consistent, objective application. The TCB does not currently have well-document policies. They follow the TCB mandate and objectives and rely on documented procedures, processes and Taxicab Board notices. Having policies would assist the Taxicab Board and staff with enforcement of *The Taxicab Act* and Regulations more fairly and consistently.

Regulation 209/91 includes a number of prohibitions that now duplicate general and specific requirements under other enactments, including *The Highway Traffic Act* (e.g., seatbelts, use of cell phone), and Workplace Safety and Health (e.g., requirements for protective equipment).
7.1.1 Insights from Other Jurisdictions

Other jurisdictions vary in the degree to which detail is specified in governing by-laws. Edmonton, for example, relies on market forces for all elements related to customer service, including driver knowledge of the city and English language skills. The main body of the new by-law is 22 pages in length. Ottawa, by contrast, includes significant detail in its new by-law, which is 86 pages in length.

7.1.2 Recommendation

1. Simplify and minimize the regulations to only those elements necessary to serve the public interest (safety and consumer protection) and which cannot be achieved through market forces and innovation.

This includes:
- Remove procedural elements, and provide authority to the TCB or Director to establish related policies and procedures
- Remove requirements for training, appearance, service and other prohibitions which are unnecessary to the safety and security of the driver or passenger
- Remove vehicle standards not related to safety or identification (e.g., cleanliness, trunk space, signs) and standardize vehicle age limitations to the extent possible or practical
- Remove requirements for annual financial returns
- Avoid duplication where other regulations govern

Details on further implications for regulatory change are included under the topic areas that follow.

**Rationale:** Standards of service, appearance or effective performance of duties (e.g., knowledge of the city) should be considered the responsibility of the employer and more effectively supported through market forces where there is reasonable choice. Removing these elements reduces the administrative and enforcement burden for the TCB, enabling focus on areas where regulation and compliance is important to passenger safety and consumer protection. Overlap with other legislation is unnecessary, inefficient, and may create inconsistencies as the various enactments are updated.

**Impact:** To the extent the removal of regulatory content alleviates the burden on the industry, it will help to reduce costs and enable more flexible and adaptive market response. Reducing the regulatory requirements will also reduce the administrative and enforcement requirements on the TCB. Resources will be required to review and re-draft the Regulation. Consideration should be given to all recommendations that impact regulations as part of the comprehensive review. [Impacts Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(2), Supply and Demand recommendations 8(8) and 8(9); Licensing Structure recommendations 9(1) and 9(7); Customer Service recommendation 12(1)]
7.2 Provincial Regulation of Taxicab Industry

Some jurisdictions have provincial legislation. In most cases the municipality is the primary licensing and enforcement body of the service within its municipal boundaries. Calgary, Edmonton, Hamilton, Ottawa, Regina, Saskatoon, Halifax, Toronto and other municipalities govern the taxicab industry and vehicles for hire through municipal by-laws. Vancouver also has a municipal by-law, although there is additional provincial regulation through the Passenger Transportation Board.

There are a number of advantages to municipal regulation, including coordination and cooperation with the municipal police service, customer contact systems (e.g., 311), parking and by-law enforcement resources. It also allows the municipality to enable or support a vehicle for hire industry that meets its particular needs.

Winnipeg is unique in that the taxicab industry is solely regulated by a provincial body. The Taxicab Act was created in 1935 when what is now Winnipeg was made up of 13 municipalities. These municipalities were amalgamated into the city of Winnipeg in 1972 (City of Winnipeg, 2014). This event would have been a logical time to transition regulation to the city as well. In the years since, Winnipeg has again grown and is part of a Census Metropolitan Area that includes eleven municipalities. The CMA, by definition, includes municipalities where 50 per cent or more of the population commutes to the city for employment or education. The proportion of the CMA population outside of Winnipeg has been growing, and is expected to grow in the future at a faster pace than within the city.

The partnership of the Manitoba Capital Region is made up of municipalities in the capital region, established with the purpose of developing a competitive, economically strong region and cooperation on issues that cross municipal boundaries. The partnership’s Transportation and Shared Services Strategy states:

*If the Capital Region is to function effectively as more than the sum of its parts, it will be largely due to the manner in which the provision of services and infrastructure are addressed on a regional scale. Addressing transportation as a comprehensive, integrated network is fundamental as is the pursuit of service-sharing agreements to promote an expanded range of services while ensuring the efficient use of resources. (Partnership of the Manitoba Capital Region, 2016)*

The strategy includes implementing a Regional Transportation Plan with goals that include ensuring the efficient and safe movement of people and goods in the region, and advancing environmental sustainability. A related objective is to research current transportation modes and travel distances, and assess the feasibility and potential priority areas for public transportation and car-pooling options.

None of the other municipalities in the CMA have established by-laws to regulate vehicles for hire. The city of Selkirk, which is considered outside the CMA but within the capital region does have a vehicle for hire by-law. There are some vehicle for hire companies licensed by the Motor Transport Board that operate from CMA municipalities. This has caused some challenges and concerns as the rates for service differ, and a vehicle for hire travelling into or out of the city of Winnipeg should be changing the rate...
charged for that portion of the trip. Tourism Winnipeg has also indicated the current system creates challenges for service from the airport to surrounding municipalities. The current structure also means that a vehicle for hire is unable to secure a return fare, and creates inefficient use of the vehicle for hire fleet.

7.2.1 Recommendation

2. **Review the regulatory structure to determine whether it is best served at the municipal or provincial level, including consultations with CMA municipalities.** If it is determined the best fit remains at the provincial level, consider including all CMA municipalities under the same regulatory structure.

**Rationale:** There are advantages to oversight of the vehicle for hire industry at the municipal level that may improve both efficiency and effectiveness. Transportation Network Companies are driving regulatory change and will require further evaluation for municipalities outside of Winnipeg. Including the regional municipalities in the regulatory response for Winnipeg will support consistency across the region. Looking forward, regional integration is expected to be increasingly important. Further consultations with the affected municipalities and provincial departments is required to understand the perspectives, needs and interests of these affected parties.

**Impacts:** Resources would be required to undertake consultations with regional municipalities. A change to a municipal by-law system would require development of a by-law and associated administrative and enforcement capacity at the municipal level. A shift in regulatory authority would impact the current staff of the TCB, who are now provincial employees. Expanding the mandate of the TCB to include regional municipalities involves the application of two provincial statutes and as such are subject to the same legislative authority. Expanding the mandate may impact administrative and enforcement workload. There are currently only a small number of vehicles for hire operating in the CMA outside of Winnipeg. The TCB may be able to cooperate with the Motor Transport Board to continue the current approach to on-road inspections in rural areas.

A regional system would expand the market opportunity for the current industry, increasing competition. Taxicab companies in the CMA areas may be resistant to competition from the larger dispatch companies from the city, however customer service standards will ultimately impact which company customers contact for service. This would also increase customer choice. The residing population of these areas are often in the city of Winnipeg for work and travel. An expansion to the CMA region would have positive changes for the public in terms of customer service, as taxicab drivers would be more willing to take trips out to the CMA if they could pick up a fare for the return trip to Winnipeg, and vice versa. Improved access to vehicles for hire may encourage use of public transportation, improve safety and reduce the environmental impact of personal vehicles. [Relevant to and supports Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(1)]
8.0 SUPPLY AND DEMAND

8.1 Demand for Vehicles for Hire in Winnipeg

Key drivers of demand for vehicle for hire service include population growth, tourist and business visitor volume. As illustrated in the Winnipeg market profile, the city has experienced growth in both population and passenger traffic at the airport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Increase 2010 to 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Passengers</td>
<td>+12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Taxicab / Limousine Trips</td>
<td>+24% / 45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trip volumes for standard taxicab (dispatch + street hail + airport) from April to September average about 10,300 trips per day, or about 25 trips per day per taxicab. From November through March trip volumes average 12,000 per day, or about 23 trips per day per taxicab with the addition of the seasonal licences. Volumes in October are 96 per cent of the November to March average, with daily trips per taxi at 28 without seasonal taxicabs.

Reliable data was not available for this study to assess demand or wait times for accessible taxicab or handicab van service in Winnipeg. Some limited data was reported for ten of forty-nine licensed accessible taxicabs from three companies. While the data is too limited to be a reliable representation of this segment of the industry, some understanding may be drawn from it. Average monthly trips per vehicle ranged from just under 300 to about 500 per month, or between 10 to 17 trips per day. This is about half to three quarters of the volume serviced by standard taxicabs. Three quarters or more of the trips by accessible taxicabs were for standard (non-wheelchair) customers.

MNP reviewed Handi-Transit statistics to determine whether there is evidence of increasing demand. The city of Winnipeg’s Handi-Transit service contracts with private service providers for the transportation of clients in cars, wheelchair accessible vans and wheelchair accessible mini-buses. Individuals must apply to become a client. Fares for Handi-Transit service are the same as for standard bus service. Users pre-book the service for a certain time (City of Winnipeg, 2016). The number of active Handi-Transit registrants declined by about five per cent.
from 2012 to 2014 (City of Winnipeg, 2016). In 2014, Handi-Transit carried 465,696 passengers. The service was unable to provide 3,773 trip requests (below three-year average of 3,954), and reported 7,343 customer no shows (above three year average of 7,049). The City of Winnipeg attributes the decline in Handi-Transit use to free access on the regular fixed route transit system, an increase in the number of Easy Access buses on fixed routes, and improving eligibility screening. While this data does not indicate an increase in demand for Handi-Transit, other factors may also impact use, such as ease of access, wait times, customer service, and available alternatives.

8.2 Supply in Winnipeg

The Taxicab Act provides the Taxicab Board the authority to determine the number and type of licenses to be issued. The Act specifies “the board shall consider the public convenience and necessity in respect of the number of taxicabs required.” In addition to the annual licences, the Taxicab Board approves seasonal and temporary licences.

The supply of licensed taxicabs in Winnipeg, by category, from 2008 to 2015 is shown below. While standard taxicab numbers have remained flat at 410, total annual supply has increased by 9 per cent, reflecting a 52 per cent increase in the number of accessible taxicabs and handicab vans. A significant increase in the number of seasonal taxicabs in 2015 provided an overall fleet increase of 15 per cent from November to March compared to 2008.

Figure 33 Standard and Accessible Taxicab Licences by Category – 2008 to 2015
The number of limousines and buses increased by almost 240 per cent from 2008 to 2012 before returning to 2010 levels in December 2015. This is approximately two times the fleet in 2008.

Figure 34 Limousine and Bus Licences by Category – 2008 to 2016

Taxi cab Licence Transfer Values

The value of licence transfers on the secondary market is an indication of scarcity, or excess, supply. The value of the licence will increase as the revenue opportunity per car increases. Licence values are commonly seen in Canadian cities in the $150,000 to $250,000 range with some over $300,000. In Winnipeg, licence values have been elevated for some time indicating a possible scarcity of supply.
Focus group participants indicated rents paid by the driver to the owner for use of the car ranged from $85 to $100 per day depending on the arrangement. This rent to the owners provides an additional potential $31,000 to $36,500 income from one shift, and essentially finances the taxicab. This rent amount also appears to be higher than in other markets, with reports of $65-85 per day (Reevely, 2016).

**Taxicabs to Population Ratio**

While the number of standard taxicab business licences has not changed since 2010, the total of standard and accessible taxicabs combined has increased from 443 to 462 (4.3 per cent). If considered separately, the ratio of standard taxicabs to total population has been declining, with seven per cent fewer cabs available per capita in 2015 compared to 2010. The ratio of accessible taxicabs to the population of persons with a mobility related disability has improved by almost 50 per cent. Accessible taxicabs do service standard trips as well. When combined, the ratio of standard plus accessible taxicabs to the total population has still declined, but only by 3 per cent. *Forecast population growth indicates an additional 35 standard taxicabs will be needed by 2020 to maintain the current ratio.*
### Table 7 Taxicab to Population Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Winnipeg Population</th>
<th>Persons with Mobility Related Disability (est.)</th>
<th>Standard Taxicab / Total Population Ratio (Standard + Seasonal / Ratio)</th>
<th>Accessible Taxicabs / Mobility Population Ratio</th>
<th>Standard + Accessible Total Population Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>669,400</td>
<td>48,197</td>
<td>410 / 1:1,633 (485 / 1:1,380)</td>
<td>33 / 1:1,461</td>
<td>1:1,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>677,800</td>
<td>48,802</td>
<td>410 / 1:1,653 (485 / 1:1,398)</td>
<td>33 / 1:1,479</td>
<td>1:1,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>689,500</td>
<td>49,644</td>
<td>410 / 1:1,682 (492 / 1:1,401)</td>
<td>34 / 1:1,460</td>
<td>1:1,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>698,600</td>
<td>50,299</td>
<td>410 / 1:1,704 (492 / 1:1,420)</td>
<td>39 / 1:1,290</td>
<td>1:1,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>709,200</td>
<td>51,062</td>
<td>410 / 1:1,730 (495 / 1:1,433)</td>
<td>45 / 1:1,135</td>
<td>1:1,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>718,400</td>
<td>51,725</td>
<td>410 / 1:1,752 (517 / 1:1,439)</td>
<td>52 / 1:995</td>
<td>1:1,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020  (Forecast)</td>
<td>762,700</td>
<td>54,914</td>
<td>435*/ 1:1,1752 *to maintain current level</td>
<td>55*/ 1:995</td>
<td>1:1,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 8.3 Is Supply Meeting Demand?

While supply has not kept pace with demand if measured simply as a ratio of population and visitors, further evidence is needed to understand whether the current supply is providing a sufficient level of service.

##### 8.3.1 Standard Service

One of the most significant measures of satisfaction with taxicab service is the amount of time that a customer must wait from the time they request a taxicab to the time that it arrives at the requested location. This is also an indication of whether there are sufficient available taxicabs to meet demand. Currently only one of the large dispatch companies tracks wait time from request to arrival at the customer location. The available data indicates average wait times range from under seven minutes downtown to approximately eleven minutes in the suburban areas. Generally, acceptable wait times are considered to be in the 10 to 15-minute range. While averages are well within this range, available data does not enable a calculation of the percentage of calls that exceed the standard. The available information is also from the service provider that focuses more on the downtown area and airport, and may under-represent the wait times in the suburban areas that are served by other companies.

Public surveys indicated a degree of dissatisfaction with wait times. Wait time for pickup received the second lowest score for satisfaction among telephone survey respondents at 7.3 out of 10. Fifty-four per cent indicated they have waited too long for a taxicab to arrive. Only 50 per cent of the online survey respondents (higher users) agreed the length of time from call to pick up was appropriate. Ninety-two per cent indicate wait times were important. Long wait times were identified as a priority for improvement by 3,300 online survey respondents (about one third of respondents).
The lack of quality data over an appropriate length of time, especially timely, reliable and complete trip and wait time data, significantly impacts the ability to complete an objective evaluation.

Consultation findings indicated the public feels there is not a sufficient supply of taxicabs, particularly during winter months, peak periods of the day/evening and after special events. Only 26 per cent of online survey respondents agreed there are enough taxis to meet demand. Only 21 per cent believe there are sufficient taxi stands in busy areas. The Winnipeg Airports Authority reports experiencing a shortage of taxicabs on average 24 times per month.

Figure 36 Customer Perception of Supply and Demand

![Survey Results Table]

Source: Online Public Survey

Sixteen per cent of dispatched trips are cancelled or no shows each month (49,180 in winter to 38,330 in summer). While this may be the result of a customer change in plans, it could also be an indicator of waiting too long. The highest volume of cancellations/no shows is during afternoon rush hour (50 per cent higher from 4 to 6 pm than other periods of the day).

The Winnipeg Airports Authority indicated that a shortage of available taxicabs at the airport is a common occurrence, ranging from 5 to over 35 times per month. Complaints to the service provider regarding a lack of available taxicabs are shown on the graph below.
The WAA acknowledges the effort made by the service provider in ensuring sufficient supply to the airport. However, arriving passengers report waiting for a taxicab for long periods of time during the winter charter season. Demand for taxicabs increases significantly during this period due to additional flights and high taxicab usage in the winter overall. The worst times for taxicab shortages at the airport is during shift change from 3 pm to 6 pm and then again from 10 pm to 2 am.

Accessible taxicab drivers from other companies may be called in if the current provider cannot meet the accessible demand at the airport. Accessible drivers and owners would like to see a designated area at the airport for a wheelchair van and/or accessible vehicles for hire.
Drivers and owners dispatched by the airport service provider explained there are opportunity costs associated with waiting in the airport corral. Flight delays often leave drivers waiting longer at the airport for a trip of any distance.

Industry consultations indicated drivers and owners feel there are enough standard taxicabs to meet demand. Summer periods are generally quiet and seasonal licences help meet demand in winter. Longer wait times during rush hours and in the winter are believed to be due more to rush hour traffic congestion and winter driving conditions, not volume of taxicabs. Access to diamond lanes and road repairs were cited as among the top three priorities for change by owners.

*Figure 39 Industry Perception of Supply and Demand*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard Taxi Driver</th>
<th>Standard Taxi Owner/Operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The existing number of licences in Winnipeg is sufficient to meet the demand.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Online Public Survey

Feedback from the industry indicated that a large majority of standard taxicab owners (82%), feel the process for setting the number of taxicab licences is fair, as do nine of the eleven accessible taxicab owners who participated in the online survey. Only half of standard drivers felt the process is fair and the small number of limousine owners who responded to the online survey were dissatisfied with the process.

*Figure 40 Perception of Fairness in Setting Number of Taxicab Licences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard Taxi Driver</th>
<th>Standard Taxi Owner/Operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The process for setting the number of taxicab licences is fair.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Online Driver and Owner Survey
8.3.2 Accessible Service

Organizations representing seniors and persons with disabilities, as well as survey respondents, felt there were not enough accessible taxicabs. Concerns with accessible service include booked accessible vehicles not showing up, and difficulty getting an accessible taxicab during peak hours or late at night. On-demand service similar to that available for standard taxicabs is desired. The organizations also stressed the importance of considering the full range of disabilities in providing accessible service. For example, non-verbal, blind, or deaf passengers require a variety of methods to contact dispatch and the TCB.

Assisting passengers with a mobility assistance device takes time, reducing the number of trips that can be completed in a day. This impacts earnings and creates a disincentive to provide this service, particularly when there is no difference in the fare. Standard taxicab dispatch companies indicate that accessible taxicabs may be unavailable for accessible customers because they are serving standard customers.

8.3.3 Limousines

Limousines and executive sedans serve a niche market that drivers and owners indicate is highly cyclical. Peak demand is experienced in June (graduations) and holiday season. Delay in approvals for temporary licences was seen as a key barrier to having sufficient supply. Otherwise the supply is considered adequate.

Public surveys did not indicate concern with the available supply of limousines.

8.3.4 Transportation Network Services

Public survey responses indicated a transportation network service would be welcomed in Winnipeg. Sixty-four per cent of respondents indicated support for a new ride share service.

The main reasons for support are that it would bring more choice and options to the market, increase competition, increase convenience, reduce wait times and reduce prices. The main concerns expressed by those that did not support such a service included safety and lack of background checks, and the service not being licensed, insured or regulated. Representative organizations expressed similar concerns and reasons for support. Some concern was expressed that improvements are needed to the current system before it could be expected to effectively handle new options for service.

Source: Public Telephone Survey
“Allowing Uber” was the top priority for change among online survey respondents. Other frequent responses indicated a desire for the convenience offered by the technology used by these services, that current fares are too expensive, and wait times too long. Just over a quarter of respondents agreed the existing service in Winnipeg is as good as or better than in other cities and there is a sufficient supply of taxicabs. Less than half indicated they felt safe waiting at a taxi stand.

Industry stakeholders expressed concern that enabling private vehicles for hire would decrease demand for taxicab services and people would lose their livelihoods. Concerns were expressed that the TNC drivers would not service short or late night trips, and would target the higher value trips. This would threaten the viability of the existing taxicab industry, and mean the necessary services may no longer be available in more difficult conditions. Other concerns were that passengers would be less safe if TNC drivers or vehicles are held to a lower standard, that there are some customers who are unwilling or unable to use the App, and that TNC drivers would not offer an accessible service. Taxicab drivers saw potential for a positive impact on working conditions for drivers, including increased autonomy and less exploitation by owners.

8.4 Insights from Other Jurisdictions

8.4.1 Standard Service

Supply is regulated in all other compared jurisdictions, although approaches and classes that are limited vary. Some cities manage supply on the basis of population ratios, others employ multi-factorial models that include fares, employment, low income population, length of winter, and cost of car ownership.

At one taxicab for every 1,555 people, Winnipeg’s ratio of taxicabs to population is lower than all other compared cities, which range from 1:647 in Calgary to 1:1,170 in Hamilton. The average of the five cities compared for this study is one taxi for every 860 people. While caution is warranted in comparisons to other cities as other factors can influence demand, such as weather, visitors, and density, Winnipeg is notably low in the number of available taxicabs for the size of our population.

Table 8 Ratio of Standard and Accessible Taxicabs to Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Ottawa</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,235,171</td>
<td>812,900</td>
<td>519,949</td>
<td>960,756</td>
<td>648,608</td>
<td>718,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Licences</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>1,235 (max)</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>410 (+112 Nov-Mar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Licences</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>95 (8%) (max)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>187 (19%)</td>
<td>133 (22%)</td>
<td>52 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Ratio</td>
<td>1:647 (calculated)</td>
<td>1:611 (calculated)</td>
<td>1:1,170 (calculated)</td>
<td>1:806</td>
<td>1:1,066 + peak period part-time (calculated)</td>
<td>1:1,555 (1:1,252 Nov-Mar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Formula</td>
<td>Maximum # in By-Law</td>
<td>Population Ratio</td>
<td>Population Ratio</td>
<td>Public Convenience &amp; Necessity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None of the compared cities increased the supply on a seasonal basis. Regina and Saskatoon apply this practice. Vancouver boosts the number of taxis available with limited licences that allow an additional 99 taxis on Friday and Saturday nights only (regular numbers are reduced for a net increase of 79).

8.4.2 Accessible Service

Accessible service is a topic that is under review in a number of cities. The common concerns are how to provide the same level of service (e.g., availability, wait times, etc.) as for standard customers, the higher cost of operating accessible services, and how TNCs fit in the accessibility picture. More on this topic is discussed under Licensing Structure in Section 9.0.

The number of accessible vehicles per city and how they are allocated varies across the country. Some jurisdictions such as Calgary and Edmonton set a maximum on the number of accessible vehicles, Ottawa requires that all new taxis are accessible vehicles, and Toronto sets the number at a per cent of taxis, with a goal of 25 per cent by 2021. The Hara Report for the City of Mississauga, which reviewed how many accessible taxis would be required to provide comparable service levels, set a fleet target of 21 per cent (City of Mississauga, 2016). A previous study by Hara for the City of Calgary suggested 11 per cent would provide reasonable service, although at a slightly lower standard than non-accessible (e.g., 77 per cent arrival within 15 minutes compared to 85 per cent for standard taxis). Some cities are requiring accessible taxis to submit trip records on a regular basis to determine whether the service standards and wait times are comparable to standard taxis. In Toronto, TNCs with more than 500 vehicles are required to provide wheelchair accessible service with wait times comparable to standard service (City of Toronto, 2016).

8.4.3 Transportation Network Companies

Edmonton was the first city in Canada to pass a by-law enabling TNC activity (called a Private Transportation Provider or PTP) in March 2016. This was followed by Calgary and Ottawa in April, Toronto in May, and Waterloo Region in August 2016. Reviews are underway in other cities including Hamilton, Mississauga and other cities in southern Ontario. A pilot project in Quebec was launched in October 2016.

Key features of these systems include:

- Pre-arranged bookings only, through a mobile application (App)
  - No street hails or service to taxi stands
  - Functionality requirements include driver and vehicle identification, fare estimates, automated payment, route tracking, driver ratings
- Driver screening by the TNC or regulatory authority
  - Criminal record check; driving record
- Annual vehicle inspections and mechanical safety requirements (verified by TNC, audited by regulator)
- Insurance requirements, with minimum coverage levels similar to taxi
- Ontario and Alberta have approved fleet-style insurance policies that enable coverage for TNC drivers and passengers through the TNC. Intact and Aviva Insurance are currently offering these products.
  
  - Annual broker licence fee paid by TNC
  - Per trip fee, and in some cases per driver fee (versus driver licence fee)
  - Trip data reporting

A comparison of key elements of regulatory frameworks for TNCs is shown below.

**Table 9 Regulatory Framework Across Jurisdictions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TNC Regulations</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Ottawa</th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>Waterloo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By-Law No.</td>
<td>17400</td>
<td>12M2016</td>
<td>2016-272</td>
<td>575-2016</td>
<td>16-044 / 045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective date</td>
<td>Mar 1/16</td>
<td>Apr 4/16</td>
<td>Sept 30/16</td>
<td>Jul 15/16</td>
<td>Nov 1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence Requirement</td>
<td>Class 4 (Commercial)</td>
<td>Class 4 (Commercial)</td>
<td>Class G (General)</td>
<td>Class G (General)</td>
<td>Class G (General)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance (all by TNC)</td>
<td>$1MM TPL; $2MM Auto</td>
<td>$1MM TPL; $2MM Auto</td>
<td>$5MM GL; $2MM Auto</td>
<td>$5MM GL; $2MM Auto</td>
<td>$5MM GL; $2MM Auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Record Checks</td>
<td>Yes – City PS</td>
<td>Yes – City PS</td>
<td>Yes – City PS</td>
<td>Yes - TNC</td>
<td>Yes - TNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers Abstract</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – TNC</td>
<td>Yes – TNC</td>
<td>Yes – TNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Yes – TNC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – TNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Age</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence Fee</td>
<td>$50,000 +$0.06/trip</td>
<td>Varies by size $5,000-$20,000 for 1001+ vehicles) +$0.20/trip</td>
<td>Varies by size $807-$7,253 for 100+ vehicles +$0.11/trip</td>
<td>$20,000 +$0.30/trip</td>
<td>Varies by size $150 - $50,000 for up to 2,999 vehicles +$0.11/trip + $0.07/trip accessibility surcharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Licence Fee</td>
<td>No (per trip fee)</td>
<td>$15 per driver (paid by TNC)</td>
<td>$15 per driver (paid by TNC)</td>
<td>$15 per driver (paid by TNC)</td>
<td>No (per trip fee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fares</td>
<td>TNC set; $3.25 min</td>
<td>TNC set</td>
<td>TNC set</td>
<td>TNC set</td>
<td>TNC set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipal By-Laws and Reports; City of Mississauga Public Vehicle Pilot Program Committee Meeting materials, October 25, 2016

After facing criticism and lawsuits about the inclusiveness of their service in recent years, TNCs are working toward developing the accessibility of their services. Uber has several pilot programs in place including uberWAV for wheelchair accessible vehicles (delivered through partnerships with wheelchair accessible taxis) and uberASSIST which is information targeted to Uber drivers on how to best assist passengers with mobility related disabilities. The Uber App technology is also compatible with VoiceOver iOS, wireless braille display compatibility, visible and vibrating alerts to assist riders with hearing and vision impairments. GPS capabilities, ability to share location and arrival time (live GPS routing), and
Cashless payment transactions also help to better serve passengers. Vision and hearing impaired passengers do not necessarily need accessible vehicles for transportation, but these technology innovations are facilitating and improving their transportation experiences. In addition, Uber uses technology to enable individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing or have mobility related disabilities to be able to work as a driver with Uber (Uber, 2016). The Lyft App has VoiceOver and the company offers local accessible vehicle dispatch services (accessible taxis) and the dispatch of wheelchair accessible vehicles (Lyft drivers) in some markets (Lyft, 2016). These companies are able to adapt their technology to be accessible; the challenge is in having a sufficient number of wheelchair accessible vehicles.

### 8.5 Recommendations

1. **Require dispatch companies and business licence holders to collect, maintain and report trip data on a not-less-than monthly basis.**

   Data should include the number of standard and accessible trips and associated wait times from request for service to pick-up, cancellations and no shows by hour and area of the city. Mandate the use of technology to automate data collection and reporting (e.g., GPS enabled taximeters or Apps with automated upload) to increase efficiency and ensure reliability of data. Publish industry performance data (in aggregate) so that the public is aware of service levels.

   **Rationale:** Service level data is required to evaluate the effectiveness of the taxicab industry in meeting demand for both regular and accessible service.

   **Impact:** Dispatch companies and independent business licence holders have differing capabilities to collect, track and report data. Mandating the use of technology will create a one-time cost for business licence holders. A basic inquiry indicated multiple Canadian suppliers, and a cost of under $500 for a taximeter with this capability. The Taxicab Board will need to make a corresponding investment in a data management system to effectively and efficiently receive and monitor this data. Service to the public can be expected to improve as companies are better able to understand demand and service levels. With reasonable competition, market forces will incent use of this information to benefit customer service. [*Supported by Supply and Demand recommendation 8(2); necessary to enable Supply and Demand recommendation 8(3); dependent on Licensing Structure recommendation 9(4)*]

2. **Develop internal data management capabilities.**

   **Rationale:** The current data available to the TCB is not being used to help inform decision making and policy decisions and requires a fair amount of manipulation to be useful. An improved information management system, knowledge and analytical skills are required to effectively track and report data important to the TCB’s effectiveness.

   **Impact:** The TCB can make informed, data-driven decisions based on an analysis of the data they receive on a wide variety of topics (e.g., licenses, staffing requirements, workload, etc.). [*Necessary for Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1) and 8(3); impacts Safety and Security recommendation*]
3. Establish a maximum total number of metered taxicab licences based on population ratio, with a phased implementation plan.

The maximum total number of licences would be based on the required supply to address demand for both standard and accessible service through all seasons. With reference to other jurisdictions, this may mean over 150 new annual licences. In the short term, the TCB should increase the total number of annual licences by up to the number of seasonal licences in the 2015/16 winter season (102) for the 2017 winter season (instead of seasonal licences). Then approve no further increase in the total number of licences issued for a period of one year following implementation of other licensing changes, and monitoring of service levels at six and twelve months. The target level should then be phased in over a period of three years, while monitoring trip volumes and response times to validate the established ratio. A common service standard is the percentage of calls serviced with wait times within 15 minutes, with a target of 85 per cent. The TCB should establish a subsequent schedule to review the ratio every five years in the context of structural market changes, if any (e.g. increase in airport demand above growth in population, decrease in car ownership). The analysis of market changes should include stakeholder input.

**Rationale:** The current process is resource intensive, slow, and un-informed by objective data. Applicants typically will not have access to data to support their application, and existing competitors can influence decisions to protect their own interests. There are indications in Winnipeg, including high transfer values and public feedback, to believe that more capacity is needed. Establishing a target number based on a population ratio is simple, easy to understand, and creates an objective benchmark that allows for adjustment as demand grows. Allowing stakeholder input on a five-year cycle will help to ensure the target ratio remains valid in potentially evolving market conditions that are not reflected in the population ratio.

**Impact:** Industry impact will increase with the number of new licences issued. The value of a business licence transferred on the secondary market can be expected to decline as new licences are made available. This will have a particularly negative impact on those who have recently purchased a licence at a high value. It will have a positive impact for those who have been unable to finance the purchase of a licence on the secondary market because the values have been too high. It will also be positive for drivers in that it should reduce the rent paid for use of the vehicle, which is driven by the owner’s need to recover their investment in the licence. The process will be more fair to all applicants for a taxicab business licence. Impact on the TCB will be to reduce the requirement for hearings and the associated administrative demand. There were 20 licence application hearings in 2015/2016. [Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendation 8(1); impacted by Supply and Demand recommendation 8(2), 8(4) and 8(5)]
4. **Discontinue use of seasonal licences, and allow licence holders to adjust use of the taxicab according to demand.** Reflect the seasonal demand in target supply ratio.

*Rationale:* Demand for taxicab services is higher in winter months. Currently, annual taxicab licence holders are obligated to have the vehicle in service year round. In slower periods this may create an obligation for operating costs without corresponding income. Allowing licence holders the ability to adjust hours or weeks of use of the vehicle, seasonally if desired, will allow a natural market response. Some limits may be warranted to maintain a licence, for example active use for at least six months of the year. The target maximum number of licences according to population ratio would take periods of elevated demand into consideration.

*Impact:* Licence holders that have previously secured seasonal licences may not have this business opportunity if they do not obtain one of the new annual licences issued under recommendation 2. Licence values on the secondary market can be expected to decline with the influx of annual licences in place of seasonal licences. Discontinuing the practice of issuing seasonal licences will reduce the administrative burden on the Taxicab Board, and eliminate the need for an additional annual application process by owners and a surge in workload for the TCB. There were 78 requests for Power of Attorney to allow TBL holders to be absent for up to 30 days in 2015/16, which would be unnecessary if owners had more flexibility. [Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1), 8(2) and 8(3)]

5. **Continue the practice of issuing new licences only for accessible taxicabs until similar service levels are achieved, then apportion future licences.** “Similar service levels” includes on-demand service with similar response times as for standard taxicabs (e.g., 85 per cent of calls arrive within 15 minutes) as well as reliable pre-booked service. New licenses can then be issued in proportion to the estimated population requiring accessible service (e.g., 1 in 5 licences must be accessible if 20 per cent of the population is considered to require accessible service).

*Rationale:* The Accessibility Standards for Customer Service creates an obligation for accessible service that may be difficult to apply strictly at an individual business owner level. Enabling a supply that balances accessible and standard needs allows accessible services to be available at an industry level and supports the intent of *The Accessibility for Manitobans Act*. Requiring all new taxicabs to be accessible indefinitely will unnecessarily increase system cost.

*Impact:* Converting seasonal standard licences to annual accessible licences provides the opportunity to immediately lift the ratio of accessible taxicabs to target levels. Business licence holders that own extra standard vehicles for prior year seasonal licences may find themselves with a redundant asset. The impact may be mitigated by incentives for conversion of standard to accessible vehicles as per recommendation 6. [Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1), 8(2), 8(3) and supported by 8(6); supported by Licensing Structure recommendation 9(3)]
6. **Create incentives to offset the higher cost to provide accessible service, to ensure accessible taxis are available for this service.**

For example, these may include:

- Grants to reimburse costs for conversion of vehicles to accessible standards, with proof of a minimum threshold of accessible service over the first year
- Subsidized accessibility training
- A ‘top up’ to subsidize validated accessible service, to reflect the additional time required for loading and unloading

**Rationale:** Accessible taxicabs also service the standard population. A taxicab can complete more standard trips with less effort. Since the fares are set the same for both types of service, standard service enables higher income over the same period of time. Incentives are necessary to ensure drivers are not financially penalized by servicing the population requiring accessible service.

**Impact:** Revenue will need to be collected through fees to fund the subsidized service. Some administrative effort will be required to administer the subsidy to accessible taxicabs. [Relevant to and supports Supply and Demand recommendation 8(5); supported by Fares recommendation 10(4)]

7. **Support ongoing access to diamond lanes for standard and accessible taxicabs.**

**Rationale:** The City of Winnipeg has recently approved taxicab use of diamond lanes on a pilot basis. The taxicab industry believes this will result in a significant improvement in arrival time for pick up and availability for the next call during rush hour. Providing timely service between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. is one of the most challenging aspects for the current taxicab fleet. If the pilot project demonstrates the use of diamond lanes may be done safely, and provides the expected benefits, the TCB could identify its support for this strategy.

**Impact:** Customer service and industry utilization will be improved. There will be no impact on the TCB. [Not dependent on other recommendations]

8. **Allow Transportation Network Companies entrance into the market, licensed as a separate category, and require they meet standards for safety and consumer protection similar to the requirements for standard taxicabs.**

This would include:

- Insurance that provides the same coverage as required for standard taxicabs, while permitting a fleet style approach to how the coverage is achieved
- Vehicle safety standards that include annual inspections and proof of mechanical safety requirements (no cameras or shields)
- Driver screening and licensing (Class 4) similar to those required of standard taxicab drivers, which may be administered by the TNC, with documentation submitted to the TCB
- Requirements for driver and vehicle identification in the vehicle and the App used to book the service
- Restrictions on service to only pre-arranged trips through the App, with an advance estimate of the fare and automated payment
- A fee structure that would recover the costs of administration and enforcement to the same degree as achieved for standard taxicabs, including a broker per trip fee and accessibility requirement or surcharge
- Obligations for reporting trip data, including the number of trips by time of day and pick up location, time from request to pick up, and fares

**Rationale:** Limiting the service to pre-arranged trips, and requiring vehicle standards and driver screening will support safety, help to prevent an over-supply, and maintain some equity with the taxicab industry while providing additional choice and flexibility. There are a number of indications that the current system has limited consumer choice to the extent that it has negatively impacted service, satisfaction, driver working conditions and created artificially high values on the secondary market that limit new owner participation. The market currently appears to be under-supplied. The flexible nature of supply through a TNC suits the variable market need with peak time and season demands.

**Impact:** Enabling TNCs while requiring similar insurance coverage will require development of a suitable group insurance product by MPI. The opportunity to examine the minimum regulatory requirements needed for safe operation of TNCs also provides the opportunity to reduce the regulatory burden on the taxicab industry generally. [Supported by Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(1); supported by Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1), 8(2) and 8(3); supported by Licensing Structure recommendation 9(6); impacted by Fares recommendation 10(4)]

9. **Eliminate limits on limousine licences, allow flexible use and eliminate temporary limousine licences.**

**Rationale:** Limousines serve a specialized market which can fluctuate significantly. Unlike taxis, there is limited negative impact from removing restrictions on supply as there remain barriers to entry in vehicle purchase and pre-booking capabilities. Market forces will cause business owners to self-regulate supply, and encourage healthy competition.

**Impact:** Limousine owners will have more flexibility to adapt to the needs of the market, which should further add to customer service and public convenience, without the need for TCB intervention. An increase in supply, if such is the market response, may draw some business from standard taxicab dispatched service. This would reflect a positive increase in consumer choice, for those customers who are indifferent to the typically higher cost of limousine service, or prefer this alternative on the basis of vehicle or service standards. Removing this limit on the number of licences would eliminate the need for hearings, and enable licence applications to be processed administratively in a more timely and efficient way. [Supported by Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1), 8(2) and 8(3)]
9.0 LICENSING STRUCTURE

The Taxicab Act grants authority to the Taxicab Board to determine the types and classes of taxicabs, the types of licences and their respective terms and conditions, the number of licences issued, and licence application criteria and fees. There are two major licensing requirements in the taxicab industry in Winnipeg – a taxicab business licence and taxicab driver’s licence.

Types of Taxicabs

There are 12 sub-categories of taxicab, limousine or bus as determined by the Taxicab Board, each specifying a combination of size, seating capacity, use of taximeter, service level required, and age restriction. Private shuttle services (e.g. for hotels, seniors’ homes, bars and restaurants, events, etc.) are not regulated under The Taxicab Act and Regulations. Winnipeg taxicab classifications are shown in the table below.

Table 10 Types of Taxicabs in Winnipeg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description and Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Metered       | Standard Taxicab (ST)  
| Taxicab       |   − Metered cab other than premium or accessible  
|               |   − Curb to curb service  
|               |   − Mandatory in-car camera  
|               | Seasonal Taxicab (SE)  
|               |   − Issued for the period from November 2 to March 31 or as determined by the TCB  
|               |   − Application-based and issued via random draw  
|               |   − Can be either standard taxicab or accessible taxicab with curb to curb service  
|               | Premium Taxicab  
|               |   − Metered luxury sedan (make and model as per regulation)  
|               |   − Must not be more than five years old  
|               |   − Curb to curb service  
|               | Accessible Taxicab (AT)  
|               |   − Metered taxicab designed for the transportation of persons while in their wheelchairs and ambulatory persons  
|               |   − May also be accessed by persons not using wheelchairs  
|               |   − Curb to curb service  
|               | Handicab Van (metered)  
|               |   − Taxicab equipped with a wheelchair ramp or lift  
|               |   − Operated exclusively for transportation of persons with disabilities and their escorts  
|               |   − Drivers required to carry a manual wheelchair and passenger up and down up to 10 steps upon request  
|               |   − Door to door service  
| Executive      | • Taxicab that is a luxury sedan as designated by the Taxicab Board under subsection 6(2), with seating for not more than six persons including driver  
| Cars           | • Vehicle cannot be more than eight years old  
|               | • Not equipped with a taximeter  
|               | • Does not display marking or sign indicating that it is operated for hire  
|               | • Condition to have a taxicab limousine business license for each executive car licence  

**Type** | **Description and Classes**
--- | ---
**Limousines** | • Luxury sedan with extended wheelbase and seating for seven or more persons including driver or a vehicle designated by the Taxicab Board suitable for operation as a limousine  
• Not equipped with a taximeter  
• Does not display marking or sign indicating that it is operated for hire
**Standard Limousine (SL)** | – Limousine not classified as classic or premium
**Premium Limousine (PL)** | – Limousine that meets vehicle requirements set out in section 17  
– Must not be more than five years old
**Classic Limousine (CL)** | – Limousine that is 25 years or older, or  
– A limousine or other vehicle designated by the Taxicab Board under subsection 6(2) as suitable for operation as a classic limousine
**Specialty Vehicle Limousine (SV)** | – Limousine of make and model approved by the Taxicab Board  
– Includes sport utility vehicles or other modified luxury vehicle  
– Must not be more than eight years old

**Passenger Van** | • Taxicab van configuration with seating capacity of 11 or more including driver

**Handicab Van (not metered)** | • Taxicab equipped with a wheelchair ramp or lift  
• Operated exclusively for transportation of persons with disabilities and their escorts  
• Drivers required to carry a manual wheelchair and passenger up and down up to 10 steps upon request  
• Door to door service

As of December 2016, there were a total of 756 vehicles licensed in Winnipeg across all taxicab types and classes, including seasonal taxis. Three accessible taxicab licenses were granted in September of 2016. The number of vehicles in each category is detailed in the table below.

**Table 11 Active Taxicab Business Licences by Category, Winnipeg 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Vehicle</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxicabs</strong></td>
<td>Standard Taxicab (ST)</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seasonal Taxicab (SE)</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handicab Van (HV)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessible Taxicab (AT)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Premium Taxicab</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limousines</strong></td>
<td>Executive Car (EC)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Limousine (SL)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialty Vehicle Limousine (SV)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classic Limousine (CL)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Premium Limousine (PL)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus</strong></td>
<td>Specialty Vehicle Bus (SV)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assisted Transportation (AS)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Licensed Vehicles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>756</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The subcategory of Assisted Transportation Bus was eliminated in 2015, and there have not been any premium metered taxicabs in Winnipeg since at least 2008, leaving 10 sub-classifications of taxicab.

Shuttles, such as those operated by hotels and seniors’ facilities, are not currently licenced by the TCB. Section 163(1) of The City of Winnipeg Charter Act establishes certain classes of public transportation over which the City has exclusive authority. This type of shuttle is an exception. Section 163(3) provides that a person may enter into an agreement with the City to operate such a service, subject to approval of the agreement by the Public Utilities Board (PUB), and approval of that board to operate the service in the city. The operation of the service would remain in all respects subject to the authority and supervision of the PUB. The PUB has acknowledged that the authority and responsibility of the PUB is unclear.

All classes of taxicab are required to be registered as a commercial vehicle with Manitoba Public Insurance and carry a minimum of $2 million third party liability and property damage insurance. In addition, depending on the classification of taxicab, vehicles must have a taximeter and the safety equipment as specified in the Taxicab Regulation including in-car camera, strobe light, first aid kit, safety shield, and specialty accessible vehicle equipment. All taxicabs must also possess a City of Winnipeg Taxicab Licence.

Other Jurisdictions

Most jurisdictions in Canada have fewer classifications of taxicab, and some regulate private shuttles. Vehicle age restrictions vary across vehicle types. The table below outlines the classifications of taxicab and vehicle age restrictions in each of the compared jurisdictions.

Table 12 Age Restrictions on Taxicabs Across Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Vehicles</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Ottawa</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxi Accessible Taxi Limousine TNC</td>
<td>Taxi Accessible Taxi Limousine Shuttle PTP</td>
<td>Taxi Accessible Taxi Limousine</td>
<td>Taxi Accessible Taxi Limousine</td>
<td>Taxi Accessible Taxi Limousine (8 classes) Luxury App based service (executive car)</td>
<td>12 categories as per above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Age Restriction</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6 years; 7 years if hybrid; 10 years if accessible</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>14 years London Black taxi 5 years if replacement vehicle</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.1 Taxicab Business Licence

A taxicab business licence (TBL) is a licence approved and issued by the Taxicab Board that allows the owner to carry on the business of operating a taxicab for hire. TBLs are renewed on an annual basis by March 1 of each year. They are not transferable or convertible to a different class of licence without the consent of the TCB and may include other conditions as determined by the TCB at time of issue.

The Taxicab Board issues business licences in three main categories:
- Annual Taxicab Business Licence (TBL)
- Seasonal Taxicab Licence
- Temporary Limousine Permit

The TBL owner is required to carry on the taxicab business, however Taxicab Regulation 209/91 permits the option to grant Power of Attorney to another individual or enter into a management agreement for a maximum of 30 days in the event of temporary absence or illness. The Taxicab Board can extend this timeframe. Any TBL holder must not contravene any municipal, provincial or federal legislation.

Application for New Taxicab Business Licence

The Taxicab Board does not use a formula to pre-determine the number of taxicab business licences required to meet demand for taxicab services in Winnipeg, and accepts applications for new or additional taxicab business licences at any time. The applicant must submit market supply/demand data as part of their application, to demonstrate need. This includes a comprehensive business plan presenting business experience, marketing plan, supply/demand data, projected revenue and expenses, human resources including employee compensation, vehicle maintenance program, customer service standards, complaint mechanisms, brand identity, financing and other business information.

All applicants must present their application at a public hearing of the Taxicab Board. Any member of the public, including industry members, may oppose an application and present their argument at the application hearing. Opposition must be filed with the TCB in advance of the hearing, however there is no criteria or fee to oppose a TBL application. Following the hearing the TCB meets to make their decision.

The Taxicab Board considers the market data provided by the applicant and any opponent to the application, making the decision to grant additional licences on a case-by-case basis. In assessing whether an application satisfies the public need and convenience, the TCB considers wait times, availability of other service providers, the viability of the individual taxicab business, and the industry as a whole. The Taxicab Board reports that they do not have documented guidelines for assessing TBL applications.

A written decision, including reasons for the decision, is provided to the applicant. The TCB reports that as part of board governance they provide reasons for decision, which was implemented as best practice in 2015. Providing written decisions can be very involved and time consuming, but provides the applicant...
with an understanding of how the Taxicab Board arrived at the decision. *The Taxicab Act* or Regulations do not provide a time frame for decisions to be provided, nor does the TCB have a documented standard. Data was not available regarding the average time from hearing to decision, however the TCB reports that applicants or licensees may not feel they receive a decision quickly. An application that is denied may be appealed to the Manitoba Court of Appeal.

Within the current licensing structure, the processes of determining the number of taxicab business licences and applying for a taxicab business licence are closely tied. As noted in the section on supply, a large majority of standard taxicab owners (82%), felt the process for setting the number of taxicab licences is fair, compared to only half of standard drivers. The TCB and industry noted that taxicab owners affiliated with the large dispatch companies attend hearings and oppose most applications for new taxicab business licences. The small number of limousine owners who responded to the online survey were dissatisfied with the process.

Hearings are not required in the five compared jurisdictions or for the Motor Transport Board of Manitoba. New applications, transfers, seasonal and temporary permits (if applicable) are assessed and approved by administrative or board staff, based on a standard application and supporting documentation.

The four jurisdictions that pre-determine the number of taxicab licences required each year (see Section 8.0 Supply and Demand) pre-qualify applicants and issue new taxicab licences through a lottery (Calgary and Edmonton) or in the order of an established list (Hamilton and Ottawa). Applicant/licence issue criteria in these jurisdictions is limited to regulatory requirements for vehicle and safety equipment, registration and insurance, and affiliation with a dispatch service. Only Vancouver and the Motor Transport Board of Manitoba require supply/demand data and financial information from potential plate (licence) holders.

Some jurisdictions allow applications from current industry participants only. Hamilton requires taxicab plate applicants to be current drivers or owners. Calgary has issued plates to drivers only in recent years in an attempt to provide opportunities for drivers and reduce the dominance of brokers in the industry. (Hara Associates, 2010). Calgary releases quarterly fleet utilization information to assist potential plate owners in making the decision whether or not to apply for a plate.

To ensure adequate coverage during peak periods (e.g., winter and weekend evenings), some jurisdictions make it a condition of the plate that the taxicab will be operated during specific time periods or have specific part-time taxicab licences (Calgary and Vancouver).

**Vehicle Registration and Insurance Requirements**

All classes of taxicab in Winnipeg are required to be registered as a commercial vehicle with Manitoba Public Insurance (MPI) and carry a minimum of $2 million third party liability and property damage insurance. Taxicab owners must keep their vehicles actively insured with MPI if they wish to maintain an active taxicab licence and permit.
In 2016, the annual basic premium for this insurance is $9,267 for standard and accessible taxicabs, and $3,013 for limousines. All have a $600 deductible. Additional extension coverage must be purchased to meet the minimum $2 million liability requirement (Auto Insurance Certificates and Rates Regulation 30/2016, 2016).

While the majority of industry stakeholders consulted felt the commercial insurance requirements are reasonable (91 per cent of standard taxicab owners), many expressed dissatisfaction with the cost of the insurance and the high deductible. Commercial insurance rates for Winnipeg taxicabs increased 58 per cent from 2006 to 2016.

Manitoba Public Insurance reviews and analyzes its insurance rates annually, with insurance rates tied directly to claims costs. In the last ten years, the average loss ratio (claims cost to premiums collected) for taxicabs was 108 per cent. Claims frequency for taxicabs is approximately seven times higher than that of other vehicles in Manitoba. The average loss amount per taxicab ($5,821) is more than three times greater than the average loss amount per limousines ($1,828) (Manitoba Public Insurance, 2016).

Commercial insurance for taxicabs is a common requirement in the Canadian taxicab industry. Hamilton, Ottawa and Vancouver each specify $2 million third party liability and property damage, similar to Winnipeg. Calgary requires $1 million liability and property damage and $1 million automobile insurance with passenger hazard coverage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>$500,000 limousine $2 M taxicab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Commercial with $2 M; $2 M limousine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Commercial with $2 M 3rd party liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>Commercial with $2 M 3rd party liability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the biggest concerns surrounding Transportation Network Providers has been ensuring that passengers and drivers of TNCs are adequately covered in the case of an accident. However, the cost of commercial vehicle insurance is prohibitive for individual TNC drivers who may use their vehicle for paid trips only a small percentage of the time. Private insurance companies have created policies whereby the TNC carries ‘fleet style’ insurance on behalf of the TNC’s registered drivers. This form of insurance has been accepted as satisfactory by Ontario and Alberta regulators.

**Renewal of Taxicab Business Licence**

Taxicab business licences must be renewed each year by the last day of February. Renewal involves payment of an annual taxicab business licence fee to the City of Winnipeg and payment of a taxicab business licence fee to the TCB. Taxicab business licences owned by corporations must provide a copy of their Annual Return of Information. Holders of taxicab business licences for accessible taxicabs and handicab vans are required to provide a list of each driver operating the vehicle and verification of a minimum of two hours of accessibility related refresher training, including an outline of the training provided. Effective December 2016, the Independent Living Resource Centre will deliver mandatory
Accessibility Transportation Training to all new and existing taxicab drivers. TCB staff will track completion of this training, and the above-noted requirement to report training for renewal of a taxicab business licence will be eliminated as of February 2018. Further detail on training for taxicab drivers is provided in section 9.4.

Transferability

Certain taxicab business licences are transferable, meaning the licence holder may sell the licence subject to Taxicab Board approval. The TCB considers licence transfer applications at a regularly scheduled Taxicab Board meeting and provides written notification of the outcome to both parties. Generally, a hearing is not required. Both parties must provide financial information in support of the transfer application, and the purchaser must supply a letter of support from the dispatch company they will be working with. The new owner of the taxicab business licence must ensure all other regulatory requirements attached to the taxicab business licence and vehicle have been met, including commercial vehicle registration and insurance. The fee for all taxicab business licence transfers is $400.

Recently, Winnipeg taxicab licences have transferred for approximately $400,000 in the secondary market. The Taxicab Board does not become involved in or influence the private transaction, beyond determining if the individual acquiring the TBL licence meets the TBL licence requirements.

Some jurisdictions, like Winnipeg, have sought to phase out transferable licences by issuing new licences on a non-transferable basis. In Winnipeg, standard taxicab business licences issued prior to 1998 are transferable. The only new business licences that have been issued by the Taxicab Board since that date have been for accessible taxicabs, handicab vans and limousines which has resulted in a situation where all standard taxicab business licences in Winnipeg are transferable, while other classes of taxicab business licence are not. About one third of accessible taxicab and limousine licences and about 15 per cent of handicab van licences are transferable. Owners of accessible taxicab, handicab van and limousine business licences report this inequity as a major concern.

In Hamilton, licence holders may not lease, sell, transfer or give up control of any portion of the licence for a minimum of five years. Ottawa has a similar requirement for accessible taxi licences only. Plates issued in Calgary since 2012 are non-transferable. Only standard and accessible taxi plates may be transferred in Edmonton. Vancouver vehicle for hire licences are all transferable.

Conversion

Licence holders may apply to convert their taxicab business licence to another type, subject to the ‘right of conversion’ terms of the licence and Taxicab Board approval. The majority of standard taxicab business licences are convertible, while the majority of accessible taxicab, handicab vans, and limousine licences are non-convertible. Examples of conversion conditions specified by The Taxicab Act and Regulations include:

- Standard metered taxicabs may convert to an accessible metered taxi, if approved by the Taxicab Board
• Standard limousine licences issued before 1991 may convert to premium limousines, and convert back to standard limousine at any time
• Limousine licences issued before 1991 may be converted to executive car licence, as long as the owner has at least one limousine licence per executive car licence. They can convert back to limousine licence at any time

All taxicab business licence conversion applications require TCB approval.

### 9.2 Seasonal Taxicab Business Licences

To accommodate the increased demand for taxicabs during the holiday season and cold winter months, the Taxicab Board issues a number of seasonal standard and accessible taxicab business licences each year that are effective from November 2 to March 31 or as determined by the Taxicab Board. Unlike regular taxicab business licences, the Taxicab Board determines the number and type of seasonal taxicab business licences that will be offered each year and the proportion of licences that will be allocated to each of the large taxicab cooperatives (92% for 2016/17), independent taxicab companies and independent taxicab drivers. The TCB does not have a documented model for determining the number of seasonal licences to be issued.

Seasonal licence operators do not have to be the owners of the vehicles, and may lease or rent a vehicle. While not required by regulation, a Notice to Industry circulated for the 2014/15 season states that seasonal taxicabs must be affiliated with a dispatch service (Taxicab Board, 2015). Vehicle, equipment, registration and insurance requirements are the same as for standard taxicabs. MPI registration and insurance is pro-rated. A random draw of applications in good standing is conducted in October and vehicles must be on the road by a specified date or the licence maybe forfeited. Only one seasonal licence is issued per applicant. The fee for a seasonal taxicab licence is $200 per vehicle.

Some seasonal licence holders expressed dissatisfaction with the requirement for seasonal taxicabs to be on the road for the entire five-month period from November through March, regardless of demand for the extra vehicles. In focus group discussions, drivers of seasonal taxicabs who do not own the vehicle expressed concern that they are required to pay the daily rental fee to the owner, yet if demand is low, will not make enough money to cover their costs.

Drivers expressed dissatisfaction with the small number of seasonal licences allocated and the limited opportunity to ‘break into’ the industry. There was some indication that the major dispatch companies may not be willing to provide dispatch service to seasonal licence holders that are not year-round shareholders, or will charge excessive costs. Accessible taxicab owners were also unhappy with the allocation of licences; 7 out of 11 report being dissatisfied.
Temporary Limousine Permit

Temporary limousine permits may be issued to current limousine business licence holders to service specific events and bookings that cannot be fulfilled within the operator’s current vehicle complement. Temporary permits are issued only for the specific dates of the bookings. Separate applications are required for each customer and each vehicle. For example, if a customer booking requires two vehicles, two separate permits are required. Applications must be submitted a minimum of 60 days in advance of the event start date and must include rationale for the temporary permit, including a copy of the client contract or confirmation of booking and proof that the booking cannot be handled by the licence holder’s regular fleet of vehicles. Temporary limousine permit applications are reviewed at regular Taxicab Board meetings. A hearing is not required. The vehicle must be registered and insured through MPI and carry the minimum $2 million liability insurance required of all taxicabs by Taxicab Regulation 209/91. Applicants pay a non-refundable $25 application fee, and a $25 permit fee if the permit is granted.

The Taxicab Board changed limousine temporary permit parameters in October 2015. Prior to this, temporary limousine permits were issued for 30 days, and could include multiple bookings within that time frame. The Taxicab Board found that temporary permit holders were operating the vehicles outside of the approved bookings. To eliminate this practice, the Taxicab Board implemented the policy of granting permits for specific dates and events only, as noted above.

In 2016 the TCB made multiple day temporary permits available for special events: A temporary grad permit effective June 17 to July 1, and a temporary permit for the NHL Heritage Classic event effective October 19 to 25. The fee for each of these multi-day permits was $100, with no requirement to list pre-booked trips.

As proof of demand for the temporary vehicle permit, applicants are now required to supply proof of bookings to TCB for the other TCB licensed vehicles in their fleet. Limousine operators who participated in the consultation process reported that the TCB verifies the booking information provided in support

Figure 42 Perceived Fairness of Seasonal Licence Approval Process

The process for approving seasonal licences is fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Taxi Driver</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Taxi Owner/Operator</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Online Driver and Owner Survey
of applications by contacting customers directly. Operators are concerned this practice breaches privacy laws and may give customers the negative impression that their business’s practices are in question.

Limousine operators also noted concerns with the application/approval timeframe, reporting that a more efficient permitting system is required to meet demand during peak periods. Many customer bookings are made on short notice; however, operators are not able to obtain a temporary permit if their current fleet is booked to capacity because of the TCB timeframe. In addition, requiring a separate application/permit for each booking results in a tremendous amount of paperwork and effort for both the limousine operators and the TCB.

In comparison, the City of Ottawa allows temporary limousine permits for specified trips within a 10-day window, and requires application to be made within 14 days of the booking. Toronto requires limousine business licence holders to register new vehicles with the regulator, but does not limit the number.

### 9.3 Dispatch

The Taxicab Board does not license dispatch services; however, Taxicab Regulation 209/91 stipulates that taxicab business licence holders may only operate or be affiliated with a dispatch service that conforms to a number of requirements. TCB policy states that all taxicabs other than seasonal taxis must be affiliated with a dispatch company that provides 24/7 service. The requirements for dispatch service include accommodating requests for service in the order the request was received, carrying on business 24 hours a day, responding promptly to requests for service and complaints, compliance with the *Human Rights Code*, and dispatching only to valid licence holders. Dispatch services must also maintain and provide the Taxicab Board with records of affiliated licences and maintain, for five months, a record of each trip including time and date of request, time of dispatch, location, taxicab and driver dispatched for the trip. Additional standards apply to dispatchers of premium taxicabs including requirements for a computerized dispatch system, on-road supervisors, TCB approved standards of conduct, complaint systems and customer satisfaction monitoring, and accessible taxicab to standard taxicab ratios (Taxicab Regulation 209/91 37(3)). Currently there are no premium taxicab or dispatch services offered in Winnipeg.

The two large dispatch services in Winnipeg are co-operatives of taxicab business licence holders and are affiliated with 99 per cent of the standard taxicabs, over 92 per cent of seasonal taxicabs and 8 per cent of the accessible taxicabs in the city of Winnipeg. They do not own any taxicab licences directly. Drivers are not employees of the dispatch companies, however some dispatch services require drivers to pay their own licence fee and comply with company service standards.

As noted earlier under Supply and Demand, dispatch data is not reported consistently or reliably to the TCB, nor is there a requirement for it to be provided in a standard format. Dispatch companies are not always able to track vehicles and drivers to retrieve lost items, and do not track or report customer complaints. Response to customer complaints was noted by consultation participants to be unsatisfactory.

Under the current regulatory structure, TNCs would be considered dispatch companies in Winnipeg.
**Insights from Other Jurisdictions**

Calgary, Edmonton, Hamilton and Ottawa license dispatch companies (commonly referred to as brokers) and require anyone who holds a taxicab licence to also hold a brokerage (dispatch) licence or be affiliated with a licensed brokerage. Vancouver does not license dispatch companies.

The fees in each city are outlined in the table below.

*Edmonton refers to TNCs as Private Transportation Provider. Ottawa refers to TNC’s as Private Transportation Company.*

---

### Table 14 Dispatch Licence Fees Across Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Ottawa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxi Broker Licence</strong></td>
<td>$1,753</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,143; $1,038 renewal</td>
<td>Varies by size $807-$7,253 for 100+ vehicles + $0.11 per trip fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>TNC</em> Licence</em>*</td>
<td>Current: $1,753 Proposed: Vary by size from $5,000-$20,000 for 1001+ vehicles + $15 per driver + $0.20 per trip</td>
<td>Regional PTP: $1,000 (driver and vehicle must also be licensed) Commercial PTP (200+ drivers): $50,000 + $20,000 accessibility surcharge +$0.06 per trip (replacing driver and vehicle licence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Calgary, Edmonton and Ottawa have advanced data collection and reporting requirements for dispatch companies, including electronic records of vehicle activity, status, distance travelled and fares.

Some jurisdictions have multiple categories of dispatch service for taxicabs and TNCs, varying by size and type of service. Edmonton has three: general dispatch (taxicabs, limousines and shuttles), regional Private Transportation Provider (small TNC) and commercial PTP (large TNC). Fees for dispatch licenses range from $807 in Ottawa to $50,000 plus an accessibility surcharge of $20,000 and per trip fee for a commercial PTP in Edmonton. A summary of dispatch categories and fees is included in Table 165.

Some jurisdictions, such as Ottawa, require brokers to maintain a minimum ratio of accessible taxicabs to standard taxicabs in their fleet. These brokers must ensure that a minimum number of accessible taxicabs are available for on-demand service at all times (e.g., 1 for a fleet of 25-99 taxicabs, 2 for a fleet of 100-249 taxicabs, and 3 for fleets of 250 or more taxicabs). Edmonton has established a $20,000 accessibility surcharge on TNCs, which is waived if the TNC provides accessible service. In Toronto and Portland, vehicle for hire companies including TNCs, must either provide wheelchair accessible service or contract to an accessible provider, and fares and wait times must be the same as for standard vehicles. Portland also requires dispatch service and customer support service to be provided in a manner...
accessible to those with hearing or vision impairments. There are provisions for the possibility of an accessible transportation fee and an accessible transportation fund (City of Portland, 2016).

9.4 Taxicab Driver’s Licence

Individuals wishing to operate any class of taxicab must hold a valid Taxicab Driver’s Licence (TDL) along with a valid Class 4 (professional driver) or better Manitoba driver’s licence. If an individual’s Manitoba driver’s licence is suspended, they must surrender their TDL to the TCB. The Taxicab Board does not place any restrictions on the number of TDLs that may be active at any given time.

The TDL is issued by the TCB and is renewable annually on the same day as the person’s Manitoba driver’s licence under The Drivers and Vehicles Act. In addition to the Manitoba driver’s licence, taxicab drivers must:

- Pass an English Language Assessment (written to Benchmark Level 5)
- Successfully complete the Taxicab Driver Training program and Accessibility Transportation Training
- Submit a recent criminal record check including a vulnerable sector search (every 4 years) and a child abuse registry check (every 2 years)
- Identify any medical conditions that would affect their ability to perform the driver requirements under The Taxicab Act and regulations
- Pass an interview with a Taxicab Compliance Unit inspector, who will assess character and general knowledge
- Submit Taxicab Driver Licence Application/renewal fee of $30

Candidates for a Class 4 drivers licence must be at least 18 years old, meet medical and vision standards upon initial application, and periodically thereafter based on their age. They must hold a minimum Class 5I (Intermediate Stage) licence, and must pass a knowledge test and road test which includes a vehicle walk around test (Manitoba Public Insurance, 2015).

Taxicab Driver Training

Prospective taxicab drivers of all vehicle types must complete four training and assessment components:

1. English Language Assessment
2. Taxicab Driver Training Program (100 per cent attendance, minimum grade of 80 per cent)
3. Accessibility Transportation Training
4. Interview with Taxicab Board inspector

The Taxicab Board Chief Inspector regularly monitors the taxicab driver training requirements and makes recommendations for enhancements.

Prior to undertaking the Taxicab Driver Training Program, prospective taxicab drivers are required to write an English Language Assessment Test (Benchmark Level 5) attaining a minimum grade of 93 per
A fee of $15 is charged. Taxicab driver applicants may make two attempts at the English Language assessment.

The Taxicab Driver Training Program has been delivered by the St. James School Division Continuing Education Department since 1998. The program is developed by the training provider in collaboration with the Taxicab Board. At the time of this report, program content was under revision. The enhanced curriculum includes 40 hours of instruction, covering the regulatory structure of the industry, Winnipeg geography and map reading, customer service, cultural awareness and diversity, human rights and human trafficking, sexual harassment, conflict resolution, safety and defensive driving. Prior to December 2016 the program included a module on passengers with disabilities, which is now delivered separately. Classes are offered over a series of evenings, weekends or Monday to Friday. The fee for this training is $300, which is paid by the driver. The course brochure indicates that the fees for the program may be eligible for the Manitoba tuition fee rebate for post-secondary programs.

The new Accessibility Transportation Training course replaces the former module included in the Taxicab Driver Training Program. Initial training for new and existing taxicab drivers occurs over a full day, covers customer service for persons with disabilities, and is delivered by trainers from the Independent Living Resource Centre. All trainers have lived experience with a variety of disabilities. The course is interactive and addresses awareness of various disabilities and barriers, communication, safety and legal standards, and proper securement of assistive devices such as wheelchairs, while being transported. It includes simulations and interaction with persons with disabilities. The initial fee for the course is $100 (one day) with the requirement for refresher training (half day) every two years at a cost of $50.

After taxicab driver applicants have successfully completed the three components noted above, they are interviewed by a Taxicab Board inspector as a final step in their application process. The interviewer assesses knowledge of the city. Drivers cannot obtain a taxicab driver's licence without passing this final assessment.

Driver/Owner survey results indicated that the majority of taxicab owners and drivers feel the mandatory taxicab driver training requirements are appropriate and that the training provided was satisfactory, however limousine operators commented in focus groups that they feel the training for the niche market they serve could reasonably be accomplished over two days. Drivers reported that the $100 expense for the additional Accessibility Transportation Training, along with missing a day of work, is a hardship.

Though not mandated by the Taxicab Board, dispatch companies reported that they provide training to drivers under their banner. This training consists of how to use the dispatch system and other vehicle equipment, and information about company service standards. Some focus group participants indicated that they did not receive orientation or training from either the dispatch company or the owner of the vehicle and had to figure out the various technology and systems while driving their first shifts.

Drivers also reported that criminal record checks can take up to two months to process and this can impact their ability to meet driver licence renewal deadlines. Criminal record checks are a common requirement for taxicab drivers across jurisdictions.
Public telephone survey results indicated that driver knowledge of the city is a very important aspect of the taxicab experience with customers ranking it on average 8.9 out of 10. Both public telephone survey and public online survey respondents indicated that driver knowledge is lacking, with public telephone survey respondents ranking driver knowledge as 7.4 out of 10. Sixty per cent of public online survey respondents indicated driver knowledge of the city is adequate.

Representatives of the tourism industry in Winnipeg would like driver training to emphasize the role of the driver as an ‘ambassador for the city’, as the taxicab experience is often one of the first touchpoints for visitors to Winnipeg. Tourism Winnipeg would like to work more closely with the industry to provide information on events and attractions in the city, and has offered to provide additional training free of charge to the industry, including offering free admission or other incentives. They also suggest having tourism guides in taxicabs, QRL codes to link tourists to online resources, and free training sessions for taxicab companies similar to what they offer hotels in the city.

Indigenous leaders expressed a need to involve members of the Indigenous community in taxicab driver training to increase cultural awareness.

The TCB reported that in response to customer complaints of poor city knowledge, English language skills, customer service, and improper securement of mobility devices, they have made efforts in the last few years to enhance driver training and testing standards. The TCB consulted with representative organizations of persons with disabilities, resulting in the new Accessibility Transportation Training program. The TCB implemented the interview process with taxicab driver applicants to experience first-hand whether drivers were acquiring the necessary knowledge and skills in the Taxicab Driver Training Program. In January 2016, 27 per cent of taxicab driver candidates failed the interview with the Taxicab Board inspector (Taxicab Board, 2016). In April 2016 the TCB increased the passing mark for the English Language Assessment from 88 per cent to 93 per cent and the passing grade for the Taxicab Driver Training Program from 75 per cent to 80 per cent. The training provider contracts do not specify a need for program evaluation.

9.5 Insights from Other Jurisdictions

Licensing requirements for taxicab drivers are similar in most of the compared cities. Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver require taxicab drivers to have a professional or commercial driver’s licence. Vehicle for hire drivers in Ontario, including metered taxis, require the general class of licence. Some jurisdictions limit the number of hours a driver can operate the vehicle. Calgary requires drivers to receive at least eight consecutive hours off duty in a 24-hour period. Vancouver drivers cannot drive for more
hours in a day than the maximum hours of work for an employee under the Employment Standards Act. All jurisdictions require criminal record checks for both taxicab drivers and TNC/PTP drivers. Edmonton requires drivers to inform the licensing authority immediately if any information contained in the criminal records check changes, and to provide an updated criminal record check.

Training requirements vary. Some jurisdictions require drivers of all classes of vehicle to take both general taxi driver training and specialized accessibility training. Others require only accessible taxi drivers to take training (Edmonton), and others require accessibility training for all taxicab drivers.

Most jurisdictions require a driver's abstract upon initial application for a taxicab driver's licence and for annual renewal. Winnipeg does not.

Some of the other jurisdictions acknowledge the fact that accessible services are more expensive to provide than standard taxi services and have responded by reducing or eliminating the licence and accessible training fees for accessible drivers. Further ways to offset this expense are currently the focus of study, including how TNC surcharges could be used.

A summary of driver licensing requirements in Winnipeg and the compared jurisdictions is presented in the table below.

**Table 15 Driver Licensing Requirements Across Jurisdictions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Ottawa</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drivers Licence</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>*Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service &amp; Skills Training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Accessible taxi drivers only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Additional for accessible only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Additional for accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Proficiency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Licence Fee</td>
<td>$135 annual renewal; $220 TNC driver</td>
<td>$100/2 years driver (all)</td>
<td>$281; $209 renewal</td>
<td>$96</td>
<td>$70 record check</td>
<td>$30 annual renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Training Cost</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>Provided by dispatchers</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,200 Program currently being revised</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$300 + $100 for Accessibility Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Winnipeg also requires a Child Abuse Registry check.
9.6 Fees

The following table summarizes the main licence fees charged by the Taxicab Board. Fines for contravention of *The Taxicab Act* are determined and collected by the courts.

*Table 16 Taxicab Board Fees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxicab Board Fees</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxicab Business Licence Application</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 new taxicab business licences</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 20 new taxicab business licences</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or more new taxicab business licences</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxicab Business Licence Annual Fee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard taxicab, limousine, handicab van</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible taxicab business licence renewal</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal taxicab licence</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary limousine permit</td>
<td>$50 to $100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxicab Driver's Licence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers licence application / renewal</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operating budget for the Taxicab Board in 2015/16 was $728,000. Licensing and related fees were projected at $260,000 or 36 per cent of regulatory costs. Fees become part of general revenues of the Province of Manitoba.

*Table 17 Taxicab Board Budget 2015/16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fees</strong></td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$628,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$728,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is a common principle that regulatory fees should recover no more than the costs of regulatory activity. The degree to which fees achieve cost recovery may reflect the priorities of government and the overall public versus private benefit achieved. While taxicab regulation is clearly intended to service the public interest, there are also private interests, and cost recovery is a reasonable goal. In Edmonton, the City of Edmonton's Vehicle for Hire Branch operates on a cost recovery basis with no tax contribution. In Calgary, licensing fees cover its operational costs and 'go back in the industry' to keep it 'safe, viable and efficient' (City of Calgary, 2016). Toronto also has mandated the regulatory function work on a cost recovery basis.

The fees in Winnipeg fees are low compared to other jurisdictions included in MNP research. Driver renewal fees in other jurisdictions range from $100 per 2 years to $209 per year, with an average fee of
$112. This is about 3.7 times the Winnipeg driver renewal fee of $30. Taxicab business licence renewal fees range from $400 to $877, with an average of $605. Winnipeg taxicab business licence renewal fees are about one third of the average at $200. One of the higher fees collected by four of the five other cities are dispatch / broker fees, with a range of $1,000 to $50,000 if one includes TNC broker fees. Winnipeg does not regulate or collect fees from dispatch companies.

In terms of TNCs, Edmonton has established a $20,000 accessibility surcharge on TNCS, which is waived if the TNC provides accessible service (City of Edmonton, 2016). In Portland, there are provisions for the possibility of an accessible transportation fee and an accessible transportation fund (City of Portland, 2016). The table below lists the fees paid by taxis and private vehicles for hire (TNC and PTP) based on the latest available published information.

Table 18 Comparison of Fees Across Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Ottawa</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxicab License Fee</strong></td>
<td>$135 reg. cert + $1051 new. + $877/yr; $220/yr AT</td>
<td>$400 + $400 + accessibility surcharge PTP</td>
<td>$4,456 + $605 renewal</td>
<td>$600 + fee (100-200) $179 handicab van</td>
<td>$559 + PTB fee ($100-300) $100 AT</td>
<td>$200; $100 AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer Fee</strong></td>
<td>$250 appln; $250 tsf</td>
<td>$930</td>
<td>$769</td>
<td>$4,033</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driver Licence Fee</strong></td>
<td>$135 annual renewal; $220 TNC driver</td>
<td>$100/2 years driver (all)</td>
<td>$281; $209 renewal</td>
<td>$96* $0 accessible</td>
<td>$70 record check</td>
<td>$30 annual renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dispatch / Broker Fee</strong></td>
<td>$1,753 new; $1,753/yr $5,000 to $20,000 minimum ($0.20 per trip + $15 per driver) TNC</td>
<td>$1,000 CPTP $50,000 + $20,000 Access. surcharge + $0.06 per trip</td>
<td>$1,143; $1,038 renewal</td>
<td>$807* (1-24) $2,470* (25-99) $7,253* (100+) + $.11/trip</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limousine License Fee</strong></td>
<td>$703</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$678 new; $606 renewal</td>
<td>Owner $996; $600/vehicle/year</td>
<td>$129 per office + $213 per vehicle</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*as of January 1, 2017

CPTP = Commercial Private Transportation Provider

### 9.7 Recommendations

1. Eliminate the redundant sub-categories of taxicabs and standardize or remove vehicle age restrictions.

   **Rationale:** Two licence categories, Premium taxicabs and Assisted Transportation, bus are not used and as such are redundant. There are 5 categories of limousine/executive cars that serve the same
market, with no apparent purpose to the sub-classifications. Replacing age restrictions with increased inspection frequency (and associated fees) for older vehicles will allow flexibility in the market. Customer choice and competitive forces can govern vehicle age for executive cars or limousines.

**Impact:** Reducing licence categories will simplify the regulation, making it easier to understand and less cumbersome to administer. [Not dependent on other recommendations]

2. **Allow transferability of all classes of taxicab licences, or phase out all licence transferability over a period of ten years.**

**Rationale:** Protecting the transferable nature of a single class of licence is inequitable. There does not appear to be any goodwill, unique knowledge or business value that can transfer with an individual business licence. In contrast, there may be significant business value in a business that operates multiple vehicles and a dispatch operation that has developed a reputation for customer service, its own brand and a customer base. This also has value to the consumer. In some markets where companies like this dominate, drivers have experienced poor working conditions. The regulatory response has been to encourage individual owner/operators. Poor employment terms have also arisen under such a structure in Winnipeg, and may be more an issue of limited choice. When drivers have a choice of who to work for, conditions tend to improve.

Phasing this feature over a period of ten years will allow current business holders and prospective buyers to make informed decisions on market value. Other adjustments in the market that can be expected to occur with the set of recommendations provided in this report may result in a natural decline in licence value, reducing the impact at the point where licences are no longer transferable.

**Impact:** The greatest impact would be on existing standard taxicab business licence holders if transferability is phased out. If existing non-transferable licences become transferable, it can be expected to reduce the value of existing standard taxicab business licences. Licence transfer values on the secondary market are not the responsibility of the Taxicab Board. Transferability will enable accessible taxicab, limousine and handicab van licence holders to realize the value of their licences. These types of licences tend to be held in multiples, and would now have the opportunity to generate further business value. [Dependent on Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(1)]

3. **Create a waiting list of qualified applicants who wish to obtain a business licence, with a fee to qualify for and maintain a position on the list. Discontinue license application hearings immediately.**

Create an open opportunity to receive a position on the waiting list (e.g., lottery for placement based on applications received in first six months), then add new applicants as they qualify. Limit qualification requirements to only those related to safety and consumer protection. Offer new licences in order of the list, with a reasonable ability to decline an offer before being removed from or placed at the bottom of the list.
**Rationale:** The current process is resource intensive, slow, and un-informed by objective data. Applicants typically will not have access to data to support their application, and existing competitors can influence decisions to protect their own interests.

The process will be equitable to all applicants for a taxicab business licence, and enable allocation of new licences through an objective administrative process instead of a hearing. Pre-qualifying applicants for placement on the list will allow quick distribution of new licences as they become available.

**Impact:** Impact on the TCB will be to reduce the requirement for hearings and the associated administrative demand. There were 20 licence application hearings in 2015/16.

Policies will need to be established on how to manage the list, particularly for the initial transition where applicants may own a standard vehicle previously used for a seasonal licence (e.g., whether they must accept an offer for an accessible licence or decline an offer and retain their position on the list pending an available standard licence, etc.). [Relevant to Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1), 8(2), 8(3) and 8(5)]

4. Establish a licence category and require a licence to operate as a vehicle for hire broker (dispatch company), with obligations for trip reporting and customer service standards. Enable brokers to process driver licence applications and renewals.

**Rationale:** The two existing dispatch companies control the market with no regulatory obligations and are currently the only means of accessing trip information. They are also the primary means of addressing customer concerns. Drivers are obligated to affiliate with dispatch companies that meet certain requirements, but are not in a position to enforce the dispatch company to do so and have limited options for other competitive dispatch services. Dispatch companies do not track customer complaints or resolution. Public surveys indicated dissatisfaction with service from dispatch companies and with resolution of complaints. A TNC is essentially a broker, and licensing the TNC itself is the only practical means of regulating that style of vehicle for hire service. By regulating all brokers, the TCB can secure important trip and service level data, monitor accessible service, and ensure there is a responsive system for addressing customer concerns.

**Impact:** Creating a new licence category will require regulatory change, and audit policies and procedures to enable enforcement. Allowing brokers to process driver licence applications may reduce the administrative burden for the TCB. Different knowledge and skills may be required for broker inspection than currently required for vehicle and on-road inspections. Fees established for this licence should consider an accessibility surcharge for companies that are not yet able to demonstrate equivalent accessible and standard service. [Necessary to enable Supply and Demand recommendation 8(8); supported by Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(1)
5. Establish a licence category for shuttles. Do not limit the number of licences.

**Rationale:** Shuttles provide a public transportation service similar to specialty buses that are licenced under the limousine category, and present similar risks to public safety. Operation of a shuttle is currently subject to review and approval by the Public Utilities Board according to *The City of Winnipeg Charter Act*, although the authority and responsibility of the PUB is unclear. Establishing a licence requirement will allow the TCB to ensure the vehicles and drivers meet safety and consumer protection standards, and to effectively monitor this activity. Including this category of vehicle under TCB regulation will be efficient in that the requirements are a consistent activity of the TCB, and would ensure consistency in standards and efficient enforcement.

**Impact:** Creating a new licence category will require a change to the regulation. Communication will be required with all who currently operate a shuttle service. There will be a modest increase in workload required to administer these licences. [Not dependent on other recommendations]

6. Adjust the fee structure for licences, applications, inspections and other services to more fully recover the costs of the regulatory function.

**Rationale:** Fees projected by the TCB ($260,000) cover just over one third of its cost ($728,000), and are substantially low compared to other jurisdictions. There are opportunities to reduce the administrative burden on the TCB while improving effectiveness and reducing costs as identified in various recommendations in this report. There are also recommendations that expand the scope of the TCB to include new classes of licences. It will be important to collect sufficient revenue from licensing TNCs, in particular, to enable compliance monitoring and enforcement. Creating the expectation that the TCB shall operate on a cost recovery basis provides a rationale and means to determine appropriate fees.

**Impact:** Licence fees in other jurisdictions are approximately three to four times the amount charged in Winnipeg. A 50 per cent increase in driver and business licence fees would provide approximately $800,000 in revenue. This would cover the gap between current revenue and costs and enable investment in systems and an additional staff resource. Business licence holders would see their fee increase by $100 for the year; driver’s licence fees would increase by $15 to $45. A reduced fee, or no increase, could be applied where driver licence applications are processed by a broker.

Re-inspection fees present an opportunity to recover costs from licencees that are not complying. For example, 1,209 inspections were conducted on 594 taxicabs in 2015. Two hundred and sixty-seven (267) were only inspected once, leaving 327 cabs requiring re-inspection, some multiple times. A fee for re-inspection would encourage compliance the first time. At approximately 2 hours each, 615 re-inspections would represent approximately two thirds of an FTE. A $150 fee for the 615 re-inspections would generate approximately $92,000, which would approximate two thirds of an FTE, with a 30 per cent overhead factor for office operations.

Ottawa is similar in size to Winnipeg. A similar broker / TNC fee would generate approximately $22,000 from the two existing large dispatch companies and one TNC. Fees could be scaled for
smaller brokers. This would contribute to the cost of data management software and training. If a new TNC service increased market activity by 10 per cent, and claimed a 15 per cent market share, a per trip fee of $0.11 would generate approximately $74,000. [Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendations 8(2), 8(3), 8(4), 8(6) and 8(9); enables capacity for Supply and Demand recommendation 8(8); Licensing Structure recommendations 9(4) and 9(5)]

Eliminate TCB involvement in training for drivers of taxicabs. Require proof of completion of driving skills and accessible training as part of a taxicab driver’s licence application. Eliminate interview and require written exam to demonstrate knowledge of TCB regulations and licence holder obligations.

**Rationale:** Training for language skills, customer service and knowledge of the city are nice but not a “need-to-have” from a regulatory standpoint if there is sufficient choice in the market to encourage competitive behavior. Customer preference will encourage the business to offer a competitive service, which includes knowledgeable, service-oriented drivers that can communicate effectively with passengers. *The Accessibility for Manitobans Act* and associated Customer Service Standard already obligate businesses to train employees on how to deliver accessible services. The only unique element for taxicabs relates to the safety and security of the passenger when entering/exiting, or riding in the vehicle. A driver skills training course is a directly related skill for safe operation of the taxicab. The TCB could encourage higher levels of training by publishing the names of those that have completed training, organizing a customer service award or such things. A written exam is a more objective means of assessing knowledge than an interview. Passing the exam would also confirm the individual has sufficient language skills to read and respond to questions about their regulatory obligations.

**Impact:** For drivers and owners, the change would be negligible. The TCB would no longer be involved in any administration or coordination, relieving some workload. The TCB would initially need to establish a list of approved training providers for the driving skills course. [Not dependent on other recommendations]

7. **Require driver’s abstract for taxicab drivers licence application and renewal.**

**Rationale:** A primary need for regulation is to ensure passenger safety. MPI has indicated that the ten-year average loss ratio for this class of vehicle was 108 per cent of premiums, with claim frequency seven times higher than the rest of the vehicle fleet. Concerns with aggressive driving and speeding were frequently mentioned in the public surveys. Requiring a driver’s abstract will allow the Taxicab Board to ensure that licences are not issued or renewed to drivers with poor records. Requiring a driver’s abstract is a common practice in other jurisdictions.

**Impact:** Preventing unsafe drivers from securing a taxicab drivers licence will improve passenger and public safety. It may have some prevention effect if drivers know they may be risking their livelihood with unsafe driving, and if the TCB can recognize when a driver may need to upgrade their driving skills. The TCB will need to establish thresholds for response to driving records and proportionate
consequences. Effective communication with industry is required. [Not dependent on other recommendations]

8. Stagger taxicab business licence renewal dates.

Rationale: Requiring all licences to be renewed on the same date creates an unnecessary peak in workload as the TCB needs to process the licence renewals all at once. The current date is also during peak season for the industry.

Impact: Spreading renewal dates throughout the year will smooth the workflow for the TCB, enable more timely turnaround, and more effective examination of renewal applications. Some additional tracking will be required to monitor licence status and renewals. The date for renewals is in the regulation and will need to be removed. If possible this should be initiated for the renewal period in 2017. This may require a one-time adjustment period where the licence is continued for a number of months pending the new scheduled renewal date. Ideally this renewal would be aligned with the owner’s TDL and MPI licence renewal date for licensee convenience. [Not dependent on other recommendations]

10.0 FARES

The Taxicab Board regulates fares for taxicabs, limousines and handicab vans in the city of Winnipeg in accordance with its mandate to ensure the availability of quality taxicab services that meet the needs of the public at a reasonable cost.

Taxicab fares are regulated by most cities primarily to protect consumers, but must take the sustainability of the industry into consideration as well. Regulated meter rates avoid situations of haggling or exploitation of customers (as on a lonely street late at night). Common law places duties on governments when regulating the price of any product or service. Prices must be set high enough to allow the industry to make a fair and reasonable rate of return on their investment. If rates are too low, service providers will stop making the needed long-term investments in equipment and service, and service may be disrupted (Hara Associates, 2015).

The Taxicab Board has historically made fare adjustments upon request from industry, assessing the information provided in support of the request considering a balance of reasonable rates to the consumer and financial viability of the taxicab industry. In 2012, Manitoba Infrastructure and Transportation (MIT) prepared an independent report in response to an outstanding request by industry for a fare increase in 2011. The report analyzed a number of economic indicators including the consumer price index and cost of operating a passenger vehicle. As a result of the MIT report, the Taxicab Board reconsidered the industry’s request to adjust the taximeter fare. It has remained the same through November 2016.
Historical Fares

Winnipeg fares were last adjusted in 2012. The industry has requested adjustments to the fare structure for a variety of reasons in recent years including fluctuating GST and inflation rates; increasing fuel prices, insurance premiums and repair costs; as well as costs associated with the implementation of mandated vehicle safety enhancements.

In 2010 the Taxicab Board approved a temporary surcharge of $0.20 to the initial drop rate to offset the cost of additional Taxicab Board mandated vehicle safety equipment. This increased the initial drop meter rate to $3.50. In 2012 the Taxicab Board approved industry’s request to extend the $0.20 surcharge indefinitely. The TCB decision was supported by a reported 3.1 per cent increase in the consumer price index in Manitoba in 2011 and a 9.9 per cent increase in the cost of operating a passenger vehicle. The initial drop meter rate has not changed since 2012.

The figure below reflects historical fare adjustments for standard and accessible taxicabs in Winnipeg from 1997 through 2012. The figure represents changes in the fixed initial drop rate only.

*Figure 44 Historical Drop Meter Fare Adjustments in Winnipeg, 1997 – 2012*

Fares also include a variable rate for distance travelled and wait time. While the distance charge has remained at $0.10 at least since 2000, the distance has decreased to provide an overall increase in rates. The combined effect of changes in the drop rate and distance charge is illustrated in the table below.
Owners and drivers who participated in the consultation process felt the rates charged are reasonable, and expressed some concern that increasing rates might drive some consumers to seek other modes of public transportation. Results of public consultation were mixed, with telephone survey participants indicating fares are reasonable, and online survey participants indicating they are too high. The Winnipeg Airports Authority (WAA) is in favour of allowing a surcharge for trips from the airport to help defray the costs they charge to the contracted taxicab provider. The WAA supported the airport service provider’s request for an airport surcharge in 2007.

Users of accessible taxicabs, limousines and handicab vans were more likely to express satisfaction with current fares in the public telephone survey. Some public online survey respondents felt that Winnipeg taxicab rates are higher than those in other cities. Public participants in both surveys indicated that fares are an important consideration in choosing whether to use a vehicle for hire.

Figure 45 Customer Satisfaction with Cost of Fare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Initial Drop (fixed)</th>
<th>Increment Charges</th>
<th>Waiting Time</th>
<th>Cost of Trip (No wait time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Distance (m)</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Distance (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.55</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>01-Dec</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>25-Feb</td>
<td>$2.95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>01-Jul</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>01-Dec</td>
<td>$3.05</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>17-Nov</td>
<td>$3.30</td>
<td>79.65</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>79.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>03-Nov</td>
<td>$3.30</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>01-Apr</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Standard and Accessible Taxicabs</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction with Cost of Fare - Scale of 1 to 10

Source: Telephone Public Survey
Industry participants indicated that the difference in taximeter rates between Winnipeg and areas outside the perimeter cause difficulty. Rates outside the perimeter are regulated through municipal by-laws and in their absence by the Motor Transport Board. For any portion of a Winnipeg taxicab trip that occurs outside the perimeter, drivers must charge the rates specified in the Tariff of Tolls for Transportation of Passengers by Inter-Municipal Liversies Regulation 46/2001.

Some public online survey participants were interested in pre-determined or estimated rates to destinations such as the airport to avoid price fluctuations created by route selection.

Public telephone survey respondents who supported private vehicles for hire (64%) noted reduced prices as one of the main reasons for their support.

10.1 Insights from Other Jurisdictions

Methods of Adjusting Fares

There are a number of methods for adjusting taxicab and limousine rates including:
- Application from industry
- Market comparison
- Taxicab cost index

Taxicab Cost Index

The taxicab cost index is an objective tool used by many taxicab regulators, including Mississauga, Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton, and all municipalities in British Columbia. A cost profile is developed, drawn from publicly available data such as earnings, fuel, and vehicle expenses (e.g., insurance, repairs and maintenance, equipment). The change in these costs is monitored, providing an approximation of how the total cost of taxi operation has changed from year to year (Hara Associates, 2015). The change in
costs is applied to a base period, typically the last time rates were set. Applying the cost index from this point forward allows meter rates to be adjusted proportionally to changes in taxicab operating costs.

The taxi cost index used by the BC Passenger Transportation Board includes four components: wages, taxi insurance, fuel, and other costs (Consumer Price Index). These components are weighted to reflect the average cost of operating a taxi in the province. The PTB contracted an independent review of their taxi cost index methodology in 2012. Strengths of this methodology for adjusting taximeter rates include its objectivity, relevance of the data and ease of use (Passenger Transportation Board, 2013). The inherent weakness in the model is that it assumes that fares were set at an appropriate level in the base period. Periodic validation of the weightings is needed to consider how cost structures may have changed.

The table below applies a proposed taxicab cost index to the meter rate set by the Taxicab Board in 2012. It also compares the component weightings used in three other jurisdictions. Percentages for Winnipeg reflect the average category percentage from the industry-supplied information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Ottawa</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
<th>Change since 2012</th>
<th>Weighted Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages (Statistics Canada, Transportation &amp; Warehousing)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>+2.7%</td>
<td>.027*.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel (Statistics Canada)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance (MPI base rate adjustments)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI (All other) (Statistics Canada)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>+7.2%</td>
<td>.072*.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming that the MIT analysis was valid and that the 2012 rates were neither too high nor too low, the negative change in the cost index since 2012 would indicate no change is required at this time.

A comparison of taxi and limousine rates in other jurisdictions is provided in the following table. Winnipeg has the lowest standard taxicab rates of all compared cities. Normalized for a 10 km trip, Winnipeg is 15 per cent below the average of $20.28, at $17.20. Limousine rates in the comparison cities are within range of Winnipeg’s minimum and maximum rates. Some cities have flat rates for limousines based on zones, some do not prescribe limousine rates. Some cities prescribe or allow flat rates from the airport (Vancouver, Calgary and Edmonton).
Table 21 Comparison of Taxicab Fares Across Jurisdictions – 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Ottawa</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limousine Fare</strong></td>
<td>$84.60 per hour; zone fares + surcharges</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$60 per hour $110 per day</td>
<td>$67.50 for first 90 min; $45 each additional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Min $44.70/hr Max $96; $170 specialty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxicab Fare</strong>*</td>
<td>$3.80 + $1.67/km max; no rate if booked on App</td>
<td>$3.60 + $1.48/km min, 4 x above max. for hail dispatch, no rate</td>
<td>$3.90 + $1.80/km</td>
<td>$3.45 + $1.86/km max. No rate if booked on App. Max surcharge for premium service $15</td>
<td>$3.20 + $1.84/km</td>
<td>$3.50 + $1.38/km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 km fare</strong></td>
<td>$20.50</td>
<td>$18.40</td>
<td>$21.90</td>
<td>$22.05</td>
<td>$21.60</td>
<td>$17.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.1.1 Trends in Fare Regulation

Harmonization of Rates

The BC Passenger Transportation Board has implemented harmonized rates in major urban areas including Victoria and area, and the lower mainland, which includes Vancouver and the surrounding CMA. Ottawa has been phasing in harmonized taxicab by-laws, including fares for the amalgamated city of Ottawa.

Deregulation of Fares

Calgary and Ottawa recently removed minimum rates for taxicabs booked through traditional phone dispatch or hailed on the street, to allow taxis to compete with private vehicle for hire operators. Rates are not prescribed for taxicabs and TNCs/PTPs booked through an App. According to local media, some Calgary taxi companies have dropped their fares by 10 to 20 per cent, and predict that lower rates will encourage more people to take taxis. Taxi company owners report that like most items in the free market, rates will eventually even out. Calgary taxi drivers who have spoken to the media are concerned that without a corresponding reduction in the daily vehicle rent they pay to the taxicab owners they will be earning less per day (Stark, 2016). Edmonton has removed minimum fares and set maximum fares for hailed trips. Rates are not prescribed for pre-arranged trips by any vehicle for hire. Toronto recently eliminated prescribed rates for limousines and enabled discounted rates for taxis.

The generally accepted rationale for de-regulating fares for limousine, shuttle and TNCs/PTPs is that because trips are pre-arranged, customers have the opportunity to shop around, and agree to the fare structure in advance of accepting the service. This is particularly easy when the fare is estimated on the App, and can be easily compared to other Apps.
Accessibility Surcharges

While fares for accessible service are often mandated at the same rate as for standard taxis, some cities offer discounted accessible service for certain users. The City of Hamilton has a Taxi Scrip program which provides individuals who register with Accessible Transportation Services a 40 per cent discount with Hamilton taxi companies. Ottawa has a system where registered clients can buy coupons that result in an equivalent fare for the individual, and a 15 per cent surcharge for the accessible taxicab. Ottawa also requires that surcharges for trips arranged via App do not apply to passengers with mobility aids who require an accessible taxi (City of Ottawa, 2016).

Advanced Payment of Fares

Fare disputes and the non-payment of fares are commonplace, and have become an accepted part of the industry. While Taxicab Regulation 209/91 gives drivers the right to request payment upfront, owners and drivers indicate that most passengers are unaware of this right and requests may lead to a confrontation between the passenger and driver. Dispatch companies and owners train new drivers not to argue with or confront passengers over fare disputes. Standard taxicab drivers believe that pre-payment options and increased public awareness would reduce the number of disputes and/or non-payment.

One dispatch company provided data to MNP on the incidents of fares not paid. In the 200 days between February 2, 2016 and August 20, 2016 there were 407 reported incidents of non-payment, at an average amount owing of $17.25. Dispatch companies report that the number of incidents of non-payment are highly underreported, with likely only 1 in 3 incidents being reported. Drivers tend not to report the non-payment of fares as it takes time away from their ability to earn fares.

Advanced payment is not a common feature in the other jurisdictions reviewed. Winnipeg and Calgary are the only cities that have a provision for advance payment. Calgary sets out a pre-payment maximum and states clearly in their Passenger and Driver Bill of Rights that the driver "has a right to require a deposit of up to $30 to cover the cost of the fare" (City of Calgary, 2016).

An example of a city with a clear advanced payment policy is Melbourne, Australia. In Melbourne, all passengers must pre-pay between 10:00 pm and 5:00 am at the driver's request, and the driver can also request pre-payment at other times of the day or have passengers demonstrate ability to pay. This policy is clearly laid out on the Taxi Services Commission website (Taxi Services Comission, 2015).

Transportation network providers such as Uber eliminate the need for advanced payment because all users must have a credit card registered with their Uber account. The transaction is automatic at the completion of the trip. No cash exchanges hands.

Mobile payment technologies reduce the risk of non-payment, increase convenience for the segment of customers with access to smart phones and credit cards, and increase safety for both drivers and passengers. While this upcoming technology has the potential to impact how a large portion of taxicab trips are paid for in the future, it will not necessarily be available to all taxicab users given the need for a smart phone and credit card.
The two largest dispatch companies in Winnipeg have Apps which allow for fare estimates. At the time of writing, neither App has the capability to accept payment of fares. Taxicabs are booked via the App; however, the payment amount is determined by the taximeter which is not currently connected to the Apps.

10.2 Recommendations

1. **Establish a taxicab cost index as a means of determining when fare adjustments are required. Review annually, with minimum threshold for adjustment.**

   **Rationale:** A taxicab cost index will allow for efficient, objective adjustment of fares based on published, reliable data, and weighted for significance. It will provide a transparent and efficient mechanism to ensure fares remain relevant.

   **Impact:** Consultation with the industry is needed to validate the cost categories, weighting and benchmarks to ensure clear understanding and credibility of the tool. If current categories are valid, and the 2012 base rate was reasonable, no immediate adjustment is required. An index will remove the need for application by industry and an associated hearing. *[Not dependent on other recommendations]*

2. **Cooperate with the Motor Transport Board to harmonize distance rates across the CMA.**

   **Rationale:** Harmonizing distance fares in the CMA will address an existing challenge when taxicabs provide service across the municipal boundary. Maintaining a variable drop rate in each zone is more easily managed if considered necessary to reflect the nature of the service.

   **Impact:** Consumers would have a clearer understanding of fares to be charged. Establishing a common distance rate will remove the need to adjust the meter to a new rate while in transit, preventing concerns of ‘tinkering’ or poorly timed adjustments. The drop rate is highly visible and would be consistent in the area where the trip originates. *[Relevant to Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(2)]*

3. **Eliminate mandated fares for pre-arranged trips where fare estimates are provided and accepted in advance of booking.**

   **Rationale:** Flexibility in fares will allow all market participants to compete on the same basis, where consumer interests are protected with advance fare information. Customers have an opportunity to evaluate / accept the fare before accepting the service. This recommendation is contingent on there being sufficient choice in the market so that a provider cannot unfairly overcharge customers.

   **Impact:** De-regulating fares may result in higher fares during peak times, and lower fares during slower periods. Allowing the industry to charge variable rates will encourage more supply during peak periods, enabling timely service, or for those who can adjust, the knowledge of how to effectively time their trip to minimize cost. *[Dependent on Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(1); dependent on Supply and Demand recommendations 8(8) and 8(9)]*
4. **Incorporate an accessibility surcharge in licensing fees and/or fares to enable subsidization and encourage accessible service.**

*Rationale:* Accessible taxicabs also service standard taxicab users. A taxicab can complete more standard trips with less effort. Since the fares are set the same for both types of service, standard service enables higher income over the same period of time. Incentives are necessary to ensure drivers are not financially penalized by servicing the population requiring accessible service.

*Impact:* Applying an accessibility surcharge of $0.10 per trip to the 4.1 million standard trips in 2015 would generate approximately $410,000, and be essentially unnoticeable to passengers in cost. This can be used to cross-subsidize operators who provide accessible services, and encourage service to the accessible market. A means to collect and distribute the revenue will need to be established. *[Required to implement Supply and Demand recommendations 8(6) and 8(7)]*

5. **Establish zone fares for on-demand airport limousine/executive car service.**

*Rationale:* Limousines/executive cars currently provide service at the airport to downtown at a predetermined zone fare. This approach could be extended to other areas of the city. Allowing limousines to serve broader areas of the city from the airport with zone fares will increase the choice available to passengers and provide additional variable supply as may be needed during periods of peak demand. The prescribed zone fares should reflect the quality of service provided by executive cars and limousines, while being sufficiently competitive to provide a real consumer choice.

*Impact:* Increased service and choice for airport passengers. Increased utilization of existing service. *[Not dependent on other recommendations; relevant to and expands impact of Supply and Demand recommendation 8(9)]*

6. **Encourage consistent voluntary industry practice of standard advance payment or automated pay procedures.**

Taxicab companies could be encouraged to implement an industry practice of standard advance pay. Taxicab providers could also be encouraged to develop mobile payment technology for their mobile Apps to enable automated payment capability.

A fare estimator can be used to determine the pre-payment amounts. Both of the largest dispatch companies already have mobile Apps that provide fare estimates. The passenger does not need to have this technology – the driver can. Fare estimates are important for transparency and so customers feel comfortable with what they are paying.

For additional transparency, a printed receipt for the advanced payment should be issued by the driver immediately on receipt of payment, before driving anywhere. The passenger should be reimbursed/given change for any overpayment, or may need to pay extra for a trip that costs more than estimated. At the end of the trip, customers should be issued a second receipt to reflect the difference between the estimated and actual fares. Customers should be permitted to make advanced payment with either cash or debit/credit card.
**Rationale**: Non-payment and threats of violence around payment impact the safety and financial well-being of drivers. When only certain customers are asked for pre-payments, many feel discriminated against which impacts customer service. Just as some gas stations in the city request pre-payment at night, so too could taxicab companies. A voluntary system is recommended to encourage industry practice versus mandatory regulation as the practice itself has its own rewards.

**Impact**: Making advance payment of fares standard for all customers at night has the potential to increase driver safety, reduce discrimination, and reduce incidents of non-payment. A voluntary system adopted by industry keeps the administrative burden off of the TCB. Industry would implement the practice for advanced payment, communicate with customers, and develop their own mobile payment technology if they so choose. TCB involvement would consist of encouraging industry to adopt a voluntary practice and assisting with communication to the public. It will be important for customers to understand that they will be expected to pay upfront during certain times of day, and that everyone is treated equally. It will also be important for the companies to communicate to drivers the expectations and responsibilities around taking advanced payments.  

[Not dependent on other recommendations]
11.0 SAFETY AND SECURITY

Safety measures within the Winnipeg taxicab industry are mandated and/or enforced through provincial legislation, the Motor Transport Board, Manitoba Public Insurance (MPI), the Taxicab Board, and the Winnipeg Police Service. The safety and security of both taxicab drivers and customers are ongoing concerns for regulatory bodies and industry stakeholders.

The following list outlines passenger and driver rights related to safety as set out by Taxicab Regulation 209/91 – Part 6 Licence Holder Requirements:

### Passenger and Driver Rights

**A Passenger has a right to expect:**
- Not to be discharged at any other place than requested (unless the driver is at risk of harm)
- A driver not to use a cellular telephone while transporting passengers
- A driver to carry change for a $20 bill
- A mechanically safe vehicle that is clean and in good condition

**A driver shall not:**
- Sexually harass a passenger or make lewd remarks to a passenger
- Insult, abuse, intimidate or threaten a passenger
- Do or say anything that would likely make a reasonable passenger feel uncomfortable or insecure

**A Taxicab Driver has a right to:**
- Request to be paid a reasonable approximation of the fare in advance (meter must be engaged)
- Refuse a person to sit in the front seat (maximum passengers allowed is four)
- To refuse service if:
  - The driver believes he / she is at risk of harm
  - The passenger is disorderly
  - There is a risk of harm by the driver assisting the passenger upon their request

11.1 Driver Safety

Safety equipment for taxicabs such as in-car cameras, panic buttons, roof top strobe lights and driver shields are mandated by the Taxicab Board. The installation of in-car safety cameras arose following the murder of a taxicab driver in 2001. The incident sparked the Minister of Transportation and Government Services to appoint a Working Group to examine options for the recommendation of a taxicab safety action plan for taxicab drivers in Manitoba. Physical assault and robbery were identified as two of the primary risks facing taxicab drivers. The Taxicab Board implemented many of the proposed safety
equipment changes and issued a $0.25 surcharge to the initial drop meter rate to offset the associated implementation costs for drivers (Spacek, 2009).

In-car cameras are currently used to take rapid still images, which are saved and stored in the camera for 7 days. Upgrades to the in-car camera functionality and memory are mandated for May 2017. The TCB is currently investigating the feasibility of audio recordings in standard taxicabs.

The TCB mandated protective safety shields in January 2011 after a number of drivers were the victims of violent attacks (CBC News, 2012). Shields are not mandatory in other jurisdictions. Interviews with taxicab industry regulators in Vancouver, Hamilton and Ottawa indicate that drivers feel that the shields have a negative effect on their ability to interact with customers. Some have stated that the safety shield makes the cab ‘feel like a police car’. The additional expense associated with the installation of the shields was also a deterrent in these markets.

Taxicab drivers may refuse a trip if they see a passenger in possession of a weapon or if they feel their personal safety is at risk. Drivers also have the right to refuse to allow a passenger to sit in the front seat. Should this be the case, the maximum of four passengers per standard taxicab is reduced to a maximum of three passengers.

Driving a taxicab is a risky occupation, not fully made secure with current safety provisions. Winnipeg appears to have the most vigorous safety equipment requirements of all compared cities. Stakeholders indicate that drivers face significant safety risks associated with violent or intoxicated passengers, discrimination, fare disputes, and a lack of police presence. Some individuals vandalize the exterior of the vehicle by throwing stones and snowballs, kicking the vehicle, etc. Intoxicated passengers may damage the interior, open alcohol, and smoke during the course of a trip. Focus group participants agreed that certain areas of the city along with late night weekend shifts are typically more dangerous for drivers.

Interviews with dispatch companies and standard taxicab drivers and owners reveal that in-car protective shields and cameras act as a deterrent in some cases, but do not provide full protection from violent passengers. The impact of the shield is limited as it only provides protection to the back of the driver, not from the side. Technological innovation may be needed to achieve higher standards of safety within the industry going forward.

Safety is a greater concern for standard taxicab drivers than owners. Ninety-five per cent of standard taxicab owner survey respondents report feeling safe compared to fifty-three per cent of standard drivers. Drivers in focus group discussions believe that owners choose to operate their taxicab during ideal times of the day leaving more dangerous shifts for drivers, which may account for why they report feeling safer operating their taxicab compared to drivers in the online survey.
Standard taxicab drivers and owners expressed frustration over a perceived lack of police presence in the city. Drivers report waiting hours for an officer to respond to a call from a taxicab driver following an incident with a passenger. Drivers seek a collaborative / more reciprocal relationship with the Winnipeg Police Service (WPS). They feel strongly that the industry supports the WPS. Drivers are additional eyes and ears on the road and are often asked by WPS to keep watch for stolen vehicles, to report criminal activity, and suspicious behaviour. Focus group participants felt a sense of pride in helping the WPS and believe that more support from the WPS towards taxicab drivers would go a long way to improving safety within the community for both drivers and the general public that use this service.

Three out of five limousine owners who completed the online survey report not feeling safe operating their vehicle. Nine limousine drivers and owners who attended focus group discussions believe that driver safety is a non-issue due to the type of customers the niche market attracts.

Accessible taxicab owners face risks associated with passengers who suffer from disorders related to anxiety about travelling in vehicles or those who are prone to seizures or aggressive behavior due to mental illness. Adequate training for accessible taxicab drivers, along with effective communication from care providers regarding the specific needs of patients when they request an accessible taxicab is critical to ensuring the safety of both drivers and passengers.

### 11.2 Passenger Safety

Taxicab Regulation 209/91 contains a number of provisions to protect passengers which are now law under other enactments. For example, the use of cellular phones while driving is now prohibited in Manitoba. Drivers can be ticketed for not wearing a seat belt or for each passenger under the age of 18 who is not properly secured in a seat belt or child car seat. Taxicab drivers must wear a seat belt at all times when they are not carrying passengers. The only exception is if the driver feels that their personal safety is at risk.

To protect the safety of passengers who use taxicab services, the TCB requires criminal record checks for taxicab driver licence applicants that includes a vulnerable sector search and child abuse registry check. Mandatory training for taxicab drivers includes modules for driver safety and safety equipment handling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel safe operating my taxicab in Winnipeg.</th>
<th>Standard Taxi Driver</th>
<th>Standard Taxi Owner/Operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Online Driver and Owner Survey
for passengers. The enhanced Accessibility Transportation Training module began December 2016 and involves instruction on how to properly secure wheelchairs in handicab vans.

The safety of passengers who use taxicab services in Winnipeg is a concern for the majority of stakeholders, particularly the general public who participated in the online survey. Results vary somewhat between the consumer telephone and online surveys, as well as between standard taxicab users and vulnerable groups such as persons with disabilities, the senior population, and Indigenous participants.

Taxicab users who participated in the telephone survey were asked to rate the importance of safety in taxis along with their level of satisfaction on a scale of '0' to '10'. Women rated Safety in the Vehicle as more important than men (9.4 compared to 8.7 out of 10). Satisfaction scores related to safety are similar; 8.0 for female versus 7.9 for male survey respondents. Telephone survey respondents, the more representative sample of the general Winnipeg population, indicated less public concern over safety than the more frequent users who responded to the online survey.

Safety is a greater concern for higher users of taxicab services as shown in the chart below. Fifty-eight per cent of online survey respondents report feeling safe while travelling in a taxicab and believe they will be covered by the appropriate insurance in case of an accident. Fifty-seven per cent expect the driver has had appropriate background checks and fifty-one per cent expect the driver has had extra training on the safe operation of a taxi.

Less than half (47%) of online public survey respondents agree they felt safe waiting at the taxi stand. Indigenous respondents are more likely than overall respondents to disagree that I felt safe waiting at the taxi stand; 37 per cent of Indigenous respondents disagreed versus 26 per cent of overall respondents who disagreed.

\textit{Figure 48 Perceived Risk to Passenger Safety}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & Important & Very Important & Agree & Strongly agree \\
\hline
I felt safe while travelling in the taxi. & 74\% & 8\% & 40\% & 22\% \\
I expect the driver has had appropriate background checks. & 68\% & 24\% & 33\% & 27\% \\
I expect the driver has had extra training on the safe operation of a taxi. & 67\% & 18\% & 33\% & 25\% \\
I believe I will be covered by insurance, in the case of accident, at least as well as if I was... & 57\% & 14\% & 44\% & 30\% \\
I felt safe waiting at the taxi stand. & 55\% & 6\% & 45\% & 33\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Perceived Risk to Passenger Safety}
\end{table}

Source: Online Public Survey
Safety was the fourth most frequently identified priority for change from online survey comments (1,602 out of 16,295 comments). Unsafe driving behaviour was identified as a concern by online survey respondents. Participants reported issues that ranged from feeling generally unsafe or uncomfortable (both male and female respondents) to speeding and disregarding traffic rules such as not signalling. Some public survey respondents believe that 12-hour shifts for drivers are too long and may contribute to careless driving habits. They believe that driver hours should be regulated similar to truck drivers and aircraft pilots to address the issue.

Driver transcripts from MPI may not fully reflect the accident experience if the driver chooses not to make a claim. According to TCB data, road safety complaints from the public, ranging from unsafe/reckless driving to talking on a cellphone while driving, have decreased from 67 in 2011 to 32 in 2015.

The concerns below were noted by a small number of survey and interview participants. This information is deemed relevant to report due to the serious nature of the remarks.

Online survey respondents reported concerns regarding replacement drivers, where their driver was not the same person posted in the taxicab photo. The photo of the driver and/or the driver number is not currently required to be posted in the taxicab. The passenger is therefore unable to note or report a driver, or identify the driver as licenced by TCB should a problem occur.

Public survey respondents report experiencing discrimination and harassment by taxicab drivers. Some respondents attribute the reason for ride refusal to racism and/or gender bias on the part of taxicab drivers. Online survey participants, both male and female, made reference to inappropriate behavior / comments by a driver towards a passenger including innuendo, sexual remarks, advances and/or touching.

A few survey respondents believe that some drivers may be involved in illegal activity or were under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Interviews with representative organizations indicate a concern that some drivers may be connected to the drug trade and/or are involved in human trafficking. This issue has attracted some media attention. Public online survey respondents made suggestions for improving safety for taxicab passengers which included more frequent criminal record checks.

While none of these concerns have been investigated, all indicate a need for passengers to be able to properly identify the driver.

**Vulnerable Passengers**

One hundred eighty-three public respondents self-identified as having a disability that limits their ability to travel. Of that group, safety was the most frequently identified priority for change. Safety was the second most frequently identified priority for change by Indigenous survey participants (492 respondents). Less than half of Indigenous women (45%) reported feeling safe in Winnipeg taxicabs. Indigenous respondents were less likely than overall respondents to feel safe travelling in the taxicab (45% versus 58%).
Interviews with organizations that represent vulnerable populations indicated that many Indigenous women have experienced inappropriate behavior and/or harassment on the part of taxicab drivers. Representatives believe that drivers are in a position of power and control over potentially vulnerable passengers. The Safe Cities Initiative reports that numerous incidents involving violence against women have taken place in various types of public transportation, including taxicabs and limousines (Winnipeg Safe City Steering Committee, 2016).

The Safe Cities Initiative, established in Winnipeg in 2013, supports innovative approaches to preventing and reducing harassment and sexual violence against women and girls in public spaces (City of Winnipeg, 2016). Members of the steering committee include representatives from the health care sector, Government of Manitoba, City of Winnipeg, Winnipeg Police Service, Winnipeg Transit, Indigenous organizations, and University of Winnipeg. The Director of the TCB has reached out to the Safe City Steering Committee in an effort to collaborate / build a partnership with the organization.

Representatives for vulnerable populations in Winnipeg report that excessive speed can create fear for Indigenous and elderly taxicab passengers, while language barriers or a perceived lack of awareness regarding Indigenous culture may contribute to misunderstandings between drivers and passengers. Representatives from seniors’ organizations indicate that many elderly passengers feel somewhat unsafe in taxicabs, preferring to share taxicab rides for ‘safety in numbers’.

There is also a concern regarding the lack of safety protocols and vehicle maintenance. Representative organizations report a consistent issue with drivers failing to fasten the required safety straps for accessible passengers as well as a concern that some drivers have refused an accessible customer, indicating that the safety straps in the vehicle were broken.

The TCB reports that to better inform passengers, in 2016, they placed information stickers in all accessible taxicabs and handicab vans that illustrate the proper securement of a wheelchair.

Interviews with organizations that represent vulnerable populations in Winnipeg indicate that the current in-cab surveillance is inadequate and that video cameras with audio capability would help improve both driver and passenger safety. Audio capability may have some benefit, but also raises privacy concerns. An interview with representatives from Tourism Winnipeg revealed that increased signage in taxicabs notifying passengers that a camera is operating throughout the ride would provide some comfort to passengers.

### 11.3 Vehicle Safety

All taxicabs and safety equipment must undergo a mechanical safety inspection and a general safety inspection semi-annually or as specified in the Taxicab Regulation 209/91. Taximeters and in-car cameras are required to be certified semi-annually by a TCB approved facility.

Mechanical Safety Inspections are conducted at MPI Certified Inspection Stations, with an MPI Light Vehicle Inspection Certificate issued to the taxicab business licence holder once the vehicle is approved, which must be submitted to the TCB.
Vehicles must meet specified age requirements. There is no age restriction on standard taxicabs. Premium/specialty limousines must not be older than 5 years; executive cars must not be older than 8 years; and classic limousines are 25 years or older. Vehicle age restrictions vary across Canada. Edmonton does not have a vehicle age limit for taxis. Calgary and Ottawa require vehicles to be no more than 8 years; 7 years is the maximum in Vancouver; and Hamilton has a maximum of 6 years for standard taxis, 7 years for hybrid vehicles, and 10 years for accessible vehicles.

A summary of the safety measures required in Winnipeg and other jurisdictions in Canada is reflected in the table below.

Table 22 Summary of Safety Measures Across Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Ottawa</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camera (taxicab)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield Required</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Records</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Records</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Safety Inspections</td>
<td>6 mo.; Annual for stretch</td>
<td>Annual, all</td>
<td>Annual; 2/yr if over 3 yrs. old</td>
<td>Annual &lt;5 yrs old; 6 mo. if older</td>
<td>6 mo.</td>
<td>6 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and/or Road Inspections</td>
<td>Can inspect at any time inspector finds livery vehicle operating</td>
<td>Upon the direction of a by-law enforcement officer or the City Manager</td>
<td>As required by Issuer of Licenses</td>
<td>Annual ≤5 yrs; Semi-annual &gt;5 years</td>
<td>Annual for Limo; Taximeters every 6 months</td>
<td>Minimum 6 mo.; Annual for limo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Age Restriction</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6 years; 7 if hybrid; 10 if accessible</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Taxicab – no restriction Exec. car – 8 yrs. Classic limo – 25 yrs. or older Premium / speciality vehicle limo – 5 yrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.4 Consumer Protection

Taxicab Regulation 209/91 stipulates requirements for receipts, working taximeters, that the driver has adequate knowledge of Winnipeg streets, and takes the most direct route to the passenger’s destination.

Taximeter inspections are conducted by TCB-approved meter shops and must pass an inspection at least semi-annually or sooner at the discretion of the Chief Inspector. Taximeters being inspected and taximeters being used are separate concerns. Industry and public consultations indicate that the taximeter is not always turned on nor the trip recorded for some short distance trips. This practice leaves consumers vulnerable to being charged for a fare that is inconsistent with the regulated metered fare.
Representatives from seniors’ organizations have received feedback from their members that drivers take advantage of elderly passengers by not charging the rate on the meter or by charging each individual separately for a shared trip.

Some consultation participants indicated there can be difficulties in tracking down a specific taxicab when items are lost and that taximeter receipts are not filled out completely. The regulation only requires driver initials on the receipt, which is unreliable as a means of identifying the taxicab. Electronic receipts are a requirement in some jurisdictions including Calgary and Toronto. Toronto requires taxicabs to have a meter that issues an electronic receipt for each trip with date, time, distance, taxi licence number and fare upon request. This increases the reliability of receipt information and would include the taxicab and driver number which is essential information required for complaint reporting and follow-up.

11.5 Recommendations

1. **Mandate in-car posted photo identification including taxicab driver number.**

   **Rationale:** Passengers need to be able to identify their driver if an issue arises so a proper complaint can be filed and investigated. One of the advantages customers see from the TNC system is the fact that they have a photo and know who their driver is.

   **Impact:** Photo ID will provide the essential information required for complaint reporting and follow-up, with the potential of increasing accountability for drivers and facilitating on-road inspection. *[Supports Compliance and Enforcement recommendation 13(4)]*

2. **Mandate increased signage within all taxicab and limousine vehicle types, ensuring clear notices of cameras, and audio recording.**

   **Rationale:** Cameras in the taxicabs serve a purpose for safety. By mandating the longer memory storage for the cameras, the investigation time crunch is reduced. As passengers may have an expectation of privacy, it is important to provide clear notice that they are on camera when they are in a taxicab. If audio recording is enabled by upgrades to in-cab cameras at a later date, it will be important that all customers are aware that their conversations are being recorded. A passenger may notice the camera itself, but would not necessarily assume that their conversations are being recorded. Individuals may have concerns about having business conversations or personal conversations recorded.

   **Impact:** Clear notice of in-car cameras may increase passenger feelings of safety and security, and make them aware of the evidence available should an incident arise. Passengers may adjust their behavior with audio recording. Some may select another mode of transportation. *[Not dependent on other recommendations]*

3. **Seek to obtain third party data to enable the TCB to monitor safety.** Approach the Winnipeg Police Service to determine if incident report fields could be created to enable monitoring of criminal activity occurring in taxicabs. Monitor WCB claims.
**Rationale:** Passenger and driver safety is a primary concern, and may require further vigilance with an expansion of drivers through a TNC. Currently the TCB does not have any available data to monitor the frequency or severity of safety concerns. Consultations indicate passenger concerns are under-reported. WPS incident reports do not currently enable an efficient search for incidents in or involving taxicabs or taxicab drivers.

**Impact:** Increasing access to data will allow the TCB to take an evidence-based approach to regulatory standards for safety. Data is available on request from the WCB. Discussion with the WPS is required to determine what further information may reasonably be gained. [Supported by Safety and Security recommendation 11(4)]

4. **Increase collaborative contact with Winnipeg Police Service and maintain an active role with Safe Cities Initiative.**

**Rationale:** Drivers face significant safety risks associated with violent, disorderly, and intoxicated passengers. A closer collaborative relationship may identify effective ways of improving safety and WPS support. Inter-agency partnerships between WPS, Safe Cities Initiative and the taxicab industry and associated public awareness would increase both driver and passenger feelings of safety.

**Impact:** Increased sense of safety and cooperation between groups that are active on Winnipeg streets on a 24/7 basis. [Supports Safety and Security recommendation 11(3); relevant to Compliance and Enforcement recommendation 13(3)]

5. **Increase the number of well-signed, supervised taxicab stands in downtown area.**

**Rationale:** Only a small percentage of public survey respondents reported feeling safe at taxicab stands. Supervised taxicab stands will provide a sense of security for customers, a reduction in the occurrence of safety-related incidents over the short and long term, fewer complaints to dispatch companies and the TCB, along with an improved public image of the taxicab industry in Winnipeg. It will also enable metered taxicabs to more effectively serve this demand.

**Impact:** The TCB is unable to implement this recommendation on its own and will need to work with the City of Winnipeg, the hospitality industry and others to enable this. For example, a bar may be able to target external security cameras and/or allow its security staff to monitor a taxicab stand outside its main doors as patrons are leaving at the end of the night. This would assist the venue to quickly and safely exit patrons, and provide some additional safety for passengers and drivers. Cooperation from the City and/or the Parking Authority is needed to enable taxi stands to be effectively placed to enable supervision by a venue and to enable effective signage and lighting. The Winnipeg Police Service and Downtown Biz, once aware of the locations, could monitor activity at taxi stands as part of its regular patrol activity.  [Supported by Safety and Security recommendation 11(4), reduces industry impact of Supply and Demand recommendation 8(8)]]
12.0 CUSTOMER SERVICE

The general public and businesses that rely on vehicles for hire to provide services to their members are the primary clients of the taxicab industry. High users of the service include those seeking transportation to work, to the airport, for personal needs (e.g., groceries and appointments) and for social outings or entertainment, whether as residents or visitors to Winnipeg. Customer satisfaction is commonly based on:

- **Availability of the service** – how easy is it to find information about the service and make contact; how quickly the service is initiated and how timely the full execution of the service
- **Quality of the service** – the existence of service standards; achievement or exceeding these standards; characteristics of the service experience (e.g. friendly, helpful drivers)
- **Affordability of the service** – the payment for the service is equivalent to the value of the service; various methods of payment are available
- **Problem resolution** – how effectively and how quickly complaints are resolved to the customer’s satisfaction; the manner of treatment

The availability of taxicab service, in terms of wait time for pick up and affordability, have been covered in previous sections of the report. This section focuses on stakeholder perspectives regarding the quality of service provided by the industry and how effectively problems are resolved.

Customer service is ordinarily encouraged by consumer choice and competition. When choice is limited by the regulatory environment, service standards become an obligation of the regulator. The following list outlines passenger and driver rights related to customer service as set out by Taxicab Regulation 209/91:
There are no obligations for drivers, owners or dispatchers to resolve, track or report complaints. The Regulations outline higher expectations for premium dispatch companies to monitor and address customer complaints. Section 37(3) of Taxicab Regulation 209/91 stipulates requirements which include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Maintaining systems to respond to and investigate service complaints promptly and to monitor customer satisfaction levels
- Maintaining and enforcing standards of conduct for drivers, dispatchers, telephone operators and supervisors
- Administering a system to discipline employees for breaches of standards of conduct
- Operating in compliance with service standards for telephone answering time and taxicab response time
- Ensuring that, for every 11 metered taxicabs operated by or in affiliation with the dispatch service, at least one accessible taxicab is operated by or affiliated with dispatch service

There are currently no premium taxicab dispatch companies.
12.1 Quality of Service

Taxicab users who participated in the telephone survey rated the overall satisfaction of their experience at a mean score of 7.1 on a scale of ‘0’ to ‘10’. Females rated their overall satisfaction higher than males; 7.3 compared to 6.8 respectively. Eight-eight per cent of standard taxicab users and 100 per cent of limousine, accessible taxicab and handicab van users reported feeling satisfied with their experience.

*Figure 49 Overall Customer Satisfaction by Vehicle Type*

Customers age 55 or older indicated higher satisfaction with an average score of 7.2 out of 10 compared to those under the age of 35 (6.9 out of 10). Taxicab users residing in the south suburbs of Winnipeg have a higher satisfaction rating compared to residents of central Winnipeg; 7.3 compared to 6.6 respectively.

Participants were asked to rate levels of satisfaction over a variety of service attributes. Limousine, accessible taxicabs, and handicap van users (*Other For Hire Users* in the graph below) are generally more satisfied with the service provided than standard taxicab users. Respondents indicated satisfaction with attributes such as the payment process, licence and insurance requirements, and safety in the vehicle. Professionalism of the driver, wait time for pick up, and the cost of the fare score lower for standard taxicab users as reflected in the chart below.

*Figure 50 Customer Satisfaction by Service Attribute and Vehicle Type*
Responses from telephone and online survey respondents vary on measures of customer service and satisfaction. The more frequent taxicab users who responded to the online survey indicated lower levels of satisfaction. A majority of online survey respondents agreed there are several methods available to order a taxi (83%) and that taxi information is easy to find (72%); however, only 27 per cent feel their entire experience was as good as or better than in other cities.

Less than half of respondents were satisfied with vehicle comfort (47%) and cleanliness (49%). Only 41 per cent indicate that the driver had good knowledge of the city and was friendly and attentive. Ninety per cent or more rate these service attributes as important or very important.

**Figure 51 Customer Assessment of Service Attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Attribute</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The driver had good knowledge of the city and the best routes to take.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vehicle was clean and well-maintained.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dispatcher was courteous and helpful.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The entire experience was as good as or better than the experiences I have had in other cities.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were several methods available to order a taxi (ex: phone, online, app)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about how to access taxi services was easy to find.</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The driver was friendly and attentive.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vehicle was comfortable.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The driver helped me with luggage and packages.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Online Public Survey

Interviews and focus groups conducted with industry stakeholders including dispatch companies, standard drivers and owners indicated customer service would be improved with the permitted use of diamond lanes to reduce travel time and fares, particularly during peak periods such as rush hour. The
use of diamond lanes was cited as a first priority for change in the online driver and owner survey. Industry reported that additional taxi stands throughout the city would provide another opportunity to improve customer service, naming it the fourth highest priority for change among standard taxicab owners.

12.1.1 Tourism and Hospitality

Interviews conducted with Tourism Winnipeg and the Manitoba Hotel Association provided insight regarding the relationship between the taxi, hotel and tourism industries. The hospitality and tourism industries strive to offer guests a superior experience during their stay in the city, and a visitor’s travel experience often starts with taxicab service. Visitors expect quality and reliable service and their experience, whether positive or negative, has an impact on the public image of the city.

Tourism and hospitality organizations would like taxicab drivers to be good ambassadors for the city. They do not feel the industry is accomplishing this goal. Online public survey respondents agreed there is room for improvement. Only 25 per cent indicated that their driver was a good ambassador for the city. In addition to a request for more tourism-related training for drivers, Tourism Winnipeg would like to see increased choice in vehicles for hire.

12.1.2 Airport Service

The Winnipeg Airports Authority (WAA) provided input regarding vehicle for hire service to and from the airport. The WAA mandates specific customer service training for companies that provide transportation services to the airport and has been very pleased with the results for those that have taken the training. Limousine contract holders participate in the training. The standard taxicab provider has not been willing to require their associated drivers to undertake the airport training. There may be little to no incentive for the company to do so due to a lack of competition for the WAA contract. The current provider was the only bidder on the airport contract in 2015 and has been the sole service provider to the Winnipeg James Armstrong Richardson International Airport since at least 1996.

Beyond availability, as addressed under Supply and Demand, the majority of complaints from airport customers involve trip refusals. Standard taxicab drivers confirmed that some drivers show a preference for longer distance trips. As a result, drivers may initially refuse a short trip unless an airport representative intervenes. Some focus group participants indicate that both standard and accessible taxicabs are not showing up for pre-arranged morning trips to the airport. Drivers, on the other hand, believe that traffic constraints prevent a timely return to the airport.

The WAA reports passengers have had difficulty getting lost items back when left in a taxicab. Airport customers want the option to pay with debit/credit cards, but drivers often indicate the machine is out of service. Public survey respondents indicate that the Prius taxi size is not large enough for luggage, and the service provider would like to see more airport signage on roadways to assure visiting passengers that the driver is taking the most direct route to the airport.
12.2 Priorities for Change and Problem Resolution

Online survey participants were asked to identify their top priorities for change, which resulted in 14,948 comments made by 6,222 respondents. Themes emerged from the analysis of the open-ended responses, which include dissatisfaction with standard taxicab driver service, taxicab condition, available technology, driver road habits, cell phone use and driver appearance. A summary of customer service related comments made by public survey respondents is reflected in the figure below.

Figure 52 Customer Service Priorities for Change

![Customer Service Priorities for Change](image)

Source: Online Public Survey

The top three priorities for change include improvements regarding customer service on the part of drivers, taxicab condition and available technology. Many respondents reported that increased market competition would improve overall customer service and satisfaction. Standard taxicab drivers acknowledged that the current industry structure does not provide incentive for drivers to adhere to customer service standards and that passengers lack options if dissatisfied with the quality of taxicab services.

Requests for upgrades to technology include the use of smartphones and/or online capabilities that would allow customers to follow the vehicle’s route, fare estimates and arrival times as well as an option to provide a driver rating following each trip. While both major dispatch companies have this technology available, it does not appear the public has adopted its use. Reviews of the Apps cite functional challenges. Users of the Apps have expressed frustration in actually securing a taxicab through the App (call request accepted and then dropped).

Only 18 out of 36 individuals who state that they use accessible taxicab or handicap van service the most responded to the survey question about priorities. Comments were not accessibility related but rather about clean taxis, App technology, Uber, safety, route knowledge, and fares - the same type of concerns shown by the general population. For online survey respondents, a concern related to accessibility was about a need for improved training for drivers, both in how they interact with passengers with disabilities.
and in securing wheelchairs in the vehicle. Other concerns raised by passengers included discrimination towards individuals with disabilities, assistance with luggage and parcels, for the service to be easier to access, and for awareness of hearing and vision accessibility concerns.

Beyond mobility, accessibility is important for passengers with limited hearing, vision, speech, cognitive or learning disabilities. The TCB needs alternate ways to communicate with these customers, enable complaints or feedback etc. All website material should meet web accessibility standards. Stickers and other printed materials for inside the taxis should use a font accessible to a wider audience. The Canadian National Institute for the Blind (CNIB) recommends using a font size between 12 and 18, standard fonts such as Verdana or Arial, bold rather than italics to emphasize information, and black or dark blue font on a white or yellow background (CNIB, 2016). Other potential information resources in addition to the CNIB include the Canadian Hard of Hearing Association – MB Chapter, and the Canadian Transportation Agency’s Removing Communication Barriers for Travellers with Disabilities: Code of Practice.

**Problem Resolution**

Public surveys indicated concerns regarding dispatch companies and the current complaint process. Issues range from dispatch operator rudeness or impatience to dissatisfaction after filing a complaint with a dispatch company. Survey participants reported being hung up on, not having calls returned, and/or having trouble retrieving lost or missing items. Less than half, forty-one per cent, agree that the dispatcher was courteous and helpful.

There is a public perception that dispatch companies are not maintaining records of complaints or taking the appropriate action that would include follow up to the complainant regarding the status of their concern. Very few online survey respondents (13%) feel their concern was addressed appropriately. Only 26 per cent agree they knew who to contact with a complaint. Focus group discussions with standard taxicab drivers revealed a potential gap in communication between dispatch operators and available drivers. Customers indicated to drivers they have waited a long time for a taxicab to arrive during slow periods of the day. Drivers, in turn, question why this would be the case when they have been sitting idle waiting to be dispatched.

A small percentage of telephone survey participants, (12 per cent of standard taxicab users and 9 per cent of limousine, accessible taxicab and handicab van users), indicated having *an unpleasant or bad experience that made you feel so uncomfortable you reported the incident to someone*. Two thirds (67%) of those who reported an incident felt that the situation was not resolved to their satisfaction.
Indigenous respondents were less likely than overall respondents to agree that My complaint or concern was addressed appropriately; 52 per cent agree compared to 67 per cent. Interviews with representative organizations revealed that many Indigenous taxicab customers either do not know where to make a formal complaint and/or feel so dissatisfied with the complaint resolution process that they refrain from reporting their concerns.
Despite the public notice that is posted in taxicabs, the consumer public is generally unaware of how to contact the TCB with matters concerning drivers and/or dispatch companies. Survey respondents who have notified the TCB with a comment or concern report feeling that the TCB is not giving due consideration to such complaints. Discussions with representative organizations indicated that customers are not receiving communication as to the outcomes of complaints.

Owners and drivers generally disagree about customer complaint handling by the TCB. Ninety-seven per cent of standard taxicab owners believe that the TCB handles customer complaints objectively and fairly. Only fifty-eight per cent of drivers agree.

Further review on the topic of complaint handling is included in the following section Compliance and Enforcement.
12.3 Recommendations

1. **Encourage, rather than regulate, details of customer service requirements.** Encourage best practices and enable market forces to promote desired behaviour.

   **Rationale:** The regulations do not appear to be effective in ensuring a high standard of customer service. If customers have more choice, vehicle for hire companies that do not provide quality service will lose business. Regulating customer service measures tends to drive behavior to the minimum required for compliance and is difficult to enforce.

   **Impact:** By monitoring customer service and/or complaint data, dispatch companies, drivers and owners will be able to address areas needing improvement. This will improve consumer opinion regarding the taxicab industry as a whole. Over time, dispatch companies may see an improvement in the number of requests for taxicab service, a reduction in complaints made by customers, as well as a reduction in the administrative burden on service providers and the TCB. [Dependent on other recommendations that increase choice: Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(1); Supply and Demand recommendations 8(8) and 8(9); Licensing Structure recommendation 10(5)]

2. **Publish the customer and driver ‘bill of rights’ on the TCB website and post in taxicabs.**

   **Rationale:** Customers need to understand their rights as well as the rights of drivers. Some customer dissatisfaction stems from a lack of understanding. People who are aware of their rights will be more engaged/inclined to report issues when their rights have not been upheld.

   **Impact:** Increased awareness and understanding has the potential to improve customer satisfaction in the short term by reducing misunderstandings between customers and drivers. There may be an increase in complaints reported in the short term that will help to establish a baseline. [Relevant to Compliance and Enforcement recommendation 13(4)]

3. **Establish accountability for ensuring effective customer service with the dispatch companies as well as business licence holder.** Monitor through periodic customer surveys and complaints data.

   **Rationale:** Customers are currently dissatisfied with taxicab service overall. While drivers are the front line service providers, dispatch companies also interact with customers, and business licence holders are in a position to provide incentives for drivers to provide superior service.

   **Impact:** By monitoring customer service and/or complaint data, dispatch companies, drivers and owners will be able to address areas needing improvement. [Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1), 8(2) and 8(8); Licensing Structure recommendation 9(4)]

4. **Encourage dispatch companies and business licence holders to undertake hospitality / tourism training offered by Tourism Winnipeg.**

   **Rationale:** Customers do not see drivers as good ambassadors, but rather view them as lacking knowledge of the city. Tourism Winnipeg offers free training for drivers. They have the knowledge,
insight and know what tourists care about. Organizations in the tourism and/or hospitality industries can promote companies that complete training via traditional and social media. The TCB can encourage this behavior by recognizing those that have undertaken the training on its website.

**Impact:** Drivers that undertake the training will have enhanced knowledge to promote the city. Promoting companies that complete the training would serve two purposes. In the short term, it would provide companies with a positive, and cost effective, method to promote their business (PR opportunity) and would improve the public image of the taxicab industry over the long term. [Relevant to Customer Service recommendation 12(3)]

5. Consider recommending a representative from the tourism or the hospitality industry for the Taxicab Board.

**Rationale:** A member of the Taxicab Board with a tourism/hospitality/customer service focus would bring a useful perspective to TCB discussions, and may enable further collaborative relationships with the tourism and hospitality industry.

**Impact:** The TCB gains an enhanced perspective and a greater connection with taxicab customers. The tourism representative can provide a service-oriented view that promotes the city of Winnipeg, as well as a global perspective on customer service issues impacting the tourism industry.

Over the long term, the potential to collaborate/build a partnership may open the door to ongoing communication between the taxicab and tourism industries, both of which rely on each other. [Not dependent on other recommendations]

13.0 COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

13.1 Compliance Inspections

The Compliance Unit of the Taxicab Board is responsible for enforcing the Regulations of *The Taxicab Act* and are considered Peace Officers under *The Highway Traffic Act*. They have the authority to issue tickets under both *The Taxicab Act* and *The Highway Traffic Act*. Compliance Unit inspector duties include, investigating complaints, participating in Taxicab Board hearings, assisting Winnipeg Police Services with collection of information or evidence, managing inspection processes mandated by the applicable legislation and performing road inspections, commonly referred to as check stops.

**Inspectors**

There are currently two taxicab Compliance Unit inspectors and one Chief Inspector at the TCB. These inspectors work regular hours from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm. After-hours inspections and road patrols during the evening and weekend result in the inspectors incurring overtime. The inspector to taxicab ratio in
Winnipeg is 1:154 from April through October. This ratio increases to one inspector for every 188 taxicab vehicles in November through March during which time seasonal taxicabs are in operation.

As seen below, the Winnipeg ratio of inspectors to taxicabs is comparable to the ratio of 1:150 in Hamilton. Inspector to taxicab ratios range significantly across other Canadian cities from 1:30 in Ottawa to 1:608 in Vancouver. Ottawa and Vancouver both have unique situations. Vancouver has one official inspector plus 'secret shopper' type enforcement people who pose as regular passengers. Ottawa has a low ratio of inspectors to taxicabs because general by-law officers serve as inspectors. Hamilton and Ottawa charge for inspections.

Table 23 Inspector to Metered Taxicab Ratio Across Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Ottawa</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Taxicabs</td>
<td>1,699 + 210 AT</td>
<td>1,235 + 95 AT</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>475 + 133 AT</td>
<td>410 + 52 AT (565 Nov-Mar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Inspectors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vehicle Inspections

General inspections are conducted by Compliance Unit inspectors at the Taxicab Board Office at an appointed time and date. General inspections incorporate general cleanliness, damage, decals, safety components such as lights and signals and in-car camera inspections. All taxicabs must pass a General Inspection at least semi-annually; limousines must pass a general inspection annually. However, the TCB noted that for a time between 2013/14 and 2016, not all General inspections were completed due to staffing pressures.

Dispatch companies are also involved with vehicle inspections, to the degree that the TCB may allow them to conduct re-inspection of select faults on standard taxicabs outside of regular TCB business hours. The TCB inspectors will specify which faults noted on their inspection report may be re-inspected by the dispatch company, and the dispatch company forwards the required re-inspection form after completion of the inspection to the TCB. Generally, dispatch companies may re-inspect minor faults such as body damage, interior condition, lights, etc. Major faults and all faults on wheelchair vans or accessible taxis are to be re-inspected at the TCB office only.

Road patrols/inspections are also conducted by Compliance Unit inspectors of the TCB. These are conducted in a similar way to a check stop, whereby taxicabs are randomly pulled over to check for compliance with vehicle, equipment, securement of wheelchair and licensing requirements as per The Taxicab Act and Regulations and The Highway Traffic Act. Road inspections are one of the methods used by the Compliance Unit to identify operators of unlicensed private vehicles for hire and taxicabs licensed
in other jurisdictions that are operating in Winnipeg. An inspector may, at any time, direct a holder of a taxicab business licence to take a taxicab to the Taxicab Board office for inspection.

If an inspection or investigation indicates taxicab equipment does not meet requirements, a Taxicab Compliance Unit inspector may order a taxicab out of service or provide the taxicab licence holder with a specific amount of time to remedy the deficiency. All out-of-service notices must be provided in writing to the driver or taxicab business licence owner, and in the case of affiliation with a dispatch service, notice given to the dispatch service. The TCB noted that generally a car is only ordered out of service if the identified fault impacts safety.

A Taxicab inspector may issue offence notices to individuals operating or driving a taxicab within the city of Winnipeg without the proper licences issued by the Taxicab Board. The offence notices do not come with set fines. The TCB inspectors noted that there is difficulty in writing offence notices. They have a Brown Book which summarizes common offence notices and allows abbreviations etc. If the offence is not noted in the Brown Book, the peace officer must use the formal wording to describe the offence and check mark the box indicating to be determined by a Justice. Inspectors noted they find this difficult and time consuming. Currently there are only three offences included in the Brown Book under The Taxicab Act:

- Section 4(1) operating a taxicab without a taxicab licence – fine to be determined
- Section 11(3) drive a taxicab without a taxicab licence – fine to be determined
- Section 21 fail to pay the proper fare – fine of $299.65

The offence notice must be filed with the Courts and upon Summary Conviction, the Court will determine the fine to be paid and any other penalties.

Tickets the inspectors can issue under The Highway Traffic Act come with set fines. Most of the offences under The Highway Traffic Act are included in the Brown Book.

2015 Vehicle Inspections

In 2015 there were a total of 3,942 inspections performed by the TCB inspectors, which includes road patrols. When a vehicle inspection is completed at the TCB office, the inspector records the results on an inspection form. These results are then entered into the TCB inspection database by administrative staff. Road patrol inspections that do not result in a directive to attend a formal inspection at the TCB office are not included in the TCB inspection database.

Semi-annual mechanical safety inspections are performed at approved garages. These inspections were not listed in the inspection data provided by the TCB.

The TCB does not regularly analyze, monitor or report inspection data. Inspection data for 2015 was tracked two ways: Inspections by Reason and Inspections by Fault. Only the Inspections by Fault data included reference to a taxicab business licence number. The data been analyzed below. The two sets report a different total number of unique inspections. According to the Inspections by Reason Data there
were 1,442 inspections in 2015. According to the Inspections by Fault data there were 1,209 inspections in 2015.

Figure 55 TCB Unique Taxicab Inspections by Reason – 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrol Check</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of Vehicles</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Taxi</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Inspection</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of Company</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Authority</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Meter Check</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Report</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Blank)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 56 TCB Inspections by Month (Inspections by Reason Data) – 2015

2015 Inspections by Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the provided data, 2015 Inspections by Fault, there were 594 taxicabs inspected by the TCB in 2015, with a total of 1,209 inspections. This is less than the total number of licensed taxicabs (all classes). Forty-five per cent of taxicabs that were inspected by the TCB in 2015 were inspected once. Twenty-five taxicabs were inspected 5 to 9 times, and accounted for 145 of the inspections. This 4 per cent of taxicabs accounted for 12 per cent of the inspections.

The most-inspected taxicab in 2015 was inspected nine times. A total of 25 faults were found, with many repeated faults, including three or more faults for Fire Extinguisher (4), Taxicab Camera (3), and Body/Damage/Paint (3). This vehicle was brought out of service seven times in 2015. The vehicle was inspected by a patrol check on April 15\textsuperscript{th} and no faults were found, then two days later on April 17\textsuperscript{th} a patrol check found four faults.

Given that an inspection can turn up more than one fault, there are more faults than inspections. With 1,209 inspections (Inspections by Fault) there were 277 instances of no fault found (Coded as either No Faults Found or XNo Faults Found), and 1,684 faults found over the other 932 inspections. Inspections resulted in taxicabs being taken out of service 767 times in 2015, or 82 per cent of inspections where faults were found. The most common faults found were Body Damage/Paint, Doors, Other –Interior and Taxicab Camera, as seen in the table below.

Table 24. TCB 2015 Faults Found (Inspections by Fault Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fault</th>
<th>Instances of a Fault in 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body Damage/Paint</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Faults Found</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - interior</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxicab Camera</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats Front/Rear</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault</td>
<td>Instances of a Fault in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headlamp Oprtations [sic]</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Electrical</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Decals</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Marker Lamps</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windshield</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxicab Driver's Licence</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XNo Faults Found [sic]</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windshield Wipers</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB Driver's Licence</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Extinguisher</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel Covers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime Running Lights</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Accessible&amp; Handivan [sic]</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty Interior</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Signal Lamps</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Exterior</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Strobe Light</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail Lamps</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lights</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Lamps</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid Kit</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Numbers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Light</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpets</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupant Restraint System</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxicab Meter</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Sign</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Lamps</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tariff Sticker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk Liner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Sheet</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Decal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust System</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Items</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securement Port Items</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat Belt/Tether Clip</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Securement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Secure System</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized Decals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TCB inspectors carry out more duties than just inspections. With three inspectors and a total 3,942 inspections (Province of Manitoba, Indigenous and Municipal Relations, 2016), with an estimated 225 work days in a year, this amounts to an average of just under 6 inspections per inspector per day.

**Complaints Investigation**

Complaints may be filed with the TCB by phone, email or in-person. In 2016, the TCB made improvements to their complaint process and no longer require written statements for all complaints. As complaints are filed, they are provided to the Chief Inspector for assessment. Complaints of a serious nature are flagged. The Chief Inspector prioritizes the complaints and determines if GPS or camera data is required. Currently, in-car camera data is overwritten every seven days, so it may have to be collected before a written complaint report has been received. The TCB recently mandated upgrades to the in-car camera which will provide a panoramic view with a larger memory card that will hold images for 28 days. The new cameras must be installed by May 2017.

If determined appropriate, the Chief Inspector or one of the inspectors will follow-up with the taxicab business licence holder or driver involved in the complaint. Failure to provide requested information or cooperate with an investigation may result in the immediate suspension of the taxicab business licence or taxicab driver’s licence for a maximum of 30 days, if so determined by the Taxicab Board.

Complaints regarding taxicab driver road habits are investigated based on information in the complaint. Complainants reporting assault, theft or other criminal matters are also encouraged to report the incident to the Winnipeg Police Service. The TCB will begin their investigation but request that the complainant provide a Winnipeg Police Service incident number.

The Chief Inspector will evaluate the results of the investigation as he/she deems appropriate, which may include ordering a Show Cause Hearing. In serious matters, the Chief Inspector can request a special hearing with the Taxicab Board to request an interim suspension prior to the completion of the investigation. If the Taxicab Board deems a suspension is necessary for the immediate protection of the public, they may suspend the holder’s licence prior to a Show Cause hearing.

**Show Cause Hearings**

A Show Cause hearing is a quasi-judicial hearing before the Taxicab Board to deal with serious issues or breach of licence conditions involving licenced taxicab drivers and taxicab business licence holders. A Show Cause Hearing may result in fines up to $1000 and penalties including the suspension, cancellation or refusal to renew a taxicab business licence or taxicab driver’s licence. The Chief Inspector presents the matter and related evidence at the hearing. If the licencee chooses he / she may be represented by legal
counsel at their own expense. The complainant is considered a witness to the incident and is requested to testify at a Show Cause Hearing. As part of the complaint process improvements made in 2016, the complainant can bring a support person with them. If after being provided proper notice, a licencee fails to appear, a Show Cause Hearing may take place in the licencee’s absence.

At the conclusion of the Show Cause hearing the Taxicab Board will meet privately to reach a decision on the matter. The decision of the Taxicab Board will be provided in writing to the licencee, including the reasons for decision. In 2016, the Board made improvements to their Show Cause hearing process and implemented a process to provide the decision to the complainant as well. Complainants are also notified of the result of an investigation or actions taken to address complaints that do not result in a Show Cause hearing.

**Fines and Penalties**

The table below outlines a summary of the fines / penalties that may be imposed upon taxicab business licence holders or taxicab drivers as authorized by *The Taxicab Act* and Regulations. Offence notices may be issued under *The Highway Traffic Act* and other related regulations as determined by the inspectors. The fines for un-licensed drivers and operators are quite low, and can be quite delayed by the required court process.

**Table 25 Fines and Penalties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infraction / Deficiency</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Other Penalty</th>
<th>Who Determines Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating without taxicab drivers licence</td>
<td>$50 - $250 for first offence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$100 - $500 subsequent offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxicab driver not in compliance with conditions of licence or not in compliance with <em>The Taxicab Act</em> or Regulations</td>
<td>up to $1,000</td>
<td>Fine up to $1,000 and / or up to the cancellation of the taxicab driver licence</td>
<td>The TCB through Show Cause Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not cooperating with investigation</td>
<td>up to $1,000</td>
<td>Fine up to $1,000 and / or up to the cancellation of the taxicab driver licence</td>
<td>The TCB through Show Cause Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxicab Business Licence Owner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating without a taxicab business licence</td>
<td>$100 - $500 for first offence</td>
<td>If unable to pay fine and costs, cancel Manitoba drivers licence for maximum one year and cancel registration for all vehicles registered to individual for first offence. Same as above plus must pay fine and costs</td>
<td>Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$250 - $1,000 subsequent offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infraction / Deficiency</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Other Penalty</td>
<td>Who Determines Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxicab business licence holder not in compliance with conditions of licence or not in compliance with <em>The Taxicab Act</em> or Regulations</td>
<td>up to $1,000</td>
<td>Fine up to $1,000 and / or up to the cancellation of the taxicab business licence</td>
<td>The TCB through Show Cause Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not cooperating with investigation</td>
<td>up to $1,000</td>
<td>Fine up to $1,000 and / or up to the cancellation of the taxicab business licence</td>
<td>The TCB through Show Cause Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Industry Concerns about Compliance and TCB Investigations**

Dispatch companies indicated that they are concerned that inspections are overzealous. There is a perception that some inspectors are sending taxis to MPI for insufficient reasons and keeping cars out-of-service longer than needed during inspections. The industry is also concerned about un-licensed vehicles for hire, citing repeated observations of the same driver at the same location intimidating passengers. Concern was also expressed about the active ride-sharing services that advertise on Facebook, with no driver screening or vehicle safety provisions. These services collect ‘donations’; minimum amounts may be defined by the service.

The dispatch companies also feel that there is a communication gap regarding customer complaints. They would like to work together with the TCB to investigate complaints prior to suspensions, and are not confident in the current process.

There is a concern by drivers that the in-car camera is only used to investigate customer complaints, not to validate mistreatment of the driver.

Owners and drivers generally disagree about customer complaint handling by the TCB. Ninety-seven per cent of standard taxicab owners believe that the TCB *handles customer complaints objectively and fairly.* Only fifty-eight per cent of drivers agree.

*Figure 58 Perceived Support for Customers by TCB*

The Taxicab Board handles customer complaints objectively and fairly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Taxi Driver</th>
<th>Important 39%</th>
<th>Very Important 40%</th>
<th>Agree 20%</th>
<th>Strongly agree 38%</th>
<th>n=123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Taxi Owner/Operator</td>
<td>Important 12%</td>
<td>Very Important 36%</td>
<td>Agree 59%</td>
<td>Strongly agree 38%</td>
<td>n=302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Online Driver and Owner Survey
Over 90 per cent of owners agreed the TCB *listens to their concerns and opinions* though only 59 per cent of standard drivers felt the same.

**Figure 59 Perceived Support for Industry by TCB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Taxi Driver</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Taxi Owner/Operator</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Online Driver and Owner Survey

### 13.2 Complaint Submission Process

The Taxicab Board has developed processes to receive and respond to complaints from the public as part of enforcement activity. Complaints are directed to the Taxicab Board Office, and may be initiated by phone, in-person, email or by downloading, printing and submitting the Complaint Report that is available on the Taxicab Board website. The telephone number for complaints is displayed in all standard and accessible taxicabs, while email and telephone contact information for the Taxicab Board is included on the Taxicab Board website.

Once received, complaints are logged in a database by Taxicab Board administrative staff, including the nature of the complaint and the assignment of a file number. The file number is provided to the complainant. Depending on the seriousness of the incident and / or the timeliness of obtaining GPS or in-car camera data, an investigation may commence immediately. As of 2016, a written statement is not required for all incidents. Matters that are of a more serious nature include obtaining statements from the licencee, complainant and any witnesses.

A written statement may be requested from the complainant upon initial contact with the TCB or through the course of the investigation. If a complainant is sent a complaint package, it is to be returned to the TCB office within 14 days. If the written statement is not returned, the complainant will be sent a second letter notifying them that their statement is required and that their complaint will remain inactive for 30 days pending the statement. If after 30 days no statement is received, the file will be closed by the Chief Inspector. The file can be reopened if new information is provided. From 2011 to 2015, 50 to 60 per cent of complaint files were not pursued primarily due to a lack of written statement. In a few cases, there is insufficient information because the complainant does not have the name of the taxicab company or the taxicab number.
When asked about the complaints process, online survey respondents reported being unaware of how to contact the TCB with a complaint, with only 26 per cent of respondents knowing who to contact. There is also some feeling among customers that TCB is not giving due consideration to their complaints.

**TCB Complaint Analysis**

An analysis of complaints filed with the TCB provides important information about customer service but should not be considered comprehensive or the sole measure of customer service. The data analyzed includes complaints made to the TCB only; it does not include complaints filed with dispatch companies or cases where a dissatisfied customer does not submit a complaint.

The following graph shows the complaint disposition by type from 2011 to 2015.

*Figure 60 Complaint Disposition Trends*

The number of times that a complaint is referred to a Show Cause hearing with the Taxicab Board has declined significantly in recent years. In 2013, 17.3 per cent of complaints went to a hearing and 14 per cent in 2012. In 2014, there were only eight Show Cause hearings (3.7 per cent) and in 2015 there was one (0.6%). In 2015, there was an increase in the number of complaints that were referred to the Winnipeg Police Service or MPI (other jurisdiction). The percentage of complaints that were resolved amicably or were referred to the dispatch company for internal resolution increased dramatically to 14.4 per cent in 2014 and 20.1 per cent in 2015. Prior to 2014 there were almost no complaints resolved in this manner. The dispatch companies do not maintain records of complaints or follow-up.
Common Dispositions for Complaints

Figure 61 Percentages of Dispositions by Complaint Type

Individuals that file complaints of a serious nature with the TCB are also encouraged to report the incident to the Winnipeg Police Services. These complaints are referred to as Police Referrals and are the most likely complaints to go to a Show Cause hearing (16.7 per cent). The percentage of complaints that receive some form of TCB action is fairly consistent across all types of complaints, ranging from 18.8 per cent to 26.6 per cent. Poor Service (15.4 %) and General/Other (13.7 %) are the most likely to be resolved amicably or referred to the taxicab company for follow-up. Police referrals are the most likely to have the disposition “Other Jurisdiction” which typically means that it is either referred to MPI or the TCB defers a decision until a police investigation or legal proceedings are completed.

Multiple Complaint Codes

Each incident that is brought to the attention of the Taxicab Board is issued a unique complaint file number. However, there may be more than one complaint related to each file. For example, if a taxicab driver is alleged to have been driving unsafely and then is rude to the customer when they raise a concern, there could be two complaints recorded under the same file number: a complaint for Driver – Conduct and a complaint for Driver – Road Habits.
In the analysis that follows, however, each individual complaint is counted as a unique item. The chart below shows the number of taxicab complaint files and the number of complaints recorded for 2011 through 2015.

**Figure 62 Numbers of Taxicab Complaint Files and Complaints**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Complaint Files</th>
<th>Complaints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Complaints Received**

Common service complaints such as wait times are the responsibility of the dispatch companies. Over the period of 2011 to 2015, the number of complaints filed with the TCB has been on a slight downward trend. There was a high of 141 complaints in 2012 and a low of 101 complaints in 2015. With approximately 4.1 million annual taxicab trips, the number of complaints is well below one per cent per year. The following figures depict the trends in taxicab complaints broken out by issue of concern. As a single complaint submitted to the TCB may contain more than one issue of concern, summing the total in each issue category will result in a higher number than the number of complaints submitted.

**Figure 63 Taxicab Complaint by Issue, 2011 to 2015**
The most frequent complaint is related to driver conduct, at an average of 40 per cent of all complaints over the past five years. Driver Conduct complaints can range from something relatively minor to very serious accusations of inappropriate behavior. The second largest category, averaging over 25 per cent, is Road Safety complaints. Most of these complaints involve unsafe/reckless driving. Complaints of the driver talking on a cell phone were included in this category. Cell phone complaints have declined significantly in the past few years largely due to changes in legislation. This is the main factor contributing to the decline of Road Safety complaints in the past few years. Service charge complaints have declined in the past few years while Poor Service complaints are notably higher in 2014 and 2015 than 2011-2013.

Other Jurisdictions

All of the other jurisdictions studied accept customer complaints about taxi service via telephone: Calgary, Edmonton, Hamilton and Ottawa to their municipal 311 line and Vancouver to Consumer Protection BC. None of the jurisdictions require written complaints. Consumer Protection BC has a website with a complaint form that customers can complete and submit via email, mail or fax. Calgary has the most technologically advanced complaints process with complaint and compliment web forms where customers can submit directly all complaint details and even upload supporting photographs. The City of Portland also has a website with a web form where customers can submit complaints about taxis, TNCS and other for-hire vehicles (Portland Bureau of Transportation, 2016).

The availability of information related to making complaints in the other jurisdictions varies. Calgary and Vancouver both have websites dedicated to submitting complaints about taxi service. Contact information for Ottawa can be found on a by-law violation page but is not taxi-specific information. A taxi customer looking to find information online about who to contact with complaints (other than the taxi company) in both Edmonton and Hamilton would have difficulty finding that information.

In Edmonton, Ottawa, Calgary and Hamilton, complaints are forwarded from the city 311 line to the relevant enforcement officers. In Calgary, Livery Transport Services receives and investigates complaints submitted via the online web form. In Vancouver, depending on the type of issues, customers are referred to the provincial Passenger Transportation Branch or individual taxi companies.

Complaint Handling – TNCS

Uber customers can get help and make complaints via Uber’s in-App support tool which was released in March 2016, or via email though the Uber help website. The App allows customers to choose the topic of their complaint or issue and then provide more information if needed. In addition to the App, Uber has a network of support centres around the globe. Uber has as an Emergency Response Team & Law Enforcement Response Team to deal with the most critical issues (Uber Canada, 2015).

The Uber App allows users to provide a rating of their driver and drivers to provide a rating of the customer. Both driver-partners and users are able to review their average rating in real time on the App. Driver-partners can also review their feedback on the App; feedback is anonymized to protect riders. Driver-partners receive their average star rating on a weekly basis and a comparison to the previous week.
and to other drivers in the same area. They also receive the top-reported issue by users that week and customer service improvement tips.

In the case of driver-partners whose average rating dips low (level depends on the city), drivers receive a warning and can take a 40 to 60-minute self-directed class called *Quality Improvement General*. Driver-partners who continue to have issues are temporarily deactivated, meaning they cannot operate as drivers in the system, and receive a link to an 85 to 100-minute course called *Quality Improvement Recovery* which must be completed one-on-one with an instructor before their account is reactivated. The courses are through online training provider R3Z Solutions (Schafer, 2016).

Lyft has a website where customers can submit questions and concerns via a web form. Customers can upload supporting documentation if required (Lyft, 2016). Customers also make complaints via the Lyft Twitter and Facebook pages.

### 13.3 Recommendations

1. **Upgrade tracking and information management for enforcement activity to enable fair, risk based enforcement on all forms of vehicles for hire.**

   **Rationale:** The TCB currently tracks inspection activity, but does not analyze or use it. Inconsistencies in the data impact its reliability. Not all inspections are recorded. Without data, resources may be expended on areas of lesser risk or value. Enforcement is the primary means of ensuring the regulatory system is effective. If enforcement is ineffective, it weakens the entire system.

   **Impact:** Investment may be required in a data management system. While functionality requirements are not complex, some degree of automation and dashboard capabilities will allow staff resources to be used more efficiently and effectively. [*Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendation 8(2); Compliance and Enforcement recommendation 13(2)]*

2. **Reduce multiple handling of data through direct entry, using mobile tools.**

   **Rationale:** Having separate individuals collect and record data is a waste of resources (time and financial) and a potential source of human error.

   **Impact:** Technology such as a tablet or laptop with an aircard, or potentially a smart phone, would enable on-site data collection and eliminate the need for data entry. Some investment, online access and staff training may be required. [*Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendation 8(2); necessary for Compliance and Enforcement recommendation 13(1)]*

3. **Increase fines and compliance / enforcement activity on illegal vehicles for hire operating without the required licences.** If possible, these fines should serve as an administrative penalty and fine without involving the courts, unless for appeal.
**Rationale:** Fines of $50-$250 for operating without a taxicab driver’s licence are not high enough to act as a deterrent. An individual operating without a licence would feasibly make that amount in a single day of work. A large amount of work is involved with imposing such small fines. Directing these infractions to the court process can result in significant delay between the intervention and the fine, lessening the impact of the penalty. This particular infraction may require additional focus with the recommendation that TNCs be regulated. It has also been identified by the industry as an active issue that puts passengers at risk, with multiple illegal services currently active in Winnipeg.

**Impact:** The Taxicab Act would need to be updated to increase the fines and authority. *[Relevant to Supply and Demand recommendation 8(8); supported by Safety and Security recommendation 11(4)]*

4. **Create a more user friendly TCB Complaint Process.**

**Rationale:** The public in general does not know where to make a complaint about a taxicab issue. The requirement for written complaints creates a high administrative burden for the TCB and work for complainants. Prior to 2016, 50 per cent to 60 per cent of complaints were not investigated due to this requirement. This leads to customer dissatisfaction with the process.

**Impact:** If changes are made to improve the complaints process, more complaints can be expected. This is a good thing because then action can be taken. By implementing technology such as an online web form and eliminating written complaint submissions, the distribution of complaints packages and the associated data entry, the TCB will be able to allocate more energy to complaints investigation and follow-up. *[Dependent on recommendation 8(2) and Recommendation 13(2); supported by Safety and Security recommendation 11(1) and Customer Service Recommendation 12(2)]*

Opportunities to create a more user friendly TCB complaint process include:

i. **Develop a web form so customers can submit complaints directly online**

   The City of Calgary has a good example of a web form that customers complete and submit online. Customers can upload multiple documents such as photos and receipts to support their complaints. In developing this type of online complaint submission system, the opportunities to improve over the current process include: auto-generated case tracking number; automatically generated email to confirm their complaint or compliment has been received; data from this web form collected in a single TCB database to allow for ongoing tracking and monitoring; complaint triage system for inspectors. Implementing technology such as online web forms for complaint submission and automatically generated complaint acknowledgement emails will improve data tracking and facilitate communication with customers while reducing administrative burden and data entry. Customers will be able to provide details on their complaint including supporting material in a standardized manner.

ii. **Encourage use of the web form for complaints submission and remove the requirement for the written submission of complaints.** *[Dependent on recommendation i. above]*
Customers can be encouraged to use the new web form that they submit online as the preferred method of complaints submission. When a customer calls in with a telephone complaint, TCB staff could complete the same online web form 'live' over the phone to ensure standardized information is collected, the information is in the same database, and a tracking number will be generated. In this way, customers do not need to be able to use the web technology, but the TCB can still benefit from it. Winnipeg is the only jurisdiction that requires written complaints. More than half of complaint files are closed and not investigated because of the lack of written complaint. There is a significant administrative burden created by the TCB's current process.

iii. **Improve communication around the complaints process.** [Supported by Safety and Security recommendation 11(1)]

Opportunities to improve communication include: ensuring that complaint phone line information and website information is clearly posted inside all cabs (with large font to make it accessible) and that essential information for complaint follow-up such as the cab number, driver number and driver photo are also clearly visible; a scannable QR code which links directly to an automated TCB compliments and complaints webpage could also be included; customer and driver's rights clearly communicated online on the same page as the complaints web form; clarify to customers which type of complaint to direct to the driver, the dispatch company, the TCB or the police; communicate to customers via social media, other media, newspaper etc. about how to file complaints.

iv. **Issue mandatory “How’s my Driving?” Bumper Stickers.**

TCB could issue mandatory stickers for all taxicab bumpers that say “How’s my Driving?” and provide contact information for the public to provide feedback. The TCB has a limited number of inspectors to watch for issues. Given the significant online survey response, the taxicab industry is a topic many individuals feel passionate about. Other businesses involved with transportation, for example the trucking industry, use “How’s my driving?” stickers as a way to increase driver accountability and provide the public with a forum to make complaints.
14.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, the system in Winnipeg has been disadvantaged by a lack of data on which to base informed decisions regarding supply and demand, customer service, safety, and compliance. Processes for considering licence applications have led to an overly restricted supply and limited choice in the market, as well as a significant administrative burden for the regulator. There are opportunities to modernize the regulations, streamline the activities of the Taxicab Board Office, improve consumer choice, and focus regulatory resources more efficiently on risk-based enforcement. The following is a summary of the regulations presented in the preceding chapters.

Section 7 – Regulatory Structure

7(1) Simplify and minimize the regulations to only those elements necessary to serve the public interest (safety and consumer protection) and which cannot be achieved through market forces and innovation.

This includes:

- Remove procedural elements, and provide authority to the TCB or Director to establish related policies and procedures
- Remove requirements for training, appearance, service and other prohibitions which are unnecessary to the safety and security of the driver or passenger
- Remove vehicle standards not related to safety or identification (e.g., cleanliness, trunk space, signs) and standardize vehicle age limitations to the extent possible or practical
- Remove requirements for annual financial returns
- Avoid duplication where other regulations govern

Rationale: Standards of service, appearance or effective performance of duties (e.g., knowledge of the city) should be considered the responsibility of the employer and more effectively supported through market forces where there is reasonable choice. Removing these elements reduces the administrative and enforcement burden for the TCB, enabling focus on areas where regulation and compliance is important to passenger safety and consumer protection. Overlap with other legislation is unnecessary, inefficient, and may create inconsistencies as the various enactments are updated.

Impact: To the extent the removal of regulatory content alleviates the burden on the industry, it will help to reduce costs and enable more flexible and adaptive market response. Reducing the regulatory requirements will also reduce the administrative and enforcement requirements on the TCB. Resources will be required to review and re-draft the Regulation. Consideration should be given to all recommendations that impact regulations as part of the comprehensive review. [Impacts Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(2), Supply and Demand recommendations 8(8) and 8(9); Licensing Structure recommendations 9(1) and 9(7); Customer Service recommendation 12(1)]
7(2) Review the regulatory structure to determine whether it is best served at the municipal or provincial level, including consultations with CMA municipalities. If it is determined the best fit remains at the provincial level, consider including all CMA municipalities under the same regulatory structure.

Rationale: There are advantages to oversight of the vehicle for hire industry at the municipal level that may improve both efficiency and effectiveness. Transportation Network Companies are driving regulatory change and will require further evaluation for municipalities outside of Winnipeg. Including the regional municipalities in the regulatory response for Winnipeg will support consistency across the region. Looking forward, regional integration is expected to be increasingly important. Further consultations with the affected municipalities and provincial departments is required to understand the perspectives, needs and interests of these affected parties.

Impacts: Resources would be required to undertake consultations with regional municipalities. A change to a municipal by-law system would require development of a by-law and associated administrative and enforcement capacity at the municipal level. A shift in regulatory authority would impact the current staff of the TCB, who are now provincial employees. Expanding the mandate of the TCB to include regional municipalities involves the application of two provincial statutes and as such are subject to the same legislative authority. Expanding the mandate may impact administrative and enforcement workload. There are currently only a small number of vehicles for hire operating in the CMA outside of Winnipeg. The TCB may be able to cooperate with the Motor Transport Board to continue the current approach to on-road inspections in rural areas.

A regional system would expand the market opportunity for the current industry, increasing competition. Taxicab companies in the CMA areas may be resistant to competition from the larger dispatch companies from the city, however customer service standards will ultimately impact which company customers contact for service. This would also increase customer choice. The residing population of these areas are often in the city of Winnipeg for work and travel. An expansion to the CMA region would have positive changes for the public in terms of customer service, as taxicab drivers would be more willing to take trips out to the CMA if they could pick up a fare for the return trip to Winnipeg, and vice versa. Improved access to vehicles for hire may encourage use of public transportation, improve safety and reduce the environmental impact of personal vehicles. [Relevant to and supports Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(1)]

Section 8 – Supply and Demand

8(1) Require dispatch companies and business licence holders to collect, maintain and report trip data on a not-less-than monthly basis.

Data should include the number of standard and accessible trips and associated wait times from request for service to pick-up, cancellations and no shows by hour and area of the city. Mandate the use of technology to automate data collection and reporting (e.g., GPS enabled taximeters or Apps with automated upload) to increase efficiency and ensure reliability of data. Publish industry performance data (in aggregate) so that the public is aware of service levels.
**Rationale:** Service level data is required to evaluate the effectiveness of the taxicab industry in meeting demand for both regular and accessible service.

**Impact:** Dispatch companies and independent business licence holders have differing capabilities to collect, track and report data. Mandating the use of technology will create a one-time cost for business licence holders. A basic inquiry indicated multiple Canadian suppliers, and a cost of under $500 for a taximeter with this capability. The Taxicab Board will need to make a corresponding investment in a data management system to effectively and efficiently receive and monitor this data. Service to the public can be expected to improve as companies are better able to understand demand and service levels. With reasonable competition, market forces will incent use of this information to benefit customer service. [Supported by Supply and Demand recommendation 8(2); necessary to enable Supply and Demand recommendation 8(3); dependent on Licensing Structure recommendation 9(4)]

8(2) Develop internal data management capabilities.

**Rationale:** The current data available to the TCB is not being used to help inform decision making and policy decisions and requires a fair amount of manipulation to be useful. An improved information management system, knowledge and analytical skills are required to effectively track and report data important to the TCB’s effectiveness.

**Impact:** The TCB can make informed, data-driven decisions based on an analysis of the data they receive on a wide variety of topics (e.g., licenses, staffing requirements, workload, etc.). [Necessary for Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1) and 8(3); impacts Safety and Security recommendation 10(3); supports Customer Service recommendation 11(3)]; impacts Compliance and Enforcement recommendations 12(1) and 12(3)]

8(3) Establish a maximum total number of metered taxicab licences based on population ratio, with a phased implementation plan.

The maximum total number of licences would be based on the required supply to address demand for both standard and accessible service through all seasons. With reference to other jurisdictions, this may mean over 150 new annual licences. In the short term, the TCB should increase the total number of annual licences by up to the number of seasonal licences in the 2015/16 winter season (102) for the 2017 winter season (instead of seasonal licences). Then approve no further increase in the total number of licences issued for a period of one year following implementation of other licensing changes, and monitoring of service levels at six and twelve months. The target level should then be phased in over a period of three years, while monitoring trip volumes and response times to validate the established ratio. A common service standard is the percentage of calls serviced with wait times within 15 minutes, with a target of 85 per cent. The TCB should establish a subsequent schedule to review the ratio every five years in the context of structural market changes, if any (e.g. increase in airport demand above growth in population, decrease in car ownership). The analysis of market changes should include stakeholder input.
Rationale: The current process is resource intensive, slow, and uninformed by objective data. Applicants typically will not have access to data to support their application, and existing competitors can influence decisions to protect their own interests. There are indications in Winnipeg, including high transfer values and public feedback, to believe that more capacity is needed. Establishing a target number based on a population ratio is simple, easy to understand, and creates an objective benchmark that allows for adjustment as demand grows. Allowing stakeholder input on a five-year cycle will help to ensure the target ratio remains valid in potentially evolving market conditions that are not reflected in the population ratio.

Impact: Industry impact will increase with the number of new licences issued. The value of a business licence transferred on the secondary market can be expected to decline as new licences are made available. This will have a particularly negative impact on those who have recently purchased a licence at a high value. It will have a positive impact for those who have been unable to finance the purchase of a licence on the secondary market because the values have been too high. It will also be positive for drivers in that it should reduce the rent paid for use of the vehicle, which is driven by the owner’s need to recover their investment in the licence. The process will be more fair to all applicants for a taxicab business licence. Impact on the TCB will be to reduce the requirement for hearings and the associated administrative demand. There were 20 licence application hearings in 2015/2016. [Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendation 8(1); impacted by Supply and Demand recommendation 8(2), 8(4) and 8(5)]

8(4) Discontinue use of seasonal licences, and allow licence holders to adjust use of the taxicab according to demand. Reflect the seasonal demand in target supply ratio.

Rationale: Demand for taxicab services is higher in winter months. Currently, annual taxicab licence holders are obligated to have the vehicle in service year round. In slower periods this may create an obligation for operating costs without corresponding income. Allowing licence holders the ability to adjust hours or weeks of use of the vehicle, seasonally if desired, will allow a natural market response. Some limits may be warranted to maintain a licence, for example active use for at least six months of the year. The target maximum number of licences according to population ratio would take periods of elevated demand into consideration.

Impact: Licence holders that have previously secured seasonal licences may not have this business opportunity if they do not obtain one of the new annual licences issued under recommendation 2. Licence values on the secondary market can be expected to decline with the influx of annual licences in place of seasonal licences. Discontinuing the practice of issuing seasonal licences will reduce the administrative burden on the Taxicab Board, and eliminate the need for an additional annual application process by owners and a surge in workload for the TCB. There were 78 requests for Power of Attorney to allow TBL holders to be absent for up to 30 days in 2015/16, which would be unnecessary if owners had more flexibility. [Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1), 8(2) and 8(3)]
8(5) Continue the practice of issuing new licences only for accessible taxicabs until similar service levels are achieved, then apportion future licences.

“Similar service levels“ includes on-demand service with similar response times as for standard taxicabs (e.g., 85 per cent of calls arrive within 15 minutes) as well as reliable pre-booked service. New licenses can then be issued in proportion to the estimated population requiring accessible service (e.g., 1 in 5 licences must be accessible if 20 per cent of the population is considered to require accessible service).

Rationale: The Accessibility Standards for Customer Service creates an obligation for accessible service that may be difficult to apply strictly at an individual business owner level. Enabling a supply that balances accessible and standard needs allows accessible services to be available at an industry level and supports the intent of The Accessibility for Manitobans Act. Requiring all new taxicabs to be accessible indefinitely will unnecessarily increase system cost.

Impact: Converting seasonal standard licences to annual accessible licences provides the opportunity to immediately lift the ratio of accessible taxicabs to target levels. Business licence holders that own extra standard vehicles for prior year seasonal licences may find themselves with a redundant asset. The impact may be mitigated by incentives for conversion of standard to accessible vehicles as per recommendation 6. [Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1), 8(2), 8(3) and supported by 8(6); supported by Licensing Structure recommendation 9(3)]

8(6) Create incentives to offset the higher cost to provide accessible service, to ensure accessible taxis are available for this service.

For example, these may include
- Grants to reimburse costs for conversion of vehicles to accessible standards, with proof of a minimum threshold of accessible service over the first year
- Subsidized accessibility training
- A ‘top up’ to subsidize validated accessible service, to reflect the additional time required for loading and unloading.

Rationale: Accessible taxicabs also service the standard population. A taxicab can complete more standard trips with less effort. Since the fares are set the same for both types of service, standard service enables higher income over the same period of time. Incentives are necessary to ensure drivers are not financially penalized by servicing the population requiring accessible service.

Impact: Revenue will need to be collected through fees to fund the subsidized service. Some administrative effort will be required to administer the subsidy to accessible taxicabs. [Relevant to and supports Supply and Demand recommendation 8(5); supported by Fares recommendation 10(4)]

8(7) Support ongoing access to diamond lanes for standard and accessible taxicabs.

Rationale: The City of Winnipeg has recently approved taxicab use of diamond lanes on a pilot basis. The taxicab industry believes this will result in a significant improvement in arrival time for pick up and availability for the next call during rush hour. Providing timely service between 4 and 6 p.m. is one of the
most challenging for the current taxicab fleet. If the pilot project demonstrates the use of diamond lanes may be done safely, and provides the expected benefits, the TCB could identify its support for this strategy.

**Impact:** Customer service and industry utilization will be improved. There will be no impact on the TCB.  
*Not dependent on other recommendations*

**8(8) Allow Transportation Network Companies entrance into the market, licensed as a separate category, and require they meet standards for safety and consumer protection similar to the requirements for standard taxicabs.**

This would include

- Insurance that provides the same coverage as required for standard taxicabs, while permitting a fleet style approach to how the coverage is achieved.
- Vehicle safety standards that include annual inspections and proof of mechanical safety requirements (no cameras or shields).
- Driver screening and licensing (Class 4) similar to those required of standard taxicab drivers, which may be administered by the TNC, with documentation submitted to the TCB.
- Requirements for driver and vehicle identification in the vehicle and the App used to book the service.
- Restrictions on service to only pre-arranged service through the App, with an advance estimate of the fare and automated payment.
- A fee structure that would recover the costs of administration and enforcement to the same degree as achieved for standard taxicabs, including a broker per trip fee and accessibility requirement or surcharge.
- Obligations for reporting trip data, including the number of trips, by time of day and pick up location, time from request to pick up, and fares.

**Rationale:** Limiting the service to pre-arranged trips, and requiring vehicle standards and driver screening will support safety, help to prevent an over-supply, and maintain some equity with the taxicab industry while providing additional choice and flexibility. There are a number of indications that the current system has limited consumer choice to the extent that it has negatively impacted service, satisfaction, driver working conditions and created artificially high values on the secondary market that limit new owner participation. The market currently appears to be under-supplied. The flexible nature of supply through a TNC suits the variable market need with peak time and season demands.

**Impact:** Enabling TNCs while requiring similar insurance coverage will require development of a suitable group insurance product by MPI. The opportunity to examine the minimum regulatory requirements needed for safe operation of TNCs also provides the opportunity to reduce the regulatory burden on the taxicab industry generally.  
*Supported by Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(1); supported by Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1), 8(2) and 8(3); supported by Licensing Structure recommendation 9(6); impacted by Fares recommendation 10(4)]*
8(g) Eliminate limits on limousine licences, allow flexible use and eliminate temporary limousine licences.

*Rationale:* Limousines serve a specialized market which can fluctuate significantly. Unlike taxis, there is limited negative impact from removing restrictions on supply as there remain barriers to entry in vehicle purchase and pre-booking capabilities. Market forces will cause business owners to self-regulate supply, and encourage healthy competition.

*Impact:* Limousine owners will have more flexibility to adapt to the needs of the market, which should further add to customer service and public convenience, without the need for TCB intervention. An increase in supply, if such is the market response, may draw some business from standard taxicab dispatched service. This would reflect a positive increase in consumer choice, for those customers who are indifferent to the typically higher cost of limousine service, or prefer this alternative on the basis of vehicle or service standards. Removing this limit on the number of licences would eliminate the need for hearings, and enable licence applications to be processed administratively in a more timely and efficient way. *[Supported by Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1), 8(2) and 8(3)]*

**Section 9 – Licensing Structure**

9(1) Eliminate the redundant sub-categories of taxicabs and standardize or remove vehicle age restrictions.

*Rationale:* Two licence categories, Premium taxicabs and Assisted Transportation bus are not used and as such are redundant. There are 5 categories of limousine/executive car that serve the same market, with no apparent purpose to the sub-classifications. Replacing age restrictions with increased inspection frequency (and associated fees) for older vehicles will allow flexibility in the market. Customer choice and competitive forces can govern vehicle age for Executive Cars or Limousines.

*Impact:* Reducing licence categories will simplify the regulation, making it easier to understand and less cumbersome to administer. *[Not dependent on other recommendations]*

9(2) Allow transferability of all classes of taxicab licences, or phase out all licence transferability over a period of ten years.

*Rationale:* Protecting the transferable nature of a single class of licence is inequitable. There does not appear to be any goodwill, unique knowledge or business value that can transfer with an individual business licence. In contrast, there may be significant business value in a business that operates multiple vehicles and a dispatch operation that has developed a reputation for customer service, its own brand and customer base. This also has value to the consumer. In some markets where companies like this dominate, drivers have experienced poor working conditions. The regulatory response has been to encourage individual owner operators. Poor employment terms have also arisen under such a structure in Winnipeg, and may be more an issue of limited choice. When drivers have a choice of who to work for, conditions tend to improve.
Phasing this feature over a period of ten years will allow current business holders and prospective buyers to make informed decisions on market value. Other adjustments in the market that can be expected to occur with the set of recommendations provided in this report may result in a natural decline in licence value, reducing the impact at the point where licences are no longer transferable.

**Impact:** The greatest impact would be on existing standard business licence holders if transferability is phased out. If existing non-transferable licences become transferable, it can be expected to reduce the value of existing standard business licences. Licence transfer values on the secondary market are not the responsibility of the Taxicab Board. Transferability will enable accessible taxicab, limousine and handicab van licence holders to realize the value of their licences. These types of licences tend to be held in multiples, and would now have the opportunity to generate further business value. *([Dependent on Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(1)]*)

9(3) Create a waiting list of qualified applicants who wish to obtain a business licence, with a fee to qualify for and maintain a position on the list.

Create an open opportunity to receive a position on the waiting list (e.g., lottery for placement based on applications received in first six months) then add new applicants as they qualify. Limit qualification requirements to only those related to safety and consumer protection. Offer new licences in order of the list, with a reasonable ability to decline an offer before being removed from or placed at the bottom of the list.

**Rationale:** The current process is resource intensive, slow, and un-informed by objective data. Applicants typically will not have access to data to support their application, and existing competitors can influence decisions to protect their own interests.

The process will be more fair to all applicants for a taxicab business licence, and enable allocation of new licences through an objective administrative process instead of a hearing. Pre-qualifying applicants for placement on the list will allow quick distribution of new licences as they become available.

**Impact:** Impact on the TCB will be to reduce the requirement for hearings and the associated administrative demand. There were twenty licence application hearings in 2015/16.

Policies will need to be established on how to manage the list, particularly for the initial transition where applicants may own a standard vehicle previously used for a seasonal licence (e.g., whether they must accept an offer for an accessible licence or can decline an offer and retain their position on the list pending an available standard licence, etc.). *([Relevant to Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1), 8(2), 8(3) and 8(5)]*)

9(4) Establish a licence category and require a licence to operate as a vehicle for hire broker (dispatch company), with obligations for trip reporting and customer service standards. Enable brokers to process driver licence applications and renewals.

**Rationale:** The two existing dispatch companies control the market with no regulatory obligations and are currently the only means of accessing trip information. They are also the primary means of
addressing customer concerns. Drivers are obligated to only affiliate with dispatch companies that meet certain requirements, but are not in a position to enforce the dispatch company to do so and have limited options for other competitive dispatch services. Dispatch companies do not track customer complaints or resolution. Public surveys indicated dissatisfaction with service from dispatch companies and with resolution of complaints. A TNC is essentially a broker, and licensing the TNC itself is the only practical means of regulating that style of vehicle for hire service. By regulating all brokers, the TCB can secure important trip and service level data, monitor accessible service, and ensure there is a responsive system for addressing customer concerns.

**Impact:** Creating a new licence category will require regulatory change, and audit policies and procedures to enable enforcement. Allowing brokers to process driver licence applications may reduce the administrative burden for the TCB. Different knowledge and skills may be required for broker ‘inspection’ than currently required for vehicle and on-road inspections. Fees established for this licence should consider an accessibility surcharge for companies that are not yet able to demonstrate equivalent accessible and standard service. [*Necessary to enable Supply and Demand recommendation 8(8); supported by Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(1)*]

9(5) Establish a licence category for shuttles. Do not limit the number of licences.

**Rationale:** Shuttles provide a public transportation service similar to specialty buses that are licenced under the limousine category, and present similar risks to public safety. Operation of a shuttle is currently subject to review and approval by the Public Utilities Board according to *The City of Winnipeg Charter Act*, although the authority and responsibility of the PUB is unclear. Establishing a licence requirement will allow the TCB to ensure the vehicles and drivers meet safety and consumer protection standards, and to effectively monitor this activity. Including this category of vehicle under TCB regulation will be efficient in that the requirements are a consistent activity of the TCB, and would ensure consistency in standards and efficient enforcement.

**Impact:** Creating a new licence category will require a change to the regulation. Communication will be required with all who currently operate a shuttle service. There will be a modest increase in workload required to administer these licences. [*Not dependent on other recommendations.*]

9(6) Adjust the fee structure for licences, applications, inspections and other services to more fully recover the costs of the regulatory function.

**Rationale:** Fees collected by the TCB ($260,000) currently cover just over one third of its cost ($728,000), and are substantially low compared to other jurisdictions. There are opportunities to reduce the administrative burden on the TCB while improving effectiveness and reducing costs as identified in various recommendations in this report. There are also recommendations that expand the scope of the TCB to include new classes of licences. It will be important to collect sufficient revenue from licensing TNCs, in particular, to enable compliance monitoring and enforcement. Creating the expectation that the TCB shall operate on a cost recovery basis provides a rationale and means to determine appropriate fees.
**Impact:** Licence fees in other jurisdictions are approximately three to four times the amount charged in Winnipeg. A 50 per cent increase in driver and business licence fees would provide approximately $800,000 in revenue. This would cover the gap between current revenue and costs and enable investment in systems and an additional staff resource. Business licence holders would see their fee increase by $100 for the year; driver’s licence fees would increase by $15 to $45. A reduced fee, or no increase, could be applied where driver licence applications are processed by a broker.

“Re-Inspection” fees present an opportunity to recover costs from licencees that are not complying. For example, 1,209 inspections were conducted on 594 taxicabs in 2015. Two hundred and sixty-seven (267) were only inspected once, leaving 327 cabs requiring re-inspection, some multiple times. A fee for re-inspection would encourage compliance the first time. At approximately 2 hours each, 615 re-inspections would represent approximately two thirds of an FTE. A $150 fee for the 615 re-inspections would generate approximately $92,000, which would approximate two thirds of an FTE, with a 30 per cent overhead factor for office operations.

Ottawa is similar in size to Winnipeg. A similar broker / TNC fee would generate approximately $22,000 from the two existing large dispatch companies and one TNC. Fees could be scaled for smaller brokers. This would contribute to the cost of data management software and training. If a new TNC service increased market activity by 10 per cent, and claimed a 15 per cent market share, a per trip fee of $0.11 would generate approximately 74,000. [Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendations 8(2), 8(3), 8(4), 8(6) and 8(9); enables capacity for Supply and Demand recommendation 8(8); Licensing Structure recommendations 9(4) and 9(5)]

9(7) Eliminate TCB involvement in training for drivers of taxicabs. Require proof of completion of driving skills and accessible training as part of a driver licence application. Eliminate interview and require written exam to demonstrate knowledge of TCB regulations and licence holder obligations.

**Rationale:** Training for language skills, customer service and knowledge of the city are nice but not a “need-to-have” from a regulatory standpoint if there is sufficient choice in the market to encourage competitive behavior. Customer preference will encourage the business to offer a competitive service, which includes knowledgeable, service-oriented drivers that can communicate effectively with passengers. *The Accessibility for Manitobans Act* and associated Customer Service Standard already obligate businesses to train employees on how to deliver accessible services. The only unique element for taxicabs relates to the safety and security of the passenger when entering/exiting, or riding in the cab. A driver skills training course is a directly related skill for safe operation of the taxi. The TCB could encourage higher levels of training by publishing the names of those that have completed training, organizing a customer service award or such things. A written exam is a more objective means of assessing knowledge than an interview. Passing the exam would also confirm the individual has sufficient language skills to read and respond to questions about their regulatory obligations.

**Impact:** For drivers and owners, the change would be negligible. The TCB would no longer be involved in any administration or coordination, relieving some workload. The TCB would initially need to establish a list of approved training providers for the driving skills course. [Not dependent on other recommendations]
9(8) Require driver's abstract for taxicab driver's licence application and renewal.

**Rationale:** A primary need for regulation is to ensure passenger safety. MPI has indicated that the ten-year average loss ratio for this class of vehicle was 108 per cent of premiums, with claim frequency seven times higher than the rest of the vehicle fleet. Concerns with aggressive driving and speeding were frequently mentioned in the public surveys. Requiring a driver’s abstract will allow the Taxicab Board to ensure that licences are not issued or renewed to drivers with poor records. Requiring a driver’s abstract is a common practice in other jurisdictions.

**Impact:** Preventing unsafe drivers from securing a Taxicab Drivers Licence will improve passenger and public safety. It may have some prevention effect if drivers know they may be risking their livelihood with unsafe driving, and if the TCB can recognize when a driver may need to upgrade their driving skills. The TCB will need to establish thresholds for response to driving records and proportionate consequences. Effective communication with industry is required. [Not dependent on other recommendations]

9(9) Stagger taxicab business licence renewal dates.

**Rationale:** Requiring all licences to be renewed on the same date creates an unnecessary peak in workload as the TCB needs to process the licence renewals all at once. The current date is also in peak season for the industry.

**Impact:** Spreading renewal dates throughout the year will smooth the workflow for the TCB, enable more timely turnaround, and more effective examination of renewal applications. Some additional tracking will be required to monitor licence status and renewals. The date for renewals is in the regulation and will need to be removed. If possible this should be initiated for the renewal period in 2017. This may require a one-time adjustment period where the licence is continued for a number of months pending the new scheduled renewal date. Ideally this renewal would be aligned with the owners TDL and MPI licence renewal date for licensee convenience. [Not dependent on other recommendations]

**Section 10 – Fares**

10(1) Establish a taxicab cost index as a means of determining when fare adjustments are required. Review annually, with minimum threshold for adjustment.

**Rationale:** A Taxicab Cost Index will allow for efficient, objective adjustment of fares based on published, reliable data, and weighted for significance. It will provide a transparent, efficient mechanism to ensure fares remain relevant.

**Impact:** Consultation with the industry is needed to validate the cost categories, weighting and benchmarks to ensure clear understanding and credibility of the tool. If current categories are valid, and the 2012 base rate was reasonable, no immediate adjustment is required. An index will remove the need for application by industry and an associated hearing. [Not dependent on other recommendations]
10(2) Cooperate with the MTB to harmonize distance rates across the CMA.

**Rationale**: Harmonizing distance fares in the CMA will address an existing challenge when taxicabs provide service across the municipal boundary. Maintaining a variable drop rate in each zone is more easily managed if considered necessary to reflect the nature of the service.

**Impact**: Consumers would have clearer understanding of fares to be charged. Establishing a common distance rate will remove the need to adjust the meter to a new rate while in transit, preventing concerns of ‘tinkering’ or poorly timed adjustments. The drop rate is highly visible and would be consistent in the area where the trip originates.  

10(3) Eliminate mandated fares for pre-arranged trips where fare estimates are provided and accepted in advance of booking.

**Rationale**: Flexibility in fares will allow all market participants to compete on the same basis, where consumer interests are protected with advance fare information. Customers have an opportunity to evaluate / accept the fare before accepting the service. This recommendation is contingent on there being sufficient choice in the market so that a provider cannot unfairly overcharge customers.

**Impact**: De-regulating fares may result in higher fares during peak times, and lower fares during slower periods. Allowing the industry to charge variable rates will encourage more supply during peak periods, enabling timely service, or for those who can adjust, the knowledge of how to effectively time their trip to minimize cost.  

10(4) Incorporate an accessibility surcharge in licensing fees and/or fares to enable subsidization and encourage accessible service.

**Rationale**: Accessible taxicabs also service the general population. A taxicab can complete more standard trips with less effort. Since the fares are set the same for both types of service, standard service enables higher income over the same period of time. Incentives are necessary to ensure drivers are not financially penalized by servicing the population requiring accessible service.

**Impact**: Applying an accessibility surcharge of $0.10 per trip to the $4.1 million trips in 2015 would generate approximately $410,000, and be essentially unnoticeable to passengers in cost. This can be used to cross-subsidize operators who provide accessible services, and encourage service to the accessible market. A means to collect and distribute the revenue will need to be established.  

10(5) Establish zone fares for on demand airport limousine service.

**Rationale**: Limousines/executive cars currently provide service at the airport to downtown at a pre-determined zone fare. This approach could be extended to other areas of the city. Allowing limousines to serve broader areas of the city from the airport with zone fares will increase the choice available to passengers and provide additional variable supply as may be needed during periods of peak demand.
The prescribed zone fares should reflect the quality of service provided by executive cars and limousines, while being sufficiently competitive to provide a real consumer choice.

**Impact:** Increased service and choice for airport passengers. Increased utilization of existing service.  
*Not dependent on other recommendations; relevant to and expands impact of Supply and Demand recommendation 8(g)*

10(6) Encourage consistent voluntary industry practice of standard advance payment or automated pay procedures.

Taxicab companies could be encouraged to implement an industry practice of standard advance pay. Taxicab providers could also be encouraged to develop mobile payment technology for their mobile Apps to enable automated payment capability.

A fare estimator can be used to determine the pre-payment amounts. Both Unicity and Duffy’s already have mobile Apps that provide fare estimates. The passenger does not need to have this technology – the driver can. Fare estimates are important for transparency and so customers feel comfortable with what they are paying.

For additional transparency, a printed receipt for the advanced payment should be issued by the driver immediately on receipt of payment, before driving anywhere. The passenger should be reimbursed/given change for any overpayment or may need to pay extra for a trip that costs more than estimated. At the end of the trip, customers should be issued a second receipt to reflect the difference between the estimated and actual fares. Customers should be permitted to make advanced payment with either cash or debit/credit card.

**Rationale:** Non-payment and threats of violence around payment impact the safety and financial well-being of drivers. When only certain customers are asked for pre-payments, many feel discriminated against and it impacts customer service. Just as some gas stations in the city request pre-payment at night, so too could the taxicab companies. A voluntary system is recommended to encourage industry practice versus mandatory regulation as the practice itself has its own rewards.

**Impact:** Making advance payment of fares standard for all customers at night has the potential to increase driver safety, reduce discrimination, and reduce incidents of non-payment. A voluntary system adopted by industry keeps the administrative burden off of the TCB. Industry would implement the practice for advanced payment, communicate with customers, and develop their own mobile payment technology if they so choose. The TCB’s involvement would consist of encouraging industry to adopt a voluntary practice and assisting with communication to the public. It will be important for customers to understand that they will be expected to pay upfront during certain times of day, and that everyone is treated equally. It will also be important for the companies to communicate to drivers the expectations and responsibilities around taking advanced payments.  *Not dependent on other recommendations*
Section 11 – Safety and Security

11(1) Mandate in-car posted photo identification including taxicab driver number.

**Rationale:** Passengers need to be able to identify their driver if an issue arises so a proper complaint can be filed and investigated. One of the advantages customers see from the TNC system is the fact that they have a photo and know who their driver is.

**Impact:** Photo ID will provide the essential information required for complaint reporting and follow-up, with the potential of increasing accountability for drivers and facilitating on-road inspection. [Supports Compliance and Enforcement recommendation 13(4)]

11(2) Mandate increased signage within all taxicab and limousine vehicle types, ensuring clear notices of cameras, and audio recording.

**Rationale:** Cameras in the taxicabs serve a purpose for safety. By mandating the longer memory storage for the cameras, the investigation “time crunch” is reduced. As passengers may have an expectation of privacy, it is important to provide clear notice that they are on camera when they are in a taxicab. If audio recording is enabled by upgrades to in-cab cameras at a later date, it will be important that all customers are aware that their conversations are being recorded. A passenger may notice the camera itself, but would not necessarily assume that their conversations are being recorded. Individuals may have concerns about having business conversations or personal conversations recorded.

**Impact:** Clear notice of in-car cameras may increase passenger feelings of safety and security, and make them aware of the evidence available should an incident arise. Passengers may adjust their behavior with audio recording. Some may select another mode of transportation. [Not dependent on other recommendations]

11(3) Seek to obtain third party data to enable the TCB to monitor safety.

Approach the Winnipeg Police Service to determine if incident report fields could be created to enable monitoring of criminal activity occurring in taxicabs. Monitor workers compensation claims.

**Rationale:** Passenger and driver safety is a primary concern, and may require further vigilance with an expansion of drivers through a TNC. Currently the TCB does not have any available data to monitor the frequency or severity of safety concerns. Consultations indicate passenger concerns are under-reported. WPS incident reports do not currently enable an efficient search for incidents involving or in taxicabs or taxicab drivers.

**Impact:** Increasing access to data will allow the TCB to take an evidence-based approach to regulatory standards for safety. Data is available on request from the WCB. Discussion with the WPS is required to determine what further information may reasonably be gained. [Supported by Safety and Security recommendation 11(4)]
11(4) Increase collaborative contact with Winnipeg Police Service and maintain an active role with Safe Cities Initiative.

**Rationale:** Drivers face significant safety risks associated with violent, disorderly, and intoxicated passengers. A closer collaborative relationship may identify effective ways of improving safety and WPS support. Inter-agency partnerships between WPS, Safe Cities Initiative and the taxicab industry and associated public awareness would increase both driver and passenger feelings of safety and security.

**Impact:** Increased sense of safety and cooperation between groups that are active on Winnipeg streets on a 24/7 basis. [*Supports Safety and Security recommendation 11(3); relevant to Compliance and Enforcement recommendation 13(3)]*

11(5) Increase the number of well-signed, supervised taxicab stands in downtown area.

**Rationale:** Only a small percentage of public survey respondents reported feeling safe at taxicab stands. Supervised taxicab stands will provide a sense of security for customers, a reduction in the occurrence of safety-related incidents over the short and long term, fewer complaints to dispatch companies and the TCB, along with an improved public image of the taxicab industry in Winnipeg. It will also enable metered taxicabs to more effectively serve this demand.

**Impact:** The TCB is unable to implement this recommendation on its own and will need to work with the City of Winnipeg, the hospitality industry and others to enable this. For example, a bar may be able to target external security cameras and/or allow its security staff to monitor a taxicab stand outside its main doors as patrons are leaving at the end of the night. This would assist the venue to quickly and safely exit patrons, and provide some additional safety for passengers and drivers. Cooperation from the City and/or the Parking Authority is needed to enable taxicab stands to be effectively placed to enable supervision by a venue and to enable effective signage and lighting. The Winnipeg Police Service and Downtown Biz, once aware of the locations, could monitor activity at taxicab stands as part of its regular patrol activity. [*Supported by Safety and Security recommendation 11(4), reduces industry impact of Supply and Demand 8(8)]*

**Section 12 – Customer Service**

12(1) Encourage, rather than regulate, details of customer service requirements. Encourage best practices and enable market forces to promote desired behaviour.

**Rationale:** The regulations do not appear to be effective in ensuring a high standard of customer service. If customers have more choice, vehicle for hire companies that do not provide quality service will lose business. Regulating customer service measures tends to drive behavior to the minimum required for compliance and is difficult to enforce.

**Impact:** By monitoring customer service and/or complaint data, dispatch companies, drivers and owners will be able to address areas needing improvement. This will improve consumer opinion regarding the taxicab industry as a whole. Over time, dispatch companies may see an improvement in the number of requests for taxicab service, a reduction in complaints made by customers, as well as a reduction in the
administrative burden on service providers and the TCB. [Dependent on other recommendations that increase choice: Regulatory Structure recommendation 7(1); Supply and Demand recommendations 8(8) and 8(9); Licensing Structure recommendation 10(5)]

12(2) Publish the customer and driver ‘bill of rights’ on the TCB website and post in taxicabs.

**Rationale:** Customers need to understand their rights as well as the rights of drivers. Some customer dissatisfaction stems from a lack of understanding. People who are aware of their rights will be more engaged/inclined to report issues when their rights have not been upheld.

**Impact:** Increased awareness and understanding has the potential to improve customer satisfaction in the short term by reducing misunderstandings between customers and drivers. There may be an increase in complaints reported in the short term that will help to establish a baseline. [Relevant to Compliance and Enforcement recommendation 13(4)]

12(3) Establish accountability for ensuring effective customer service with the dispatch companies as well as business licence holder. Monitor through periodic customer surveys and complaints data.

**Rationale:** Customers are currently dissatisfied with taxicab service overall. While drivers are the front line service providers, dispatch companies also interact with customers, and business licence holders are in a position to provide incentives for drivers to provide superior service.

**Impact:** By monitoring customer service and/or complaint data, dispatch companies, drivers and owners will be able to address areas needing improvement. [Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendations 8(1), 8(2) and 8(8); Licensing Structure recommendation 9(4)]

12(4) Encourage dispatch companies and business licence holders to undertake hospitality / tourism training offered by Tourism Winnipeg.

**Rationale:** Customers do not see drivers as good ambassadors, but rather view them as lacking knowledge of the city. Tourism Winnipeg offers free training for drivers. They have the knowledge, insight and know what tourists care about. Organizations in the tourism and/or hospitality industries can promote companies that complete training via traditional and social media. The TCB can encourage this behavior by recognizing those that have undertaken the training on its website.

**Impact:** Drivers that undertake the training will have enhanced knowledge to promote the city. Promoting companies that complete the training would serve two purposes. In the short term, it would provide companies with a positive, and cost effective, method to promote their business (PR opportunity) and would improve the public image of the taxicab industry over the long term. [Relevant to Customer Service recommendation 12(3)]
12(5) Consider recommending a representative from the tourism or hospitality industry for the Taxicab Board.

*Rationale:* A member of the Taxicab Board with a tourism/hospitality/customer service focus would bring a useful perspective to TCB discussions, and may enable further collaborative relationships with the tourism and hospitality industry.

*Impact:* The TCB gains an enhanced perspective and a greater connection with taxicab customers. The tourism representative can provide a service-oriented view that promotes the city of Winnipeg, as well as a global perspective on customer service issues impacting the tourism industry.

Over the long term, the potential to collaborate / build a partnership may open the door to ongoing communication between the taxicab and tourism industries, both of which rely on each other. *[Not dependent on other recommendations]*

**Section 13 – Compliance and Enforcement**

13(a) Upgrade tracking and information management for enforcement activity to enable fair, risk based enforcement on all forms of vehicles for hire.

*Rationale:* The TCB currently tracks inspection activity, but does not analyze or use it. Inconsistencies in the data impact its reliability. Not all inspections are recorded. Without data, resources may be expended on areas of lesser risk or value. Enforcement is the primary means of ensuring the regulatory system is effective. If enforcement is ineffective, it weakens the entire system.

*Impact:* Investment may be required in a data management system. While functionality requirements are not complex, some degree of automation and dashboard capabilities will allow staff resources to be used more efficiently and effectively. *[Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendation 8(2); Compliance and Enforcement recommendation 13(2)]*

13(2) Reduce multiple handling of data through direct entry, using mobile tools.

*Rationale:* Having separate individuals collect and record data is a waste of resources (time and financial) and a potential source of human error.

*Impact:* Technology such as a tablet or laptop with an aircard, or potentially a smart phone, would enable on-site data collection and eliminate the need for data entry. Some investment, online access and staff training may be required. *[Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendation 8(2); necessary for Compliance and Enforcement recommendation 13(a)]*

13(3) Increase fines and compliance / enforcement activity on illegal vehicles for hire operating without the required licences.

If possible, these fines should serve as an administrative penalty and fine without involving the courts, unless for appeal.
**Rationale:** Fines of $50-$250 for operating without a taxicab driver’s licence are not high enough to act as a deterrent. An individual operating without a licence would feasibly make that amount in a single day of work. A large amount of work is involved with imposing such small fines. Directing these infractions to the court process can result in significant delay between the intervention and the fine, lessening the impact of the penalty. This particular infraction may require additional focus with the recommendation that TNCs be regulated. It has also been identified by the industry as an active issue that puts passengers at risk, with multiple illegal services currently active in Winnipeg.

**Impact:** The Taxicab Act would need to be updated to increase the fines and authority. [Relevant to Supply and Demand recommendation 8(8); supported by Safety and Security recommendation 11(4)]

13(4) Create a more user friendly TCB Complaint Process.

**Rationale:** The public in general does not know where to make a complaint about a taxicab issue. The requirement for written complaints creates a high administrative burden for the TCB and work for complainants. Prior to 2016, 50 per cent to 60 per cent of complaints were not investigated due to this requirement. This leads to customer dissatisfaction with the process.

**Impact:** If changes are made to improve the complaints process, more complaints can be expected. This is a good thing because then action can be taken. By implementing technology such as an online web form and eliminating written complaint submissions, the distribution of complaints packages and the associated data entry, the TCB will be able to allocate more energy to complaints investigation and follow-up. [Dependent on Supply and Demand recommendation 8(2) and Compliance and Enforcement recommendation 13(2); supported by Safety and Security recommendation 11(1) and Customer Service recommendation 12(2)]

Opportunities to create a more user friendly TCB complaint process include:

i. **Develop a web form so customers can submit complaints directly online.**

   The City of Calgary has a good example of a web form that customers complete and submit online. Customers can upload multiple documents such as photos and receipts to support their complaints. In developing this type of online complaint submission system, the opportunities to improve over the current process include: auto-generated case tracking number; automatically generated email to confirm their complaint or compliment has received; data from this web form collected in a single TCB database to allow for ongoing tracking and monitoring; complaint triage system for inspectors. Implementing technology such as online web forms for complaint submission and automatically generated complaint acknowledgement emails will improve data tracking and facilitate communication with customers while reducing administrative burden and data entry. Customers will be able to provide details on their complaint including supporting material in a standardized manner.

ii. **Encourage use of the web form for complaints submission and remove the requirement for the written submission of complaints.** [Dependent on recommendation i. above]
Customers can be encouraged to use the new web form that they submit online as the preferred method of complaints submission. When a customer calls in with a telephone complaint, TCB staff could complete the same online web form ‘live’ over the phone to ensure standardized information is collected, the information is in the same database, and a tracking number will be generated. In this way, customers do not need to be able to use the web technology, but the TCB can still benefit from it. Winnipeg is the only jurisdiction that requires written complaints. More than half of complaint files are closed and not investigated because of the lack of written complaint. There is a significant administrative burden created by the TCB’s current process.

iii. **Improve communication around the complaints process.** [Supported by Safety and Security recommendation 11(1)]

Opportunities to improve communication include: ensuring that complaint phone line information and website information is clearly posted inside all cabs (with large font to make it accessible) and that essential information for complaint follow-up such as the cab number, driver number and driver photo are also clearly visible; a scannable QR code which links directly to an automated TCB compliments and complaints webpage could also be included; customer and driver’s rights clearly communicated online on the same page as the Complaints web form; clarify to customers which type of complaint to direct to the driver, the dispatch company, the TCB or the police; communicate to customers via social media, other media, newspaper etc. about how to file complaints.

iv. **Issue mandatory “How’s my Driving?” Bumper Stickers.**

TCB could issue mandatory stickers for all taxicab bumpers that say “How’s my Driving?” and provide contact information for the public to provide feedback. The TCB has a limited number of inspectors to watch for issues. Given the significant online survey response, the taxicab industry is a topic many individuals feel passionate about. Other businesses involved with transportation, for example the trucking industry, use “How’s my driving?” stickers as a way to increase driver accountability and provide the public with a forum to make complaints.
15.0 IMPLEMENTATION

The recommendations of this report, if implemented, will have a significant impact on the taxicab industry in Winnipeg. These recommendations are also interrelated and interdependent. It is crucial to successful execution that a comprehensive implementation plan, including a strong change management and communication strategy be developed.

Recommendations were assessed based on their complexity, cost, involvement of others, and required timeline and have been distributed into three categories: short term, medium term, and long term. Short term involves little or no cost and could be completed relatively easily within a short period (e.g., three months). Medium term recommendations may involve other parties or regulatory change and may require approximately a year. Longer term recommendations may have greater impact, require more preparation and longer lead times (e.g., more than a year). All are subject to the decisions of the TCB and the Province of Manitoba regarding which recommendations to adopt, at what pace, and are provided as an initial assessment only.

Table 26 Implementation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply and Demand</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support ongoing access to diamond lanes for standard and accessible</td>
<td>8(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taxicabs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Licensing Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a waiting list of qualified applicants who wish to obtain a</td>
<td>9(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business licence, with a fee to qualify for and maintain a position on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the list.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eliminate TCB involvement in training for drivers of taxicabs. Require</td>
<td>9(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proof of completion of driving skills and accessible training as part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of a taxicab driver’s licence application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Require driver’s abstract for taxicab driver’s licence application and</td>
<td>9(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renewal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fares</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish zone fares for on demand airport limousine service.</td>
<td>10(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage consistent voluntary industry practice of standard advance</td>
<td>10(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>payment or automated pay procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mandate in-car posted photo identification including taxicab driver</td>
<td>11(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mandate signage within all taxicab and limousine vehicle types, ensuring</td>
<td>11(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear notices of cameras, and audio recording.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase collaborative contact with Winnipeg Police Service and maintain</td>
<td>11(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an active role with Safe Cities Initiative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publish customer and driver ‘bill of rights’ on the TCB website and</td>
<td>12(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post in taxicabs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage dispatch companies and business licence holders to undertake</td>
<td>12(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hospitality / tourism training offered by Tourism Winnipeg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Medium Term

| Supply and Demand | 8(1) Require dispatch companies and business licence holders to collect, maintain and report trip data on a not-less-than monthly basis. |
|                  | 8(2) Develop internal data management capabilities. |
|                  | 8(3) Establish a maximum total number of metered taxicab licences based on population ratio, with a phased implementation plan. |
|                  | 8(4) Discontinue use of seasonal licences, and allow licence holders to adjust use of the taxicab according to demand. |
|                  | 8(5) Continue the practice of issuing new licences only for accessible taxicabs until similar service levels are achieved, then apportion future licences. |
|                  | 8(9) Eliminate limits on limousine licences, allow flexible use of and eliminate temporary limousine licences. |

| Licensing Structure | 9(1) Eliminate the redundant sub-categories of taxicabs and standardize or remove vehicle age restrictions. |
|                    | 9(2) Allow transferability of all classes of taxicab licences, or phase out all licence transferability over a period of ten years. |
|                    | 9(4) Establish a licence category and require a licence to operate as a vehicle for hire broker (dispatch company), with obligations for trip reporting and customer service standards. Enable brokers to process driver licence applications and renewals. |
|                    | 9(5) Establish a licence category for shuttles. Do not limit the number of licences. |
|                    | 9(6) Adjust the fee structure for licences, applications, inspections and other services to more fully recover the costs of the regulatory function. |
|                    | 9(9) Stagger taxicab business licence renewal dates. |

| Fares | 10(1) Establish a taxicab cost index as a means of determining when fare adjustments are required. Review annually, with minimum threshold for adjustment. |
|       | 10(2) Cooperate with the MTB to harmonize distance rates across the CMA. |

| Safety and Security | 11(3) Seek to obtain third party data to enable the TCB to monitor safety. |
|                    | 11(5) Increase the number of well-signed, supervised taxicab stands in downtown area. |

<p>| Customer Service | 12(3) Establish accountability for ensuring effective customer service with the dispatch companies as well as business licence holder. |
|                 | 12(5) Consider recommending a representative from the tourism or hospitality industry for the Taxicab Board. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance and Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Upgrade tracking and information management for enforcement activity to enable fair, risk based enforcement on all forms of vehicles for hire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce multiple handling of data through direct entry, using mobile tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase fines and compliance / enforcement activity on illegal vehicles for hire operating without the required licences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a more user friendly TCB Complaint Process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Simplify and minimize the regulations to only those elements necessary to serve the public interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review the regulatory structure to determine whether it is best served at the municipal or provincial level, including consultations with CMA municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create incentives to offset the higher cost to provide accessible service, to ensure accessible taxis are available for this service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allow Transportation Network Companies entrance into the market, licensed as a separate category, and require they meet standards for safety and consumer protection similar to the requirements for standard taxicabs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Eliminate mandated fares for pre-arranged trips where fare estimates are provided and accepted in advance of booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporate an accessibility surcharge in licensing fees and/or fares to enable subsidization and encourage accessible service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage, rather than regulate, details of customer service requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>