

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Wednesday, November 20, 2013

The Council met at 9:35 a.m.

The City Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Havixbeck.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Mayes, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steen, Swandel, Vandal, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: I'd like to make a few personal remarks before we start. It is an honour and a privilege to be sitting before you as the seventh Speaker for Winnipeg City Council. I believe you all to know me as a fair individual and I intend on keeping that reputation. It is also an honour to be the first female Speaker of City Council. Over the last while, I have received a number of phone calls and e-mails from individuals who found inspiration in my election and who are using this as an opportunity to recognize their own potential. It is empowering for women to feel they can be successful in any role and sector they choose. I would like to thank the Mayor and members of Council for their confidence and encouraging comments over the last week. Before we start, I would like to thank our former Speaker, Councillor Grant Nordman for his years of service. Thank you, Councillor Nordman for the time and dedication you put into this position. Without further ado, I would now like to welcome our guests and hear announcements. In the gallery, we have Sheri Thompson, Recruitment, Training and Coaching Coordinator, together with Amy McGuinness, Team Leader, and 311 employees. They are here with us today to learn about the Council process. Welcome to you. Mayor Katz, you have an announcement I understand, on Universal Children's Day.

Mayor Katz: I have several, Madam Speaker and I'm wondering if I can flip flop the order if that's okay with you. I think what I'd first like to start off with is this morning, Madam Speaker, we are paying tribute to some of the outstanding men and women who represented in Manitoba in the 2013 Canada Summer Games. In August, Team Manitoba returned from Sherbrook, Quebec, with a record number of medals and the coveted Centennial Cup. The total medal count for Team Toba was an impressive 35, the best showing at the Canada Games for our province. Today, we're shining a light on Team Manitoba's Winnipeg gold medalists, by presenting them with the City of Winnipeg outstanding achievement awards. These awards recognize four Winnipeggers who have demonstrated exceptional skill in their chosen sports. It is an honour to have two of Team Manitoba's gold medal winning athletes with us here today. Being recognized for winning gold in the C2, 5,000 meter pairs event is the canoe kayak team of Hannah Guttormson and Stephanie Lowrie along with their coach, Jerome Seremak. So I want to congratulate Hannah and Stephanie and their coach and please present, starting off with Hannah...this way...and Jerome. (applause). Council is also recognizing swimmer Breanne Siwicki and runner, Julia Zrinyi an outstanding...with outstanding achievement awards for their gold medal wins. Unfortunately, both Breanne and Julia are unable to be here, but it's a pleasure to present the outstanding achievement award to the coach, Andy Tough, who worked with Julia to reach this milestone in her athletic career and Andy, I'd very much like to present this to you. Thank you for everything you've done (inaudible). (applause). And in case you're wondering, Breanne and Julia are both away at school but they have received their medals. I guess next on the agenda, Madam Speaker, I'm hoping that everybody's aware that today is Universal Children's Day, a day where across the world, we honour children. Although the day is marked as Universal Children's Day, every day I know that we honour children and I wish that every child is in an environment, whether that be at home, at school, at a park, or at a recreation centre that is safe. Every child should be empowered to grow and develop and to lead lives that they will value. I'd like to mention a program within our Winnipeg Police Association that is making a difference. "Cool to be kind". This campaign is all about celebrating and promoting acts of kindness. Our officers within the Winnipeg Police Service will visit schools and leave students with positive tools outlining why it's cool to be kind. I was pleased to be able to become a sponsor to this program. On the weekend, Madam Speaker, I attended an anti-bullying event for young people called "the hateless tour". Young people spoke about the effects of bullying and how difficult it is to stay true to yourself when other people are critical of what you wear, how you speak or the kind of music you listen to. I applaud the efforts of organizers to help empower children to reach their true potential. As former President Mr. Nelson Mandela once said, "education is the great engine of personal development. It is through education that the daughter of a peasant to become a doctor, that the son of a mine worker can become the head of the mine, that a child of farm workers can become the president of a great nation". And lastly, Mr. Speaker, on a much more somber note, I rise to acknowledge the devastation that the

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
November 20, 2013

Philippines has experienced as a result of Typhoon Haiyan. Earlier this month, the Philippines experienced the largest typhoon in recorded history with winds of up to 314 kilometres per hour and flash flooding, Typhoon Haiyan caused extensive property damage and power outages across 40 provinces. In Leyte Province, one of the hardest hit areas, a five meter storm surge swept much of the port city of Tacloban out to sea. What remain lies in ruins. At last count, nearly 4,000 people have been confirmed dead, 1600 are missing and another 18,000 are injured. Over 10.3 million people have been affected, with 4 million either displaced or left homeless. Winnipeg is home to a large but close knit community of Filipinos. We express our sympathies to everyone experiencing grief or crisis as a result of these events. Our thoughts are with everyone in the Philippines including our sister city of Manila. As they struggle to clean up the widespread damage and deal with their grief. Until December the 8th, the government of Canada will match any donations to register Canadian charities providing aid to the Philippines. I encourage all Winnipeggers who have the means, to donate to the Philippine relief efforts. With your blessings, Madam Speaker, I would like to invite Councillor Mike Pagtakhan to speak about contributing through the Canadian Red Cross. As many of us know, Councillor Pagtakhan is a strong voice in Winnipeg's Filipino community and I want to thank him for getting the word out. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Katz. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker and I appreciate the Mayor's words on that. It's worth repeating again, Madam Speaker. On November the 8th of 2013 of this year, a super typhoon of such sheer energy, Madam Speaker, ripped through the south and central Philippines, causing catastrophic damage of epic proportions. It left at least 4,000 people...it took away 4,000 people's lives, Madam Speaker. 18,000 people are injured and anywhere between four to 10 million people have been negatively affected by this. So I also want to acknowledge the incredible work that's happening within our Filipino community. We have well over a hundred associations right here in our city and there's a few more across the province and you know through the good work of groups like the Filipino Seniors Group of Winnipeg, the Manitoba Canadian Filipino Association the Bacoor Association, the Association of Filipinos of Manitoba, the Manitoba Filipino Business Council and several dozens more, Madam Speaker, they're ongoing fundraising efforts right here in our city and particularly hardened, Madam Speaker, you know, if I go a grocery store, or I was at a couple dinners over the last couple of weeks, and people come up to me and expressed their concern and their willingness and desire to help and that really makes me proud and I'm heartened and touched by those sentiments. And what I have done, Madam Speaker, is I've arranged for two Canadian Red Cross donation boxes to be placed one here at Council Building at the security desk and another one at the customer building payable station, at the Administration Building, so if you are so inclined, please do give as much as you can, you know, every dollar helps and you know, the Canadian Government has been very supportive of this. The people of Winnipeg have been very supportive of people, the citizens of Manitoba and across the world, so you know, my heartfelt thanks to all those who were giving and continue to support this cause and who are making the burden a lot easier for those affected by. And Madam Speaker, on a positive note, I want to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of Winnipeg City Council. Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan has a strong tradition of having Speakers at Winnipeg City Council with Councillor Mike O'Shaughnessy, Councillor Harry Lazarenko and myself as Deputy Speaker. It's great to see you from Old Kildonan continue that tradition of Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan as the new Speaker, the 7th Speaker of Council. Congratulations to you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Pagtakhan, for setting up that collection boxes and thank you very much for nominating me to this position of Speaker. Councillor Nordman, you have an announcement to make as well, I understand?

Councillor Nordman: Yes, I do, Speaker Sharma. Congratulations. I already gave you a hug earlier, but bon voyage. I hope your reign as Speaker is as successful as mine was. It's not often I have the chance to rise on the floor of Council and congratulate somebody for somebody for being named to a hall of fame, and I'd like to take this moment to recognize His Worship Mayor Sam Katz, for being nominated and inducted into the Manitoba Baseball Hall of Fame as a builder. Congratulations, Mr. Mayor. (applause).

MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: We have two condolence motions today. Madam Clerk, will you read the first condolence motion?

Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Karen Ruta, wife of Mike Ruta, Chief Financial Officer, which occurred on October 13, 2013.

This Council extends to Mike Ruta and his family, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Madam Speaker: Would all those present on the floor and in the gallery, please rise for a moment of silence.

(Moment of Silence)

Madam Speaker: Madam Clerk, will you read the second condolence motion, please?

Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz,
Seconded by Councillor Swandel,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Romesh Joshi, father of Deepak Joshi, Interim Acting Chief Administrative Officer, which occurred on November 17, 2013.

This Council extends to Deepak Joshi and his family, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Madam Speaker: Please rise for a moment of silence.

(Moment of Silence)

MINUTES

Councillor Steen moves that the minutes of the meeting held on October 22, 2013, October 23, 2013 and November 6, 2013, be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We have four delegations with us today in regards to the award of the contract of the provision of telephone and other systems. I would like to remind our delegations there are Procedure By-law limits address to Council and Awards of Contracts only. You can only speak to the basis of the criteria set out in the invitation to tender and not on any other issue. Thank you for observing our rules today. I'd like to call Peter Spavrouopoulos, on behalf of FlexITy Solutions, in support of the item. Sir, you have ten minutes.

Peter Spavrouopoulos: First of all, I'd like to thank everyone here, Council, Executive Committee, Worship, everyone for allowing me this ten minute opportunity to speak on behalf of...keep it very tight in terms of the guidelines, the RFP. I do have some documentation that I'd just like to distribute around. There's, unfortunately, 19 copies, so hopefully that will be enough.

Madam Speaker: The clock is on, sir, if you'd like to start.

Peter Spavrouopoulos: Obviously, I'm in support of the recommendation as presented in item no. 6, which is for the award of contract for the provision of the telephone system infrastructure opportunity Bid No. 695-2012. Just a couple of highlights I think that are important from our RFP. From a fair, equitable process perspective, we're complying with the cost savings with group in architecture, KEY, we are in partnership with our technology partners, Cisco, who I believe presented last week and will present next. This voice over IP service is private and dedicated. No data calls are ever placed over the internet, as highlighted in the RFP response from FlexITy. It is safe and secure, end to end encryption. Nothing, calls, voice mails, can be traced or listen to. As we expressed in our RFP response, it's not just a phone and a mailbox. It's actually a platform innovation and transformation, more specifically, around collaboration for the City of

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
November 20, 2013

Winnipeg. Included was all the training, transition, to ensure a very safe and secure transition from the existing infrastructure that the City has. And we strongly believe as I will indicate in the next page, that's positive impact on the employment for the City of Winnipeg. This RFP actually created investments for us in this province. I work directly related to or will be directly related to the award of this RFP. In order to service the City of Winnipeg, we will be creating a point presence which has facilities, construction, job creation to service the City of Winnipeg and more importantly, long term from an expansion perspective in terms of job creation to service the entire western Canada for us. This is key. Millions of dollars will be invested in the next six to nine months in order to facilitate this infrastructure. The majority of the infrastructure will be right here in the City of Winnipeg and ensure all voice communications and traffic will be local to the City of Winnipeg. Our relationship with Cisco is one that's very deep, intense and Shane from Cisco will indicate to you the 6,000 or so students that have gone through the network, Academy Cisco, here in the city of Winnipeg and for us it's prime because now we have a platform to pick from, from an employment perspective, very skilled labour here directly in the city of Winnipeg. Obviously, in support of this RFP and the award. Any questions?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Spavrouopoulos. Can you please wait on the floor of Council? We're going to first hear everyone in support and then we'll take questions at the end. You can just wait. I'd like to call Mr. Shane Warnez on behalf of Cisco. Is he here today? He's also in support of this item. Mr. Warnez, you have five minutes.

Shane Warnez: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Council and the Honourable Mayor. Thank you for the opportunity to allow me to speak here today. I work for Cisco Systems here in Winnipeg and I'm the regional director of the prairies. The reason that I'm speaking today is just to highlight some of the opportunities for the City of Winnipeg when it comes in regards to, the award of RFP, I wanted to mention, first off that this is proven technology and there are quite a number of companies, public sector as well as private sector companies, both within the Province as well as across Canada, that have adopted this technology. This is certainly not something new. We've actually had many partnerships with various resellers, integrators across Canada, across Manitoba and across the world that have been implementing this technology for ten years now. So this is what I would describe as a very low-risk technology as long as you're well qualified to do it. So from our perspective, you know, certainly there are you know, many, many customers. In fact, the slides that I have provided reference over 200,000 customers. We've actually deployed over 65 million of these end points, these IP phones and in fact, your entire network infrastructure today is built on Cisco technology and the opportunity is really to be able to leverage that investment that was made and that will help you to reduce your cost. There is, again, an opportunity to enhance the infrastructure that you have to make it secure, reliable, et cetera. So that's all part of, you know, the recommendations that were provided. As far as market share, we have the number one market share in the world as far as this type of technology and we do over \$5 billion of research and development per year. So...and many, many references can be provided, you know, large, large references, globally, in Canada, and even in Manitoba, which were, I believe, pointed out within the RFP response. Also, it's...I think it's important to highlight that Cisco is also investing in Manitoba. And in fact, if you look at the second slide that I provided there's actually a picture there of the University of Winnipeg with the Cisco Centre for Collaboration Technologies, a number of years ago, actually three years ago, we made an announcement with the Province and with Western Diversification to contribute together collectively \$12 million to the University of Winnipeg to create this innovation centre and in fact, when you talk about this particular contract, this is actually around collaboration technologies which is what the innovation centre is all about. So you know, clearly the intent is to create innovation and economic development out of that...out of that centre that's been created here. Our portion of the contribution by the way was \$5 million. Also, you know, we, the other thing I should mention as well, which is...sorry on the next slide that we continue to hire here in Manitoba. In fact, I've hired six people in the last year into our Cisco office which is located just down the street here at 201 Portage on the 18th floor. So these are local sales and engineering resources to you know work with customers and ensure projects such as this are successful. Another thing that we're working on with the City of Winnipeg through your economic development group, is something called a smart connected community initiative and I'm sure some of you are aware of that. It was just announced actually within the last month that Winnipeg had qualified to be on the top 21 smart connected communities. There are a number of references to the Cisco Innovation Centre. In that document and in fact, we have assigned a person dedicated to working with the City of Winnipeg to try and get to your goal of being on the top seven which is obviously a very prestigious place to be. So that is something I think that you know really helps to create a positive vibe around the city that we can start to tell people across the country about. Also...

Madam Speaker: If you can start wrapping up, sir, you have 30 seconds.

Shane Warnez: I'm running out of time? Okay. Also, we do, as FlexITy mentioned, provide IT training through 10 colleges and high schools throughout Manitoba. So far, we educated over 6,000 students and that contribution has been to the approximate value of 2.54 million. There's actually a hand-out there that provides further details on that specific to Manitoba. So I would just close by saying that you know really innovation drives economic development and economic development creates employment here in our city and province.

Madam Speaker: Thank you very much. Are there any questions for the two gentlemen? Okay, I just want to remind everyone on Council that the questions can be only on the basis of criteria and no other subject. Councillor Orlikow. Gentlemen, could you come up to the podium, please.

Councillor Orlikow: I'll ask the question. I'm sure you could rule me out of order if I'm out of order. I don't think I am. My question is do you know or have any estimates about if this contract goes through, how many employees that you would see kind of being in Winnipeg? You know, you mentioned six today. Would there be an increase if that goes through?

Shane Warnez: Yeah, this...this is from our perspective and this is from a Cisco perspective, we have plans on hiring, you know, two to three more people in the next year here. This type of a contract, obviously, leads towards me being able to justify, you know creating those positions here. The more innovation that we get here in Manitoba and the more of these types of technologies that, you know, obviously looking to a reference like the City of Winnipeg is key for us to be even more successful with these technologies which allows us to then grow our footprint here in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions?

Peter Spavrououlos: I believe that goes to FlexlTy so I'd just like to also piggyback off Shane's response for us directly, the service's contract, we're probably...we haven't done the full analysis but we're somewhere between four to eight new employees and they would be hired immediately following contract signing and as we start, obviously, the transition in terms of the technology. And as we grow, and this is important for us, as the footprint as a footprint grows, this is our launching pad here so as we service other customers in the west we've picked the City of Winnipeg start here in Manitoba, if we are awarded this contract to continue to grow that and for every city that winds up coming on the platform I see one to two more folks being added over the course of time here within the city.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm a little bit once bitten twice shy. In the transition with our garbage and recycling program, I hadn't received a complaint about it prior to a changeover. What kinds of contingencies do you have in place so that if there is a problem, we can have an immediate resolution of those problems?

Peter Spavrououlos: Sure. So the one thing we've done and I'm going to try to keep the technology talk to minimum, but what we've tried to do and every single site that is part of the contract, it provide local site survivability. So not only will we have technology going into the site from a main site, but that site itself, I think there is 129 various sites will have local sites survivability technology built into it. So let's say, for example, fiberoptic link is cut to the building and there is no connectivity, that building still has its own site survivability to get out to the world or to the city to be able to make 911 and other type of emergency calls, including our regular calls.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, gentlemen, you can return to the gallery, thank you. Our next delegation is Robert Linsdell and Dee Gillies on behalf of Telecommunications Employees Association of Manitoba, and they are in opposition to item no. 6. Thank you. You have ten minutes.

Dee Gillies: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Mr. Chair, Councillors, ladies and gentlemen in the gallery, we're here today to question whether the City administration, in making the recommendations, followed its own RFP criteria, specifically condition B21.4.1, which stipulates all costs must be considered in evaluation of proposals, and to question whether the criteria in section D2.2.D.1 that requires information be retained and stored within Manitoba is adequate. I want to start with section D2.2.D.I that requires that the information be retained and stored in Canada. It should be of concern to the Council and to the City that the citizens of the city, that the criteria does not include a number of very important requirements, we feel to mitigate the city security risks. The requirement speaks only to the retention and storage of data but not to who has access to it or from which country. There is no security requirement for accessing the data and no requirement that guarantees any standard of security clearance for the individuals outside of city facilities. There is also no criteria that requires the data not to leave Canada, which could make it subject to foreign interception and monitoring. E7.15 requires the proposed system be compatible with external recording devices and provide an option for allowing recording of phone lines continuously or on demand. And in the response to question 25 in the addendum, in addendum 1, which states the recordings of telephone conversations shall be stored off premises by the contractor and shall be stored in Canada. The network has been designed to be tappable. It's understandable. But there are no stringent requirements in the RFP to ensure the security of those recordings and the data in the event of a takeover of the contractor. FlexlTy Solutions is a small privately owned company from Ontario that according to Dunne & Bradstreet had about \$4.9 million in sales last year. All companies, particularly small ones are targets of mergers and acquisitions. What we don't see in the RFP criteria are any securities for what happens in the event that FlexlTy is sold and what happens in the event it is sold to a foreign entity. Once voice data is...once voice is converted to data it can be shipped anywhere

in the world with ease and it's important that the City and its citizens have absolute confidence that the City's communications is secure. The...very briefly the service level agreement has no provisions for catastrophic events that could be for the City and that might require a major mobilization of telecommunications manpower to restore or rebuild a system. It is incumbent on Council to take the time to carefully consider whether the security concerns of Winnipeggers have been addressed adequately. The item...this item was walked on to EPC agenda very late in the day. And the notice went out on the Friday before a long weekend. I think it's important that we take us...take the questions seriously as to whether this process allowed...has allowed enough time for us to seriously consider all the implications of this of the lack of these requirements in the RFP. Now, B21.4.1 states that the proposal will be evaluated on the basis of all costs associated with the proposed solution, including infrastructure, even though the cost may not be reflected in the proposal. And an amendment...amended clause B21.9.2 states that notwithstanding B22.3, the City shall not be obligated to award any section of the responsible bidder submitting the most advantageous offer, for that section and shall have the right to choose the solution that is in its best interest. Are the full costs of the upgrade to the wide area network facilities that will be required to support the additional band width and the national, and the necessary quality of service upgrades, are they known? The administration's recommendation to remove over \$6 million from the local economy over the next five years cannot be in its citizens' best interests. Has an impact study or full cost benefit analysis has been undertaken? And what is the cost of the...to the local economy? What impact will it have on employment here?

Madam Speaker: Ms Gillies, I want to remind you that you need to speak to the tender and not the award.

Dee Gillies: Thank you. I beg your pardon, but I think that the social cost of a contract is part of the cost of doing business. Thank you. So I would just like to finish then in asking that to protect the security of the City communications and to present unforeseen and unexpected additional costs we ask that you reject the recommendation concerning Section D of the RFP land line voice over IP.

Madam Speaker: Do you have any comments, sir?

Robert Linsdell: I'm here to answer any questions that may come from Council.

Madam Speaker: We'll do that in a few minutes if you want to just stay on the floor of Council, okay? We do have Dave Sauer here on behalf of the Winnipeg Labour Council, also in opposition. Dave, you have five minutes.

Dave Sauer: No problem. Just, Mr. Speaker, my name is Sauer, I just want to make sure I emphasize that. Two times I've been down here but Sauer is the pronunciation of my last name.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Dave Sauer: No problem. So the Winnipeg Labour Council is pleased to present its views here today. The organization represents the interests of working Winnipeggers both in the public and the private sector. Forty seven thousand workers from 76 affiliated union locals work hard every day bringing home pay cheques that are then spent directly here in our community. From those pay cheques, tax dollars are also deducted. We believe the City of Winnipeg should be taking the money it receives and investing in our local economy. We are therefore opposed to having work a Manitoba company and Manitobans can perform being performed by a company in Ontario. Good jobs are the essence of good communities and good cities. (inaudible) up the local middle class shops hurts Winnipeg. City Council has an opportunity here out, MTS and the Telecommunications Employees Association of Manitoba, Unit 4 Local 7 and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 435 and let them perform the work, in which Winnipeggers are already familiar. In recent years, Winnipeg has seen a loss of numerous good paying jobs. Phillips & Temro, represented by the Steel Workers Local 907.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Sauer, can you please speak to the...you know the rules in this chamber.

Dave Sauer: No. I am aware, I'm just sort of citing as an example of other jobs that have been sort of put outside of the community.

Madam Speaker: You can speak to the tendering process.

Dave Sauer: Okay, well, I mean I want to speak about good jobs, but I'll continue on then. So I'm just...this is a situation I believe that is a little troubling that we can continue to see companies outside of the province being awarded tendering contracts. We were led to believe that a company from France is best suited to deal...

Madam Speaker: Do you have any specific comments about the tendering?

Dave Sauer: I'm talking about local jobs, so I'm just fine to bring you...we allowed Cisco to talk about bringing in its local jobs. I just find it emphasize the local job situation here.

Madam Speaker: Do you have anything new to add?

Dave Sauer: Well, I'll leave it at that then if it doesn't appear...I can't address local jobs, then that's unfortunate.

Madam Speaker: We will take questions at this time if I can ask the delegations to come back to the podium. Are there any questions? Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, I may be ruled out of order, but I was able to ask the other question so I'll ask it the first time. Do you have...we talked about the jobs. Do you have any idea how many jobs will be lost?

Robert Linsdell: We're talking \$6 million of revenue leaving the Province so that is money that would've been going into a local company. A portion of it from what we've heard from the (inaudible), that they will employ a few employees whereas a local company, they all will be local employees plus their support employees, so definitely more if it is a local company.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. Is Mr. Dave Sanders here? Good morning. You are in opposition to two items, sir, and you have ten minutes. The first item is report...item no. 1 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee on the establishment of the City of Winnipeg Code of Conduct. Is that correct?

David Sanders: Yes.

Madam Speaker: And the second item is item no. 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Finance, regarding Cross Jurisdictional Review, the Delegated Financial Authority, correct?

David Sanders: Yes.

Madam Speaker: You have ten minutes for each item.

David Sanders: Thank you, Madam Chair...Speaker. Members of Council, with regard to the first matter, the Code of Conduct Committee and Disclosure Process, the Winnipeg Public Service report before you states that the text of the Code of Conduct is only available on the City's internal web site and it's true unless you look back to March 21, 2001 for Council minutes when it was adopted. I submit that the code should be posted on the City's main public website forthwith so that the general public may understand what the expectations of City employees are and how to lodge complaint. There is a proposal, a good one to institute an annual employee electronic reminder and sign off regarding potential conflicts of interests, which is already used by many private sector organizations. But I ask you to note that this must involve not only the potential benefits to the employee or to their family, but also the possibility that the behavior of the employee may improperly further another person's private interests and as specifically required in the City of Winnipeg Charter. I find this report focuses almost entirely on the protection of the employee's privacy rights which is really not the question at all. What has been missing is an employee awareness of the code, regular employee disclosure of potential conflicts within the City administration as required by the code, effective enforcement of the code by city administrators and real protection for the whistleblowers. Furthermore, I find this totally inexplicable today, after all these months, that EPC, well actually all these years, EPC has failed to establish the code of conduct committee which is to include at least three members of EPC and which is required under the code to investigate and take remedial action with respect to the statutory officers, including the former Chief Administrative Officer, the present Interim Acting Chief Administrative Officer, the Chief Financial Officer, and the...all who figure prominently in the decision making with respect to both the new Fire Paramedic stations construction project and the new Police Service headquarters Redevelopment Project. And as a citizen standing here today, I ask, and demand really that EPC now establish the Code of Conduct Committee. I have some questions which I hope some councillors may ask with regard to EPC's report and other matters. On the second item, the delegated financial authority, you have a recommendation before you, a single recommendation.

Madam Speaker: Sir, are you finished with the first item?

David Sanders: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Okay, questions for Mr. Sanders? Okay, proceed.

David Sanders: Okay, thank you. On the second item, the delegated financial authority, in addition to what I think is a wholly inadequate recommendation before you, which the writers of the report admit, places almost no significant additional restrictions on the financial authority which as Council has delegated to as their administration. Now, Finance Committee apparently requested that the service undertake a further review to ensure consistency with the new Fire Paramedic stations construction project audit report and to report back to the committee in two months. I really don't know what that means, but the same meeting, the Finance Committee obediently concurred in the Police Service recommendation that it receive financial status report no. 3, for the Winnipeg Police Service headquarters redevelopment project, "as information" and stated, it's there in the minutes that nil action is required in response to that shocking report. If ever there was an example of what is wrong with City Council's almost complete abdication of responsibility for the financial commitments being made without its oversight, the new Police headquarters project is it. As a citizen, I really demand that EPC or now Council address the huge problems with the delegation of financial authority for this project as outlined in the financial status report and its report in the press. Now, with regard to the report before you, the only recommendation is that the Chief Administrative Officer's authority toward contracts be limited to \$5 million instead of \$10 million. In this case, the recommendations come from the Winnipeg public service meeting, the interim acting Chief Administrative Officer, Deepak Joshi, the Chief Financial Officer, Mike Ruta, the Manager of Materials Management Barb D'Avignon and the Corporate Controller, Paul Olafson. All of whom were implicated to some degree in the Ernest & Young audit report, and obviously they have no desire to subject themselves to greater supervision when they admit and I quote from the report, "based on past experience it is anticipated very few additional contract awards will require the approval of the appropriate standing policy committee." This is a manageable amount that should not have significant implications to the program's delivery. They just don't get it. I did suggest that the Standing Policy Committee on Finance, they want to take some real action, which starts by limiting the authority of all of the above to contracts of no more than \$100,000 and require that any further delegation of authority be approved in advance by Finance Committee. And the Finance Committee would be willing to meet once a week which is not extraordinary, I'm sure it could handle the flow of contract approvals for the next few months and then decide what level of supervision is required going forward. And I certainly think that Finance Committee ought to undertake a thorough review of the City's main financial authority policies, and Madam Speaker, that's my presentation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any questions? Okay, seeing none, thank you very much. That concludes our delegations for today. We'll now move on to committee reports. Mr. Mayor, on the report of EPC dated October 2.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 2, 2013**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of October 2 and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 to 3.

Madam Speaker: You would like to pull 1 and 3. Okay, 1 to 3. I saw another hand up. Should we go to 4 and 5 and 6, Mr. Clerk?

Item 1 - Precinct Plan 'T' – North Inkster Industrial Neighbourhood

Mayor Katz: Yes, they are all related.

Madam Speaker: Yes, can we deal with one, two and three together?

Mayor Katz: I would very much like to hear from the Councillor who stood it down and then we'll try to address any issues or concerns they have.

Madam Speaker: Yes, and we'll deal with number one, two and three together. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Speaker Sharma. Congratulations on your first meeting. I stood these three down. I spoke to this at the last Council meeting and it had to be removed for various purposes but I want to say that I can't in good conscience vote for opening up more precincts and more land when we have the conditions where we don't have the money to pay to fix the growth related to all these new areas, new suburbs. We have to provide them with transit; we have to provide all kinds of different growth expenditures in order to afford this, and while these precinct plans, they make arrangements, make arrangements to pay for the local needs of the precinct, but it doesn't really contribute to dealing with the growth related to this city and there is a substantial amount of growth actually in the area where this is

and there already has been a precinct opened. I don't know that they started building yet, but I think there's a...it will be quite a good supply of housing in Waterford Green that was passed last year I believe it was. So there is already land opened up in this area and so for me, again, I can't be voting for opening up all this land when we are unable to gather in the money needed to expand our regional infrastructure and other things such as, there is a need, going to be a need for a community centre. You know, when I campaigned in 2006, I believe it was, in the Old Kildonan ward, there was a demand in the Meadows West area for a community centre. They wanted their own community centre. They felt that it was too far to go to the Maples Community Centre that it was too far to go to the Tyndall Park Community Centre at the Tyndall Park school grounds and anyway, so, the point being is that when we have this kind of growth, we need to have this money to be able to do this so I will not be voting in favour of opening up more land when we can't afford it. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Congratulations. It's nice to have a woman Chair. Congratulations, again. The cause before us today asks for an amendment to the Complete Communities Plan and you know, I feel an obligation to speak to it. I realize some of these issues go down to a local rezoning process that all of us weren't part of but still, this is something that impacts on the entire city, it's a change to our city plan so that's why one of the reasons I'm speaking to it today. We only just recently passed, relatively recently passed our new city plan and this is asking to amend it to allow more essentially low density development at the edge of the city. This land was designated in the City plan as part of a limited supply of general manufacturing land and furthermore, there's an abundance of land already set aside for new communities in the plan. Lately, we are seeing an onslaught of new suburban development ahead of the densification and non-sprawling type of development that the plan calls for, but the plan also opens up this new land. The new development area seems to be developing at hyper speed while the infill and densification projects are happening slowly and in smaller amounts and one of the flaws with Our Winnipeg is that there is no mechanism in place to establish priorities to guide which development should happen first. It's a very reactive process driven by the development and the money to be made from that. So it's not necessarily happening in the order that's in the best interests of the City of Winnipeg. So...an example of that is the recent approval of the Precinct Plan for Ridgewood South, the size of Lindenwoods on the edge of Charleswood, I mean this is happening very quickly. And today, we are being asked to amend the plan to create more new land to be immediately developed which will add to our problem of low density and unsustainable infrastructure cost. In order to address the impact of new growth and its additional costs on terms of its impact on broader infrastructure, we are in the process hopefully, of asking for the authority from the Province to enable, to charge adequate growth fees to cover the true cost of development, but we aren't there yet, and so, with the approval of Ridgewood South and other developments coming that have happened and are coming, the huge requirements for regional road investments are outside of the scope of our current development charge structures, you know, and now we are adding more on to our infrastructure deficit without having the tools in place to cover the cost. So, really, I think we're moving too quickly. I also noticed in the report on the rezoning that public transit, the report notes that an important consideration with respect to development of new neighbourhoods is they ought to be designed in such a manner to be accessed by public transit. In the case of Castlebury Meadows, the Transit Department raised concerns that the proposed neighbourhood is not designed in a manner that supports public transit. The report says its transit requires a collector road through the development. Without that connection, Winnipeg Transit has indicated efficient transit service will be difficult and it seems like that's not being considered. Another area of concern from the administrative report is that active transportation as that appeared in the Precinct Plan are absent from the DSZ application. Why are these active transportation plans absent and why are we allowing this for this particular development? The application does not meet the intent and understanding of a complete community. It is absence of the proximity to commercial. It's not designed in a way that support of a public transit. It's missing active transportation paths we're recommended and there's not adequate recreational space so there's more than one red flag happening with this. The Our Winnipeg plan and complete communities directions strategies set specific strategies out for a reason and it seems like they're being ignored in this case. So I will not be able to support this precinct plan, this amendment to our complete communities plan nor the rezoning based on the information I have in front of me. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and I rise to support these three reports. Madam Speaker, you know, for the past 11 years, there has been no massive developments within the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee and nothing happening in the Old Kildonan for a long time. Recently, Madam Speaker, you and I have been part of a process, a public hearing that saw that the development that started the development of the new Waterford Green and that's a great thing Madam Speaker because there's a huge need for more affordable housing and brand new housing, multi-family housing and for especially for the new immigrants that are coming within our city and there's a huge contingent of new immigrants that are living in northwest Winnipeg. Madam Speaker, this particular subdivision and rezoning that's taking place that's supported North Inkster Precinct Plan as well as the complete communities amendment is much needed, Madam Speaker and I can tell you, you know, is, there was a reference to are we doing infill housing? Absolutely, Madam Speaker, I was part of a process where we've seen

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
November 20, 2013

Welcome Place on Bannatyne and you know, with 27 brand new suites for low income, as well, Welcome Place No. 2, which is taking place on Salter and Pacific, Madam Speaker. There's going to be 72 units of housing for immigrants and newcomers to Canada. On Ross Avenue right here in the Centennial neighbourhood, the poorest neighbourhood in our city, Madam Speaker, we are seeing ten condominiums for home ownership. That's a good news story. In Councillor Smith's ward, the Greenheart Housing Co-op Project, I don't know how many units it was, I think it's 40 or 50 units of housing at the corner of I believe Sherbrook and Portage Avenue or just south of there and now we have the Living Gospel Church Madam Speaker, family centre which is 42 brand new housing units for new Canadians. There's a lot of great infill projects and I'm just touching the ones I know that are happening within Point Douglas, the inner city; but there is a whole host of new infill housing projects that are occurring, Madam Speaker, within our city and, so what I want to say is that this provides some balance and it provides some much needed development where we have not seen anything over the last number of years in your ward, my ward, Councillor Eadie's ward, we mostly see infill development and now we have a major development for here, Madam Speaker, Terracon Developments and I applaud them for the work that they're doing. You know, they're going to be bringing 593 brand new units to your ward, Madam Speaker and that includes 226 single family homes, affordable homes, beautiful homes on the lake and very residential neighbourhood. 168 duplexes, Madam Speaker, and 196 multi-family. These homes are going to be taken up just like that. There is a need for more development. We need to continue this as I think it's very sensitive and some very good planning principles are involved. There is going to be transit usage within this neighbourhood that there is going to be sidewalks and active transportation, Madam Speaker, there are going to be trees and very nice neighbourhood design using sound planning principles so it's something that I hope that this whole Council will support and I just want to welcome all developers to this area of the city of the northwest. There is beautiful land to be developed and to meet the demands of more new Canadians that are coming here. Madam Speaker, I just want to say, we have 10,000 new Canadians coming to this province every single year and I can tell you in my community, there are thousands of Filipinos coming from the Philippines investing living here, working, shopping and playing right here in our city and you know, when they come here, Madam Speaker, they are often living with other families. When my wife's cousin came here and lived with us for six months, that was a trying experience having another family live with us for that length of time, but we did it and they have, they now have a house in the Weston neighbourhood and I know that all my friends and many of my countrymen from the Philippines, they do the same thing. Sometimes they have two, three families. Madam Speaker, when I first came here, my uncle had seven families living in his house in St. Vital. That was unbelievable. I couldn't believe it, but that's what happened. That's what he did and that's what's happening within our community. We have you know, there is a need for more housing and this will help satisfy that need.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to wrap up.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and to be very frank with you, they are both right. All the comments made were valid. Here is the reality. We are getting a lot of infill housing, which we refer to as growing up and as Councillor Pagtakhan said, there is new developments, which means we're growing out, but the reality is we want to find a balance between both. I very much understand where Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Eadie are coming from as far as how to pay for that growth and hopefully the answer will come in the near future, but the realities are, if we don't continue, because there is demand and if there is demand and no supply, I can tell you where they're all going. They're all going to the capital region and you'll see more and more development into the capital region and as far as from that point of view, we get zero tax dollars and they use all our services, Madam Speaker. That's not an appropriate scenario. So from my point of view, the public decides where they want to live. I was at the meeting. There was a lot of discussion with Public Works and Property and Planning. They addressed many issues and only then did this move forward. So I certainly do understand the concerns and I think those issues should be addressed, but I'm not convinced you want to stop good development where people will want to live. And growth in these areas is happening and it's a positive and so is infill housing happening as well. So Madam Speaker, I will definitely be supporting all three.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question now and it will be on item no. 1, 2 and 3. We'll be voting on them concurrently. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now, items no. 4, 5 and 6 that were left on the consent agenda.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, the report of November 6. My apologies, I was looking too far down.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 13, 2013**

Mayor Katz: No problem. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 6.

Councillor Eadie: One, please, and six if nobody else.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Mr. Mayor, Item No. 1. We'll call the question on two, three, four and five. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 1 – Establishment of the City of Winnipeg Code of Conduct Committee and Disclosure Process

Mayor Katz: I would very much like to hear from Councillor Eadie and any other Councillors and then will try to address it.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Speaker Sharma. As people may remember, myself and Councillor Orlikow moved a motion to establish a disclosure process for all employees several months ago and I would like to first start off by thanking our administration for putting in the due diligence to research; look at all the pertinent laws that may have an effect on a disclosure process for all the employees and I have to say I will be actually supporting this particular report that comes to us, but there are some difficulties and I want to say I do acknowledge that it would be quite cumbersome. The liability related to privacy of information, I know is, we have a lot of employees in this city of Winnipeg. It would be quite difficult, not that all of them are making decisions on a day-to-day basis other than maybe driving a bus, that sort of thing, but making decisions that may affect the public interest. But, so, in terms of this report, it doesn't actually help deal with the biggest problem that I see, and that is...and you know, it's very important that everybody is able to try to make ends meet. I know as your families grow, actually, the cost of buying a house in a new suburb is way higher than buying a home in the inner city and renovating, or just buying a home and living there, so that's what's driving up costs actually in the inner city, but I digress. In order to meet those family needs, I understand that there's a need for secondary employment or secondary activity in business or whatever other kind of undertakings they might look at doing. But really, the biggest problem that I see is that if you have an employee who has outside employment or engaged in business or undertakings that are directly related to their actual position within the city...that is a conflict. They may or may not be making decisions not in the public interest, however, it is a conflict, like it is conflicting. Some people might say it's merely an appearance, but it is very conflicting. This particular report doesn't actually deal directly with that, but I do appreciate that there is a disclosure process being put in place for our senior management and our statutory officers of the city, I think that is very, very important, and I will say though that there is a section in the Employee Code of Conduct that would cover off this conflict that I talked about being involved in a sector that's directly related to their position with the City and that is part D, section 2, subsection C, but it's not very clear, so I just, Speaker Sharma, in the future, I will be looking at moving a motion to put in a simple amendment in the Employees Code of Conduct to deal with that. So given that, I like that this report is also asking for our employees to review the Employee Code of Conduct every year because I think that's very important. But as I said, part D section 2, subsection C is not very clear. I don't think that some employees may understand that or not, so we need clarification so I will be supporting it and thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Are there any other speakers on this item? Councillor Havixbeck?

Councillor Havixbeck: I'd just like to point out a couple of things. For the most part, I am supportive of it; however, there are a couple of things that I was hoping that perhaps when he closes, the Mayor could address in his closing comments on this item. My first one is a question about whether there is the intention to actually appoint EPC members to a committee. The recommendation is to have a committee that's been set by Councillor Eadie at a number of meetings and who will monitor and will there be regular reporting of that meeting? As well, on page one of the report, Item 1 C, the CAO initiates the requirement for department heads including the four statutory officers. Well, at our last meeting, we adopted the recommendations in the Fire Paramedic Review Audit and one of those was to move Legal Services reporting to Council. Does that not now become a statutory officer, I guess is my question and should the language in this policy be reflective that it's actually five statutory officers? I'd like some clarification on that. And so those would be my comments, but perhaps the Mayor could address those in his closing comments. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any other speakers? No? Mayor Katz to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I very much...I concur with everything Councillor Eadie said. I heard the presentation at EPC and I think we're certainly making progress and I actually look forward to Councillor Eadie, you know, clarifying and making that amendments and I think anything we can do to make things very clear is very positive, that's number one. But number two, I should also add that as far as moving forward and setting up a committee with three members of EPC, I'm totally open to that and as far as the statutory officers, I think there might be a point in that and I look at that, but I know right now it's actually the Legal will be reporting to Council was my understanding, but I certainly will clarify that point and I'll get an answer to Councillor Havixbeck.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll call the question on item no. 1, City of Winnipeg Code of Conduct. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 6 - Award of Contract for the Provision of Telephone System Infrastructure, Related Equipment and Systems, and Cellular Wireless Services – Bid Opportunity 695-2012

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, I think we've heard quite a bit on this so I'd very much like to hear from Councillor Eadie and address it at that point in time.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Sharma. I'm going to be voting for this report today, but I think that...what I want to do is put what my opinion is on record here today. I think that it is very important that we are able to expand local employment. I'm not sure that MTS is going to lose any...or would have to lay off any employees necessarily. It wasn't clear in the questions, but...and maybe that might be when you take out the old system and put in a new system. However, I want to just say though that for me, my most concern was that this system is actually going to work and that we have a stable phone system, and in terms of the security of the data or information, I just...it seems to me that it's pretty clear that it should be protected, but I would point out though just because you have a smaller company that might be purchased by another company doesn't necessarily mean that going with a local company here in the city would protect your information. I will bring to people's attention when MTS decided to give Microsoft their e-mail servers and I was quite concerned that my e-mail information was on a server in the United States of America with Microsoft, and so companies are able to set off some of their processes and stuff and contract out to other companies so that, you know, that is a concern. But ultimately, what we have here is what I think was a very fair RFP process. Everybody put their bids in and it...during the time of that bid and it sounds like MTS wasn't able to be competitive in terms of its offering to deal with the VOIP and that is truly distressing to me, but you know, we have trade agreements and you know we've got a new trade agreement called CETA with Europe coming down the pipe and that's going to affect us and I think what this is really, I think should be a wake-up call for all local companies that operate here in Winnipeg and I'm very supportive. I...you know, if there was problems with the RFP process I would be voting against this, but there wasn't. It was operated appropriately. It was clean, it's quite clear, another competitor to it, but in terms of the future, I think that MTS now has a VOIP offering that they could maybe I know that once school divisions see how much money we're saving in terms of our phone system because of utilizing VOIP, there could be good opportunities for MTS to offer out cheaper service to those school divisions. Since, you know, the Winnipeg School Division is huge. It's a big area. I'm sure there's tons of phones. I think they have a whole school wide network. I know that the Seven Oaks School Division has a school division wide network that might add possibilities to go VOIP for all their phone services. So, you know, I think that this is a wake-up call to get more competitive. I'm sorry that it does affect the employees of MTS and I personally only use MTS services when it comes to my home and I think that that is a personal decision, but this was a fair, competitive process and I can't, in good faith, actually vote against the awarding of the contracts the way they are and congratulations to MTS on the wireless. You know, there's some huge wireless competitors out there and I think it's great that MTS has actually won that contract, that it's very important to them and to the ongoing viability so I'll leave it at that, but I will be, however though, voting for the report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker and congratulations on your appointment today. I think it's very important to have an open and independent bidding process. That's what went on here and the reality is on section C, MTS was the incumbent, they were not successful in winning the bid as other providers provided a lower price. I'd like to point out though, just doing a very quick Google search. Allstream, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of MTS, has done work for a lot of other governments. For example, the City of Pitt Meadows, B.C., the City of Port Moody, B.C., the Township of Esquimalt, B.C. The Hamilton Area Community Care Access Centre, the North Simcoe Muskoka Community Care Access Centre, the Government of Quebec, the Toronto Parking Authority, the Calgary Parking Authority. Had those various municipalities and groups decided to only go with the local provider, that's be business that wasn't coming to Manitoba, to Allstream, which is a Manitoba based company. So the reality is we have a competitive market, you have a competitive country and I'll be supporting the motion before us here today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Hope I got that right. Just a couple of quick points. There's...two issues that kind of stood out as people were talking is one was security and I don't know if it was said here today, but it was certainly said to us at the Executive Policy Committee that the system being proposed here is the same system that's utilized the RCMP, and by the Federal Government. So and actually, there was a lot more detail with the EPC

meeting as to what the difference in security was and that actually this system was a higher level of security. The other issue is this issue of where jobs are and it was good that Councillor Browaty mentioned all those different cities and that actually falls out of an agreement on internal trade. It's been around since 1994, 1995, but I'll just read one quick piece for you from the January 2010 Procurement Bulletin Re-agreement on Internal Trade under the General Rules, item no. 3, under the heading of no obstacles and this is law. It says no obstacles will...it requires governments to ensure their policies and practices do not have the effect of creating obstacles to trade. The example given is parties must ensure that the tendering of contracts covered under the agreement does not favour suppliers of a particular province. It's not hard to figure out what we're legally obligated to do with these tenders. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck? Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, I've heard lots of reasons for why this should be supported, however, my trust has been eroded. With the recent review of contract awarding as it related to the fire halls, I don't have as much trust. As well, I put my trust in the administration on a new garbage and recycling collection program. In the first year I was elected, I had not one complaint. Now there isn't a week that goes by that I don't have a complaint. And it's that kind of trust that's eroded when we adopt a policy; implement something new, a significant change. I ask the question of the members in delegation and I didn't get an answer of call this number if your phone doesn't work. That's the kind of answer I'm looking for. I'd like to know...I've received a number of e-mails from my constituents and they've asked me, and I'm going to ask the question and perhaps the Mayor can answer these. Why...was MTS in fact bypassed in the contract awarding process? What is the net result in job loss? We heard job gain of four to eight. I'd like to know whether jobs will be lost in Manitoba. We are doing things at City Hall in the Province of Manitoba to try to stimulate meaningful work in this city and that's the only way we will keep our young people here, to have jobs, leave the province, to me, seems to put all that effort and all of that money into fruitless efforts. And I guess my final question would be why was there no council seminar. We had e-mail exchanges with the director of the area. There was no council seminar on such an important topic to go through the process. And at a time when trust and confidence is eroded, I look to my colleagues to help restore that and continue to move forward in restoring it. This does not help me do that. And I look at the savings and one member of EPC told me that the savings would be in the range of \$1.4 million, yet I don't see that in the financial reporting. In the first year, I do see a million dollars, but I would like to know at what cost that comes. And my trust, as well, goes so far to the mayor and the EPC who gave us responsible Winnipeg because I liken that to this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I voted no to this City PC, I'm going to vote no, again. I do have a procedural question which is get it...I would like a separate vote on paragraph 6, but in the paragraph 6 and paragraph 5, interrelate would we have to vote paragraph 5 and 6 together or can we simply shave out paragraph 6? Perhaps I'll leave that to the deliberations of the City Clerk. My remarks will be brief. I agree with some of what Councillor Havixbeck said which was once bitten twice shy. The transition and the garbage recycling transfer turned out to be a big problem and I think where you see here, paragraphs 5 and 6, section C and D interrelate, we're going to have two competing companies. The faster it moves from five to six, the more the FlexiTy will get, and the less MTS will get, so I'm not optimistic about a huge degree of co-operation there. One positive thing that seems to come out of this regardless the vote is in a world where we have Councillor Eadie voting with EPC and I'm voting against EPC, we will hopefully be saved in the future from speeches of the conspiracy theory of yes-man speech that we heard last time from one of the Councillors, so I will be voting no to paragraphs 5 and 6 and supporting the balance of the report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. So, to clarify Councillor Mayes, you would like to vote on paragraph 6 separately.

Councillor Mayes: I'd like to vote on paragraph 6 separately and I'll defer to the Clerk's judgment on whether 5 needs to be bundled with 6 given that there's some inter-relation there. If not, then yes, 6 separately is fine now, vote for the balance.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Just a few brief comments, I will be supporting this motion coming forward. I think it's a good, a great initiative if you know, if the numbers are what they are saying, in fact, if you can save \$1.5 million for taxpayers and it looks like a good system that's been used kind of all over, and Councillor Browaty mentioned if another places that have been used by the RCMP And so I think at the very least, you know, we should look at what's in the best interest of taxpayers. You know, some debate back and forth about jobs in that sorts, and I guess that's a valid argument, but from my point of view and you know I think what we are here to do is provide the best cost services to our, well, I guess, to our staff that will be using this for taxpayer purposes. So if you can have a service that's there, you are able to save \$1.5 million, do it. It's a tested commodity that's been out there, very supportive of this and I want to thank Mr. Mayor and the

rest of Executive Policy Committee for coming forward with this initiative. I think it makes sense and I will be supporting it. One thing, I am interested in this that 1.5 million if that is the case, I just want to know, is that something that, you know, could be used in the budgetary issues or something that there's an extra \$1.5 million that's out there. So that would be my one comment, but I do appreciate the report and will be supporting it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I'll be fairly brief on this. I tend to agree with a lot of the comments that Councillor Eadie said on this. I mean, this is difficult. Obviously, we would all prefer to give business to a local company, but the information that we've been given, which is that the Canadian agreement on international trade is very, very clear that we do not have the authority legally to not give this contract to this company based on the fact that they are not a local company like MTS so we really don't have that authority based on that. Another issue was that we were advised that on the particular, the three contracts went to MTS, the fourth one, we were told that the requirements weren't met in the RFP, so if we're going to start stepping in politically and saying you know in an RFP that you should pick this one and that one because we prefer these, you know, we can't...we shouldn't be doing that and I realize I'm one of the people who's been calling for audits and have concern about the way things are being done here as much as anybody here, but we have to have some trust in our administration. Like, you can take this too far that every single issue that comes forward, you know, I don't trust this so I'm going to, you know, we've all got constituents from our e-mails from our constituents that work for MTS and you know I'm supported by labour, I support the labour movement, but we have to make decisions that are fair, legal and justified so I hope people understand in the labour movement, and I hope people understand that when we get something put in front of us, we have legal obligations, we have ethical obligations. You know, we're going to stand up here and call for audits and talk about ethics. I think we have to act with an ethical manner ourselves with every contract and it's not fair to our staff to use every single issue that they bring forward to us, you know, to compare to the fire hall audit or whatever. I mean, this has nothing to do with that. They're trying to get the best contract for telephones and those services. I'm like, let's calm down a little bit about this, I think, and we have to have some faith in some of those basic processes that the City functions. You know, I'm all for auditing things that have clearly gone wrong and many things have. So, that's the reason I'm supporting it...is the information in front of us is pretty clear that the RFP process dictates this result and it's a fair and ethical result even if it isn't necessarily what...you know that there is disappointment for MTS. I was relieved they at least got three of the four contracts. So, with that, that's the explanation and I hope people understand, thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Pagtakhan

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to support the report and just take a moment, Madam Speaker to applaud our public service to thank them for the good work that they've done. Last week's...at last week's Executive Policy Committee, the public service came forward and explained to us the rigorous and stringent evaluation process and some of the technical merits and technical strategies they have to mitigate any type of disruptions and to ensure a smooth process and basically in a nutshell, Madam Speaker, is that, you know, they're going to be doing a parallel process at the flip of a switch. Once they are satisfied they'll make the migration, so for me, Madam Speaker, this is a very professional tender and it was put together in a very fair and equitable way and I think it's good value for taxpayers dollars.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further speakers, Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I had a great closing prepared but I don't think I can say much more than Councillor Gerbasi said. I think she put it all on the record. I will say this, MTS is a great corporate citizen, we all know that. They do a lot for the community, and in a perfect world if they had been the lowest bidder, I don't think anybody here would've complained. They have won three out of four contracts. I do find it extremely unfortunate that there are still members of Council who keep taking shots at our administration because as you know they cannot defend themselves, so as far as I'm concerned they are definitely doing the best job possible. It's already been put on the record several times about the international trade agreement we have. That's pretty much black and white and it is what it is. I think it's just that simple and I thank Councillor Gerbasi for actually putting this in the proper perspective.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We'll now vote on the item in two parts. We'll vote for recommendations one through five. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now, Item...Recommendation no. 6. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. And item...recommendation no. 7 carries automatically.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: Now on to motions. motion No. 1, we have a few motions here today. Motion 1, no. 1 is by Councillor Havixbeck and seconded by Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Havixbeck: Suspension of the rules to have it debated today?

Madam Speaker: Okay. All those in favour of suspending the rules, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Sam Katz, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steen, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Councillor Mayes

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas 15, nays 1.

Madam Speaker: Motion carried. Councillor Havixbeck, you may introduce your motion.

Motion No. 1

Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,

WHEREAS citizens have the right to know how such a significant amount of money was spent on major projects and how cost over runs of \$75 million and counting occurred;

AND WHEREAS the findings presented in a recent review of the four fire paramedic stations showed gross mismanagement and incompetence and significant cost overruns;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that an independent audit of the entire Winnipeg Police Service Headquarters construction project be undertaken by an independent company;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all members of the Public Service who had any decision making and all elected officials both now and dating back to when the project began be interviewed in this process;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this report be available to City Council by May 1, 2014.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just...I guess to reiterate what is actually written in the motion, we right now have an expenditure of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$75 million and counting on the police headquarters and the findings presented in a recent review of the four fire paramedic stations showed mismanagement and significant cost overruns, so Councillor Gerbasi and I are requesting that an independent audit of the Winnipeg Police Service headquarters construction project be undertaken. In addition to this information, we were notified and I forwarded that e-mail to all of Council, that this particular item would not be part of the realty transition audit requested last year in the fall of 2012, so it's not going to be included so I will hear what others have to say and then make some closing comments.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. When...I just wanted to...when the five year real estate audit that was unanimously approved by Council recently, was approved, it was my expectation at the time that the audit would cover all the major projects which would've included the Winnipeg Police Service headquarters project. However, at the

recent Council seminar on the project, we discovered that the wording of the motion called for the five...called for in that audit had been interpreted as only including the acquisition of the Canada Post building and that it doesn't cover the management or the construction aspects of the project. While I'll take it face value that that's how the words that can be interpreted, it's very clear that the intent of myself moving the motion and Council, I believe, at the time our intent was to get to the bottom of the questions swirling around this project, following the scathing Fire Paramedic station audit, which will be our major mismanagement in the contracting and construction of the projects, it became even clear that a similar audit of the Winnipeg Police Service headquarters project was essential, so I really think that this was always our intention. But when the seminar happened a few weeks ago about this project, it raised even more concerns and more clarity about the need for a complete external and thorough audit and I believe that is indisputable based on the information we all have been given. There are a number of obvious reasons why it's necessary to ensure that a proper audit is done and not just another report from our administration. First, Council must learn from its mistakes and steps must be taken to ensure such mistakes are not repeated and the end result of an audit, hopefully, there would be a series of recommendations to help Council prevent the same kind of outcome from happening again. That's why we do audits. It would also identify more clearly, who can be held accountable which is something, who is accountable and how we got to this point, which is very important. The fire hall audit was crystal clear in identifying the major lead on the project and the major individual accountable. So I think that there's a purpose to that. The project, as Councillor Havixbeck mentioned, is very much over budget. The public has a right to have an explanation of how that happened and what was done that led us to that. A number of, I would say, bizarre circumstances have come to light recently which have been discussed at length in the media. It's all public. The contract award process was amended a number of times and involved sole source contracts at times. The audit of the fire stations showed that the competition process was unfair and uncompetitive in terms of the contracts and we need to determine if this was also the case here. The project was switched in mainstream from a design-bid build to it, a design-build bid model part way through 2010. I think we need further understanding of why and the impact of those kinds of decisions is just something we want to keep doing with projects and there were problems with the design in terms of code issues, in terms of the design being inadequate and incomplete. It was discovered that the design was only 30 percent complete and that Council wasn't informed of that at the time that other decisions were made such as the guaranteed maximum price which at the time we were guaranteed we would not be paying a penny more and it turned out not to be a guaranteed maximum price at all. The project management team idea disappeared and one person was hired to report to the City once a month, sole sourced. Again, there's got to be answers to that, and on and on and on. There's many more. If anybody thinks it's reasonable to allow a situation such as this to go unaudited, or to be simply shrugged, shrugged off, you have a lot of explaining to do to the public and to this Council. Bartley Kives, recently described, I thought in a rather humorous manner, the behaviour of muskoxen in the wild. When threatened, a herd of muskoxen forms what biologists call "a defensive circle". They stick their horns out and cover their rear ends. Well, I'm certainly not expecting to see that today. So I urge Councillors to support this motion. It's very straightforward. It's basically just saying what Council intended at the...when we unanimously approved a five year audit going back, this is one of the projects we wanted audited, and I don't think the intention was that it would just be the audit only of the building acquisition, so this is really what was intended with that original motion, which you voted for unanimously, so I urge you to carry through on that. We owe it to Winnipeggers who are paying our City's debt in the ongoing future to have the answers and the accountability for an issue as important as this. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, Madam Speaker. I'm sorry; you got me all nervous of that one now. Anyway, Madam Speaker, I'd like to move a motion to refer this matter to EPC without instruction for the purpose of obtaining information, frankly, the request is for an independent audit. I'm assuming that that means it's not going to be our auditors who are doing the audit. I'm quite curious about cost. I know we spent upwards of a quarter of a million or half a million on a previous audit for a project that was in the \$10 million range or thereabouts for fire halls. This is well above that. This is about 20 times that amount. Will the audit cost 20 times the fee? I think we need to know exactly what you are requesting here. You are making a motion without having any idea of what the cost could potentially be to us, to conduct this audit. And frankly, I think there could be other options if you want to; there's...we have a standing policy committee, Standing Policy Committee of Protection and Community Services that could organize a subcommittee to investigate this project further, to look at options, to look at costs and to be taken to the site. Nonetheless, I'm suggesting that this be referred because of the lack of information in this motion and the potential cost to people.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Havixbeck. You have three minutes to speak on the referral motion.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think it's absurd and I would have to ask Councillor Wyatt what there is to hide by having a full audit. As the Chair of the Finance Committee, he would know that that audit just completed by the Fire...on the Fire Paramedic station cost \$230,000. I asked that in the Council seminar. We heard that at the Finance Committee meeting just not even...not...you know what, I'm sorry. Can I finish? I think that...I think that perhaps we could make an amendment to put it to a maximum of \$250,000 if that would be amenable but, we set off last

year, a year ago, September 2012, allocating half a million dollars towards the fire hall audit as well as the realty audit, and the first one has come in under the \$250,000 allocated to it. The realty audit is still an uncertainty; however, that came to Finance Committee and was approved last year. So, because we don't have a dollar figure should not mean that we throw the baby out with the bath water here on this motion right here, so we can put to a maximum of \$250,000, same as we did before.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question, though. Are other speakers...we'll vote on the referral, Mr. Clerk? All those in favour, please rise for the referral, to refer the motion to EPC.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Mayes, Nordman, Steen, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith, Swandel and Vandal

City Clerk: The motion Madam Speaker, yeas 6, nays 10.

Madam Speaker: Motion is defeated. Councillor Wyatt, would you like to continue? We'll continue with the list of speakers, Mr. Clerk, yes? It would be Councillor Pagtakhan next.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Having read the motion, clearly the mover and seconder are looking for information. Madam Speaker, the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development Heritage and River Bank Management is going to be considering the over-expenditure report this Friday at a special meeting at 1:30 in the afternoon. I've spoken with the Chief Financial Officer and asked him to make arrangements to ensure that we have the engineer on site, that we have the Winnipeg Police Service project manager as well as the external project manager at that meeting and hopefully that we can have some answers to the questions. I also invite all members of Council to provide if...to come out and make a delegation and to ask any questions, I will be taking a list of questions and if you have specific questions that you'd like to be answered, I will certainly be making sure that those are answered at the committee. And so what I'm saying, Madam Speaker, I think this motion, the intent of the motion is to get some information but at the same time, Councillor Wyatt alluded to a very important point: there is a cost involved to this. If we are...and since we are having a meeting on Friday regarding you know, the history, the background and an opportunity to ask questions of our staff and of the external engineers as well as the external project manager, Madam Speaker, I think that we can deal with this at a later time. We can always call for an audit, but I think it's important that we have an opportunity to have our questions answered and this venue, which is on Friday, I believe will allow us to have a better understanding of what exactly happened here. So for the time being, Madam Speaker, I won't be supporting the motion today.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Anyways, I am supportive of this motion before...let's face facts, this whole thing, whatever the real numbers, you know, Paula...Councillor Havixbeck has said \$75 million, you know, it's a mess from when it's originally started, I was here when we talked about the recladding at that point and there's some decisions made and I supported that at that time, but the project has gradually gone up and up and up and up and up, and there's been some back and forth of why contracts are sole sourced and it's a convoluted web of interesting changes. So at the very least, I think it should be supported to take a look at. I'm not married to having an independent. I could have our existing auditor do it. I will be supporting the motion before us. If cost is an issue, I know it has been raised, I know where there is money to pay for something like this. When we initially, and I can tell you this because I was Chair of Finance at that point, we initially put money away for a Public Works review and we put money away for Police operation review. There is money that's incorporated that's still, I believe in Corporate Finance, to do implementation of these things, Public Works would decide internally to do that, do the implementation piece so that money was not required for the Police as well as the operation review, there is money that's left over to do an implementation piece for it so there should be some money, Corporate Finance. The costing would probably be somewhere around \$200,000 or so to do it. If you're asking me from...is \$200,000 worth peace of mind to make sure that there's openness and transparency? I would say yes. I would say I would support that. I would also support our existing auditor doing the work if need be, if money is the real issue for folks then let's send it off to Mr. Whiteside and he

can do his work. If he doesn't feel he can do it internally then, an outside independent auditor I think would make some sense but so once again, I will be supporting this, I think we need to get to the bottom of all the information that's there and I hope every member of Council supports this unanimously because at the end of the day, you know, increasing a budget by \$75 million on a huge project like this is just unacceptable and I understand there's some reasons why the numbers change back and forth, I don't think it's really anyone in this Chamber's fault because I don't think we were given the proper information at that point and so that I will be supporting the motion before us. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. With the fire hall audit, it felt like an onion. Every couple of days, we were taking off another layer and there was more...more problems with the particular project. I mean, there was new stuff, it seemed, coming up for the...over the course of a month. That was unacceptable. The audit was the right thing to do in that case. At this point, I'm not there yet. We still have questions. I still have questions and I plan to be asking them on Friday at the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage, Riverbank Management. If those are unanswered, we feel we've opened another level of the onion because there's new information that keeps coming out, perhaps we'll need to do an audit here as well, but I'm not ready at this point to say that. I'm not saying that I won't be asking for one in the future. So at this point, I'll be voting against the motion before us today. I think it's just premature and hopefully we won't need it. I do expect our Public Service to come out and be very honest and forthcoming and frank about the mistakes were made. I want to know who made the mistakes and why they were made and I expect to see that on Friday and answers...expect the answers to be answered fully, frankly and properly. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, it's really unfortunate because it would appear once again, many of our colleagues have not read the report that's coming forward to our Downtown Committee. I think on Friday, if I'm not mistaken, be posted for at least a day now, maybe more than that. But that report very clearly outlines what the issues were here, nothing to do with process and as a matter of fact, this Council in 2011, I think it was unanimously voted that we go down and we gave the direction to do a GMP project with this contractor and at that time, in that report that we all voted for, every one of us voted for, we also knew, if we all read that report, that is...that the contractor's submission includes several conditions involving remediation construction costs, caseons, piles, slab flooring, fire stopping, fire proofing, et cetera, that may impact the final cost of redevelopment. We knew...we know. You know, if you read the report this coming to us on Friday, it specifically to these items that were identified in 2011. This is not to do with the original GMP. So if you want an audit, maybe we should audit IQ around this Chamber, you know, because to me, this repeated...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Swandel, please keep our comments respectful.

Councillor Swandel: Sorry. Sometimes I think I would be at the bottom end of that test, but these repeated calls for audit every time somebody sees a flicker that they can politicize. There's nothing short of...there's nothing more than a sad commentary on the level of leadership we have in this Chamber these days. This...the facts here are very clear. People are putting stuff forward where they already know that they are part of setting this in motion, and that the explanation that is provided in the report that is posted publicly, not just for City Councillors but for all of the city of Winnipeg and all of our media, those heroes out there that we champion so much, who seem to love taking bits of information but never dealing with anything in its entire context and putting the real true and whole story in front of our public. It's all out there. Just go and do like five minutes of research, you can find it. It's a pig in a poke. Let's get done with this craft.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to support the motion. We are talking and we can make counter-arguments of politicizing this or not. I just look at some pretty basic facts. Do we know everything? Well, we supposedly knew everything on the fire hall. Again, as a non-EPC member who is excluded for the most of the reports that you maybe know...you may know everything in EPC, we're still trying to fight to get reports on the fire hall. So again do I know everything? I'm not too sure. My instinct says, no I...we don't everything. Maybe EPC does, but not everybody knows everything and nor does the public. So again, we're talking \$76 million and that's not...I don't believe it's over yet. I hope it is but I don't believe it's over yet. I believe some more money will be coming down the pipe later on, again I don't have...we'll be discussing that on Friday. So why don't we just let a committee...a committee look at this internally? Well, we know one of the most fundamental problems in this project is that regardless of what the report says, that when we had the guaranteed maximum, which we talked about, the Mayor, and we talked about it downstairs. We were all in the kind of behind that. It was more than 30 percent design built. We are already kind of had that. Well,

we find out after, we weren't even close. Well, maybe, how did we decide, who decided and how was it evaluated to go forward on that basis? Will I ever get that answer? Probably not. Again, so I don't think...I'm not sure how we can get those answers. And remember the fire hall review downstairs. When the auditor talked about, you know, I made my rounds of interviews. Had some good interviews with them, however, quote unquote, "Ninety percent of my information came after my interviews when I was able to look at the e-mails." Again, I don't think our administration at the time was disclosing of the information. The auditor found out many, many pieces of information once he was able to dig down to e-mails. We can't do that. I can FIPPA request it, but I'm sure I'll get a lot of black lines, so again I'm not too interested in going that route. And again, it's a political route, so let's go with the third party, independent person, \$200,000 to give the public at least the hope that this Council will show the leadership and fix these problems. I still don't see even from the fire hall a lot of changes going on and how we're going to fix those problems which I believe have actually have transpired and moved over to the Police headquarters, and I also feel...will move over to the southwest BRT model that we need to provide leadership so we actually solve these problems. We can't solve those problems until we know what they are. So the auditor will be able to help us to do that so we can preserve the taxpayer's money. Again, will the police headquarters be an awful building? No. But again, it's what, \$76 million over budget, something that shows good financial management on the City's part? Absolutely not. So again for the public, I think we have to have the audit. We need to do it now. We need to get on top of this to learn lessons so other capital projects are coming down the pipe, won't go to the same thing. So let's get on this today, \$200,000, I think this is well worth the investment.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie:

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. Maybe we can straighten that out for the next meeting. And I meant no disrespect by calling you Speaker Sharma. Anyway, speaking to this motion, the...for me, I think that it's important that we do this audit, but I just wanted to note something in the financial report that did come out or the announcement about the cost overruns and then...there was the framing of what is the real cost in association with actually building new because we all know that we had to build a new police headquarters. It's obvious that that building across the street is not able to support the kind of Winnipeg Police Service that we need and to support where our good Chief Clunis is going. So, for me though, I noticed that with the cost, the lease was somewhere over \$300 per square foot. This is going to will come in with the increase in the budget borrowing the 5 million, I'm not sure where the other part of the 70 million is coming from, but I'm sure we'll find out in the...I might have missed that in the report somewhere, but one of the things I will note is the cost and I know that it is a concern of people about the cost to do these audits. Now, there have been with this particular project over time some controversial areas. I'll remind Councillor Wyatt about his motion to remove a management contract of a building, which I don't know if that will be audited or not but I am supporting an audit, but the 200 and whatever thousand dollars that's going to cost to do a proper audit of this and to really discover some of the problems, we've got some really good recommendations out of the fire hall audit. Some recommendations to improve our processes; to deal with our big capital projects, and I think that out of an audit on this one, we will get that so 250,000, let's say, I don't see where that's going to have an effect on...on the \$289, I think it was per square foot once it's finally built with all this costing out. I guess there's still might even be some slight change orders, I don't know, but anyway, I think that it needs to be audited and simply, let's simply vote to do this. It is a very controversial situation that I think needs to be dealt with in that way and I'm anxious to hear from an audit what effects talking about a guaranteed price, you know, when I hear that it's a complex situation. You know, we heard about 30 percent design. There were certain...I don't know how we base the guarantee on that, but I'd really like to hear the opinion and recommendations from this external auditor as to, you know, how, if we're making...if we are framing things or making comments about technical terms, I'd like to know that we are implementing those technical terms in the way that they're supposed to and I think the audit will get that and I did learn a lot from the fire hall audit that...and we got some great recommendations so I'll be supporting it today. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you very much. Any further speakers? Councillor Wyatt as I had you on the list followed by... Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Madam Speaker and congratulations by the way. You'll do a fantastic job. I think...I mean, you have to look at this as a series of errors and whether we choose to recognize it or not, we've lost the public trust. The public confidence in our ability to manage complex, semi-complex projects and I know this is a very complex project. But the facts are, Madam Speaker, that we are talking anywhere from \$73 to \$76 million. Million dollars of cost overruns and I respect Councillor Wyatt being worried about the public purse and the cost of all these audits, but \$75 million, \$200 maybe \$300,000 for an audit, I don't think we have a choice here. And the reality is I was downstairs at the briefing. Councillor Swandel is right, in July 11; we did approve a report for design build with some contingency. Certainly, nobody thought it was going to be \$73 million of contingency and the facts are at that point, at that point, Madam Speaker, the design was 30 percent complete and that fact was not in the report that we approved and it has to beg the question, how can we call anything a design build when you have a 30 percent complete design or I'm sorry a guaranteed maximum price with only a 30 percent design? It's just...it's...it doesn't make any sense. I think we have to do this to restore the public faith in the work, the important work that we are doing as City leaders and yeah, it's...you

know what, I...full kudos to Councillor Pagtakhan at Downtown on Friday afternoon. I'm still not sure why it's at Downtown and why a \$75 million cost overrun is not at Finance where we can...we can look at those issues from a financial perspective, but nevertheless I think it's incumbent on all Council to do their due diligence as we always do, but I think we also have to get an outside set of eyes to look at this whole...this whole scenario given our context that we've gone through in the last six months, so I will be supporting the motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, the...you know, I asked for a referral simply because I had no idea...I have no idea, Madam Speaker what the cost of this audit is going to be. I've heard numbers of 200,000, 500,000. This is a massive capital project, much larger than the previous scope of the previous capital project. I would not be surprised if you asked for an independent audit of a project of the size that you'd be looking at, millions potentially for an audit to be done. I find it ironic that those who...those very same individuals, members of Council who are the first to criticize us and to attack us when we do an operational review to try to find savings in Public Works and inside the Winnipeg Police Service and we're spending up to half a million dollars to conduct these operational reviews to try to find savings in the Police Service and inside Public Works, they are the first to criticize us for doing all those operational reviews of spending that kind of money, yet they're...they don't hesitate...I'll would argue for political ends to do an audit here on a project which clearly, there's no doubt, that there's absolute incompetence probably gone to the highest level> There's no doubt about it. I believe, Madam Speaker, that the...the original decision, this, you know, the old saying that goes you often whether one person can really make a difference, and clearly one person, I do believe, can make a difference...good. I think one person can also make a difference to the very detriment of an organization and I think we dealt with that individual recently. I believe that that...if an audit were undertaken, I think your findings will be probably pretty similar to that of the fire hall audit in terms of decisions made that should've been made...shouldn't have been made or decisions made that should've been made and basic...someone probably in over their head when it comes to leading a project of this size and scale. I'm being very cautious how I use my words and how I speak as you can appreciate. And I think that is a big part of this before us today. And I can tell you that when EPC first learned of this matter, which was September the 30th of this year and the cost overruns that were coming...the latest cost overruns, it set off a chain of events which made the decisions happen which caused the changes that would...which took place. I can also tell you that when you buy an old house, you're going to have problems that only an old house can give you and when you buy an old building, you're going to have problems an old building can give you. Number two, this building, clearly, they've had problems from the get go. They've had to separate the mechanical from the electrical, from the tower, separate completely from the tower from the main building in the back. They've had issues with flooring. They've had issues with HVAC; they've had issues across the board and their costs, if you're going to take an old building unfortunately, you're going to have headaches, headaches that you did not expect, nor budget for, number two. Number three, I don't want to hear anybody here saying, unlike the...it's interesting the fire hall debate that there was something maybe up towards or illegal taking place here and I appreciate probably why that's the case because during this project, from what I understand, there were members of the Winnipeg Police Service staff on this project every day, day in, day out, monitoring this project. And there is no doubt that they were part of the supervision and there is no doubt that no different than any other security building and I'll call it that, a security building, there are requests and you can just look through the report that's going to the standing committee and you can see the variances related to what...I gather has to be security related, for stronger walls, for concrete slab, for ceilings, for protection, for security unto itself. They have one item, a security adjustment of 2.3 million out of budget. You know, is there the pentagon effect here, you know, the \$10,000 hammer? Probably. You know, the...our best and finest deserve the finest? Yes, but there's a price. There's a price, and we are building a building which will, no doubt, house, as a headquarters, the Winnipeg Police Service, not probably the next 50 years, but the next hundred years. We combined over a dozen...half a dozen divisions into this building. We're bringing all parts of the service together. They have this building designed as a post catastrophe building, a post catastrophe building. A back-up generator system that could power 2700 households that if power were to go down, this whole could probably run the downtown; with plate glass window on it, that could resist probably a sub machine gun hitting it. You know, this thing is built to last. These, of course, have never been the case if it was built for any other department in the City of Winnipeg. We know that. That would not be the issue, right? So, above and beyond, above and beyond. So I think, Madam Speaker, let the committee do its work on Friday, you have a report before you. If there's still calls for an audit later on fine, but I think you're going to get a lot of answers to your questions at that point and I would argue that you could end...you could end up spending millions on an audit and coming back to the same conclusions that you came up with before coming out of the fire hall and we will have lost millions to some auditor out of who knows, Toronto this time, maybe Montreal. Anyway, I would've liked to have...I wish there was a support for my motion referral. I would've liked to know when the cost overrun I'm voting for, but obviously Council has just...symbolic of...maybe the very debate, whatever it cost, let's do it. I'm sorry I'm not on that page. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much. Madam Speaker, I'm very much of the opinion that any time a project goes over budget, it's something we should be concerned about. I can think of many projects that we've done the last little while that are great success stories. The Osborne Bridge, Chief Peguis, Disraeli, I can also think of a lot of projects that many Councillors have been here and other levels of government such as the Main-Norwood Bridge, \$30 million over budget; Millennium Library over budget; Esplanade Riel over budget; a beautiful building in downtown, Winnipeg, Manitoba Hydro, \$20 million over budget; the Floodway, \$75 million over budget. All unfortunate, but have all happened. Those are all realities, but as I was listing to this debate, it became apparent to me that many Members of Council have not read the report. I spent two hours going through this report last night and I just want to share a few facts with you because the realities are if you don't have answers to questions, I can figure out where people are coming from. But if the answers are there and you're ignoring them, that's a different story. So what I'm going to start off with, as outlined in the report, the extra cost from conceptual design of 30 percent was created by the change in mechanical, fire alarm and electrical systems at \$12.1 million. The Genset \$4.4 million. Change orders at 220,000 and pressurization of 486, that's the 17.2 million we're all aware of. As well as, which is very important and I thank Councillor Eadie for pointing it out, construction today is 70 percent complete. The final cost per square foot for the new Winnipeg Police Headquarters is \$293 per square foot including land, compared to the East District, which cost \$379 per square foot and the West District, just completed, \$479 per square foot. So you want to talk about value for money, these are all 50 year life spans. Value for money based on comparing it to the East District, \$52 million. Do you want to compare it to the latest, increase that by about \$60 million. So that's number two. Number three, the project was a major capital project and had an oversight committee. There was an oversight committee of seven people, Mr. Speaker, Madam Speaker, my apologies, included the Chief of Police, the previous and the current, including Inspector Randy Benoit, included two people from Corporate Finance, included the CAO as well as the COO and there was the project manager. Seven people who were on a steering committee and they met on a regular basis. In December of 2007 and I'll never forget and I'm sure Councillor Smith will remember this, every time we met at Council, Councillor Smith would say, "How long is that scaffolding going to be up and what's going on there?" Okay? The realities are those numbers kept on doubling, 10 million to 15 million, to 27 million, to 40 million until we finally started looking at other opportunities for the Police Service. And I also want to say that the purchase price, okay, and it's interesting because you've heard the number about 75, 76 million. That's not the number, okay? We were all in a Council seminar where we basically were informed that we paid \$31.6 million and out of that \$18 million on our City's books are assigned to the tower which we could sell tomorrow and we might get 18 million, we might get 25 million, so let's not inflate numbers. I've seen that done by other people. In addition to that, in the report to Council in 2009, the acquisition and renovation costs did not include furniture, fixtures and equipment for the Winnipeg Police Service. Should it have included that? Absolutely, but it did not. That's \$22.1 million of the number. They didn't include furniture, fixtures and equipment from the Winnipeg Police Service, \$22 million. As I mentioned earlier, the acquisition of the building, it's divided 12.6 for the Winnipeg Police headquarters and \$18.967 million for the tower which we can sell at any time. I would prefer we sell it; we get maximum dollars for it. The other thing they talked about was sole sourcing. I'm going to remind a few Councillors here, and on, this is in the report, it's in the report On August 19th of 2010, the City entered into a contract with an engineering consultant and it was a sole source. It went to Executive Policy Committee on December 7, 2011. Councillors Havixbeck and Fielding both approved that sole source for the record, Madam Speaker. In July of 2011, Council approved an increase to \$162 million for the redevelopment of the WPS headquarters. This included the \$7 million in interest and the...included the original cost of the building of 31.567 and so now we are at 193.567. On November the 17th, the City entered into a GMP with Caspian Construction for 137.1 million. It says why they entered into it. You may not accept their explanation, but it tells you why. Councillor Orlikow is asking why did we do that? It's a good question. It specifically states that if they had delayed the commencement of construction until September of 2013, costs would've even gone higher than they are today. It's in the report. No one wants to look at it. During demolition, it was identified that the present condition of the south wall was such that the long term durability of the existing wall was compromised by air leaks and penetration, so what they did, they did required repairs and now it has a 50 year lifespan. That increased the cost. Security requirements. They budgeted 1.5 million, in the report it says they now require an extra \$3.9 million. Mechanical system had to be changed. You know, it's all in here but I guess people don't want to look at it, Madam Speaker and I think that's...or maybe they didn't have the time, so I'll give them the benefit of the doubt, but the most important thing to me is that when you look at value for money, it specifically shows what we paid for two stations based on their square footage compared to what we are paying now, we're so far ahead of the game, it's unbelievable, \$56 to \$110 million depending which station you want to use a comparison, and what's really important, the consulting engineers and contractors have advised in writing that the 17.2 million additional budget is sufficient to complete the project. Further, the contractor has reaffirmed in writing that no further construction or other cost will be charged to the City unless change orders are approved by the CFO that are initiated by the City. You know what? A lot of questions, read the report, the answers are there. I will not be supporting the motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck to close on the motion.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, it is my hope that every one of you around this table will take this seriously and will support the need for an audit now. Not after Friday, not after the next Council meeting, not into the

New Year. Number one, we must prevent this from never happening again. Number two, I would like and I hope all you would like clear explanations of what went wrong here, who knew what when and at various points and most importantly, citizens who we all represent have the right to know these answers. Without it, we cannot restore trust and confidence. Some Members of Council said, "We are looking for information." Yes, we are looking for information. I have e-mailed our administration over the last two to three weeks for answers. I have been shut down, I have been stone walled and I've been told to bring it to the floor of Council and that's exactly what I'm doing. I have asked repeatedly. I asked at the Council seminar. I've asked publicly. Who authorized the 2010 decision to not have a project manager on this? The cost involved...the cost involved is raised repeatedly around this table. What about this cost to taxpayers? This project is 54 percent over budget and climbing and I'm astonished by all the other projects that I just learned about today that are over budget. What kind of business could stay in business with that many projects over budget? Friday's report, as I understand it, for the Committee to authorize \$15 million more borrowing. So somehow our administration was able to find a lower interest rate and a longer amortization period to borrow 15 more million dollars. What could we have done? Many of you complain about roads in your wards having to...need to be re-done. Back lanes need to be redone. Fifteen million dollars, how far would that have gone, 60 blocks perhaps between back lanes, sidewalks, roads? At least three fire halls could be done with \$15 million. That's a lot of money. Being accused of not having read the report, I have gone through the report. I've read it, I attended the Council seminar. How does something grow by that significant of an amount? Fifty four percent over budget and climbing. Because it was estimated when we received the report at Finance Committee, it was in the report and we were told that it was still an estimated number. Estimated so what pivotal event is going to occur to make this be an actual event that isn't going to be another increment that we're going to be incurring? My main question is when is final, a final number, not an estimated final number? I have many other questions that are not answered in this report. Where will the proceeds from the sale of the tower go? Is there an agreement from prior years ago that is not listed in here that could be a significant amount of money? And the question still begs the original project that was set out to re-clad a falling-apart building right in our campus. No one has asked and no one has provided information on what will happen with that re-cladding. It was estimated at \$21 million. Where is that cost now? Along with a parkade which we were supposed to have an engineering report come forward on that is still yet to be known. What will these now cost taxpayers? Some have argued that there are savings that we need to continue to work towards...finding savings. I brought savings in last year's budget process. I brought \$27 million worth of savings to the Finance Chair and they were dismissed. And now the Finance Chair is having to look at some of those. What did the decision cost to allow the CAO to leave? Being over budget this many times on this many projects is extremely concerning. Two point three on fire halls compared to a number we can't even pin down at this table. Some have said 69, some have said 73, the newspapers report 80 million over. \$73 million compared to two. We spent \$230,000 to explain what happened in a \$2.3 million overrun and we're not willing to spend the \$200,000 or \$300,000 to find out an \$80 million problem here? My opinion, this is mismanagement and I want to know...I want the answers and I want the answers for taxpayers. We cannot do it without. We cannot restore trust and confidence at City Hall without knowing these answers. And I encourage you to support this motion and I encourage you to go willingly when you are called to be interviewed in what you know in this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Call the question on the motion. All those in...recorded vote? Okay. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Smith, Vandal

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Mayes, Nordman, Pagtakhan, Steen, Swandel, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas 7, nays 9.

Madam Speaker: Motion defeated.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, if I may, I know we're running and I know we'll be...I'm assuming breaking for lunch, but there is one thing that I did want to do. We were hoping to get there so if I could take a little privilege before lunch in between these. It was actually something that was brought up by Councillor Mayes and it had to do with the fact that just recently, the City of Vancouver apologized for its complicity in war time internment of the Japanese and, you know, the Japanese did arrive here in the 1940s and what I'd like to say is that during the fall-out of the Second World War, that

people of Japanese decent living in Canada faced blatant racism and were stripped of their rights. Those who were uprooted and moved to Winnipeg were met with restrictions as well as prohibitions related to their movement, property ownership and employment. The City of Winnipeg recognizes and acknowledges that at that time, our city did not provide encouragement or support to the Japanese that were relocated here. Many of those Japanese were men who came to Winnipeg; they did back-breaking work in the sugar beet fields in Fort Garry, so what I'd like to propose and this will come to Council in the future that as that area is developed in the near future, the City of Winnipeg will find a suitable way of honouring and remembering the Japanese Canadians who were displaced as a result of the war including those who moved to Winnipeg. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll have a question. I just want to recognize Art Miki is...has been waiting patiently for this announcement. Former president of the National Association of Japanese Canadians who's put in a lot of work on the war time issue and pleased to hear the Mayor's announce today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Madam Speaker, I know we're going to break for lunch and unfortunately I have a funeral to attend this afternoon, so I'm going to...well, I won't be here this afternoon for the rest of the debate so I'm just giving notification.

Madam Speaker: Oaky, thank you. Given the hour, we'll now adjourn for lunch and reconvene at 1:30. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
November 20, 2013, at 1:30 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Welcome back, Councillors. We're still on Executive Policy Committee. Motion no. 2 is in front of us. Yes, Councillor Gerbasi.

**Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz,**

WHEREAS a stable and secure housing system that creates and maintains jobs and allows for a range of living options is essential to attracting new workers, meeting the needs of young families and supporting seniors and our most vulnerable citizens;

AND WHEREAS the high cost of housing is the most urgent financial issue facing Canadians with one in four people paying more than they can afford for housing, and mortgage debt held by Canadians now standing at just over \$1.1 trillion;

AND WHEREAS housing costs and, as the Bank of Canada notes, household debt, are undermining Canadians' personal financial security, while putting our national economy at risk;

AND WHEREAS those who cannot afford to purchase a home rely on the short supply of rental units, which is driving up rental costs and making it hard to house workers in regions experiencing strong economic activity;

AND WHEREAS an inadequate supply of subsidized housing for those in need is pushing some of the most vulnerable Canadians on to the street, while \$1.7 billion annually in federal investments in social housing have begun to expire;

AND WHEREAS coordinated action is required to prevent housing issues from being offloaded onto local governments and align the steps local governments have already taken with regard to federal / provincial / territorial programs and policies;

AND WHEREAS the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) has launched a housing campaign, "Fixing Canada's Housing Crunch," calling on the federal government to increase housing options for Canadians and to work with all orders of government to develop a long-term plan for Canada's housing future;

AND WHEREAS FCM has asked its member municipalities to pass a council resolution supporting the campaign;

AND WHEREAS our community has continuing housing needs, such as a severe shortage of affordable rental housing as well as affordable homeownership options, that can only be met through the kind of long-term planning and investment made possible by federal leadership;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council endorses the FCM housing campaign and urges the Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism to develop a long-term plan for housing that puts core investments on solid ground, increases predictability, protects Canadians from the planned expiry of \$1.7 billion in social housing agreements and ensures a healthy stock of affordable rental housing for Canadians;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be sent to the minister noted above, to the Honourable Kevin Chief, Minister Responsible for the City of Winnipeg, the Honourable Shelly Glover, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and to the Association of Manitoba Municipalities.

Councillor Gerbasi: I would like to ask for two-thirds...ask for a vote to suspend the rules to deal with this today. This is an FCM resolution. Motion two.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just...this is a part of a campaign from the Federation of Canadian municipalities on housing. It's a national campaign and they're hoping to have resolutions from Councils all across Canada supporting their campaign as part of their advocacy efforts with the Federal Government on housing which is one of their top priority items at FCM. The infrastructure and housing are probably their top...are their two two advocacy issues and essentially, the motion speaks for itself. It's talking about urging the Federal Government to develop a long term plan for housing that puts investments on solid ground and increases predictability as well as protecting Canadians from the expiry of \$1.7 billion in funding for social housing that is currently happening. So there's obviously a lot of concern about the Federal Government support for housing. It ends up being downloaded on to other levels of government. So I hope Council will support this unanimously, and I thank you, seconded by...thank you to the Mayor for seconding the motion.

Madam Speaker: Any other speakers? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, thank you. Motion no. 3. Councillor Havixbeck, would you like to introduce your motion?

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,

WHEREAS there has been a cost overrun on the construction of the police headquarters of approximately \$69 million;

AND WHEREAS one of the significant issues outlined in the review of the fire paramedic station replacement program was that there was no project steering committee;

AND WHEREAS it has been identified that there is a project steering committee for the police headquarters construction project;

AND WHEREAS the public service has indicated that they are not willing to provide Council with information about who the members of the project steering committee are, the dates of their meetings and/or their minutes;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Public Service provide all members of Council with a list of the members of the project steering committee, their meeting dates and the minutes for the respective meetings for the last five years.

Madam Speaker: Or pardon me, it's an automatic referral. Right. Okay. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item no. 5, Gross development charges. It's no. 5, is it not? (inaudible) Yes, Councillor Wyatt to introduce the motion.

**Motion No. 5,
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,**

WHEREAS the Conference Board of Canada is forecasting Winnipeg's population to grow by over 200,000 people over the next 23 years;

AND WHEREAS these additional 200,000 people will trigger the need for an additional 100,000 dwellings resulting in the development of new subdivisions as well as redevelopment of land;

AND WHEREAS these additional 200,000 people will be the labour supply for a growing economy which will need to be supported by increased land and infrastructure requirements for commercial, industrial and institutional sectors;

AND WHEREAS this combined growth in housing and commercial land requirements will result in needed growth related infrastructure such as Regional Streets, Rapid Transit and other services (recreations / parks etc.);

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg's Transportation Master Plan outlines the need for increased growth related infrastructure spending with cost estimates approaching \$3 billion;

AND WHEREAS the infrastructure deficit study presented to Council indicated that the infrastructure deficit will grow to \$7.4 billion by 2019 and that growth related infrastructure makes up about half of the total amount;

AND WHEREAS currently, Development Agreements do not cover growth related infrastructure needs that are "off-site" or downstream from the new subdivisions, such as regional street work, bridge work, as well as increased demand for public services such as Rapid Transit and recreation centres;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That Council request the Province of Manitoba to amend The City of Winnipeg Charter to provide legal authority to permit the City to impose growth development charges by by-law on development/building permit and subdivision applicants for various types of growth related capital infrastructure, such as but not limited to, regional streets, bridges, rapid transit and recreation and leisure facilities;*
2. *That Council request the Province of Manitoba to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter to permit the City to require an owner to enter into a development agreement as a condition of approval of any of the following:*
 - a variance,*
 - ii. a conditional use,*
 - iii. a development permit, and*
 - iv. a building permit,**to provide the same authority to the City of Winnipeg as other Manitoba municipalities have under the Planning Act (i and ii) and additional authorities (iii and iv). (Note: presently the City can require a developer to enter into a development agreement as a condition of approval of a subdivision or re-zoning only. The City would like the ability to require a development agreement at other points in the development approval process, in order to have the developer install / pay / partially pay for needed infrastructure relating to the developer's proposal.);*
3. *That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.*

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, I'd like to move suspension of the rules so we can debate this immediately.

Madam Speaker: Okay, it's motion 5, yes. All those in favour of suspending the rules? Carried. Opposed.

Councillor Swandel: Recorded me opposition.

Madam Speaker: Okay, record Councillor Havixbeck in opposition and Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Wyatt: I thought we just carried the motion.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. To introduce the motion, thank you..

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. First of all, I want to thank His Worship Mayor Sam Katz for bringing forward this initiative. This...the Mayor held a Council seminar, I think about two weeks ago now, roughly, and there was strong support around the table at that time. This is an item which clearly, you know, cuts across EPC, non-EPC lines, if you like. They often talk about free votes. I suppose this is a free vote like they have in the House of Commons or in the Legislature. Every vote should be free, absolutely. But you know, I think this is an issue which is extremely...had been worked on by our staff, the motion actually was devised by our staff to request the Provincial Government to give us the authority no different than what other municipalities now have in the Province of Manitoba, to have growth development charges or development cost charges, similar to those municipalities around us. And we have seen the type of growth that has occurred, Madam Speaker, in the last number of years here in the city. The challenge we have is to manage that growth. And the expectations that comes from growth, and we know that our city is growing physically, it is growing and population wise, it is growing. And so far, the predictions by the Conference Board of Canada have been a hundred percent correct and if they continue to be correct we know we will be pushing beyond a million people in the next couple of decades, and we will have to manage that population with regards to the issues, with regards to facilities and services, transportation, roads, transit, buses, rapid transit maybe LRT down the road, recreational facilities, regional transportation specifically as well, we also have challenges with regards to new fire halls and libraries, all the soft services so to speak that are expected to come with growth and are expected to be serviced in a modern city. We know from the analysis done by our staff that we are behind when it comes to what other cities charge. We know that other cities have a more comprehensive growth development charge policy, and we know that we need to move forward. When this came forward through the Council seminar, I think it was given a very poor light and I think there was a...shall I say a political spin put on it, that this was a tax being applied, a tax on home owners which I think is absolute nonsense. It's ironic that we could call this a tax on lots or on home owners and yet, the very charge of land itself is not considered a tax or a burden. In 2005, Madam Speaker, a lot was going, a bare lot, 14 metres by 35 metres was going for \$60,000 in 2005. Nine years later in 2013, nine years inclusive \$130,000, more than doubled, an increase of well beyond a hundred percent, well beyond Madam Speaker, the rate of inflation. I would say based on that, about approximately 13 percent increase a year not compounded, just straight up, 13 percent increase a year. Six times the rate of inflation, believe it or not. Do we have any cries? Do we have any calls for an inquiry, price fixing, collusion in the market? We as a Council, after all, have put more land on the market than any other Council in the history of this city. We have opened uplands in the southeast with Sage Creek and the huge development taking place there with Waverley West. In the northwest, with Amber Trails. In the northeast, all the developments that are taking place in my end of town and North Kildonan. We have actually facilitated more housing development on raw land than never before and yet, even though we have supplied the market with raw land, you would think from Economics 101, if the supply is increased, the price should fall. The exact opposite has actually occurred. The supply of land has increased and the values continue to rise and rise astronomically, far beyond the rate of inflation, and so what we are saying here is that the development community has done extremely well, and we as a City recognize that. At the same time, we recognize that all this new development is putting pressures on our existing transportation, recreation, our existing infrastructure across the city. Let me just read to you what was written by our Public Service about off-site infrastructure. Developments cumulative also have an impact on the wider or regional network of public infrastructure. This is especially true of open services like roads, where greater congestion will occur if steps are not taken to address the likely increased use of available infrastructure. There is no...there is ability to include these costs as part of the development agreement framework that we know today. Therefore, the provision of regional growth-related infrastructure comes at a cost. Provincial and Federal grants are sometimes available to fund some portion of growth projects but the remainder will fall to the City to fund, through property taxes and be paid for by for all existing homes and businesses across the city and additional effect of using property taxes to fund growth of infrastructure is to reduce the amount of funding the City has available to renew and maintain its existing infrastructure. Winnipeg is not alone in forecasting future growth. Most major Canadian cities across Canada are also forecasting population growth and as a result, are planning to invest in growth-related infrastructure. One key difference with Winnipeg is that most of these cities have some form of funding tool that enables them to charge the cost of growth to growth itself. This is achieved through a charge on the development activity that creates new homes and business premises. This funding tool is known generally as "development cost charge" and seeks to place a one-time fee on land subdivision and/or building permits. Development cost charges are seen as a more efficient funding tool because they force developments to finally internalize the cost of development when determining financial viability. Thus any private gain is determined through an evaluation of all cost and does not rely on subsidization through a public source, which is the case right now. In order for cities across Canada to impose development cost charges, they have obtained legislative authority from the Provincial Government. While Winnipeg does not have this authority under the Charter at present, our neighbouring Municipalities have established by-laws under the Planning Act to charge developments for the cost of growth. Unfortunately, these provisions of the planning act do not apply to the City of Winnipeg and therefore the only way to obtain similar authority is to seek Provincial amendment to the City Charter. The City cannot sensibly avoid the cost of development through stopping all investment in growth infrastructure. This would simply result in a continual deterioration of service quality levels as growth arrives and more and more people are forced to use increasingly overburdened services and infrastructure. Equally, it would be economically damaging to the City if we were to force or restrict development activity because of the fact of limited

infrastructure capacity. It is therefore important that we find a funding method to address the growth infrastructure needs other than property taxes. Once the Province and hopefully the Province will change their view as they give it some more sober second thought and work closely with us, we will be able to address a lot of the challenges that we face as a city. One only has to read our transportation master plan and see in terms of what the new strategic infrastructure, what we need to do as a city if we want to continue to facilitate growth. We know from reading history that every time there is a massive public sector investment in infrastructure, whether it be roads or bridges or subways or trains, that with that typically will follow economic growth, private sector boom, jobs, wealth activity, wealth creation. It happened after World War II. It happened again in the 60s and the 70s. It happens when we...we stepped up after the 2008 financial crisis and we invested tens of billions across this country to keep us from going down the path of other nations. We need to re-invest in the infrastructure and growth infrastructure of our City. I'm saying that the development community has done extremely well, Madam Speaker, extremely well in the last number of years and I don't begrudge them that. All I'm saying is that they know that their pie is big enough for them to be able to share and ensure, ironically, that the growth that they have been enjoying and the prosperity they have been enjoying, will be able to continue. This is about managing growth. Let me assure you, I know there are Councillors who have not any experience.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Swandel moves extension. No? Councillor Steen moves extension. All those in favour. Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: I know there...thank you very much, Councillor Steen. I know there are Councillors who maybe...don't necessarily come from wards that have had to manage growth or the challenges that come with growth and I can assure you there are times where I wish I didn't have the challenges that growth brings with it. It brings huge challenge, huge headaches, managing where the roads...how do you get the...how do you build the roads? How are you going to handle the traffic? Where is the traffic light money going to come from? Where's the crosswalk, when are we getting another crosswalk? And all of those things, you know, and it's coming out of the fact that...that we're having growth and we're doing it in a kind of a cowboy, kind of wild west way right now. It has to be organized, Madam Speaker. If we want to continue to have strong and healthy growth, it has to be organized and it has to function in a way that makes sense and we have to be able to finance that type of development. If we want to complete the inner ring road of the city to allow for more development, it's got to find funding. If we want to continue the rapid transit; to be able to service the new neighbourhoods, we're going to need to find funding for it. If we had this approved already, the announcement yesterday which was to announce rapid transit, BRT, we could have been announcing LRT actually, if we had had this in place. We would've had a funding source to be building LRT from Downtown Winnipeg to the University of Manitoba. It would've been that simple. This allows us to dream of a city that we can build. This allows us to be able to dream of a city that will again outlive Calgary, will again outlive Edmonton, will again be the gateway to the west as it was before and will be again. That to me, that to me, Madam Speaker is a vision that's worth believing in and worth finding good public policy to make happen. If we don't address this challenge, we will continually be behind the eight ball, we will continually be behind the eight ball with regards to infrastructure and new infrastructure challenges in our city. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: I want to grab and jump right on top of that cowboys and wild west comment because I just had to run down to my office and grab the slide show from our development cost charges seminar. A lot of the information that's being put out here by Councillor Wyatt sounds good, but it doesn't pass the reasonableness test. For example, other cities that have development charges if I go to Calgary who's got a \$14,000 development charge on the average 1500 square foot home, those development charges are for things like sewer, sanitary sewer, water, transportation community and recreation and charges per hectare irrespective of use. But in our world, sewer, sanitary sewer, water are already dealt with under our utility rates. They are not part of development charges. The developer installs, front ends and then there is a pay back when the rates start to accumulate. Edmonton covers again sewer expansion, sanitary sewer trunk, arterial roads which is already included in our development parameters and they also require land dedication of 10 percent which we already include in our charges. Saskatoon's charges again, sewer, water, roads, it doesn't differentiate between whether or not it's on site or off site roads. Parks and recreation which we already take land for. Signing and signals which are part of development charges so once again, those are kind of zeroed out there because our development charges cover off. You get into Toronto and places like that they're taking development charges for child care and subsidized housing and you know places that we in this particular municipal government as a rule, don't usually tend to play in. But you go outside of the City of Winnipeg and you get to places like East St. Paul per lot covers capital, sewer and water and all again, already covered off by utility charges here not by...it's not something we would deal with in development charges. Macdonald covers capital fee and sewer and water and the capital fee by the way in a lot of cases here is dealing with the arterial streets, it's not...it's not dealing with regional roads. The regional roads I hope I don't need to remind you all in rural municipalities are paid for by the Provincial Government, like in most cases the provincial highways. Headingley, there are \$4500 per lot covers capital fee and roads, so \$4,500 is a number and I don't think that would really do much here for us. Springfield, again, we're back into emergency services in

that case, storm water, water and sewer, you know, and again, just so stuff that's already included in our charges. So as you can see, there's a lot of work to be done to really understand an apples to apples comparison here and it was interesting to hear Councillor Wyatt talk about the 2005 numbers and I'll tell you, the cost of borrowing has changed a lot since 2005, and so prices will move according to the customer's ability to pay and especially if you have a run on supply, if you have high demand, you're going to see it move and if the customers are there and they have the ability to pay that you go to see the price move, but let's not forget, too that since 2005, the cost of concrete in this city has gone up by, I don't know how many times, far more than double, which is a cost to the lot. I know what the price of lumber's done, but I know it's gone up significantly and many of the other pieces of material required to build a house have increased enormously since 2005 because of the reduction or the increase in the cost of getting those from other places. There's also representation made that supply has increased. As a matter of fact, 2005, it's pretty close to when we did the Waverley West Plan Winnipeg amendment and at that time, we had looked at Waverley West as being a 18 to 25 year supply, I think those numbers were again batted around. We brought some other lands on in Our Winnipeg. As it...through that process in 2011 or 12, later 11 or 2012, and those lands are already starting to be gobbled up. I think we would be hard pressed to say today that we have an 18 to 25 year land supply that we have control over that is actually buildable, so I don't know where those numbers are coming from. So you know, what we really need...one other point too is that when you build new homes, they actually have a higher assessment than homes that are already existing and that's why we do a cost benefit analysis when we do new development. I know in that case of Waverley West, where you included development costs or development impacts on regional streets and fire and everything, the net present value there was \$212 million in the net or debt? present value over a 80 year life. When you look at it as attributing 100 percent of the off-site costs which we know we won't do when we can't do, the net present value was still positive, still \$89 million. So these people are already paying or these developments are already paying their share of the infrastructure. And let me...and I reminded me of...I don't know if they did it in Council or if I did it in a seminar, but let's not forget that much of that benefit is going to pay for some of the sins of the past. And you know, it...there is our crumbling streets and infrastructure that has slid. It's that new tax, that new benefit that is helping us pay for that, you know, we...and not just on the tax, that also needed the utilities side. You look at the combined sewers. New developments don't have combined sewers, they have twin sewers, but yet we all pay for it in our utility rates so what we're looking for here is fairness and you know I mention fairness because this is not about cowboys or the wild west. We...this is not the first time, this has come up for our Council. When I was Chair of Property and Development many, many years ago, 2006, 2000...somewhere around there, 2006, 2007, we actually had meetings of what was it called the Ad Hoc Committee on Development Charges. We actually sat down with the industry and we had consultants go through and actually get the apples to apples information and talk about the development standards that we have here. What makes sense and it was pretty open book process, I thought, but it included, I believe and I'm going from memory here, four members of the Executive Policy Committee including the Chair of Finance, the Chair of Property and Development and the Chair of Public Works a night, the 4th one not mistaken was the Chair of Downtown Development and that's the make-up of the Ad Hoc Committee on Development Charges along with at least two members from the development community, and I don't know if that was UDI and somebody else or just two members from UDI, which is the Urban Development Institute that the industry uses to do some ground work. So you know, sort of going off a little bit cowboyish, suggesting that you know we need to rush into this and that this is some sort of panacea. I think the math and the truth, the reality of the day will prove out that this is not the panacea that it's being represented as. And so I just urge you all to have some caution and I think a more appropriate motion here would be to reconstitute or to activate...and I don't think anybody has deactivated it, the Ad Hoc Committee on Development Charges, or development agreement parameters, I can't remember the exact name of it, but that would be a more appropriate road to take. In order to address this issue in a fair and reasonable fashion, you know, I believe that development is part of a healthy city. We can't just basically stand up here and make representations about urban sprawl, and blah, blah, la deda. It's...we need, we need quality communities and some of them are old communities, but some of them have to be new communities as well. We represent all the people that live in this city. We represent those that are seeking new housing and a white picket fence in a new community with a new school and in a new community centre.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Fielding moves extension. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Swandel: So, you know, let's...let's use what we have in our disposal, do this in a reasonable fashion. Let's not just go trying to play the politics of it and, you know, it's easy to paint the developers as evil developers. I just want a fair process and get all the voices at the table. How many times do we hear: let's have consultation? We need to involve the stakeholders. Well, I would suggest to you if you are going to start, creating development charges, people like the developers and the home builders and, you know, so the commercial real estate people might be stakeholders in that game. So you know, we have the process for this. Let's use it and let's not go just running off for the sake of making some nice noise. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, followed by Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think I made it pretty clear that I am in support of some sort of means to finance the growth and the debate we had on the opening up of another new precinct. We do need the housing, make no mistake. I am not...not against growth. I'm not against us establishing houses that are needed. And we can do and try to achieve a balance as Councillor Wyatt has referred to because there does need to be a balance achieved here in terms of increasing the density of our city where in older neighbourhoods, increasing density where you know, in spaces that you know formerly have been used for railways, for example, referring to the old Fort Rouge Yards. You know, these kind of things, the...you know, Waverley West, yeah, it was needed, yeah, there's no doubt about it. As I understand it there was some kind of report that was produced that said that somehow these, these new suburbs were paying for themselves over time and paying for that new infrastructure. But you know, it takes many, many years for the city to be able to recoup the cost they put out for building that...what I say is our biggest problem is the regional infrastructure. It was referred to by Councillor Swandel that...as a matter of fact, the municipalities that have capital charges or fees, they don't have to pay for their regional roads, we do. That's the reality we live in. We have to pay for those regional roads and we need to make sure that they're wide enough. You know, I should mention this now. You know, I've seen the announcement, rapid transit is part of something that could be...that growth development charges could be utilized for and I'd like to thank the Province of Manitoba for chipping in to fix a growth problem we've had for many years. We need to widen the Pembina Highway underpass at Jubilee. It's needed to be done for years like Waverley underpass, but you know, I'd like to thank them that at least they're going to help us cover off some of the growth charges there, but the reality is the Province isn't using their five-point whatever billion dollars to solve our growth infrastructure problems, okay. It's not happening. So we need to be able to find a way to do this and I don't...you know, the charges that are added to these and you know, you can't really compare Calgary necessarily because the housing prices there are astronomical as compared to the City of Winnipeg from what I can think of. I'm not sure if Vancouver charges or it's...if the other municipalities in the lower mainland charge a capital fee or a growth development charge, but you know, try to buy a house there. I mean, the reality is this, where there's a higher demand the prices do go up, and that's right, but we need to be able to pay for that growth. I refer to my campaign in 2006 in Old Kildonan and same in 1998 actually. You know, these expansions, Meadows West was there, Inkster Gardens built up; they expect to get a community centre that's more local. That's what people like to see. They didn't relish having to go so far to participate it at a community centre, although you know, the sports games happen all over the place, but the reality is, is that we need to provide those services. I wouldn't necessarily call them soft services. These are services that people expect to have, like a library. They expect those things to be there. So, you now, I don't know if we should utilize our growth development charge, a development charge for that. I still think that our biggest problem is the major regional infrastructure and we do, we do have to bring in the regional piping so that the localized developers can hook into the sewer system. Of course, many of our things have storm collection ponds and sort...in that sort of stuff, not like the old city. But you know, it's...this City of Winnipeg's been around a long time and there needs to be improvements, and on one hand, you can't say, "Well, we pay for our sewers through our water billing." and then on the other hand...I can't remember, sorry. I heard some issues that I think are misnomers. The reality is that this development charge, it's not going to stop the growth of the suburbs. It will continue to happen because the people who are doing the best in this economy are the ones who are buying the new houses. The people who moved to this city, they are buying the older houses and they're driving up the cost of that. So you can't just say because we're going to implement a development charge, a growth development charge that somehow that's going to stop the suburbs from growing. They're going to grow. They definitely will as people participate and you know, I think that we are trying to govern for the whole thing. We are trying to set a policy and make things work for the whole city and that's the balance we can achieve and this kind of a policy helps us do that and I will point out that this motion is purely asking us to go to the Province, directly, and request them to change our Charter so that we are able to charge this growth development charge. And in order to get it, I am very, very sure that the Province is going to force us to demonstrate the financial purpose, the reasoning for this, to prove it out before they're going to allow us to do something like this. So you know, this due diligence in numbers for, you know, the past council that just spoke, you know, you can talk all the finances and throw numbers around all you want, the reality is when we move ahead to do this, we are not talking about running away crazy, charging a whole bunch of money because we don't need it. We're talking about moving something forward because it's been demonstrated in this city for some time now that you know Sage Creek was developed. We all need transit. Yeah, we need transit, we don't need a fire station? We need a fire station. We don't need this, yes, you need it because what happens is...the reality is people need public transit. They need all these things in order to have a good place to live, and so I'm truly, 100 percent behind making this request and I hope that the Province, somebody there, you know, make some e-mails and make some calls, but the reality is, this city needs to be able to do this because we can't continue to draw existing property taxes away to pay for some of those...what Councillor Wyatt calls soft costs, nor can we continue to drag it away from being able to fix our regional infrastructure, our regional streets and for that matter, arterial streets repair as well because that is part of facilitating trade in this city as well. Because we can't forget the other component is developers are making lots of money. The reality is, in this city, they make a ton of money, and we need to be able to deal with that so that...and allow business to do that and that regional infrastructure is also about trade and about business and about the economy and so the City of Winnipeg wants to grow, we, in the City of Winnipeg, we want to be a state of the art city, we want to be right up there, well, the reality is in North America, there are growth development

charges all over in the cities and the reason they need to do that, so that they stay as some of the best cities in North America.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: Let's be number one, let's be able to find the money we need so that we can say, we've got rapid transit, we can say, the City of Winnipeg is a place for us to be proud to live in and the city is a much bigger picture than the...some people just referring to its only, our roads although and that is our problem with regional roads, but this city is much, much more and we'd be...need to be able to pay for and share amongst all neighbourhoods in the city, new and old to share in those good things in life that we want to support as all us City Councillors, I think, want us to do that, and the reality is we need to do such a development charge and I'll again thank you for allowing me to speak, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Growth charges are an accepted practice across the country in major cities and it's interesting, Mayor Nenshi was mentioned in Calgary. He was recently elected by I believe 75 percent of the people on a campaign platform of doing something about increasing growth charges from what they currently have, so I mean this is an issue that every city is facing. Every city that's growing at all and Winnipeg is growing even more than we have in the past. We're dealing with a lot of growth. This is a very real issue and I think the question is, should growth pay for growth? I think most people would agree it should. Does it? We've been having this debate back and forth on Council. And some have been arguing it doesn't pay for it completely and others have said it does. Well, our administration at the seminar made it pretty clear that it may cover some of the costs of the developments that are sort of obvious within the development itself, the sewer and water and certain things. But, it's...was made very, very clear to us that there's a number of other impacts of development, those people don't just sit in their houses, they use City services, they drive their cars to the amenities. They need transit, they need all the services we all need. So it's...when you are looking at growth, you are not just looking at...you have to look at the whole picture of growth. And it's very clear that growth should pay for growth and I think most people can agree with that. It is true that under our municipal act we need the authority from the provincial government, under our Winnipeg charter act, we need the authority. We do not have that authority, we need to ask for it. Other parts of Manitoba have that authority, that's clearly unfair. Our financial sustainability as a City is probably the biggest challenge we face as a City. We have frozen or cut taxes in the last 14 years. Our staff is stretched to the maximum, not only because of that, but because of growth. We have parks, the same number of parks people now taking care of parks in Waverley West than everywhere else across new communities as well as old, stretched thinner and thinner. You can argue the same about many other city services. Fire and police, we've had to build new stations, Councillor Eadie mentioned Sage Creek. That was approved, we didn't need transit when that was approved. Well, sure enough, we had to extend transit service there. So I don't think the costs clearly have not been calculated-in fully and fully-costed. I'm disappointed the Province's initial reaction when this came out a few weeks ago was negative, like Councillor Eadie mentioned I'm fully prepared to lobby them, to work with them, to encourage them to give this authority to the City because I think it's the right thing to do. I think we can make that case. I think there was a very strong and clear case made by the administration. They've done the foot work; they've done homework to explain this, and we need to have those meetings, every one of us who's willing to do that and our mayor to go over there and to make this case and I think they will listen, ultimately. I certainly hope so. We're not rushing anything here at all. We're trying to get authority from the Province. That usually doesn't happen that quickly. There is nothing reckless about this whatsoever. We're simply asking for a basic authority. We need to go forward to deal with one of the biggest challenges we face as a City. We're about to go into a budget, which I understand is not going to be very much fun because we don't have enough money to deal with our operating costs. We don't have enough money to deal with our capital costs; to fix our existing infrastructure. Another point was made that we represent all communities. Yes, we do and all communities pay property tax but the communities that are older if all the money is going, if the money is...has to go to pay for all these services for newer communities, those older communities' infrastructure is suffering. If the communities, the new communities are paying for themselves, if growth is paying for growth, then those...then that freeze up some of our tax revenue to pay for the services for all of our communities and that's more fair. There is no rushing ahead or skipping consultation here. We're simply getting the authority to begin a process. It was made very clear in the seminar. We would be working with and talking to the development community. Nobody is running over anybody. I don't think that the development community could say that they have an unfriendly Council to development. I think that they seem to get...and we've had massive approvals of new green field low density development in every quadrant of the city, massive. As Councillor Wyatt said, the community is doing very well and nobody is talking about stopping the...you know, crushing development or stopping it. We're talking about making it fair, making growth pay for growth and if...that's fair and logical, and it's not only fair and logical. It's necessary, we're going to go bankrupt if we don't do something eventually. I mean, this is a serious problem we're facing, just to run our City's operations and we're not the only city facing them. As I said, Edmonton was mentioned, too. They also just elected a new Mayor who also believes in growth paying for growth and they have a big problem, too

because they are growing and even though they have LRT and all these other things, they need more growth charges to deal with it and to make it fair for their citizens. Winnipeg used to be...it's nice to hear discussion on this Council actually. I really enjoyed Councillor Wyatt's speech because he talked about a vision for our City. Winnipeg used to be the fourth largest city in Canada. I don't remember fourth or fifth or something, third, whatever. I mean, we have slipped back in terms of some of our status in this country and part of that, I believe, is because we didn't proceed with rapid transit development in the 80s when Ottawa did. We were the same with Ottawa, but we slipped behind because we made choices that held back the success of our City, I believe. But we can't change the sins of the past, but we can certainly, we can certainly go forward in a future course and take a smarter course going forward in the future, and that's all this is asking. This is very, very reasonable. This is the most reasonable thing that's come out in a long time and you know, I don't automatically support whatever comes out of EPC and the Mayor's Office, but this particular item was...made my day when this came forward and our staff came forward with all this work they'd done on it and I just thought this is wonderful. You know, the definition of insanity is to make the same mistake over and over again and expect different results. And I always like...it was a new world that day and I was really, really happy. So, I hope that, you know, it was talked about playing politics, I don't think any of us...I don't know anyone here who's playing politics on this, at least, I'm not. I don't think...I think Councillor Wyatt is speaking genuinely that we have a problem and we have to deal with it and we have to start doing things differently. So I think you will see Councillors from different political points of view supporting this and some not and for whatever reasons they may be very valid, but I don't think people are playing politics here. I think we're trying to solve a problem like...and we need to solve this problem. We need to make progress on this problem. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Well, I think we all know we had a Council seminar recently where we had a good discussion on this topic. I believe with one exception, there was unanimity around the room that the whole concept of growth paying for growth was accepted and embraced by this Council. That said, I mean, there were certainly members of us that felt that the devil would be in the details. How was this going to be implemented and what is it going to cover off? Is it going to be open and transparent as to what it's going to cover and what's not going to cover? The reality is though, the details at that Council seminar became very public and the next morning, I was listening to the radio, the Premier unequivocally I believe said, no. I don't know why we're banging our heads against the wall at this point and going down this path without a specific ask. I think the correct approach at this point is to figure out what is fair, how it's going to be implemented properly and how we can justify it to our residents that are looking to buy their next home or their first home. How can we justify it and for what means and what it's going to cover it off? It's not open or transparent, what's the point? And the Province isn't going to say yes until they have good details and good meat on the bone as to what this is going to be going towards. I believe that the committee...Councillor Swandel was speaking of, it's actually, the Ad Hoc Committee on Development Standards. It consists of three members, the Chair of the Finance Committee, the Chair of Public Works and it's...that committee is chaired by the Chair of Property and Development as well as the Chair of Downtown Development is the alternate. I think that committee should be reconstituted. It should go through a process of looking at what's fair, what's equitable, what's done on the other jurisdictions, and at that point, once we've got all those ducks in a row, we've got a plan. At that point, we go to the province, we ask for a change to the Winnipeg Act so that we can have the power to do this. So again, I think this is a...this is a little premature. I think it's on the right path, I think growth development charges make sense and that's some over the City needs to go. We do have tremendous infrastructure challenges and growth challenges. We've got our transportation master plan. I think a...I thank Councillor Fielding for getting those numbers out there. Again, I believe full package of goods for the next period of time is around \$600 million. We don't have that money today. We need to find a way to get that so that we can continue to grow and prosper as a City. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Browaty has said some of what I wanted to say. A good debate in terms of the concept of growth development charges, but what we've got is not a vote, yea or nay, on growth development charges. If it were, I think that I'd be making a different speech saying, "I favour this as a means to deal with mass transit". Glad to hear Councillor Gerbasi has been listening to my speeches about riding mass transit buses when I was in Ottawa as a student in the 80s, and they were...they were where we are now in the 80s, she's right on that. We are 20/30 years behind. That said, I agree with what Councillor Browaty said. This idea was put forward to the Province. Unfortunately, they've already said no. Pretty clearly they've had a couple of days, they had different people come forward and make that position clear, which is unfortunate, but that's the position of the Province, I think another alternate definition of insanity would be to continue, we went to them with the gas tax they said no. We went to them with the one percent PST debate devoted to municipalities, the Province said no. So I'm not sure the best course of action here is to pass this and go cap in hand to the Province. Certainly, there's been a good debate about growth paying for growth and the concept, what needs to be made clear is these things do overlap. Yes, there would be a cost to older home owners when we put in the Warde Avenue interceptor station for the sewer there. That's going to serve new

development. No doubt. If we put in a bridge to service the new Precinct K at Warde, that's going to cost, that's to service new development. Conversely though, and it's worth noting part of yesterday's announcement, and Councillor Swandel touched on this, was a project to undo the combined sewers in an older area, the Calrossie area. Everyone's going to pay for that. This is the "wash our sins off our hands" argument. We keep hearing about past sins, so when we announced yesterday, the funding for the St. Vital Centennial Pool, an older pool in the northern end of my ward, all of the taxpayers are going to pay for that, not just the older houses, but the newer ones going in south of Aldgate. When we've got announcements about paving projects of old streets, like Pulberry or Hull in my ward, it's not just the old houses that pay for that, but the new houses as well. So this kind of cuts both ways, the old helps subsidize the new and clearly the new, in some cases, help subsidize the old. I think the better approach here is to take a look at the committee that's been talked about. I think there's a real opportunity, for example, in Precinct K, which is at the southeast portion of the city. It aligns very nicely with a future proposed under the master plan, a future proposed light rail or bus rapid transit leg that would extend down there. Can we deal with the developer there? Can we get some sort of arrangement that would enhance...obviously the development there will be enhanced if we get BRT or LRT going down there. That would be in the developer's interest to fund that. We need to talk to the developers in that way to see if we can make that work. So I concur with what Councillor Browaty said. I think the Ad Hoc Committee is a good idea, not just because I seem to be the only member of EPC who wasn't going to have to join yet another committee though. I have faith in my colleagues like Councillor Pagtakhan will be on that committee; will do a good job. But I think the committee is as Councillor Swandel said, a way to get some data, otherwise we're going to end up in a huge argument about East St. Paul charges this and we charge less, yes, but East St. Paul doesn't include this and includes that. Let's try and get some data. Let's try and get that agreed upon, otherwise we're just going back to the Province having them say no to us yet again on a funding request and not really being any further ahead. So, again the debate is not on the philosophical concept of development charges. I think there's actually a pretty good call for that to tie it into our mass transit. The Province said, "No, they're not interested." Okay, well, let's go at this a different way. Let's talk to the UDI. Let's try and get some idea from the development is a street what they might co-operate with us on and let's try to move forward on the idea instead of simply passing this out of the Province say no and they are back to square one. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Philosophically, I believe in a motion with what is...what Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Gerbasi have put forward with us today. I believe that growth should pay for growth, Madam Speaker, but I also agree with some of the comments made by some of my colleagues here, that we do have an ad hoc committee on development standards and I think it's good to understand that further without being too repetitive. We understand that other municipalities in our province do have development cost charges or some sort of fiscal instrument in that matter and I think it's good to have a good understanding of that. However, Madam Speaker, you know, the Mayor has had a chance to speak with the new Minister responsible for the City of Winnipeg and so, no, I'll be looking to the Mayor to see his thoughts on the matter and what the appetite is of the Province of Manitoba relative to this motion. I don't have a problem with supporting this motion; however, you know, that...either way, I can support the motion, I can also the ad hoc committee going back to that committee and do some more work and working with our stakeholders, Madam Speaker, so you know, for this one, I'll be looking to the Mayor for a bit of direction on this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Provincial Government has said no. Do we need to get hit in the head with a hammer before we understand no? We heard it from Minister Kevin Chief. We heard it from the Premier. No. The purpose of area development cost charges that already exist under our Charter are to pay for this growth. What is being proposed here, I believe, strongly, is a tax on citizens; citizens who have the right to choose to live in a certain area, to buy a newer home. I have a number of concerns and I asked these questions at the Council seminar and they were not explained. There was no explanation provided on how much. Reports in the media show \$10,000, \$12,000. Nobody really knows, and nobody answered that. No explanation of whether infill is affected. I would think many of the Inner City Councillors around this table would be concerned about whether infill housing, which is already difficult enough to get a developer to develop on, is going to have yet a further tax. No explanation of this double charge, and I'm going to get into what I've learned being on Council about how much developers actually do pay right now. No indication of where the money will go. Is it going into general revenue? Is it being divvied up among communities? No explanation and no explanation and no answer to my question about whether this will apply to commercial development. Commercial development. Imagine an investor coming to Winnipeg. Imagine some of our own developers planning to develop in this city, how will they know or why would they come here? Some interesting information I was able to gather from developers on this issue, and from the UDI and from the Manitoba Home Builders Association. When Sage Creek was built, \$52,000 per lot was allocated towards cost of sewer, road and other infrastructure costs. In Waverley West, that number is 45,000 to \$48,000, in Ridgewood, which this Council just passed and passed a Charleswood Transportation Levy, a new levy, is still being worked out. Things can be done within this existing Charter that are fair. I'm a firm believer that growth pay for growth, and taxes pay for ongoing maintenance. In...and there has been a

number of references around the table to the lack of or you know large sprawling properties. Since my time on Council, our Community Committee has approved three major projects, one on 11-acres of land along a railway that needed remediation, high density, 592 units. If \$10,000 per unit were added to that, the developer likely wouldn't have gone ahead with that project. Another project, 63 units along a railway, another piece of property requiring remediation, in Whyte Ridge, on McGillivray, along a train track, high density, two acres, 63 units. All have paid sewer, traffic analyses, look at ways to pay for collectors when the roads are at peak loads and all contribute to land dedication towards our park space and green space. Councillor Swandel mentioned the net present value of 212 million, Waverley West, Ridgewood was estimated at 54 million. That's a benefit to the city. I still cannot have answered accurately by the administration what the average cost is to service a lot in this city? It's somewhere I'm told in the \$1,700 to \$1,800 range. Well, the average cost in some inner cities do not pay that share of municipal taxes. We still cannot get that answered and that was not presented nor answered at the Council seminar. So I would argue that we're cherry picking the information that we want to push this argument forward. There's been two references at least to Councillors, by Councillors, that developers are making money. That's what free enterprise is about. This cost, this tax, will be passed on. It will be passed on in the price of lots, it will be passed on to citizens who want to have an alternate choice. The ongoing taxes are supposed to pay for that community and I would argue that those on going taxes in newer neighbourhoods are now paying for areas that don't quite pay that average cost. The real problem is that this is a narrow view of this issue. Why is there wear and tear on our roads? We have many suburbs that now don't have any green space in between the City line and the rural municipalities, East St. Paul, West St. Paul, Springfield, Headingley, all of those, all of those areas coming into the city to work, to play, to do things here, put wear and tear on our roads. That is a real issue here that nobody has addressed in this motion. We have enough money. I've heard this argument repeatedly. We don't have enough money, we don't have enough money. Year over year, the Province gives us nine percent more than the prior year. The growth in this city is at 12 percent in the accessible property rates, values, direct as a result of new growth and refurbishment of old communities. Another fact. At the Council seminar, we heard that this would be implemented at the permit stage, at the permit stage. How much more is this going to affect? There's still far too many questions and somebody said the devil is in the detail and I would absolutely agree. I believe that this kills our city by cutting it off at the knees in terms of economic growth and development, creating affordable housing and choices about housing. And I'm not up for any more cowboy antics as it was put at the beginning of this debate. I think we need to drop this. We have what we can do within the Charter and I would hope that we can support that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith followed by Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Smith: Madam Speaker, let me tell you this. Is the history of Winnipeg. You look at it, wherever we expanded, people wanted libraries, wanted all those facilities, you know, it seems to me growth should, in effect, help develop the neighbourhood to where we have a better community. You know, it's...it's, all we have to do is examine what's happened to Winnipeg over the years. That's true. I think developers will actually like this because home owners really want the facilities of community clubs, libraries, et cetera. So it's worth...now, I think what we should be discussing, how do we get the Provincial Government to go along with us? You know, the Mayor always says go and meet with the Premier or wherever it may be at the Provincial level. But why don't we do something unique? Why don't we as a whole Council go to the Leg., all of us, and present the case? You know, I...look it, we can do it. It'll make a better city and we should do it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Well, this is again another one of those great debates, where there is value on both sides and as a conflicts resolution practitioner from days past, we can both get what you want. There's no reason why we can't set up an ad hoc committee immediately. We should've done this years ago, but it hasn't been done. We should be doing it again. After six years of trying to figure out how we're going to do this. We've had our strategic planning sessions. It works out well. We've had a number of things, nothing's really worked so well. This is the first in my opinion, idea that's come forward that will actually try to deal with some of these issues we're facing systemically. Do I fully support the idea? No there are some questions that need to be answered, i.e. commercial infill, but again, this is just a part of that process of going forward. So on one hand, when keeping a pressure up on the Province, we say, this idea has some merit. We like to talk about it some more, but that doesn't bar us on the other side to set up the ad hoc committee to start discussing those details. So again, what I'm hearing from one side is don't go to the Province until we do the ad hoc, the other one is saying, do the ad hoc first before we go to the Province. I don't see why one, they both can't be done exactly the same time, and it should be done at the same time. We should always be exploring new ways and other ways in which we can either reduce expenditures or raise expenditures. We should be doing both of that. Again, this is the first piece I've seen that would actually trying something and looking at it. It's a great opportunity for community get together. So I think we should go off to the Province. This motion is a Council motion. It's not just a request coming from the Mayor's Office and not just a request coming from an administrator. This is...say, Council as a whole, believe this is one idea worth looking at. And at the same time, set up your ad hoc committee Start looking at those things. Start jelling down the ideas. Start figuring out. So this is a no brainer for me. We're both going to get...everybody can get

what they want. We can get some more details to see if this is something that can work. It may not, once we get more details, but again, we need the Province's support on it and how do we get that? A Council motion towards that will actually go, I believe, a long way. So again, it's not an either or argument here. So I'm expecting everybody's support on this. I'm talking about me.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Well, thank you, thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, this has been a great debate. I...this is...I really enjoy debates like this. I enjoy hearing perspectives from the Chair of Finance, Councillor Wyatt. I respect a lot...Councillor Wyatt, you have to listen to me here. I respect what you have to say, your opinions on things. I think you are wrong on the subject, but I do respect your opinion and I do respect other people of Council's opinion in terms of the development cost charges. I just think that there is a better way. You know, I put a piece in the Free Press this weekend, and it's...you know, about 500 words and some people my critics say, you know, that might be the only 500 good words that Fielding can say on any subject and that might even be criticism in my household, but I thought of what I'd use. I'm going to use that as kind of a base in terms of what my arguments are and I'm going to add a few things as well, but I truly believe that the home buyer, the home buyer tax scheme is ongoing, it is a tax, plain and simple. And I did have some concerns and I know Deepak is not here today, you know, and I don't want to kick a guy when he's down. I did have some concerns of why the administrator is putting kind of an opinion piece in before Council has a chance to debate that. I do understand the process. I'm sure there was a discussion at EPC and you know, you had to have someone come forward with a debate and that's fine, but I just didn't think it was that appropriate, but I do have respect for Deepak. Really, what it comes down is new tax for me really comes down to the old adage: if it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck, well, you know, it's probably a duck. Growth development cost charges in my opinion are a tax, plain and simple. The new tax will cost home buyers anywhere between \$10,000 and \$12,000. I mean, that...I was on Executive Policy Committee, that's the numbers there being debated. That not only is the cost that are there, but there's also \$2,200 because of the new PST that's been increased, that a new home buyer will have to pay. So you could pay upwards of \$12,000. So what does that mean? Well, that means that home ownership here in the City of Winnipeg will be a little bit less affordable, at least buying, building a home. And what I have concerns about as well as, and it was...I asked the question in the Council seminar and the CAO for the City, Acting CAO of the City did confirm that this policy will drive up costs for existing houses because if you've got a house that's built (inaudible) \$12,000, you know, four or five months later if they've put on the market, it's going to drive up the cost for existing houses. So really what that means is for anyone looking to buy a home, it could be a little bit less affordable for people to get into that process, and this is something that I know the infrastructure funding council specifically looked at it and recommended opposed to it. That's probably why because it's going to drive up the cost for home buyers here in the City of Winnipeg. Another argument that's been put forward by a lot of the supporters of the development, a new home buyer tax piece, in terms of what it's going to cost in another municipalities. And sure, do they have...do they have development cost charges? Yes, they do. What they don't tell you is the home buyers in Winnipeg already pay...this is...and that's what it is, it's home buyers of Winnipeg. It's not developers because everyone knows what's going to happen is developers will pass it on, to the home buyers, that people, new home buyers that are there, new immigrants that are coming into town, Councillor Pagtakhan had talked about 10,000 people of immigrants that are coming to town. People that just want to buy a new house that are there, they're the...ones penalized for it and as I mentioned in terms of the capital region. There are in the City of Winnipeg, you're already paying for a number of things. Home buyers are to paying for additional infrastructure requirements, like transportation, like land drainage, like hard development standards than the people in the capital region, already do. In terms of cost of infrastructure, what functions as Councillor Swandel said earlier on as an arterial road in an RM is really a provincial highway in the City of Winnipeg, home buyers already pay for 50 percent arterial roads and pay for 100 percent of intersections that are there on the purchase price, so that's built into your purchase price when you buy your house. In RMs, home buyers basically pay zero. RMs do have to pay of course some of the intersection improvements that are there, but not to the level, the same level that the City of Winnipeg has. Development standards I can say and every municipality is going to be different, right, in terms of what the standards are, are different. But typically, I think you can say that you know, development standards are going to be a lot lower in the capital region or areas surrounding the City of Winnipeg than in Winnipeg. Also another item is in terms of land drainage. In the City of Winnipeg or rather in rural municipalities, drainage is done by open ditch, not buried pipe, which ditches which provide storage. The pavement standards also rural RMs depending which one you're looking at, also is a lot lower than you have in the City of Winnipeg whether it be asphalt curves, gutter compared to concrete, and as they mentioned every RM is different so it really depends on which one you look at in the development standards, but sufficed to say, it's a drop in the bucket of what you're going to have to pay and standards that you're going to have in City of Winnipeg. So in my opinion, the new home tax and new tax on home buyers is extremely bad public policy and it really needs to be rejected otherwise you can hear giant sucking sound of people and investment dollars going outside the City of Winnipeg, into the capital sounding municipalities. New tax could only cause a sprawl issue in my opinion, where you have a doughnut in the form of development in and around the City of Winnipeg. So I see some dramatic concerns that's what I identified in the Free Press earlier in this week. I noticed the Free Press had an editorial as well, that identified a lot of the issues as well, so it's just not myself that's talking about it. There's been some talk of the

development community supporting that. That's not really what I'm hearing for the community that...they're in favour of a development cost chart, but maybe I'm wrong on that. I think there's been some talk of the development parameters, committee that was in place, they haven't been...the committee hasn't had a meeting to establish some of those I think in 11 years, so I think that's a worthwhile venture to have some discussions with it as well. I think there also needs to be some public consultation that's a part of it. It's new home buyers that are the ones that are going to be billed for this if they do have added tax that's a part of it. Even the Provincial Government, even the Provincial Government has said no to this tax. I mean, other Councillors had mentioned this in and itself. So they've already said no to this. Even the NDP Government believe that this is gouging consumers and home buyers, so why are we looking to go after this? The next question would probably, well what are you going to do, Councillor Fielding? What is your answer to the infrastructure? And the two things that I think...I'm open to the idea of having a small group look at the development standards. I think that's fair process if you have people from committee, others of stature, people be involved as most people in the development committee, maybe having some residents association that's a part of it as well, ones that are going to be impacted by this. But I think also looking at things like tax incremental financing for some of the developments, we've already done some of this obviously that's there. I think that's an avenue that we can take a look at for more infrastructure funding. I think also tolls. You look at new infrastructure that comes on line, not for existing infrastructure, but that's something that definitely there should be a full on the debate. I'm not sure I'm there exactly yet, but I think those are some ideas of how you can fund some infrastructure there. So Madam Speaker, my point with this is I think this is very bad public policy. I don't support it. I do think that it's a new...it's a tax, plain and simple on new home buyers and it's going to impact people, home prices here in the City of Winnipeg, and you're going to have, not everyone is going to flee to Oakbank and all these others. But I think that the person that's thinking about building a house and they've got a choice whether they are building Waverley West or whether they go to La Salle or they build in Sage Creek or do I go to Oakbank. They might make that decision to go to Oakbank because we know that they're paying less taxes or paying less for a lot of other services. I think this is something that will impact the development in our area. You look at the amount of people, too, that are involved in the home construction process right now. I think that there's over 23,000 people that are involved in the whole process of home construction, whether that's going to impact jobs, I don't know. Some other interesting stats too is in terms of home buying in the City of Winnipeg, since...in 2012, there's over 1800 new homes built in the City of Winnipeg, which generates somewhere between \$7.4 million in taxes. Over the last seven years, nine years, you see about 13,000 new homes being created in the City of Winnipeg, that's creating over \$52 million in tax revenue that's ongoing for the City of Winnipeg. So I do...I don't support the motion going forward. I hope Council will...I don't see come to their senses. You'll all get to make their own decisions on this. I just fundamentally believe this is the wrong policy, wrong direction. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The number one candy on Halloween, anyone have any idea? Reese's Pieces, 89 percent of the public prefers Reese's Pieces. Why do I tell you that? Because everything I heard here today is 100 percent correct. So why don't we do what Reese's Pieces, bring the chocolate together with the peanut butter and move forward. What do I mean by that?

Madam Speaker: Please explain.

Mayor Katz: You heard people talk about apples to apples. I agree. Fairness, I agree. Involve the shake holders, I agree. Those are all accurate statements, growth paying for growth. I agree with all of that. Let me share something with you. On Monday, I spoke to the Mayor of Saskatoon who is probably the leader in this, and I was making notes as Councillor Swandel was talking, and he is correct, there are many things that others have included, which we already charge for in other areas, but here is some that we're not. Interchange levie. Wouldn't it be wonderful as opposed to at grade crossings or if we were actually going down a street that's supposed to be a bi-way, we could actually move without having to stop at a red light every 15, 20 minutes? That's how they pay for them. Buffers, fencing, planning, inspection, long term warranty, they cover it all. So here is what I think is the solution, and for those who keep on saying the Province has said no, the Province hasn't said no because no one's ever asked them. There was never a motion that came to Council and then came forward to ask the Province. Hasn't happened yet. They've given their opinion and it's quite simple. Unfortunately, there was some people on the floor of Council decided to call it tax on new home owners. I think you know right now the Provincial Government is kind of shying away from taxes at this particular point in time. We all get that, but you know it's rather interesting because we...many people brought up rapid transit. Well, it wasn't that long ago that the Province said no to going 50/50 with the City of Winnipeg, upon more dialogue, upon putting out the information, guess what, Madam Speaker, they said yes. There's an announcement yesterday. It wasn't that long ago that the Province said no to Cadets. More dialogue, explaining the advantage and guess what, they said yes. This is all a matter of dialogue and I've got a few others on the list, but I'll stay away from them. Madam Speaker, I could support this motion with an amendment because the key in this scenario is that there has to be dialogue with the stakeholders, the development community, whatever you want to call it, and I looked at that. I looked at "Therefore be it resolved that", if on number one, somewhere in there you add "consulting with the industry" because the problem is right now. No one

knows what the number is and I do agree with Councillor Swandel. We don't want to know what kind of impact this could have. Could it mean thousands? Could it mean millions? We don't know yet. We have to determine that. We have phenomenal work that has been done by our administration. We have some great expertise there so let's consult with the stakeholders development community. Let's get an answer to make sure there is no duplication; that they're not paying for things they shouldn't be paying for or they already are paying in development agreements and then let's see what's left. But if there is something left, why would you not want to move forward if it makes sense and if it's fair? That's the way we should be going and if Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Gerbasi can add something in there, so we have details because I'll tell you this much. If you want to get the Province on board and Councillor Smith came up with an idea and I respect that idea. The key thing is, is to have all the information which we can do in the interim because Councillor Gerbasi pointed out, this isn't happening overnight. There is no revenue here from 2014. No one's expecting anything. We have time to work on it. We can get the motion approved. We can work with the industry; get all the I's and T's dotted and crossed and then we can make the official ask. So that would be my recommendation. That's my suggestion. If you do that, I'm supporting Reese's Pieces because I love them, too. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Katz.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of Order, Madam Speaker. On hearing the Mayor's fine speech and I just spoke to the mover. The following, the mover has prepared... the seconder I should say suggests...has prepared, I believe...add a Clause 3, and Clause 3 would be renumbered as Clause 4, and Clause 3 would read. "The proper officers of the City of Winnipeg consult with the industry on this matter." And that will be the City of Winnipeg staff consulting with the industry, so that would be one, two, three and now four. I hope that addresses the Mayor's request in terms of consultation with the industry.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, you were saying you wanted it written down Sure, okay, I guess the time is now or you would like to....no further speeches at this time? So, Councillor Wyatt to close.

Councillor Wyatt: The...you know, the matter before us I think is...

Councillor Swandel: I've just got a quick point of order for an amendment like that, do you not need unanimous consent? Is that a friendly amendment or are we going to debate that as an amendment to the...?

City Clerk: You are going to debate it as an amendment, right?

Councillor Swandel: Yeah, but we haven't had the ability to debate that. I would prefer it be the ad hoc committee. I would support it if was the ad hoc committee, so...

City Clerk: We're putting it in writing and you're going to vote on it as an amendment to his amendment.

Councillor Swandel: Just on a point of order, I believe we're entitled to debate the point. I have no problem with a friendly amendment that involves both the administration and ad hoc committee on development standards. That's what the purpose of the ad hoc committee and development standards or whatever, I think Jeff had the correct language. I have no problem with that and I'll support that wholeheartedly that we do that prior to making any request, but I don't have the opportunity just by you changing it on the fly with the seconder to actually debate that or talk to the logic of that.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, would you like to reconfirm your amended motion.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, the amended version that I have agreement from my seconder on is three: "That the proper officers of the City consult with the industry on this matter." How the proper officers of the City, which to consult with them will be up to them.

Madam Speaker: The floor is open to speak to that amendment at this time. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: The point that I think the Mayor is trying to make and I've been trying to make is that we need to do some proper consultation here with the stakeholders. We have a process for that that creates dialogue with all three entities here: the development community, our administration and politicians. And we established that because we considered that at one time to be fair and so I have no problem with an amendment. I would support this wholeheartedly that if it said that we would use the ad hoc committee to get the appropriate request to go to the Province, then I could support this. They are sticking to it just being the administration, well, if that's the motion then I'll just hold my ground and oppose it because I think you're going to end up with sort of another self-fulfilling prophecy here as opposed to good dialogue and good debate. But you know, I don't know, like I...why anybody would be scared of using that process, I'm not sure because I think what you're going to find is you're going to find is you're going to get drilled down into the

numbers and the numbers you know, the Mayor mentioned a couple things that are included in Saskatoon that aren't included in Winnipeg. I'm sure as we'll further find things that are included in Winnipeg's development agreement parameters that aren't included in Saskatoon. You can't do this just by cherry picking things that serve your belief in any moment in time. I know the Mayor loves that phrase, "any moment in time". You know, I think when we are here, we're looking out over a much greater period of time than this particular moment in time and so to have proper dialogue, debate involving politicians as well as the administration, as well as the development community, I think that's very important before we go to the Province and just make an ask or we just use the administrative perspective because I think a lot of us are confused about by what was brought to this at the Council seminar because at the Council seminar, the guy that presented from the City was very clear in saying, "This is not a position. We're just presenting information here, concepts, ideas. It's not a position. There is no number. We don't know the number". He did very clear in saying it's about fairness, it's about paying for only things that you can attribute that are not already being paid for, no double dipping. There's a bunch of stuff here that anything to do with utilities would not be on the table. You know, for example, one of the things we did when we did Waverley West, Madam Speaker, was with regard to flyovers. The cost benefit analysis showed that at build out as the transportation needs grew and it was everything from four-laning Taylor Avenue to the addition of flyovers were already included in the analysis that was done for that development. You know, and there was still money left on the table at the end of the day, to pay for the sins of the past, not the sins of the development, but the other things we have to repair in this city, still money left on the table. You know, there's been representations here that you know, developers need to pay for regional streets, developers do pay for regional streets. In the Waverley West development, one lane of existing Bishop Grandin was paid for by the developer. I believe it's one or two lanes of the extension of Kenaston are paid for by the developers. It's two lanes actually because the developments are on both sides of that regional street. So I mean, there's so much misinformation out here, why don't we use the tool that's at our disposal? You know, the way we are supposed to do this, you know, there's times when you want to have procedure, you want to do things right. We have a tool that gets us there, that gets us good information. So we're not relying on weak information. We have good information, we have proper information. We can hammer the real numbers out. What happens if you go through this and it comes back and says, "Oh, hang on a second. Our guys are paying more than they do in Saskatoon." Are you willing to take a step back? So let's be careful what we do here. Let's make sure that we as politicians are involved in looking at this and are involved with our stakeholders and our administration. I mean it's such a simple amendment to make. The ad hoc committee on development parameter standards, whatever it's called, it's been there, it's been used before. It's been effective. We used it for things like debates on concrete verses asphalt. If you want to go down this road, let's go down this road properly. Let's use the processes that are right in front of us and then if you come through that and then it's the all, the entire industry and the City of Winnipeg going to the Province saying, this is not a tax. We need the flexibility in applying this because it is a real charge that we need to be able to impose. Together, we can do that. But to just sit out here and say, we're going to go to the Province, you know, the administration has clearly stated to all of us in that seminar that this is not fact. This is for purposes of discussion, for creating a conversation. So let's get the work done before we go sticking our chins out. You know they'll get hammered on again and I think you might be surprised how much actually you get out of the industry when it comes to things that they should actually be responsible. Stuff that their developments you know actually contribute to costs where they haven't already done it and if it can be properly argued that it is. And particularly, you know, one of the things I regret is we never put a per lot charge for recreation amenities in Waverley West, and I've had that discussion with developers...both the development communities out there and it's not been met with a negative light, like it's something that they see that as a valuable amenity in the community. If you know that that community centre is already funded when you're moving in there, you know, the means of creating it is already there. You know how much volunteer energy you need to build a community centre? You know, the days of you know getting that type of volunteer energy and raising the capital from in the communities, it just doesn't exist anymore, so I regret not having done that. I don't think there would've been any argument if I would've tried to impose that because it really...you could've washed it out over the sides of the development when you look at the number of lots would've been created and the amount of commercial space and you know a reasonable contribution from this city in general for their share of that regional infrastructure. It could've been done. So let's get sitting down. Lets' get to work and let's do it right.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt has asked for the indulgence of this Council to properly introduce his amended motion which didn't happen, so I'm going to allow that at this time.

Motion No. 6

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,**

THAT Motion No. 5 Moved by Councillor Wyatt and Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi be amended by adding a further resolve which reads:

- "3. *That the Proper Officers of the City of Winnipeg consult with the industry on this matter.*"

and that the existing resolve 3 be renumbered accordingly.

Councillor Wyatt: I have to speak again? As part of the debate on the clause...

Madam Speaker: And then you get to close.

Councillor Wyatt: If I...I do get to close as well, yes. No, I mean, I think I heard what the Mayor said and he said, look it, asking for consultation of the industry, I think we've included that. You know, I remember the Ad Hoc Committee on Development Standards. I was on it. I remember it and there was a reason why, I'll remind this Council, it was called the Ad Hoc Committee on Development Standards, and that's so it could be held on an ad hoc basis, so just as quickly as you have a meeting, the meeting disappears. You have a meeting one month and then there is no meeting the next month and it's funny how they worked. Let me tell you how they worked. You started to raise questions, no, let me speak about...

Madam Speaker: Excuse me.

Councillor Wyatt: Let me know, I listened to you and now you can listen to me. No, you're out of order. You are out of order, Councillor.

Madam Speaker: Order. Councillor.

Councillor Swandel: Point of Order, Madam Speaker. Good to see Councillor Wyatt's Jack Nicholson impersonation. I'll remind him where that went for the Jack Nicholson's character some other time, but my point is is this an introduction that I get to respond to.

Madam Speaker: I believe he is finished introducing the motion now. Shall we go on to the next?

Councillor Swandel: Is that the introduction he's done? Okay, thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: No, I'm speaking...I'm speaking...I'm speaking to the amendment.

Madam Speaker: Okay, let's speak to the amendment.

Councillor Wyatt: I'm speaking to the amendment...I'm speaking to the amendment just as the good Councillor spoke to the amendment for 20 minutes.

Madam Speaker: Okay, let's stick to that then, please.

Councillor Wyatt: Absolutely, and I'm speaking to the amendment because of the fact that it's been argued that this ad hoc committee is the "Be all and End all". Let me tell you how the ad hoc committee worked, Madam Speaker. The ad hoc committee worked, Councillors got together, they started recommending changes to development standards. Guess what? The developers didn't like it. Why are you only having a one year warranty on that sidewalk instead of five year warranty? You only start seeing a sidewalk heaving or not after five years, that's a known fact. We don't want to have that, Councillor. That's...that's...we don't want to have that changed on our development standard. It's amazing how quickly that ad hoc committee disappeared, just as this is going to go to the black hole that Councillor Swandel really wants it to go to, which is not to see the light of day again, and that's really the truth going on. We are at least bringing forward an idea, ladies and gentlemen, an idea long overdue. We know the power of the development community has to reach into this chamber and to grab people and shake them. We know the power of that development community and we know what they can do, but the reality is we are now seeing a city which is growing; which is growing leaps and bounds and the industry is part of the solution, which is why I welcomed the Mayor's suggestion that they should also be part of it. I know they've already been consulted by the way. We know our staff have already met with UDI. We know that already taken place. We wouldn't dare even have a Council seminar without having the first...this consultation take place informally. No, informally. Well, I can assure you Councillor. I believe there was discussions before that as well and the reality was the industry was not blindsided at all. The industry knew this debate has been coming for years. They wish it would go away, but they knew the debate has been coming for years and the debate is here. It's a debate that faces any successful city that is growing, that has challenges with growth, issues with growth and how to manage that growth and any other city that has continued to be successful, manages to be successful because they've addressed this issue successfully in the right manner by introducing development cost charges. This motion is reasonable. It...I appreciate...I want to thank the Mayor for his suggestion that the proper officers of the City of Winnipeg

will consult with the industry on this matter. That is now part of it. That, Madam Speaker, I think makes the motion even more whole. Let us not be scared of the boogey man as the Mayor referred to Halloween the other day. Let us not be scared of the boogiemer. Let us not be scared of, you know, going into the unknown and doing what we know is right. We know this is the right direction. Our Public Service is recommending it to us that this is the right direction. They know that we have a huge financial liability coming to us, coming down the track like a runaway freight train.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Boy, you're looking very dignified in that position, I must say.

Madam Speaker: Someone has to in this Chamber, Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Swandel: I'm trying to understand. Was that an opening?

Madam Speaker: He's finished now.

Councillor Swandel: Okay, so that's the opening as I understand our Procedure By-law.

Councillor Wyatt: You already debated.

Councillor Swandel: Could you call for order please, Madam Speaker. You know, this cowboy wild west shenanigans have to stop. As I understand our Procedure By-law, after the amendment is introduced, then the person who introduced it stops speaking, then we have a chance to speak and then after that the person closes. So that was either an opening or closing. There is no grey area in that, so I would just ask your indulgence if that was the opening that I be able to respond.

Madam Speaker: We have...we have some speakers lined up here, and Councillor Wyatt, you will keep your closing brief. Councillor Browaty. (Inaudible) Yes. We are opening it up. We have a list of speakers. Yes. (Inaudible) Now, you did. Councillor Swandel, you did speak already.

Councillor Swandel: Again, Madam Speaker. I would like to remind you that it's introduced, we get to speak then it's closed, so either that was an introduction or closing. If it was an introduction, I'm entitled to speak.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order, Madam. Speaker. You made a ruling...Madam Speaker, sorry, you made a ruling, Madam Speaker. If the member would like to challenge that ruling, we can vote on that instead of arguing about this all day long.

Madam Speaker: That's right.

Councillor Swandel: (Inaudible) the garbage so...

Councillor Gerbasi: (Inaudible)

Councillor Swandel: No, I was thinking that by doing this back and forth that the garbage that has been put on the floor has already been identified as garbage and I'm fine with that.

Madam Speaker: I made a ruling, I did make a ruling to go back to hear the introduction properly and now we'll proceed with other speakers and Councillor Swandel. you had already spoken. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to thank His Worship for trying to find...capture the commonality that actually...believe it or not may exist in this chamber. That said, with my nut allergy, I won't be partaking any Reese's Pieces, but regardless. I do think at this point, because of, you know, our Council seminar, because of the conversations that have already happened, you know, with the Province making a political stand, I do believe that we do need to have a level of political involvement and political direction in terms of the specifics as to what's being asked before it goes forward to the formal ask for the Province, so. I thank Councillor Wyatt for his thoughts on this matter, but I don't think just a direction from the Public Service is enough at this point and that it should in some way come back to elected officials to set some direction, some details and that, so I will be voting against the amendment at this time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Havixbeck followed by Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Havixbeck: Just for clarification, Madam Speaker. I'm speaking just on Item 3 for now, correct or the entire motion?

Madam Speaker: The amended motion.

Councillor Havixbeck: So with this amendment then.

Madam Speaker: The amendment that was presented, yes.

Councillor Havixbeck: Okay. I guess to back it up and speak specifically to the fact that the pieces added "that the proper officers of the City of Winnipeg consult with the industry on this matter". I believe some consultation has already occurred. If Councillors recall, and those who attended the Council seminar, we were given a hand out and the hand out had the priorities as UDI saw it at that time. And for the most part, I have to say that it was ignored. It was not incorporated into the document that we read that was presented. When we asked for clarification, it was dismissed. Furthermore, somebody made mention that this was a position or was not a position. I would have to disagree. We had an acting CAO write a letter to the Free Press, it's published, exerting a position. Last I checked, it was the responsibility of Council to set policy, not the administration. So a position was extended and I would have to argue that information has been cherry picked along the process on this. That hand out was key. It reflected the intent and the sentiments of the MHBA as well as the industry. And if that's the starting point, that's a terrible starting point for coming forward with a good solid relationship and something meaningful that we could present to the Province. We heard from the administration that they went to the Province and asked. They went to the Province. The Mayor did not call the Premier that I've heard. The Mayor did not call the Minister. I have not heard that a Councillor from this Council has contacted the Minister responsible for the City of Winnipeg. So, someone has extended again, the administration's will and direction on this. So on two fronts within this very preliminary stage of this initiative, we're seeing the administration moving out ahead of what Council's will is, so I cannot support either, either the amendment or having this move forward to the Province in the state that it's in. I believe that we, for the most part, have been ignored and that our administration has moved out in front of us on this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Yeah, just a couple of quick comments. No, I won't be supporting the amendment before. Look...listen, okay, at the end of day, I mean, the number one element is still being said that the Council request the Province of Manitoba to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter to provide legal authority, going on in terms of development cost charges. So, you know, either you are pregnant or you're not, right. Either you support this or you don't. You can talk about, you know, consulting an issue. That's going to happen no matter what, any ways or not, but don't be fooled. This is just an attempt to blur the lines and kind of ride the middle ground for it. So either you are supporting this or you are not, so, you know, I won't be supporting the amendment and I definitely won't be supporting the clause. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In the first instance, I want to thank the Mayor for his comments and that he's going to be supporting the motion with the friendly amendment. And on the friendly amendment, Madam Speaker, we just went through the digital sign review, Madam Speaker, and we tasked our administration to consult with the industry and they did so in a very satisfactory, very comprehensive manner and a very sensitive manner as well. And they came back to us and were able to have consensus among the industry with the eventual plan of allowing us to pass a very controversial digital sign review. So having said that, I think that we...I believe that we have the capacity and I know that we have the capacity amongst our very capable professional public service to do the consultation with the industry, Madam Speaker, and would be supporting the amendment.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to reset this back a little bit to focus back on what this is. This is not a complete plan with every detail completely decided or anything like this. This is about getting authority from another level of government.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, I think you need to specifically speak to the amendment.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yeah, I am because...I believe I am speaking to it. I'm not sure why, what I said that wasn't, but.

Madam Speaker: The consultation, please.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay. So, this...what is...sorry, I lost my train of thought now. Really, it's been a long day so I apologize. Just give me a moment here. What...the motion in front of us today as amended doesn't...the amendment merely adds a comfort level in that the administration will make sure that the industry is consulted. I mean, I think it's reasonable but I mean, what is being done here today in this debate and what is happening is that there are a number of Councillors who don't agree with going to the Province and asking for this authority, and that's fine. We had a Council seminar with a significant majority of people felt this was a reasonable step to go forward and the motion is simply to go forward with that. It's not...it's just asking for that authority, it's not deciding how much money or doing this and that. It's getting us the basic authority and then the next step is to work through that process so I guess that was really my major point is that we seem to be getting off track from what's been approved today. You know, when Councillor Havixbeck is talking about this detail and that detail and questions weren't answered. Frankly, the seminar was very thorough and a lot of work has been done and I don't think the administration in any way, I feel I need to say this because of the things that have been said. I don't think they've run off and done anything that there was a Council grouping up...at least 12 people in that room agreed with the notion of going to the Province with something, and then it became a media story and so people talked about it and I...when I contacted the Province and lobby them on something, I don't give Councillor Havixbeck a call to let her know, so I don't know if she knows what's been said and can make that accusation that nobody's talked to anybody. So my point is let's move on. We know what we think. The people, everyone's debated this. The people who support it will support it today and the people who don't believe, we should ask for the authority to have these charges won't. The Mayor's tried to compromise and give people little more comfort level and I think that's all the amendment is about today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the amendment, in order for us to proceed with the rest of it, administration does have to do a certain amount of work because it's clear when we go to the Province that we're going to have to present a real solid case and so the administration is going to have to do this, whether it should say ad hoc committee or not, the reality is that the administration can proceed in the fashion of our debate because I know that our administration is here listening. And I know that the concerns will be carried forth, and so I see this amendment as allowing me to eat my favourite peanut butter cups because I love peanut butter cups. Yes, and it really goes to, in a sense, mediating from where Councillor Orlikow's position was in terms of us being able to proceed. So, I don't see this as a problem and, you know, it's chicken and egg. You know what, some hens will be laying eggs and then the hens will be there and it will all happen at the same time. We're not...there's no set date in this thing anywhere and when we're ready to proceed to the Province, we will. It's very clear. So I'm supporting the amendment and the whole motion.

Madam Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Just for clarification, first of all, some logistics, because there's been a few comments made during this specific debate on the amendment. Number one Madam Speaker, we had a Council seminar planned for Monday. Prior to that Council seminar, this may shock or surprise you, but some of this information was leaked out to the development community who started calling. As a result of that and meeting of a breakfast meeting over the weekend took place with members of the development community, which included members of UDI and our administration and it was brought to our attention at the Council seminar that they discussed it and they wanted to have conversations continue. That's number one. Number two, I'm not sure exactly what Councillor Havixbeck is referring to, but I know no member of Council asked the Province. The administration never asked the Province. The Province was responding to a question asked by the media after the comment that was made about tax on home owners. That's what they responded to. They didn't respond to anybody sitting here or the admin. So let's just get that all cleared away. You know, there seems to be on, you know, for one moment, I almost see consensus, another moment I see us going in two different directions and I think the key thing is that when we have consultation with the stakeholders and whether that's UDI combined with admin, I think admin has to be there. That part's irrelevant to me, but the realities are we need to establish some basic ground work. What are you paying for? What aren't you paying for? Should you pay for this or should you not pay for this? And that was the whole purpose of having this dialogue and I believe it's a dialogue took place and people here had a little faith, you probably see buy-in from the development community because in the end, it may mean nickels and dimes and it may mean dollars, we don't know right now. But that's something that has to be determined. I appreciate the friendly amendment. There are obviously some who don't think it goes far enough, but from my point of view, as long as everybody realizes it, that this dialogue has to take place in order for us to cross the finish line I'm okay with it. If you don't think that's the case, then you've got trouble. I'm just going to leave it at that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt to close on the amendment and the original motion briefly, please.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you. It's been a long debate and a lot of back and forth. I thank all the speakers and respect everybody's view point on this. I just want to say that I want to thank again the Mayor. I think there's no doubt that you can consult with the industry and work with them and Councillor Pagtakhan made the good point about the

digital sign and how we as a city actually made progress. I understand that we are actually one of the few...actually only countries...cities in Canada to have such fees in place compared to the rest of the country. And so we actually broke ground there and so, you know, the reality is Madam Speaker, we have to address this issue. We have a massive challenge with growth. With that challenge comes expectations; expectations for new roads; for Chief Peguis Trail, which was built through North Kildonan and I know Councillor Browaty has his section built, but we've still got to build the rest of it. We've got issues with regards to rapid transit. I know it's been announced that we're using building now to the University of Manitoba, but we've got to build to other parts of the city to make it work. We have huge challenges with regards to recreation and the need for new recreation facilities. When was the last time the City opened a new indoor pool? Decades, ladies and gentlemen, decades. And yet, children are lining up for swimming lessons and they can't get in because there's no room; because we have not kept up with the growth and because the demand is there. If anything, the real debate here today should not be about ten or twelve or whatever the number is and by the way, yes Councillor Havixbeck, it is also being applied...would be applied to commercial, be based on an area charge, but the debate should really be, the debate should really be, the fact that we know from our own statistics since 2005 to 2013, a per lot, which is a pretty big lot, by the way, 46 square feet, so it's actually probably even more for smaller but \$70,000, the price has gone up, \$70,000. It's 117 percent, in eight, nine years, 117 percent. Now just think about that. If we raised our taxes 117 percent in the last nine years, none of us would be here right now. If...I can assure you the workers, who're on those sites doing the work putting those homes up have not seen their wages increase 117 percent in the last eight, nine years. I can assure you that their fixed costs have not gone up. The developers' fixed costs have not gone up 117 percent, whether it be for cement or whatever on that site. If this motion fails, ladies and gentlemen, be assured that that's where the debate is going to focus. That's where it will turn and I'll draw you...just a bit of history. You know, there's not a lot of good books written about municipal government, but believe it or not, one of them was written about Joe Zugen by Doug Smith. And if you want to read about a history repeating itself, and history repeating itself in the 1970s, 72, in 76, four years later, the prices had on properties had basically shot through the roof. The developers in question, major land development companies, Genstar, Metropolitan, Qualico, Ladco in the early 70s. In property in Transcona was flipped three times finally with Qualico buying it from originally 28,000 to \$348,000 in 1973. It caused the provincial government of the day actually to create a provincial commission of inquiry headed by Ruben Bellan to look into the exorbitant prices of land speculation and the greed that was being driven artificially. What I spoke about earlier, Madam Speaker, the fact we put more land on the market than ever before, there's only so many developers in the city, and yet, the prices are rising at exorbitant levels. This is a direct attack on the working class families of the city, your children, your grandchildren, your grandchildren who will not be able to afford homes in the future; who will not be able to afford homes in the future, that is really what's at stake. We have a choice. We could turn, we have a choice here with this, believe it or not. This could actually change things. This could build what we believe in, which is the...an equitable society, a just society where we reinvest, no, where we reinvest, yes, and one time health care was called that at one time, Councillor, where we reinvest in the kinds of things that create quality of life, the quality of life where you have parks, where you have recreational facilities, where you have transit. This is what can ensure that land and homes and housing can still remain affordable. If we do decide not to go down that path of creating up more equitable society, this will just get worse, and more and more families, and more and more kids, and grandkids will not be able to afford to buy their first house. We always have said we are a city with some of the most affordable house prices in Canada. We've always bragged about that. That is not. That is changing. That is changing and it's a challenge and parents who are able to help out their kids, to get it to their first home, great. But, those who can't, you know, it's not the same and so we as a city, have to ensure that there's room for people of all backgrounds to be able to have dignified housing and a dignified place to live with a roof over their home. That is what creates human dignity. This is what speaks to as well. This is good public policy. This is good public policy and this allows us to go forward, ladies and gentlemen, to start that conversation with the provincial government as was noted, to have that conversation about what we could do if we do this with the industry and it was rightly pointed out I think it was Councillor Smith who pointed out that in the long run, these investments believe it or not are going to help the very industry that will be paying towards them because it will facilitate more development to actually occur, not less. Those are my comments, Madam Speaker; by the way, you are doing a heck of a job. I'm proud to have voted for you. You're a cross between (inaudible), it's true, cross between yeah, you are a combination of the Iron Lady or Indira Gandhi or a combination of the two. You know, you're doing an amazing job so you're doing a great job and very dignified. So thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk to call the question. Okay. Yes. Order. And a recorded vote has been called for. We are voting on Motion No. 6, the amendment only at this time. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steen, Wyatt, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Mayes and Swandel.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas 10, nays 5.

Madam Speaker: Motion carried. Now...we'll vote on motion no. 5 as amended. All those in favour? Do you want a recorded vote for this as well? All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steen, Wyatt, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Mayes and Swandel.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas 10, nays 5.

Madam Speaker: Motion carried. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND AND 3RD READINGS

Madam Speaker: Now we're on to consideration of by-laws, finally. Second and third readings.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move that by-law numbered 86/2013 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: Please record Councillor Eadie in opposition.

Clerk: By-law No. 86/2013.

Mayor Katz: And I would move that By-law no. 86/2013 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: Recorded as opposed.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Madam Speaker: Next set of by-laws, His Worship.

Mayor Katz: I move that the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 123/2013, 124/2013, 125/2013, 126/2013 and 127/2013.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
November 20, 2013

Clerk: By-law No. 123/2013, By-law No. 124/2013, By-law No. 125/2013, By-law No. 126/2013, By-law No. 127/2013.

Mayor Katz: I move that By-laws numbered 123/2013 to 127/2013 both inclusive be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 123/2013 to 127/2013 both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: And I'd move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 123/2013 to 127/2013 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period for the Mayor. Councillor Mayes following by Councillor Havixbeck.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: Question period for the Mayor. Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker. It seems like hours ago we heard the Mayor's statement about the treatment of Japanese Canadians during the Second World War in Winnipeg. I have a question following up from that. I was pleased to hear that statement. I was lucky enough to attend the 25th anniversary dinner this year of the Federal announcement and apology, announcement of re-dress and apologies to the Japanese Canadian community, and the Mayor said earlier today that we would try to do something in the sugar beet lands in the southwest portion of Winnipeg to commemorate that. It is worth noting there were...research shows there were over a thousand sugar beet farms in Manitoba during the war, second only to Alberta, and Manitoba actually had the fifth largest population of Japanese Canadians by the end of the War, so my question is, given yesterday's commendable announcement about the BRT being extended down...I went by the open house last night to confirm this, that there will be a station, plaza station is going to be right adjacent to the sugar beet lands, what were the sugar beet lands, and my request is can we direct the administration to look at possibly using that station as a way to commemorate, to celebrate the role that the Japanese Canadians had here. They were re-located to Winnipeg during the war. A number of them worked under great duress in the sugar beet fields and I'm wondering if we can do something at that station to commemorate the role of the Japanese Canadians during the war.

Madam Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Mayes, I would be more than happy to explore those opportunities and start some discussions with the administration and see if that is a feasible scenario. Happy to look into that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes thank you Madam Speaker. With the release of the recent fire hall review, over-runs on the police headquarters building, is the Mayor aware of any agreement, either in writing or in principle, with regard to the sale of the new police headquarters tower, and where would those proceeds of the sale be going?

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Havixbeck, to my knowledge there have been no unsolicited offers for the tower. I know that we have not declared it surplus to sell it. Our intention always was to sell it. As I mentioned earlier, when you're dealing with buildings, Madam Speaker, they're basically bricks and mortar. The value of the building is in the tenants so we want to make sure we have maximum occupancy with quality tenants and depending on what the cap rate, will determine what someone will pay. As far as where those monies would go, it's my understanding or my recollection that we have actually paid for that out of our own resources so I'm sure the CFO would recommend that go back to the City. I don't think there is anything identified explicitly where those monies would go. If the Councillor has some other ideas, I'm sure we'd be happy to hear them.

Madam Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes thank you Madam Speaker. Could the Mayor tell us, is there a report being prepared that would outline internally, a report being prepared internally, that would outline for us what processes and procedures

have occurred with regard to the police headquarters, transactions specifically as they relate to the construction, other than the report on the Downtown Committee on Friday.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, through you to the Councillor, I think the report that I actually mentioned earlier today that I read last night, basically gives you a detailed review of exactly what has taken place. I think it would be incumbent upon the Councillor. I know she's read that. If she has further questions to feel free to address those questions. I believe the committee meets on Friday. I believe all the people who should be able to answer any questions should be there so I think that would be a perfect forum.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Last question?

Councillor Havixbeck: Last question. Yes and I have registered to appear in delegation at that meeting so I will ask those questions then. Further to the police headquarters though, will the Mayor...can he share with us whether he will be supporting releasing the project steering team meetings, the dates of meetings, the members on the committee at the various times and the meeting minutes?

Madam Speaker: There was a motion on that already was there not?

Mayor Katz: Yes. Madam Speaker, I have never seen those. I'm very much aware of the fact that there is a steering committee. I think I specifically identified who was on that steering committee. It kind of surprised and shocked me that the Chair of Protection and Community Services did not know who was on that steering committee but I think we all know who was on there now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Madam Speaker. First of all I want to just say I'm delighted...I was very delighted to hear of the funding agreement that was reached on rapid transit. Fantastic news for the City and not only is it rapid transit, it's dealing with the Pembina underpass; it's dealing with water and waste infrastructure challenges, so it's great news for the City. I guess my question has to do with, there were issues in coming to this agreement in terms of the borrowing and other aspects of how this was going to work and I guess I'm just wondering at what point we will learn how those issues were resolved in terms of some of those issues, because they lead to other issues and how are we going to deal with these costs going forward.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Gerbasi, thank you, and that certainly is a question that will come up. As you know, we basically supported...and when I say "we", I'm talking about Council obviously...as far as the rapid transit was concerned. As was mentioned earlier, the Calrossie situation and the Jubilee were also integral parts of this whole process. I can't tell you where the Province is going to get their money from. They have committed publicly that they're basically in for 225. We're in for 225 and we are hopeful that we will get the maximum contribution of 25 percent from P3 Canada, which would be \$150 million. Now, right at the end of that announcement, I was asked by a member of the media...it was almost...it was over and then someone just threw out a question who was leaving. What happens if the P3 Canada only gives us 140, 138, whatever the case may be? Obviously it would be my expectation that we would move forward based on what we've already established, a 50/50 sharing. As far as the City of Winnipeg is concerned, these monies, we'd have to be borrowing to get these monies at this stage of the game. These monies are not coming from Building Canada funds. Our share we'll have to pay for from borrowing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. Mr. Mayor my first question is will the other reports related to the new fire paramedic station construction project be made publicly available as the motion that was passed by Council on October 23rd stated? There were two reports in that that were requested specifically but I think the administration, as I've tried to discuss with them, have missed the third point that states, "and be it further resolved all other reports presented to EPC related to the new fire paramedic station construction project, be made publicly available." So this would include the Stantec's traffic study report for Portage Avenue, steering committee updates, other administrative analysis, and other reports out of EPC have received. I think the motion is quite clear, and I'm very sure that EPC are very much...I hope so...EPC have received more than just two reports on the fire hall. Do you agree that all reports mean all reports?

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Orlikow, number one, I'm very much aware of the two reports. It's my understanding that those are coming forward. As far as the steering committee's reports, I have no idea what Councillor Orlikow is talking about. I certainly haven't seen any so maybe he could clarify those in his next round.

Councillor Orlikow: ...so many. Well I will follow just to quickly state, it's all reports. I wasn't at EPC. I don't know what EPC has received. Whatever reports they have received they should be made publicly available as Council motion, so that's my point.

Second question though is regarding the southwest BRT announcement / Pembina underpass / active transportation connectivity / Calrossie line / whatever else is going to be out there. I support all these projects. They're wonderful. They're much needed. But my question is and my concern is that we're heading down the same kind of line that we did with the police headquarters, and what I mean by...

Madam Speaker: What is your question Councillor?

Councillor Orlikow: What I mean by that is...well the question is quite simply is are you confident that based on...really I would see Class D estimates, if even Class D estimates are there, based upon some very complicated project, that the City is not going to be on the hook for more than 225 million. How confident are you of that?

Mayor Katz: First of all Madam Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, if the Provincial...sorry if the Federal funding through P3 Canada does not hit the max of \$150 million, I believe there would be more monies required. I already said that. Number two, what I can tell the Councillor through you is that the administration briefing the Province as well as the City, has basically done their calculations, that's number one. And number two, put in what they believe was significant funding for any new things that may appear, they very much believe. I know Dave Wardrop was part of this. He's very clear, by the same token, I would say that there would be probably absolutely nothing wrong and more than likely everything right to get some due diligence so that we all feel confident with those numbers. I certainly would concur with that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Third question?

Councillor Orlikow: Following up on that last question and something I've talked about before and I've heard about, how are we going to pay for it? I don't understand...like...\$225 million in debt borrowing. We don't have that ceiling. We're almost tapped out with the police headquarters at \$15 million just pushed us up. I know it's coming sometime, but can you give us any idea on how are we going to take out \$225 million in loans? I don't understand. We don't have that in our debt ceiling at all. Is there another model you're looking at? Is there...I just really don't understand how we're going to pay for it. It's nice to do a project but before you do a project, I like to have comfort knowing how we're going to pay for it.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, anytime we're talking about these projects I can assure you that we take servicing our debt very seriously okay. That's number one. We also know our ability on an annual basis. We meet with our bond holders. We talk about capacity, etc. The CFO sits in these meetings, and don't think for a moment there's nobody more concerned about our CFO when it comes to basically what we can service. The realities are, the City continues to grow. It's been pointed out at every time how new revenue is coming in Madam Speaker. It's just a matter of deciding what is your priority. The motion that was just passed earlier, okay, if there are some new growth charges that should be...should be part of this growth development charge, there's one avenue right there. But the City does continue to grow and we have new revenue coming in on a regular basis. That's just reality. Our tax base is always getting bigger.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Madam Speaker. Good to hear this conversation on BRT stage 2. One of the phases is going to affect a number of homes in, I guess it would be the Richmond West area, or University...Waverley Heights area just in behind the Safeway and Winners and there's quite a bit of single-family, multi-family residential in there. There's part of the plan, I believe, involves moving a railroad track over closer to the existing residential. I'm just wondering, given that we support the number of recommendations that come from FCM and I know that we've had the FCM railroad standards talked about in our planning department. I don't know if we've specifically adopted them here, but I'm just wondering if the Mayor would confirm that in principle he agrees with the position that we should stand by the FCM standards for development near railroads when we're looking at doing this BRT and the relocation of the rail lines.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Swandel, if the point that's trying to be made is that rail lines should not be moved closer to residential, I totally agree with that.

Madam Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Swandel: Yeah, I mean if it's not moving them at all I'm fine with that, but I just want to make sure that you understand that there's a set of standards out there that have been established, and you know, if we're forced to move them I would hope that we would at least adhere to those recommended standards by FCM, is what I was driving at.

Mayor Katz: I would totally agree.

Madam Speaker: Third and final question Councillor? No? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. I wasn't aware that this announcement was coming yesterday with the Mayor regarding rapid transit. I do have concerns about our debt limit and the numbers involved. Can the Mayor confirm that the Province's portion of the project, the 225, will not be borrowed by the City of Winnipeg? Again, I do have concerns about our debt ceiling and I know for phase 1, we are holding the debt on behalf of the Province.

Mayor Katz: I can absolutely assure you that's something that has been stated by me both publicly and privately that we're not in a position to carry that debt like we did in the past, so the answer is absolutely, no. The Province will find their funding from whatever sources they have and I think as Councillor Browaty knows, they have a lot more sources than we do and we'll have to find ours.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Mayor? No? So we'll go on to our second round. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Madam Speaker. Can the Mayor please tell us when the realty audit is coming to Council?

Mayor Katz: I believe I saw an email from our auditor, Brian Whiteside, correcting the Councillor as he already told her exactly when it's coming. This was about maybe ten days ago and he said within the next couple of months was what I last saw.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Havixbeck: I can keep going here. I have many more questions. Over a year ago I asked, and had moved a motion at Council that was accepted, that we have a Council seminar...well it ended up being a Council seminar. I had asked for a report, and the impetus for this was that the Elmwood Community Centre had a fire, a significant fire, that required budgetary dollars be dedicated towards its re-building. Instead of a Council seminar, which was scheduled for September 16th, we received slides, PowerPoint presentation slides. This, 10 days after a fire at the St. James Civic Centre. My question is to the Mayor, how much coverage do we have for yet another example on a building such as the Civic Centre, and could we not just have a simple chart that shows a list of our buildings with the anticipated coverage and whether that is enough for replacement value.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Havixbeck, I very much remember the fire. I stood there with the children next door at the school and looked at the empty lot where the building had burnt down. As you probably know, my recollection is that we had just under a million dollars in insurance. We now have all the funding to not re-build but to build something bigger and better to accommodate those people who basically need that facility, so that's number one. Number two, if the Councillor is asking me, do I know how much insurance coverage we have on every property we own, the answer is no, I definitely don't know that off the top of my head.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Swandel. You're not finished? Okay. Okay.

Councillor Havixbeck: There's been much discussion about the budget of late and a proposed tax increase. Can the Mayor perhaps tell us what the anticipated property tax increase will be for citizens?

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Havixbeck, I think we've already discussed that number one, what's going on with our local street renewal where we put that one percent into something that, it'd be up to Council to decide on an annual basis to continue. From what I've seen and heard from the public, this is something they're very supportive of. I believe that the announcement has been made when the budget will be tabled, which will be November 29th. At that particular point in time everything will be in black and white.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Madam Speaker. Through you to the Mayor, I'm just wondering if he can confirm that he's aware that we constantly review our insurance requirements in the City of Winnipeg to ensure that the cost of our insurance is reasonably related to the need of insurance and that we don't go out and just acquire mammoth amounts of

insurance without the insurance experts selling (inaudible) required. We're constantly...I don't know if it's on an annual but it's on a fairly frequent basis that we review it. Could the Mayor perhaps just confirm that he's aware of that or if not...

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor, yes I'm aware of that. I have seen and been at meetings with people from administration in the risk management. These are very astute people. They're always making sure that we have the proper coverage. You know, I'm not sure it's an exact science but yes I am aware of that and I thank the Councillor for reminding everybody.

Madam Speaker: On to Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. We have no report, no motions, no motions and no by-laws. Are there any questions for the Chair, Councillor Mayes? Seeing none, we'll move on to Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Report of October 29th. Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE
 STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
 DATED OCTOBER 29, 2013**

Councillor Swandel: Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda items 1 to 3.

Madam Speaker: Pulling no. 3? All those in favour of 1 and 2? Contrary? Carried. Item no. 3.

Item 3 - Granular Roadway Policy

Councillor Swandel: I'll just introduce it and listen to what Councillor Mayes has to say. It's pretty straight forward. I'm sure he's just trying to get some face time on the issue of granular back lanes, which affect us all and if there are any cameras or reporters left in the room, perhaps we can just say that everybody supports the idea and concept of improving our back lanes and that we all equally share in the problem and also equally share in the solution and that no one Councillor has done anything greater than any other Councillor or any other citizen of the City of Winnipeg. You can sit down. I'm going to go on for a while, Councillor Mayes. I'm allowed to introduce here. You know, granular lanes, granular roadways. At one time, we actually did you know sort of respect...it's a good place to actually talk about it. It's one of those places that development charges come into play because when you do do new developments, the cost of the back lanes and roads and sidewalks and everything are included in the development. Our general practice has been for dealing with these issues is to do it by local improvement. You'll see this still uses local improvement, but it just creates some incentive to get it going on. I think I wasn't a chair when this was done, but I'm pretty sure if I recall reading the report correctly, that there is some logic to the value on that, and that the cost of maintaining an actual back lane versus gravel back lanes can actually work to our advantage. So, with a little of humour, I will wait and listen to Councillor Mayes' concerns.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I had planned to be brief, but Councillor Vandal and I both put in a lot of work on this as has Councillor Fielding and in the past Councillor Nordman. It's a worthwhile initiative. The current program, which I think Councillor Fielding started the million dollar granular program, has actually worked to some extent, at least in my ward, I know there's some problems in other words, so we're reallocating the funding out of that to asphalt. It might be worthwhile doing some work looking at that granular program again in the future. One of the items that has been brought...been brought forward repeatedly on this by some of the residents was the City should change its policy around having 60 percent requirement for local improvements. It occurred to me last night, I didn't think that was a policy and 9:30 at night e-mailed City legal staff, and I want to put in a good work for Michael Jack who e-mailed me back at 11:30 at night was a pretty comprehensive answer. As did Mel Chambers saying, "No, this is Provincial legislation. It's the City of Winnipeg Charter. It sets up the 60 percent thresholds, so to some extent, you hear the folks who are upset that we aren't allowing local improvements at less than 60 percent sign-up are going to have to go and take up that issue with the Province." What we're doing here is trying to reallocate some of the funding to improve the granular back lane situation. I'm sure Councillor Swandel will be delighted to hear me list off alphabetically the various gravel back lanes in my ward, that benefited or may benefit from this initiative and he is particularly fond of my stories of going to door to door, so I will conclude by saying last week after our EPC session, I was out going door to door on Morier two weeks ago actually, and a woman there said: "Hey, I hear you've got something new with asphalt back lanes". This is about an

hour after our meeting or two hours after our meeting concluded. So, there's a lot of support in the public for this. So I'm in favour and wish to commend Councillor Vandal also for working on this initiative.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to say as the City Councillor Mynarski, we have vast majority are concrete back lanes although they need a lot of repair similar to Councillor Smith's, but have one gravel back lane in the Mynarski Ward, and I appreciate this initiative. When I was listening to the discussion and debate about it, it sounds like many were quite interested in trying to improve this because I think probably there's legacies of gravel back lanes in everybody's ward and so thanks to the administration and Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works for the work that they did on this and thanks for the inspiration from Councillor Mayes' door-knocking.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further speakers, Councillor Swandel to close.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, I, me, me, me, I, me, me, me, I, I. I believe it was Ralph Waldo Emerson, that said, "It's amazing what you can get done when you don't care who takes credit for it." With that, I'll let you call the question.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of item no. 3? Opposed? Carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: Okay, we have one motion, motion no. 7. Did all the members of Council have an opportunity to read it? Okay, it'll be automatic...yes, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: A point of privilege. I'm sorry I didn't get a chance to read the e-mail.

Madam Speaker: Okay, yes. Madam Clerk, could you read the motion out?

Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

WHEREAS the people of the City of Winnipeg need to have trust and confidence in City Hall;

AND WHEREAS the public trust has been damaged after the recent fire paramedic station review and with the revelations of cost overruns at the police headquarters;

AND WHEREAS public safety is paramount and the administration should be as transparent as possible with the public;

AND WHEREAS the provincial Ombudsman's office has ruled the City of Winnipeg has sole discretion to release the traffic study into the new fire hall on Portage Avenue;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Administration release immediately, the Stantec traffic study related to the new fire hall on Portage Avenue and any other administrative analysis on the same subject in their entirety.

Madam Speaker: Yes. Okay, that'll be an automatic referral to committee. On to by-laws, Councillor Swandel.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll move that By-law No. 129/2013 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 129/2013.

Councillor Swandel: I will move that By-law No. 129/2013 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 129/2013.

Councillor Swandel: Madam Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 129/2013 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: Question period for the Chair. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Madam Speaker. Through you to the Chair, could the Chair please tell us when the fire paramedic station audit came forward? When reference was made recently at Executive Policy Committee, on both occasions, the Chair stepped out of the room and publicly stated that it was politically motivated. Could he please explain what he meant by that?

Councillor Swandel: Absolutely Madam Speaker. Nothing I like better than when they take the bait. By "politically motivated", what I mean is that when you stand up and you spew off half-truths, innuendos, assertions; take things out of context; don't refer to time lines; don't read administrative responses; that the only reason in the world that could be left to do that is because you're looking for a little bit of press time and all you have is political motivation.

Madam Speaker: Second question if any?

Councillor Havixbeck: I guess that explains his views on that. My question would go further to why he stepped out and why he chose to step out of the vote on that.

Councillor Swandel: Madam Speaker at EPC, in the room I stepped out to go to the washroom because what I heard smelled like crap so I wanted to be in a place that actually smelled like crap.

Madam Speaker: Let's watch our language please and let's be professional and respectful. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you. My final question: in July it was realized that spending on road work was \$7.2 million under budget from the tenders that had gone out in late June, May. Can the Chair tell us has the \$7.2 million been allocated and actually spent in contracts awarded towards new projects that wouldn't have otherwise been realized?

Councillor Swandel: I'm not sure. I can't understand that, but usually that's what happens, is that the \$7.2 million, especially on regional streets, we roll it into the future projects. I mean, I personally, if I were a king, might have allocated the money differently but bringing projects forward is generally a good process that we try and get the extra work done either because it's urgent or because we want to avoid some kind of construction inflation.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, as I recall we voted on a motion that clearly defined where the money was to be allocated and the question was, was the construction season still long enough in order to spend that money, so I'm not sure if you need to find out, but my question is, you may recall that Chairperson?

Councillor Swandel: I'm sure that the money was spent wisely and that, you know, in construction...there's not only the construction season, there's also the detailed design that needs to be done. The allocation of the dollars is key in order to be able to get our tender processes moving. You might recall we just did one a little while ago. Actually I think it was previously here, we just did the advancement of some projects ahead of the 2013, or just coming to us soon...the 2014 budget because we know we need to get the work done to get things out to tender.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I'm just wondering whether or not the Chair is aware of the fact that because of preparing early, getting our work out there to tender and we had \$7.2 million, that in discussions with Public Works, that they did address doing more TBOs, addressing some streets, and there was a complete and thorough list issued by Public Works for that 7.2 which meant we got more work done on our infrastructure.

Councillor Swandel: I was aware of that Mr. Speaker. I was also aware that there was some urgent riverbank stabilization work that was required and that's...a large chunk of that money went to that as a matter of fact, so it was a wise use of our dollars. You know, we could all have our own individual beliefs on what to do and where to get the best value out of that money. You know, I might have done something differently with it if I were king but certainly the projects that were put forward were all worthy projects; in fact, one was urgent.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Any further questions? Okay. That ends question period.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED NOVEMBER 7, 2013**

Madam Speaker: Committee on Finance. We have one item.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, I'd like to move the item.

Madam Speaker: Yes, we have an amendment to the item in front of us. Councillor Wyatt, you can introduce the report and the item and Councillor Havixbeck will introduce the amendment.

Item 1 - Cross Jurisdictional Review – Delegated Financial Authority

Councillor Wyatt: I'll wait to hear the comments. I mean I've heard Councillor Havixbeck speak to this matter at the Standing Committee, which she is a member of and I understand her point of view. I believe that the Cross Jurisdictional Review did indicate a reduction in the authority granted to the Chief Administrative Officer in terms of awarding contracts being reduced from 10 million to 5. The Council feels that that should be reduced even further to 1 million. We do know and I've been advised by our staff at the Finance meeting that this would, of course, would require more reports and report writing with regards to actually then getting approvals for the award of contracts and that would actually slow down our ability to do work and so it's ironic that we hear about the need to get the work out and get more work done and do it faster, but then we're throwing up more red tape and so I think we have to walk that fine line. I think it was recognized by our public service if you look at the report before you, you will see that actually right across the country, the authority given to the public services of different cities really does vary as high as 20 million actually in some cases, in some cities, to as low as a hundred thousand dollars. And so it's really all over the map, there doesn't seem to be one, you know, standard in terms of what's taking place across the country. This is reducing, this report, I want to emphasize, is reducing the authority by the...of the CAO in terms of awarding contracts from 10 million down to 5 million, so cutting that in half, which I think is an important step, and I think maybe it doesn't go as far as what the Councillor would like to see, but I think it is a step in the right direction and it was supported by the majority of the committee at Finance. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck, introduce your motion.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Fielding,

WHEREAS the current Acting Interim Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) was named repeatedly throughout the fire paramedic station review document;

AND WHEREAS one of the main issues highlighted in the report was the high level of delegated authority that the CAO held;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Recommendation 1 of Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Finance regarding the proposed reduction of the delegated authority from \$10 million to \$5 million be further reduced to \$1 million until such a time as a permanent CAO is recruited.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Much of what the Chair says is true. I did raise this issue, I asked at the last Finance meeting that the rules be suspended. I was denied that option. The reduction in my view does not go far enough. Yes, a cross jurisdictional study was made and conducted. However, concurrent to that, we received the most scathing report of any workplace I have ever worked in, sighting contract splitting; sighting problems in awarding of contracts. So \$5 million could still see a fire station being built. It could still see, without Council approval, it could still see a police station being built, it could still see a lot happen and I don't want to go down this path again. This morning, we heard "what do you need a police headquarters audit for? You're going to hear more of the same of what you just heard in this report". More reports slowing down the business of City Hall, not true. The Finance Committee could meet weekly to approve reports. I don't see that as a reason to object this. That's our job. That's our job here at Council. That's...we are accountable to taxpayers and citizens in this city. So I'll leave it at that and see what anybody else has to say on this.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Not too much, sorry, Madam Speaker, not too much to add to what Paula, Councillor Havixbeck had to say about it. I think it's reasonable; a step in the right direction from 10 to 5, but going down to 1, I don't think it's going to burden many people, just have more reports, I don't necessarily see how writing a report is going to necessarily slow down a process, you know, you might have some administrative having to write the report, but I think we need to be as transparent and open as we can with accountability and if you've got to reduce it down to one, I don't think that's...I don't think that's over-burdened. I don't think there is an issue on administrative basis to write up these reports, so I support that and we'll see how the rest of Council supports. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to rise in support actually of the amendment. I don't really think that it should be too cumbersome to do a report on this given that many of those expenditures if not, well, all of those expenditures if I recall correctly, go to the bid site where we have our request for proposals and bid opportunities and then if you look at it, it also shows and you would find that when you looked at all the streets, I knew what the cost was going to be when...on a particular section of Parr Street in my ward. I went to the bid and I can see that this was here and it was being implemented so there's two reports already generated there. One is the tender, it goes out or whatever, so to me, I think not much of this stuff that would be required for reports is already prepared by our, by the Winnipeg, by the Public Service of Winnipeg. So I'm going to stand in support of it. It's...I think the motion actually says temporarily and so it could be experimented with until we find a CAO, I believe, that's what the motion reads, excuse me, and I think that at \$5 million, well let me put it to you this way, and \$100,000, I think that's totally unreasonable, like really, in a city like Winnipeg, but I don't see a problem with the 1 million as amending this. In terms of 5 million, I think that it could be a bit lower. Could be a bit lower. I'm sure the 20 million might be Toronto which is probably a multibillion operation, but 5 million represents about .625 percent of our operating budget, 1 million, of course, is substantially less, but those are, you know, if you add up all those projects and what we do, I don't think it's too burdensome to look at the million. Thank you. So I'll be supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Okay, Councillor Havixbeck, do you have some closing comments?

Councillor Havixbeck: Well, I'd like to reiterate my position that I think this is a necessary and important amendment in order to restore trust and confidence at City Hall. I further reinforce that the reduction does not go far enough, 10 million to 5 million. It's cited numerous times in the fire hall review that there was contract splitting. If we were to look at that isolated situation with a \$10 million threshold, with a \$5 million threshold, that could've still occurred except on the station on Portage Avenue, which would be well over the amount. So I refute the argument that it would slow down City Hall. I don't believe it would at all. I believe that's our job and our purpose here is to meet and to continue to move the business forward. And the fact that other cities are cited in this study, no city has had go on what has gone on in Winnipeg right now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt to close.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. It should be pointed out that the way the existing amendment being proposed just so that everybody knows what they are voting on here which is somewhat surprising,

the way it reads, who's read it, that it recommends that we go down from ten to five be further reduced to one until such time as a permanent CAO is recruited, which the way it reads is we're back to ten. I don't think that was the intent of the mover, but that's certainly is the way it is being interpreted. I would prefer to support the clause which says to go from ten to five. I definitely do not support an amendment that says that we should go temporarily to one until we recruit a permanent CAO and then we're back to ten, because that's what this, no that's what's your motion, to amend says. That's what your motion to amend says. So obviously, the mover of the motion who cares passionately about this, Madam Speaker, has really not given a lot of thought to what she was actually moving in the first place.

Councillor Wyatt: The debate is closed, call the question.

Councillor Havixbeck: I would like to make a friendly amendment to clarify that wording.

Councillor Wyatt: A point of order, Madam Speaker. The motion is closed, the debate is closed, I was the last to speak, we're now calling...I call the question.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on motion 4. All those in favour? Contrary? Motion is defeated. We'll call for the question on the item. Number one, all those in favour? Contrary? Carried. No by-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: Question period for the Chair on Finance. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Madam Chair. It is imperative on any budget to know staffing costs. Staffing costs at the City of Winnipeg are directly related to full time equivalent. Can the Chair tell us how we can pass a budget if we cannot know the number of actual full time equivalents?

Councillor Wyatt: I think this has been explained before to the good Councillor by our public service and I was there actually in the standing committee when Mr. Ruta did explain that the public service is going through a position management exercise to sort out that issue with regards to the actual verses budgeted. I realize the Councillor would have liked the answer yesterday and I would have liked the answer yesterday, but the reality is it's being sorted out. It's, I believe, coming forward as part of the budget so hopefully we can have those discussions and that information available. I will point out that the Councillor has voted for budgets in the past that did not contain that information and fully supported those budgets without that information.

Madam Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, the Chair has said repeatedly that this will be a fourth year of property tax increases.

Madam Speaker: Do you have a question Councillor? No preamble.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes I do. Can the Chair tell us the approximate amount of a proposed tax increase?

Councillor Wyatt: The Mayor asked me a question in the last question period which I answered...he asked me will there be a one percent continuation of the Local Street Renewal Reserve and so he kind of gave that one away and confirmed it already so, one percent we know the local street renewal reserve. We wish...we've heard from the public. The public wants to see their local streets renewed and rebuilt and the idea that we continue to build that fund over the next number of years so that in 25 years, not 50 years as was wrongly reported by one of the periodicals in our City, but within the next 25 years, that we will have a fund if Council sticks to it, that will be able to maintain all of our residential streets at a good condition, which we cannot say today, and that is something that this Council, and I give everyone here credit for being part of it, you know, brought forward and I think it's having a position effect. Indeed the challenges have been that our public service in terms of getting that money out there has always been a challenge and the great thing is that the private sector was able to bid and bid competitively and give us good pricing at the same time, even though we've increased our funding for capital spending on local streets, so that part I can confirm. The balance of course we have to wait until the budget comes forward Councillor Havixbeck, although I can assure you that we have worked strenuously to find ways to find solutions to address the 73, 74 million dollar shortfall which was affecting us...projection affecting us at the beginning of the year.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Madam Speaker. I usually don't like to ask questions on the budget ahead of the budget, but listening to this sort of circling of, you know, the vultures thinking that they're going to be able to get out there in public and say that there's just some sort of terrible evil whenever you have to deal with the reality of your financial situation requires. I just want to ask the Chair of Finance if he thinks it's possible...possible that we as a Council can deliver a budget that, outside of infrastructure dedicated increases, could have a tax increase of less than one percent.

Councillor Wyatt: You know...the good Councillor for St. Norbert, you know, I'll tell you it seems...I mean the...I would at face value say no only because, you know, we've sat here in this chamber and unanimously approved contracts to our various different groups well beyond at the rate of inflation usually in the case of CUPE and in some other bargaining units we all know that it's been beyond the rate of inflation. I don't think I need to name the names of those groups, but it has been beyond in some cases double and in some cases more than double the rate of inflation, so when your fixed costs go up and the cost of doing business is going up higher than the rate of inflation, okay, sooner or later you're going to have to make decisions on where you're either find the savings or pass those costs on and that is what the challenge has been as a City, even with the growth that we're experiencing.

Madam Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Madam Speaker. I've only been back on EPC involvement in budget process for a couple of weeks now and a quick look at stuff, I think you know, I do challenge the Chair to talk with me about some of the issues that I've seen that are in front of us because I think we can hit that, so let's sit down. Let's have a commitment from you Mr. Chair through you Madam Speaker to the Chair to sit down and see if we can't, if we're doing anything...it's not infrastructure. Like I'm all for things like, you know, for dedicated infrastructure...
(inaudible speaking in the background) Absolutely. I, me, me, my. About time. You guys are catching on. If we could get...if we could find some solutions, let's do it, so my question is, is the Chair willing to be challenged by something at less than one percent?

Councillor Wyatt: I think from the get-go Madam Speaker, my goal from the beginning of this budget process was to find savings without affecting core services; to find savings, working with members of EPC. The reality is, this is not a ministerial system. I'm a member of Council like every other member of Council. I act as the Chair of Finance but at the same time I'm a member of Council working as a Council with the Executive Policy Committee which under the Charter is mandated to bring forward the budget. Not the Chair of Finance, Executive Policy Committee mandated to bring forward the budget. So, I hear what the Councillor is saying and it's great for the drama and everything else in this Council Chamber, but the reality is, we need to address the challenges with regards to the costs that are on the rise and try to keep those costs down, because we know that the taxpayer, the ratepayer cannot...we have a Provincial Government that is raising taxes and we have to be mindful of that as well and be cognizant of the fact that at the same time, we have services we have to provide, so we are walking that balance and so hopefully we can keep our costs down and keep our taxes down as well, although I have said from the beginning of this process that it wasn't, you know...it's a huge challenge and have said that, you know, taxes I think in terms of having an increase is a responsible way to go in terms of the fact that it avoids down the road having a massive bump, a massive increase in taxes just being for political reasons pushing off tax increases for political reasons and then later on having huge increase that's facing the ratepayers that's basically tax shock that they're hard to absorb all at once.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Councillor...

Madam Speaker: Oh. Last question, sure. Councillor Fielding?

Councillor Fielding: Justin kind of answered the question that I had, but anyways, why not it's only 4:25 pm right? Got some time. So just for clarification Councillor Wyatt. So you just said in your preamble that the answer...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Fielding. Direct your comments to me.

Councillor Fielding: Sorry Madam Chair. It's late in the day. I'd rather look at you than Russ any day. Trust me! Anyway Madam Chair, the question that I have for the Chairperson of Finance is, you said in your statement that you don't want to impact core services. We've talked about that a lot. So if I'm able to find a way where you're not able to impact core services would you support an amendment to the budget to freeze property taxes, not including the infrastructure piece.

Councillor Wyatt: I don't answer hypothetical questions.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Fielding, supplementary? No? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, given that at a special meeting, there's a report coming to the Committee on Downtown, Heritage and Riverbank Management on Friday, and given that it has had, I'm sure, an impact on the EPC member who has been responsible for shepherding forward a capital and operating budget, will the Chairperson of Finance be there to appear and speak to the report on the table for the Downtown, Heritage and Riverbank Management Committee?

Councillor Wyatt: Typically what happens in the standing committees is the different departments come forward and make their presentation regarding the budgets. I definitely attend all the standing committee meetings and listen to the dialogue that takes place in the standing committee meetings, but it's the public service that brings forward the different aspects of the budget as it pertains to each standing committee and that's typically what is done and I make sure that I'm there to hear any dialogue and any suggestions, ideas or amendments that are being brought forth from each standing committee, so I look forward to hearing those discussions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question?

Councillor Eadie: Yes Madam Speaker. Will the Chairperson of Finance appear in delegation to speak to the report on Friday?

Councillor Wyatt: No.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Chair of Finance. Seeing none. That will end question period.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Madam Speaker: We are now on to the Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management. There's no report, no motions. Consideration of By-laws, Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I am pleased to move By-law No. 119/2013 and By-law 122/2013 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 119/2013, By-law No. 122/2013.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'm pleased to move that By-laws No. 119/2013 and 122/2013 both inclusive be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 119/2013 and 122/2013.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Madam Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 119/2013 and 122/2013 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period for the Chair. Councillor Eadie.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you Madam Speaker. The by-law that was 119 I believe it was Councillor Browaty? By-law 119 which is not debatable but in there is the content and I believe there was a schedule and a grid that was increased related to an issue that we debated last spring and if everybody would recall Madam Speaker, there was mis-

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
November 20, 2013

information put out into the public that somehow we were using people's existing property tax dollars to give grants to build condos or for people to purchase condos. Clearly this is what's called a tax incremental financing program, and eventually those property taxpayers who purchased those condos over time, it is paid back, and so my question to the Chairperson of Downtown is can he also explain a little bit further about how these incentives are handled with the City?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much...thank you Madam Speaker and thanks Councillor Eadie for the question. Basically what this is Madam Speaker is this is a Downtown Residential Development Grant program which we moved in June 1st, 2010, and there's a grid that's been attached to the report that we approved in April of 2013, Madam Speaker, that lays out the grant amounts ranging from 40,000, 35,000, 30,000, 25,000 for both condominiums and apartment developments in the downtown area and it's a pretty complex explanation but in a nutshell, we have been using this program for the last number of years Madam Speaker to incent development programs for affordable housing and development projects within our downtown, and if the good Councillor needs some more information, I'd be happy to get that for him.

Madam Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Madam Speaker, the...I just want to confirm though, this is an amendment to what already exists and I think the amendment was to deal with mostly the condo grid?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Madam Speaker. I appreciate the question from Councillor Eadie. What this was Madam Speaker is that there is a bi-annual update for condominiums and an annual update for medium market rents as a result of the assessment that occurred and the assessment was a 12 percent increase and so this reflects that increase.

Madam Speaker: Third question? No? Any further questions for the Chair? On to the Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE
 STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
 DATED NOVEMBER 5, 2013**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I'd like to introduce the report of November 5, 2013 and move adoption of the consent agenda items 1 through 9.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Are you not going to 10?

Councillor Browaty: I'll get to 10 after we move these.

Madam Speaker: Okay, sure, 1 to 9. I'll call the question. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Browaty: At the request of the area Councillor, I'd like to move item...to move a layover of one month on no. 10. Sure, refer it back? Sure.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all those in favour? Contrary? Carried. No motions. Considerations of by-laws, Councillor Browaty.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
 CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – FIRST READING ONLY**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to move that By-law No. 99/2013 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 99/2013.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 128/2013, 132/2013, 133/2013, 134/2013, 135/2013.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 128/213, By-law No. 132/2013, By-law No. 133/2013, By-law No. 134/2013 and By-law No. 135/2013.

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-laws numbered 128 and 132 to 135/2013 both inclusive be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 128 and 132/2013 to 135/2013 both inclusive.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 128 and 132/2013 to 135/2013 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period for the Chair. Seeing none, we'll move on. Governance Committee of Council. Councillor Nordman, can you please introduce the report on my behalf?

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED OCTOBER 3, 2013

Councillor Nordman: I'd be happy to Madam Speaker. I'd like to move the amended by-law with regard to the time meetings should be completed particularly community committee meetings, given the fact that we're almost there today.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Consideration of by-laws, Councillor Nordman.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Nordman: Certainly. Yeah, I'd like to move 131/2013, By-law, City of Winnipeg Procedure By-law be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 131/2013.

Councillor Nordman: I'd like to move that 131/2013 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 131/2013.

Councillor Nordman: I'd like to move that 131/2013 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Orlikow moves adjournment. Madam Clerk, Roll call. Thank you.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
November 20, 2013

ROLL CALL

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Mayes, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steen, Swandel, Wyatt, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Council adjourned at 4:32 p.m.