

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Wednesday, January 30, 2013

The Council met at 9:40 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 Pagtakhan.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We're today joined by Midori. Where is Midori? She's around...she's photocopying right now so. Midori Matthews from St. Mary's Academy and she resides in the Charleswood-Tuxedo Ward. I don't know if we have any other special guests that I can see or been made aware of, so we will go to the announcements. January 27th is the International Holocaust Remembrance Day and in recognition of that Councillor Steen has a message he'd like to provide.

Councillor Steen: Yes. Mr. Speaker, January 27th marked the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau, the largest Nazi death camp in Europe. In 2005, the general assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution which designated January 27th as the International Holocaust Remembrance Day. This resolution also rejected any denial of the holocaust as an historical event. The resolution also looks to the future and rejects any religious intolerance, incitement, harassment or violence against persons or communities based on ethnic origin or religious belief. As City Council, we concur with the United Nations resolution to an annual day to honour the victims of the Nazi era and the strong message it sends on human rights around the world. I noticed earlier this month that a fellow Swede and the first honorary citizen of Canada appointed, Mr. Raoul Wallenberg, was being honoured with a postage stamp by Canada Post. While serving as Sweden's special envoy in Budapest between July and December 1944, Wallenberg issued protective passports and sheltered Jewish people in buildings designated as Swedish territory, saving tens of thousands of lives. At the end of the war, Mr. Wallenberg disappeared into Soviet custody and we do not know what his fate was, and Mr. Wallenberg's heroic efforts in the face of extreme danger are an inspiration to all and I can remember as a...since I was a child, I've been searching for Mr. Wallenberg my whole life with no success, but the last theory is that he disappeared in Siberia. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Steen. You'll notice that...at your computer tops, you have received a Festival du Voyageur sash from the Speaker's office and we encourage you to wear them as a lapel pin, I see many of you put them on and in recognition of the fact that the next Council meeting is after Festival du Voyageur, we're going to have Festival du Voyageur today and Councillor Vandal would like to make some comments.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, thank you very much for the sash. It's a great...I think it's a great notion, it's a great message and invitation that you are sending to the rest of City Councillors. It's that time of the year again. I want to invite each and every one of you to the western Canada's largest winter festival in my ward: St. Boniface. I was going to bring my sash this morning but unfortunately I forgot it on the bench at the entrance, so thank you for this. It's western Canada's largest winter festival. It's the time to go out and celebrate winter; look at the world renowned snow sculptures; incredible music festival and wonderful voyageur park which is Whittier Park, most of the rest of the year and I know that you're all getting an invitation on February 15th for the actual opening ceremonies. Some of you were there last year, it's that same sort of event. There's going to be a fun and frolic for the whole family inside and out. Lots of music and lots of fun so get your long johns out and come out to the festival, February 15th. Thank you

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Vandal. We'd like to have a motion to adopt the minutes of our December 12 meeting. Councillor Eadie so moves. Thank you.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
January 30, 2013

MINUTES

Councillor Eadie moves that the minutes of the meeting held on December 12, 2012, be taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. After yesterday, it's kind of a relief; we have no delegations, so we'll just move right on to the agenda. And Mayor Katz, report from January the 16th.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 16, 2013**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 4.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. EPC, January 23rd.

**REPORT "A" OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 23, 2013**

Mayor Katz: I'll introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Executive Policy Committee, by-laws.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Mayor Katz: I move following by-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 5/2013, 6/2013, 7/2013, 8/2013, 9/2013..oh, are there motions, Mr. Speaker? 10/2013.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 5/2013, By-law No. 6/2013, By-law No. 7/2013, By-law No. 8/2013, By-law No. 9/2013, By-law No. 10/2013.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-laws numbered 5/2013 to 10/2013, both inclusive, be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried

Clerk: By-laws numbers 5/2013 to 10/2013, both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: And I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 5/2013 to 10/2013 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question period. We're moving right along. Councillor Mayes was first.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions. I don't want to appear to be...is there a microphone? My question... I was struck yesterday, there was...well I wanted to...we all spoke well yesterday of Mike Ruta and I've had some very good meetings over the past couple of weeks with Dave Wardrop and the Sachers and Mr.

Thorgrimson, so...and I appreciate your admonition yesterday, don't attack people who aren't here to respond, but there is a question I want to ask about a thing called the "SIFF" Program, Western Economic Development and our Community Services Department's handling of that. I was at a very good event last week. Federal Government, Shelly Glover, to her credit, announcing \$75,000 in funding for the Windsor Park Golf Course and Nordic Centre, cross country ski lighting. I went to that event. Unfortunately the way I found out anything about this event, which is on City-owned property, is through Madam Glover's office. In fact, they started asking me some questions and I had to say "I have no idea. No one from the City has given me any information on this." I did have a meeting back in October with the C.A.O. and Mr. Wightman about this whole "SIFF" Program and how at least the non-EPC Councillors were not being given any information on this, and I questioned some of the priorities the City had raised. We're in a situation now where I've had to say to community groups in my ward, "You were beaten out by a City proposal but it's okay because I was totally in the dark. I would have warned you that you were up against the City but I didn't know anything about it." So my question is, what kind of report are we going to get and are we going to have a chance, all of us, to review the priorities that have been laid out in these infrastructure applications to the Federal Government, because right now I'm literally in the position of saying to groups in my ward, "I'm sorry I don't know what the City has put forward. I don't know what the City's priorities are" and that causes me a lot of concern.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Mayes, I appreciate the question. I think it's a very good one. I can tell you that I have had the opportunity to attend some "SIFF" announcements. Just recently I was in St. Norbert and the good Councillor Swandel was there who is a non-EPC member, but obviously he was there and aware of it, the announcement. The library in St. Boniface as well. And what I can assure Councillor Mayes is I know when this program came into effect, it was Councillor Glover's office that made the City aware of it and asked the City to put in whatever their priorities are. I know there is a list that was submitted and I would very much be more than happy to undertake to get a copy of that to Councillor Mayes and any other Councillor who would like that. There is no reason for anybody not to know what our departments have listed as things that have to be done when there's an opportunity to get funding from the Federal Government, so I would consider that a pleasure.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Mayes: Second question follows up on that. I would also like the opportunity, I think we all would, to take a look at the priorities and have a discussion of that. If Mr. Wightman's indicated that he would like renovations or upgrades to Roland Michener Arena, perhaps that's not agreed to by the area Councillor. If he's put in some proposal for a water park at the Canoe Club, I wouldn't agree with that, so will we have an opportunity for some feed-back to discuss whatever priorities have been identified by the City staff?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is in any way, shape or form an unreasonable request. My understanding is this was specifically done by the Department the same way that roads are, when they consider something to be poor or fair or good, you know, hopefully the experts are making that decision. By the same token, I very much support the idea of Councillors being involved and knowing what's going on in their wards, so yeah, I would be happy to discuss that and have dialogue between the Department and the Councillors, and obviously I think that would start from them knowing what may or may not be approved because I don't know what's been approved and what the Federal Government's planning to put money in. We find out when they make those decisions.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Mayes: Still don't have my light on. Is this...

Mr. Speaker: They're not working.

Councillor Mayes: ...a bad signal. Third question on a different topic and that is Manitoba, as I think we all know, has been selected...well it's Manitoba's turn to host the Canada Games in 2017. We don't have to beat out any other Province. It's Manitoba's. The bid put forward by the City of Brandon has now been rejected. I know, I've talked to Councillor Steen in his capacity as Recreation Coordinator on the Council. He is interested, I think, and supportive of a bid for the 2017 games. Some people think the Canada Games are too small potatoes, but I notice Winnipeg hosted the Western Canada Summer Games as recently as 1990 and there's a plaque downstairs commemorating that. There was a report in the media...and I want to commend the Mayor actually for supporting Brandon's bid and offering the Pan Am Pool because that was their main issue was that they didn't have the right size pool, but for whatever reason Brandon's bid did not succeed. My question is, there was a media report a week or two ago that City Council of

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
January 30, 2013

Winnipeg had said “no”. We’d already said “no” to making a bid and I just want to clarify that, I don’t need details or ask details on where things are going, but I just wanted clarified, we have not officially said “no” to putting in a bid for the games in 2017?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Mayes Mr. Speaker, number one I’m not going to reiterate everything that Councillor Mayes said, but he is absolutely accurate. Brandon, unfortunately, was not successful. I was contacted by the people of Brandon and they basically told me that the key reason they were turned down was because their aquatic facility did not meet the needs. It didn’t have enough lanes. I did speak to the Mayor of Brandon, Mayor Shari Decter Hirst, and told her if that was the case, then we’d be happy to host the aquatic events here in Winnipeg. I wrote a letter to that effect. I also wrote a letter to the Committee Chair letting them know that. I have not got a response. I can also tell you that I believe last week, I had a meeting with, I guess I would call a semi-Committee, regarding the possibility of having the games here. I can tell you that I think Councillor Mayes has just realized once again, don’t always believe everything you read in the media or hear in the media. There’s obviously no truth to the fact that Council has turned it down. By the same token, I can also let you know that I spoke to the Premier on this topic, and obviously one of the key priorities is that if the games are here, we want to make sure there are some legacy projects, and that is a complete up to date as of right now.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question involves the decision which was finalized yesterday in the budget to withdraw from the Poverty Reduction Council and the Peg City Indicators Programs as a partner. And as I mentioned yesterday in my speech, the Peg City Indicators was a partnership that was specifically mentioned on page 21 of the Sustainable Winnipeg as one of our enabling strategies that we were going to be participating in with the Province, the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, the United Way and other partners. Many people would like to know what this decision that we made yesterday means, and on top of that, the decision to no longer partner with the Poverty Reduction Strategy also has many people worried. That group is working on bringing forward a ten-year plan with us as partners obviously as the City and the Province and others to address homelessness along the lines of what happened in Alberta in an initiative that was led by their two major cities with their Province, so we all agree that the City can’t tackle poverty alone. But these cuts take things to a new level and they raise the question, and this is my question: Is it true that the City of Winnipeg is no longer interested in partnering with other levels of government, the community and the private sector to develop a meaningful strategy to address homelessness and poverty. Is this not our department or are we going to be involved in our partners in developing a strategy? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Gerbasi, no it is not true.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well I really look forward to hearing how we’re going to do it but thank you. It was argued by some yesterday in the budget debate that Winnipeg is giving out too many grants and I would like to just question those numbers since I don’t think we’re comparing apples to apples since Assiniboine Park, for example, is included in the grants which is really just our own park. But, so I would argue with that. But my question is this. After the discussion yesterday, many people are worried, and some of the comments made, that this is only the beginning of reducing the City’s commitment to support non-profit museums, arts groups, crime prevention, small community non-profits, and I’d like to ask the Mayor if he will continue to vote in future budgets to reduce...I know you can’t say what you’ll do next year, but what’s your principle in terms of going in that direction and reducing our support to these organizations in the future?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, first of all I thank you for the question. Number one, I think as you are aware of, this Council and Councils before us made significant contributions through grants to many worthy organizations, and I sincerely doubt you will see that stop in my humble opinion. I think that will continue. By the same token, there are many who feel that we have to look at the big picture, and hopefully we can set up a process to look at grants, how grants actually get approved, and they’re done based on what I would say an open process as opposed to someone having a favourite this or that and somehow something appearing and then 20 years later it would still be there. There are many worthy causes in the City. I think the City of Winnipeg does make contributions on a regular basis, has continued to fund all sorts of organizations, and there’s very little doubt in my mind that that will

continue. By the same token, there are many Councillors who believe that we should be looking at the process and the whole grants scenario.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Gerbasi: My last question is more related to my first question was: it does really concern me that one of our enabling strategies in OurWinnipeg which was just approved is basically just completely reversed by the decision to cancel the Peg City Indicators, because the wording on Page 21 of A Sustainable Winnipeg specifically says we will fund that as a partner in that strategy and now we're not in that partnership, so how do you explain, and how do you tell people to have faith in our City plan and that it actually means something and it's not just a piece of paper?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think the realities are we've been talking for a long time about some of the root problems okay? And whenever we talk about crime, poverty is always part of that equation. And I'm sure you've heard me on the floor of Council on many occasions say if you're going to tackle crime, it takes everybody to be part of that. It takes the City of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba, the Government of Canada, the private sector. In addition to that it takes faith-based groups, etc., etc. No one can do that alone. That's just the facts. We all have to join in, and I can assure you Mr. Speaker, that the City of Winnipeg will be part of that. By the same token, you can be part of something. It doesn't mean you're always going to be equal to the largest contributor to that, but we certainly will be part of it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, did you have your hand up earlier? Alright you're next.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Mayor, just a couple of questions. First one is regarding Veolia, our water partner I guess, or our waste management partner. I'm trying to saying this...I don't want to be political. I'm trying not to be, but a serious concern is that do you support...do you know if it's true or not because I believe it is true, but again I just heard this, that Viola is installing equipment at our water treatment plant and our waste treatment plant, that they exclusively have any idea how to use it. Our staff aren't engaged in understanding how the equipment works. Are you aware of that?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Orlikow I thank you for the question. So that's once again, that's how rumours get started. Mr. Speaker, we have no partners. They are not a partner. The Councillor knows they're not a partner, so why did he even say that is beyond me. They've been retained to provide a service. End of story. And what has just been pointed out by the Councillor I have no knowledge of, but is certainly something that I would be happy to look into because I find that hard to believe considering they're working for us just like any other contractor providing a service and they are answering to us, so I can assure you that before the day is over, I'll be contacting, you know, the utility and finding out exactly, and if I could get any more details from the Councillor, it would be much appreciated. Whether there is any truth to this, I'd be surprised. Whether it's a rumour started by some, quite possible, but I will get to the bottom or it I can assure you.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, and that's all I do hope for. I do actually consider anybody who works for the City, contractor or not, we're all working together as partners, so I don't regard it that way.

The other one I'd like to talk about just quickly is the proposed Rapid transit route that will be presented to the Standing Policy Committee tomorrow. This is the new route that will take...been suggested that it will run parallel to Parker Avenue and it's going to go out to Waverley and then it's going to hitch back up to Bishop Grandin way, do a "dog leg". My question is quite simply that the report that, the 108 pages, was released yesterday. This gives the community two days. Two days' notice and this is the same community that had to deal with the parker land swap. So we've now given this community two days to go through 108 pages with things such as proposed potential overpass suggested at a route that is ridiculous. So I guess my question is, do you believe, and it's almost a rhetorical question because I know you as well, do you believe that's enough time for the community to be engaged and actually be able to come and speak to the matter?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Orlikow Mr. Speaker, absolutely not. I would totally agree that based on the information that has just been shared, no. Two days is not reasonable. There's no question about that. I know a

Committee was struck quite a while ago. They worked on it for a long time. They put different proposals out there. They landed on one which was just announced. I can tell Councillor Orlikow that I have not had the opportunity to read the report. Everybody has many responsibilities you know. Your family, your job, etc. etc. So no and I think there should be some discussion immediately to give more time to the public regardless what...if any Councillor asked that question the answer should be the same Mr. Speaker. Not enough.

Mr. Speaker: Good, thanks. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. In yesterday's meeting, there was a discussion about grants and the person in charge of the budget said that we give \$38 million in grants and that exceeds somehow more than any other big City, or City in Canada contributes. Now I went through that list and we have things like the Convention Centre in there. We have the Winnipeg Jets, we have the Goldeyes, we have the Winnipeg...well I don't think the Blue Bombers, they had a little grant, but there was a number of...well, the Arts Council's another one which is an entity that was created by the City of Winnipeg. CentreVenture is listed as one of those, another entity that the City of Winnipeg was instrumental in establishing a number of years ago. I don't really see those as grants. Those are, I think...I wouldn't consider those to be the grants to these not-for-profit organizations who are trying to achieve good things for our community like museums and stuff, so my question really is, if we are going to continue to look at this, should we actually be considering our Assiniboine Park. I mean, as far as I understand it you know, it's still the City of Winnipeg. It's just managed and run by what you might call a private entity or a conservancy group, but can you answer that question?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would say that many of the items that Councillor Eadie mentioned to me would probably, you could debate whether they're legal agreements or whether they're grants. I mean, and there's different types of grants, and I know we have different categories. I think the realities are the City does put a lot of money into grants. There's no question about it and I think they're doing the right thing. If the debate is, what is and isn't a grant, that could be a discussion for another time. It doesn't make a difference whether you call it, you know, previous Councils entered into legal agreements with certain entities. If you want to call it a grant, call it a grant. If you want to call it something else, call it something else. I don't think the debate was on \$38 million whatever the case may be and as I said earlier, I think there is merit in looking, and for all of Council to look into the process and I'm not talking about the current grants, but there's always new ones coming up as well. It'd be nice if we had a process and knew exactly how we could handle it for future applications for grants as well, but whether the number is 38 or 50 million, it is what it is and I'm not going to argue or discuss that.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, well I mean the argument, the debate was yesterday on the budget and \$38 million was thrown out there to sort of back pedal or make it look like we're not doing something that bad, but do you believe that we should be supporting not-for-profit groups that are achieving good things in our neighbourhoods by helping people take responsibility for their lives?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I think the proof is in the pudding Mr. Speaker. Look at all the organizations that we are supporting right now. Councillor has seen the list. We obviously do support them. We support great organizations in the inner-city who are helping families and children. I believe that there's an opportunity for them as well and we're right throughout the entire, every single ward we are supporting organizations, so I'm not sure what I mean, why the Councillor would ask that. We're doing it. Talk is talk, and Mr. Speaker, when you're in a debate, I don't know about you but I sit here and listen to stuff that I know is nonsense but people say whatever they want to say. That's your priority. We live in a democratic society. You have that right.

Mr. Speaker: Last question?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you and to some degree I would agree with that. Well, no, I mean if you're going to make a position in public, you should make your position and stand by it right. But anyway, my third question is sort of off topic, but regarding Councillor Orlikow's question, I'm just wondering, I thought the Mayor attended a seminar after there was community consultations about the different routes to take for this, what are we calling it, the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor, we had a seminar in there where we had a discussion about the consultation and the roads. I can't remember. Was the Mayor actually in attendance at that seminar?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, that seminar was led by Deepak Joshi and I was one of the few Councillors in attendance.

Mr. Speaker: Okay that's it for Councillor Eadie. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just want to follow up on where Councillor Orlikow was at. I've actually asked to appear in delegation tomorrow with regard to this report coming forward and a designated alignment for the Rapid Transit Corridor going south. There seems to be a bit of a disconnect here. I'm having trouble understanding who's actually in charge of this project. It seems like the group that's working on deciding on this is either funded or controlled or in some way managed by the Province more so than by the City. Or at least there's a great deal of influence there. And I'm wondering if in light of what Councillor Orlikow is saying, as one of the Councillors representing the area, I represent a great deal of the area that's affected by Rapid transit. Is there not a better way to be doing this because I don't feel like we're being properly engaged in this process. At least I don't feel it. I can't speak for Councillor Orlikow, but it seems like the issues that we put forward as local issues just go and get talked about in this group, committee or whatever it's called, but they don't really rise to the surface in the deliberations, and as Councillor Orlikow correctly said, you know it's a couple of days to go through 108 pages of information. In particular I look at the alignment going out to the Parker lands verses the alignment down Pembina Highway and I don't know that you need to choose one or the other, but I don't really have a good place to vet that and to get into the detail of it. Is there a better way...can we get into some sort of a Council seminar or some sort of an engagement with the Councillors that are most directly affected as part of this process rather than just being...it seems like this is going on away from us rather than including us, and I hope that we can find a way to do that. I'll bring the question up for Councillor Vandal later on and if need be I'll appear in delegation tomorrow, but I think we need to do a little bit more work here because as far as I recall, the City operates the transit system. The Province is a funder and I'm not sure who has total control of this project right now. So perhaps you could respond to those comments more than questions through you Mr. Speaker to the Mayor.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker first of all, I'm hoping that everyone here is aware of the fact that a committee was set up quite a while ago with a representative from the City of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba, as well as the University of Manitoba. That was the Committee, it was struck, they came up with potential routes for this. I believe, it was maybe a few months ago where they actually had an open house where they showed the three options that existed and they showed all three options and then just recently we heard they've landed on one. I'm also of the opinion, and I'm hoping that Councillor Orlikow will confirm, that I mean I think the Councillor has already expressed, you know, certain concerns on certain issues, and has had discussions with, you know, City representatives on concerns that he has hoping to get them all addressed. I know that Councillor Swandel was actually I believe one of the Councillors that was at that seminar that took place not that long ago. So I'm wondering if maybe Councillor Swandel could be a little bit more specific and tell me exactly what it is he would like to see and then maybe we could discuss that further.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: I guess I'll do this in the form of a "are you aware" question seeing as there are no preambles during supplementary questions, but it would appear to be that there's some low hanging food out there. When we started conversations about bus rapid transit we talked about the flexibility of it and being one of the key components of choosing bus rapid transit. You can be on the regular road system; you can be off at times. I see some low hanging food out there along Pembina Highway. There's some pieces of it that are just ripe for re-development including transit-oriented development and pieces of this corridor. The specific options that the University...I don't want to get into that because there's some bigger picture planning stuff going on there. But what I need to see is some flexibility on this. We're not welded into one particular alignment. That if there's a redevelopment opportunity that comes along that could be tied into this, there's some incremental taxes that maybe could be tied into it that we can go there. I would also add Mr. Speaker...

Councillor Wyatt: Question Mr. Speaker. What is the question?

Councillor Swandel: ...as an "are you aware" question just to help Councillor Wyatt remember what I said at the beginning of this, that there's already a lot of transit oriented development going on in what we refer to as the Fort Rouge Yard site. But to date I don't believe they've broken ground other than clearing. I don't think there's any sewer or pipe or retention ponds or roads have gone in there yet, so why we would go out into another completely empty piece.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, what is the question?

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
January 30, 2013

Councillor Swandel: ...so I will

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Glad to see somebody can manage the decorum around here. So those "are you aware" comments are on the table for the Mayor to respond to. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Still not sure I figured out the question okay. But Mr. Speaker, I think it's a well-known fact that Councillor Swandel has been very vocal on the fact that sometimes he thinks there are stretches of Pembina highway you could use existing roads. He's made that clear on many occasions and you know, maybe he's not a big supporter of the proposal that's been put forward, but certainly is his right to do that. But you know we are going to have public hearings and we're going to go through a process and I'm sure the Councillor will be there as I'm sure many other Councillors and hopefully members of the public, but this has been ongoing for a long time. As a matter of fact, I've been getting asked what's been taking that group so long to make a decision. Now they finally made a decision, they had an open house, they got input from the public and this is where they've landed, so let's see if we can get something done. If not there, then obviously we'll have to go somewhere else, but keep something in mind. It's this group of people that will make the final decision Mr. Speaker. I mean, you know, recommendations come to us, that's why we sit here, and we weigh in on it, we give our opinions and eventually we vote and we move forward. So the process is ongoing and let's go forward. The only thing I do agree with is the previous question that the public should have the opportunity to review things and have the time to come and make their delegations and their thoughts known.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any further comments, questions for the Mayor? Okay you've got one minute and six seconds Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Just very quickly, it's an awareness question. In terms of the Fort Rouge Yards was questioned by the last person asking questions, so simply is the Mayor aware that the developer for that particular piece is taking bids right now from the builders who will start the building of those units at the Fort Rouge Yards?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I'm not the manager of the construction site okay. But the realities are, my understanding is that project is moving forward and I believe that the Councillor may be accurate that they have been putting things out for tender. You know, maybe when Council is done he may want to speak to Councillor Gerbasi. She may know more but that's what I know to date.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. And that concludes question period for the Mayor. Standing Policy Committee, Property and Development, Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JANUARY 15, 2013**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of January 15th. I'd like to advise first that Item 16 has been laid over by Executive Policy Committee to its meeting of February 6th and I'd like to move Items 1 through 15 as consent.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to...I don't want to pull it off but I'd like to be recorded in opposition to No. 4, please.

Mr. Speaker: All right. One through fifteen, all those in favour? With 4 and 12 for Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Swandel in opposition. Councillor Browaty, carry on.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS**

Councillor Browaty: I have a motion here, that's Item No. 1. I'd like to move it.

Motion No. 1

**Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Fielding,**

WHEREAS:

- (a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 111/2012, The City of Winnipeg ("the City") authorized the expropriation of the following lands:

the lands taken for Sturgeon Road, as the same are shown bordered on Plan Deposit 936/2012, prepared by Kenneth Max Yerex of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

("the Lands")

for the purpose of the construction of the Sturgeon Road Bridge Project, and executed a Declaration of Expropriation dated October 24, 2012 ("the Declaration");

- (b) *The Declaration provided in section 2 that the Lands were expropriated free of encumbrances except for Caveat No. 80-18197, which grants to:*
- (i) *the Manitoba Telephone System certain rights over the Lands with respect to telephone lines and related equipment and facilities, and*
- (ii) *the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board certain rights over the Lands with respect to electric power lines and related equipment and facilities;*
- (c) *The City served notice of the intended expropriation upon all owners of the lands intended to be expropriated, and published notice of the intended expropriation in a newspaper having general circulation in the locality in which the said lands are situate, pursuant to section 1 of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act;*
- (d) *The statutory period for owners to object to the intended expropriation has expired, and the confirming authority has not been served with any notices of objection;*
- (e) *Both the Manitoba Telephone System and the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board have, by means of execution of Plan Deposit 936/2012, formally consented to the City's acquisition of their respective interests in the Lands;*

AND WHEREAS in light of the consent referred to in (e) above, the City may now proceed to expropriate the Lands free of encumbrances, which it is advantageous for the City to do;

AND WHEREAS under The Expropriation Act Council of the City may confirm the Declaration with such modification thereof as it considers proper;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

- (1) *The Declaration is amended to provide that the Lands are expropriated free of encumbrances; and*
- (2) *The Declaration as amended herein and accordingly replaced by an Amended Declaration of Expropriation dated January 30, 2013 is hereby CONFIRMED.*

The Lands except:

- a) *mines, minerals and named substances which are excepted from or not included in the Certificate of Title of the registered owner of the surface under The Real Property Act or are not owned by the owner of the surface under The Registry Act; and*
- b) *reservations in favour of the Crown as excepted from the Title of the owner of the surface, or to which Title is subject by implication under the provisions of The Real Property Act.*

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
January 30, 2013

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Okay, do you have that in front of you? Those opposed on motion 1? Don't need to, no.

Councillor Browaty: Apparently, it's been before this Council and it's not required, they, the Clerk's advised.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour again? Opposed? Motion carried.

Councillor Eadie: Speaker Nordman.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Item no....

Councillor Eadie: Speaker Nordman. Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, sir.

Councillor Eadie: or privilege I can't remember which it is. There was a whole bunch of motions introduced I have the signature, the seconder on one but I haven't had time to read any new motions so if...if there are any more motions coming up, if they could be read into the record for me, that would make it a little simpler.

Mr. Speaker: Motion No. 4 actually was mislabeled in the process here. Standing Policy Committee for PCS, it really should be Property and Development. Councillor Browaty, do you want to move this one? Or that's actually Councillor Havixbeck, I'm sorry. It's automatic referral? Okay. Okay, Andrew go ahead, and Clerk, read it.

Motion No. 4

**Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Vandal,**

WHEREAS a fire resulted in the Elmwood Community Centre needing to be rebuilt;

AND WHEREAS the funding for this came from insurance of approximately \$900,000 and the 2013 Capital Budget;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Administration provide a report about all civic buildings, their replacement values, liabilities and the current level of insurance coverage.

Mr. Speaker: And that's automatic referral. Okay, by-laws. Councillor Browaty.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND AND 3RD READING**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that By-law No. 136/2012 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 136/2012.

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-law No. 136/2012 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

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

Councillor Browaty: I move that the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law 14/2013, 15/2013, 16/2013, 17/2013, 18/2013, 19/2013, 20/2013, 21/2013.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 14/2013, By-law No. 15/2013, By-law No. 16/2013, By-law No. 17/2013, By-law No. 18/2013, By-law No. 19/2013, By-law No. 20/2013 and 21/2013.

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-laws numbered 14/2013 to 21/2013, both inclusive be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 14/2013 to 21/2013, both inclusive.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 14/2013 to 21/2013, both inclusive be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question period for Property and Development, Councillor Browaty is open to your comments, suggestions. Are you aware? No? Seeing none, all right we'll move on to the Standing Policy Committee for Protection and Community Services, Councillor Fielding.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED JANUARY 14, 2013**

Councillor Fielding: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm...I'd like to move, not consent agenda but the report of February...I'm sorry, January 14th and I'm going to move Items 1, 3, 4 and 5.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to stand down Item 3 but I wish an opportunity to speak to it.

Mr. Speaker: Yeah, you've got to stand it down.

Councillor Fielding: I'll stand it down, which number?

Councillor Fielding: Three, okay. Item 3 as well?

Mr. Speaker: And Councillor Smith? Four. So we're just...

Councillor Fielding: Okay, so then we're left with one and five, is that right?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, yes Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: I'm looking at the motion that is why we're standing down on Item No. 2, the motion and the recommendation seem to be the same. The recommendation is that it's a negotiated memorandum, and this motion is about negotiating a memorandum, so I don't know that they're not...could you let me finish please, Councillor Gerbasi. Can you give me a ruling here, Mr. Speaker?

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Before we get into the rest, let's move consent agenda 1 and 5, all right? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Okay. We have 2, 3 and 4 that are...

Councillor Gerbasi: Two is a motion.

Mr. Speaker: Item 2.

Item 2 – Downtown Cadet Patrol Program

Motion No. 2

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) requires agreement by both parties;

AND WHEREAS the terms of the MOU regarding the Downtown Cadet Program with the Downtown BIZ have not yet been approved by the Downtown BIZ Board and negotiations are still occurring;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 2 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated January 14, 2013 on the Downtown Cadet Program be referred back to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services to allow time for completion of negotiation of the Memorandum of Understanding with the Downtown BIZ.

Mr. Speaker: Scott, please introduce that, please.

Councillor Fielding: Sure, I'll introduce the motion. I think that there's some discussion and amendments, so willing to hear what the member has to say about it.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is simply a referral motion, referring it back to the Standing Policy Committee. The whereases are just trying to give some explanation. It's really nothing out of order I don't believe. It's just basically asking that it go back to the Standing Committee. And the reason why I'm asking that is that what this clause is is a Memorandum of Understanding with the Downtown BIZ regarding the downtown Cadet Program which is eventually, when this is signed, will be an agreement between the City and the Downtown BIZ. The Downtown BIZ will give the City a hundred thousand dollars of its business members' money to support the Cadet Program downtown. As Council is aware, the Downtown BIZ had an outreach program prior to this the decision was ultimately made to move to using the cadets for that program. And at the time, you know, the BIZ has had some, you know, initially there were some concerns about it, that changed and you know, because the Outreach was really a specifically focused on working with down and out people in the downtown in a very sensitive, helpful way, not necessarily a policing approach. But ultimately that was resolved It went forward. The political decision was made that we were going to, instead, we were going to supply ten Cadets in partnership with the BIZ and they were going to pay a hundred thousand dollars. That was all fine but that was based on a Memorandum of Understanding that everyone had agreed on. So that, what just came to my attention and I apologize for this last minute kind of thing, it was at the Standing Committee and with two budgets and everything we were dealing with, I didn't really get a chance to figure out all of this out but what happened was that the particular Memorandum of Understanding is not been...the negotiations really haven't been fully completed and the board, as you know how BIZ boards work, they have to vote on it and they have to agree to spend a hundred thousand dollars of their budget. So, that hasn't happened. There may have been some discussions. I know Councillor Swandel was involved when he was the Downtown Chair. There might have been some discussions with maybe even one member of the board or something. I don't know what happened in the past but what's happening now is that there's a memorandum in front of us that the second party has not had...taken to their board and has not finished having the negotiation. So, all I'm trying to do, I mean, and I just want to warn you that the concern I have, too, is that if we proceed without the memorandum being agreed to by the other party you know it really won't be a decision that means anything because they can't give us the hundred thousand dollars unless their board agrees and I don't...and I also just want to make a comment about partnership. This is a partnership, this is the downtown businesses, a respected organization that does a lot in our downtown as we all know, who wants...who was funding part of our safety program; who was funding part of our policing program and they stepped in to do that initially because there was a gap in service that we as a city can't afford to provide and they are giving us funding so, is this how...you know, I don't want to treat our partners in a disrespectful way. I'd rather not be having this discussion on the floor of Council. I would've preferred to simply have if referred back and have it dealt with privately and have them negotiate and work this all out, that's what I'd really prefer to do but I know there's some people chomping at the bit to bring in a bunch of previous conversations and whatever. The point is: I'm on the board of this BIZ and I've been part of these discussions for years and I've talked to the executive director and he's been very clear that they are close to being ready to sign the memorandum but there are specific things in it that still need to be discussed and then brought to the board. So all I'm asking Council to do is give us a little more time to do that and then we'll have our, the program will be complete, that the program that was changed into this kind of a program. So I'm just asking for this to be referred back for those discussions to happen and then for a memorandum that both sides have agreed to be

signed. I think it's fairly simple. I just wanted to make sure everyone understands and I don't think we should be ramming Memorandums of Understanding down people's throats. It's kind of an ironic thing to be doing. You know, it's about understanding and about working together and about partnership and I believe the BIZ want...they're very close to signing it but I mean they have a process there, a group out there that have to answer to their businesses and their members that are paying for this, or paying a significant portion of it. So I didn't want to go on too long that I know, and I'll respond to any concerns that come up in the debate. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: It's unfortunate you didn't get to rule on my point of order because we would've had to, I don't think we would've had to go through all this. I don't have any problem with what Councillor Gerbasi is saying; all I'm pointing out is there is no Memorandum of Understanding here. All this is asking to go out and do a negotiated Memorandum of Understanding. There's no Memorandum of Understanding attached. There is the letter of intent, was done a long time ago, the principles are there, that's why I say the motion is out of order. There's no Memorandum of Understanding attached to be signed by both parties. We're not agreeing, I think we're saying it's got to be negotiated. Exact wording in the motion is that a negotiated Memorandum of Understand...or Memorandum of Agreement between the Downtown Winnipeg BIZ Improvement Zone and the City of Winnipeg be approved and that the proper officers be the City authorized to do all thing necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing. We're trying to do exactly what Councillor Gerbasi is asking for. That's my only point.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Vandal: Either there is an agreement or there's not an agreement. I'm going to...and if there's not an agreement, the wording is kind awkward because it says a negotiated MOA, Memorandum of Agreement between the BIZ and the City be approved. So you would think that there would be something attached, there's nothing attached. So my question to Councillor Fielding as Chair, is is there an agreement or is there not an agreement?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: I just wanted to point out a couple of things on this, that you know while I can appreciate where Councillor Gerbasi is coming from, it would seem that there is no Memorandum of Agreement. However, I can recall that when I was Chair of Protection and Community Services, the last meeting I had been part of was in May and this agreement was to proceed in June. And prior to that, there was a meeting in about January and prior to that there was a meeting in about January, 2011. And so we keep putting this off almost, in terms of moving forward with it. And so I'm concerned that any kind of an extension, I mean, maybe the wording can be changed here to say that you know, an agreement needs to be forthcoming from this group within 30 days it just seems like it's delay after delay and so that was all I wanted to bring forward, that information that while there is no Memorandum of Understanding, how long can you keep putting this item off? So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: With the comments to this point, I see you Councillor Eadie. You know, a motion to refer is always in order. At this point, I think that's what the chair would be open to and we would look at putting this over as Councillor Havixbeck said, something to the effect of 30 days, so.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order. The Councillor for St. Norbert does have a point of order. That a point of order should be responded to because it is point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Wyatt: Therefore I call point of order as well. So I think from what I...on the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Councillor Vandal: Which one?

Councillor Wyatt: I think, Mr. Speaker, you know this motion does seem rather redundant because this is exactly what the report says we're doing so.

Councillor Gerbasi: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. ..the motion.

Councillor Wyatt: No, I'm explaining my point of order.

Councillor Swandel: And you can still speak to the motion.

Mr. Speaker: I'm going to rule that this is in order. All right, all right, all right. I'm...my ruling is that this motion is in order, okay. All right. At this point we have Councillor Smith; he wanted to speak, followed by Councillor Eadie and Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Smith: Let me first of all say, I represent part of the area that the Downtown BIZ. Jenny represents the south part, I represent the north part of Portage and I support the idea of giving more time. It seems reasonable to do so. And I know that it will be worked out; there's really no conflict. You know, it will all be smoothed out once more discussions take place. So I'm supportive.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Speaker Nordman. It does say that the City should move to sign an agreement of Memorandum of Understanding and if I knew that the situation existed when it came to our Protection and Community Services, you know, I do want to know what kind of agreement we are signing and as far as I understand it, there is no Memorandum of Understanding to sign. I know it's not, I'm not a lawyer, but it seems to me that the second party to a Memorandum of Understanding should agree and I'd like to see this come back to our committee and know that there's a Memorandum of Understanding that's agreed upon between the two parties who will be signing it, which is we're giving direction and so I stand in support of this referral motion. It just you know there's letters of intent but a letter of intent is whatever. Just I don't see any problem with this as I understand it, I've seen the e-mails, the Director, Executive Director of the Downtown BIZ says they're close, but there's some things in the Memorandum of Understanding and there's a number of business people in this room who have negotiated and been part of signing contracts and basically this understanding is a contractual obligations as far as I know and you know, give them some time to figure it out and just refer it. I don't see the problem. Yes, it's taken quite some time but I think the Downtown BIZ believes that the Cadets need to be out there doing their work and we're adding 10 more so that our streets in the downtown area are a place where people feel comfortable to be. So I don't see a problem with this so I'll be voting for the motion to refer.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding to close.

Councillor Fielding: Sure, thank you Mr. Speaker. You know, at the very least there's a bit of confusion in terms...

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, Gerbasi will be closing.

Councillor Gerbasi: Processes (inaudible)...

Mr. Speaker: That's okay, go ahead Scott.

Councillor Gerbasi: Just quickly and I realize that we're likely going to refer this back, I thank the Chair, I'm sorry for taking up people's time, see everyone is impatient it's already 10:30 but it's just that there is...it isn't clear where the status of this is. I appreciate the wording is a little unclear but I have reason to believe that there isn't that some need for further negotiation on the memorandum itself, so to make sure it's agreed on by both parties so let's give them the time to do that. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Sure. You know I'm going to agree to the amendment, I guess...or rather, the referral. At the very least you know there's a bit of confusion in terms of what the BIZ thing is happening versus what's happening and what Councillor Swandel mentioned is exactly accurate. I have had a conversation with the Deputy Chief of Police on this matter and you know if we laid it over a month, it's...put it back for a month, there isn't a concern so you know just in the essence of being cautious that you know we will send it back at least that's where I'll be supporting it, just a couple of points I do want to make on this whole thing, I did receive some e-mails, I think everyone did from Stefano you know, Executive Director of the BIZ. I can't say I agree with everything that's in his letter because I also was at Executive Policy Committee and Council where there clearly was a commitment for the hundred thousand dollars and at least some of the language in here makes me a little concerned that they seem to be moving back from that. And so if that is the case or if there's another program, looks like they're looking for some sort of funding, I'm a little concerned about that because if that hundred thousand dollars, you know the commitment was made, is being reneged upon that would jeopardize the program. So I don't think that's the case but just in some of the language that was brought forward, some concerns with it. But to be safe, more safe than sorry, we'll put it back for the month. It's not going to have any financial implication, and it'll just you know, take a little bit of time at Protection, so.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Fielding. All right. Question on the motion. All those in favour? Opposed? Councillor Swandel in opposition. Motion carried. Thank you. Item No. 3 was stood down by...Councillor Havixbeck.

Item 3 – Agreement to extend the Winnipeg Police Service School Resource Officer Program in the Pembina Trails School Division

Councillor Fielding: Sure, yes, Mr. Speaker, I will move...I'll wait to hear the member's questions or concerns that she mentioned.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: It's not so much a question or concern, I just feel that this is a very important initiative and it goes hand-in-hand with another one that came out of the Protection and Community Services meeting two weeks ago. Last fall I raised a motion that was received as information by that committee about SROs. I think it's important that we are mindful of the tragedies that occurred in Connecticut when we look at this initiative, and when we think about the safety of our students and teachers in schools. Coincidentally, I think I have said it before but coincidentally, I was in Calgary meeting with the Calgary Police Services on the day of the Connecticut tragedies and looking at an initiative and how we can expand it. I've met with the school divisions, two school divisions so far, and I've heard an outpouring from parents and teachers who have written or called me about this who are very supportive about this. SROs build relationships in schools and in the community. And this is something that needs to be permanent and city wide and I will continue to push for this. This report is sort of the traditional report that comes forward to put it forward for the three year period, but I want us to really think about when we send our kids to school every day and we hope that they are safe. When my kids come home and tell me that there was a lock down whether it's real or for practice and they ask me if they're safe and I hear from school divisions that there's a real lock down nearly daily in the inner city, I'm very startled. And how do I answer my children? I say, "Yes, you are" and I do my best in my role with in our city to bring things like this forward and to continue to have these things. This initiative needs to be permanent. The motion that I brought forward actually went to the administration for review to come back to the Police Board eventually and it needs to be city wide and I will continue to push for that. The budget that was approved just yesterday allowed for one new SRO in our city. Still not all school divisions have access to an SRO and it's imperative and we need to step up and show leadership and continue to show leadership to expedite the use of SROs and dedicate additional resources to those needs. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any other comments? Oh, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Speaker Nordman. I rise to speak to this. I voted for this particular motion that came through Protection and Community Services because it is within the rights of the Pembina School Division to decide if they want to implement such a program, but what the public needs to understand is, is that the actual program that we have where police go into schools, it's never was in its intention to actually have an armed protector in the school. The whole purpose of this program is to have our officers, the Winnipeg Police Service, in the schools where they can earn the respect and establish relationships with youth and the people in the school. I am formerly a Trustee of the Seven Oaks School Division. It is a school division in which they need to make their own decision as to whether or not they want police officers in it. As I understand it's 75 percent of each officers, it's the cost of that school division. That particular school division has to make financial decisions. What its decision to do to make sure that our kids are safe in those schools, is every adult who works in that building needs to have a relationship. Every student has to have a relationship with at least one adult in that school so that there is an appreciation for who those kids are. To put an armed person in there and say "you know what, you are dangerous" puts pressure on those kids. It gives them the impression that somehow they are violent and they should not be trusted. When you have adults making relationships, proper relationships in the school with all the students, you alleviate a lot of that problem and when there is time, that there's something's going to go down between two schools or something, that adult will be informed by the other students who have respect for that adult. So if the whole idea here is that we want to put armed police officers to protect our kids in schools, that's wrong. Putting police officers in school is good but it's to establish relationships and respect for the Police Service who we know do a really good job and it's more of a community policing basis not an armed protection basis. So I will be voting in favour of this motion but I just thought we should be clear about what the purpose of officers in schools are.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further comments. Councillor Fielding to close.

Councillor Fielding: Sure. Well, thank you.

Councillor Havixbeck: I'm sorry, Councillor Smith I didn't catch him.

Councillor Smith: I wasn't going to join this debate but after hearing Councillor Havixbeck talk about schools in the inner city having lock down, and I represent part of the inner city and I haven't heard of any such number of schools having a lock down. So, I'm supportive of the clause but I just think it's so easy to make statements like that without any basis of fact. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steen.

Councillor Steen: I was in this meeting, too and I just want to make a note that I asked the police; they said they have never turned down a school that's asked for a police officer in their school. I think there's 11 right now and well, so it is working and it's up to the school right now to ask for the resource officer. That's all I want.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes. I'd just like to add to that and confirm what the Councillors are saying. I think Councillor Steen as well has tried to encourage...and I think Councillor Browaty, River East Transcona to support this program and to send a letter but the board there for whatever reason chooses not, they have to earmark funds, resources towards that as well. They choose not to, for whatever reason, and it's really, the schools don't belong to us, Mr. Speaker, they belong to the School Boards and the Province, but the police have been...I know the previous Chief talking to him. He's always said you know if a school division comes forward, we will work with them and we see what's happened here with the Pembina Trails which is great, so I think you know, there should be an understanding that we don't control the schools, Mr. Speaker. You know, the schools belong to the school divisions and the provincial government so.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Right. Just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I mean, I think it's a good program. Councillor Havixbeck is obviously passionate about this program. There's also been some good comments by some of the members of the committee, Councillor Eadie and Councillor Steen and yet, you know it seems to work well in the past with schools. Schools obviously have got to be a partner with it. There's a financial piece for them that makes sense to do it. You know, it's something that we asked our administration to report back on. At the end of the day, it's the Police Board that's going to be making these decisions on these things and you know if you ask my personal opinion, you know my priority would be...although I think this is a good program and continuing on on it but if you are able to find some more dollars for doing the Cadets, you know pound for pound, that is the best investment. I think right now that the City can make because they offset...you know they are able to help out police officers and police can get to there is where they really need to be as opposed to kind of directing traffic if lights go down or guarding a crime scene. So I think...you know I was just at a national conference that dealt with all these items and the auxiliary police officers or the cadets we call them is something that people are really looking at nationwide and so we've actually taken a leadership role of this and if you ask the Police, they say the Cadet Program's worked out even better than we thought. So I think if there's more dollars that is a big priority for myself. Also there is a...the provincial government just recently talked about the William Whyter in Councillor Eadie's area and making real focus in on the way in what they call the 21 block that live safe area obviously it's based on these areas and the Province is going to be unrolling kind of some initiatives in terms of that but a real focused campaign in these areas where there are some major issues, a whole bunch of issues is something I think that can be addressed and it really needs to be focused in on, but with that being said I think the program is working well right now and if we can review it and if there's an ability and the experts and the Police think that we can refine it and enhance it then let's hear what they have to say about it. I mean, you know, we obviously got some major crime issues here in the city. We need to look at all ideas and come up with a balance that makes sense. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Call the question. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item No. 4.

Item 4 – Taxi Hydrant Parking Zones

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Sure, well the essence of going to Mexico tomorrow morning, taking a taxi there, I'm more than happy to hear anything that you said about this. I'm not sure that they'll be parked in a hydrant area. So I'll wait here for Councillor Smith's comments on this.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Fielding: Not that my mind's already in Mexico.

Councillor Smith: As a person who takes a lot of taxis and also I'm a member of the Taxicab Board representing the City of Winnipeg, this is a good direction. You know, we don't have taxi stands around this city. Taxis drive around all the time and for environmental reasons it's useful to support this clause and secondly it prevents illegal parking. The cab driver has to be in the cab and if there is a fire, they can move the cab. So it protects that spot for such situations. So it's really a worthwhile clause. It really, we should've been doing this years ago. Calgary has been doing it and since it's been very successful in Calgary and we should really support this because we really...taxis are vital to this city. I know many people here don't seem to think so but it really is a vital part of the communication system of the city of Winnipeg and we should really have a lot of cab stands and we haven't done that. We really treated taxis as not important. It's very important to our city and I would hope we all support this clause.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to point out that it was almost two years ago that we brought this motion forward. It's a pretty basic report. You know, you could've got this information just by searching some agendas in other jurisdictions, particularly in Calgary. We could've done this in a month or two. It's taken us almost two years to do this. It's...you know, I think that's a bit of a wakeup call for us and we have a lot of these types of things that are brought forward by this council and they seem to languish out there somewhere. I don't know where it is but this one in particular if you look at this. I think this could...report could've been done easily in 30 days and all we're doing right now is we're just asking the provincial government now to give the authority to be able to do this. And when you look at how our downtown has been changing and growing and the amount of people that are coming down not just for hockey games for all kinds of events and nights out with dinners. You know the number of restaurants is increasing in our downtown, these taxis are over, more and more becoming...the drivers are becoming increasing, the drivers are becoming increasingly frustrated with the inability to be able to pick up their fares up at the different venues around downtown. We need to get this done and you know I won't dwell on it any more but...almost two years for something this basic which shouldn't take that long.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Yeah, I mean what more can I say to that? Ditto. I mean I agree with you in terms of the length that takes to do it. It seems like a pretty common sense approach. Calgary's done it obviously. It's a pilot project, they're going to look at different destinations in the downtown to do it. It's going to help with parking issues, it's going to help with people looking to get taxis; people you know, a whole bunch of things will happen. It's the taxicab drivers obviously would have to be in their car so they can't...kind of park there and leave there if there's a fire. It just makes a lot of good common sense and you know we really hope that the Province sees it that way. I'm assuming that they will but you never know. So with that I move it forward. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Question, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have no further motions. Question period. Motion 3, oh, absolutely we do have motion 3 which is automatic referral regarding Police Service and Winnipeg Transit so that will be referred back to...actually it's Public Works. Anyway, okay, Russ, we will do that. Who had their hand up? Councillor Sharma, Councillor Mayes also.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES **QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Sharma: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question for the Chair is regarding the Police Board. What are the next steps in getting it up and running?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Sure. Thank you for the question Councillor Sharma. Right now we're in the process and we hope to have the appointments made by now. We're in a process where we're doing some background checks on it. You know it kind of makes sense why we're waiting an extra month to do it. The reasons are you've got to have an extensive background check because you're available to sensitive data, so we don't want to appoint someone. Also when they do a background check and they don't pass the background check it could be kind of embarrassing to the people that are being appointed. But that process is happening. I understand all the packages have been picked up in the process of, you know, working with the Police to do it and so the next steps would be the Board would be appointed and then at that point the next steps, we obviously brought in someone, the Executive Director from the Peel Region to

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
January 30, 2013

talk about kind of the transition process. That's something we had committed to doing and the process after that of course would be to hire an Executive Director and go forward from there. So...

Mr. Speaker: Second question? No? That's fine. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Continuing with my Community Services theme and the theme I've touched on a number of times here with Councillor Fielding, the arenas. The comprehensive report on the future of the arenas was to come to us as a result of the E.O.I. in January of 2012. That was never received. I asked about it in July. I was told the report was coming forthwith. There was a report at the committee in November and I have to say in terms of a comprehensive report I think we're looking at the first of never in terms of getting that from the Department, so I know Councillor Fielding had indicated he's awaiting the report on a couple of the proposed arena sites, but I wanted to ask him if there's a plan from your committee or from E.P.C. to come forward with a comprehensive report. We have another budget a year from now and that will be our last budget as this group. I would like to see the issue of the arenas. We're the ones that said this system is in a crisis. What are we looking at in terms of trying to come together and get some sort of comprehensive look at the 15, 16 different City-owned arenas?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Absolutely. You know, without trying to sound like I'm skating because I'm not, there is a number of agreements. There's one in particular that will be coming over the next little while, so I don't want to say have a bit of patience, but I know it's been a long process. You know, I became Chair a couple of months ago. Not that I've (inaudible) that whole process but you know, at the end of the day, there is a number of agreements that are being discussed and will be rolled out over the next little while, so I guess have a...without sounding..."patience grasshopper" is always a great line to say with it, and so there is a number of agreements that are coming forward over the next number of months, so I know there's been some talk in the media and that sorts. It's dragged on which it has, but to a certain extent it has taken a long period of time to get us in the situation we are. I think the agreements going forward will make some sense for taxpayers. I think it will make sense from other levels of government's point of view too, so if I could ask you just to be a bit more patient with it I think you're going to see some agreements come over the next few months.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Mayes: Staying with the arenas theme and thank you for that answer, and I know Councillor Fielding has been following up on this. There was an earlier question I asked at a previous meeting which was can we get any more recent Facility Condition Index, the FCI numbers. Can we get anything more recent than the 2007 numbers and I think the answer provided by the civil service was we'll have something new this year. If you actually look at page 106 of the Operating Budget yesterday, there was an FCI for all the arenas given for each year since 2007, so I don't need an answer today and I wouldn't expect one, but can we get a response? Is that some sort of trend line or guesstimate that's being put forward by the Department for each year since 2007 and if it is, I think that should be made clear in the budget documents or perhaps they actually have the data since 2007. Great and we can get that from them because that's the updated data that I'm looking for. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Sure. Further to that, there is a process and I don't have the exact information from me. I've had a lot of conversations with Iain Day. I was actually in Councillor Browaty's area, but a part of that, as I understand it, they do the Facility Indexes; I believe it's every five years. And so they're engaged in that. They'll be engaged in that process, you know, throughout the spring when we're making some decisions on this, so as I understand it, that process is underway or will be starting over the next little while, and it's the course of business they have done, I believe it's over five years. So at the end of 2012. So we're just on schedule to do it. So...

Mr. Speaker: That's it? No more questions? Alright we'll move onto Standing Policy Committee of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. There's no report. But we do have a motion on transit safety. There you go. (inaudible).

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS**

Motion No. 3

**Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Vandal,**

THAT the Winnipeg Public Service, in consultation with Winnipeg Police Service and Winnipeg Transit, be directed to report back to Standing Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works within 180 days with a comprehensive report on what strategies other Canadian cities of roughly comparable size are using to enhance safety on their public transit systems, including security staffing, if any; and outlining potential options and their associated costs to enhance safety on the Winnipeg transit system.

Mr. Speaker: Got that Councillor Eadie? Okay, and it's automatic referral. We have no motions for Infrastructure Renewal Public Works but we do have question period. Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Browaty and the Mayor.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Eadie: Yes Speaker Nordman. During the budget meeting there was also a report at the last Public Works Committee meeting, Report No. 1, which talked about the 40 kilometer...slowing down residential speeds to 40 kilometres, and there was a lot of good rationale presented. There were a number of presenters that talked about that it isn't just reducing speed that actually makes the streets safer, although it was pointed out by the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority that there are jurisdictions that lowered the 40...just the speed limit itself and it did result...although there was still a fair number of accidents the injuries were substantially less, but my question to the chairperson is, I have an idea that maybe as we're reconstructing some of our residential grid streets under our new plan, I'm wondering if...and I would ask him to ask, to commit to finding out if Public Works will narrow some of those...look at bulb-outs at the corners or narrowing those streets a bit more so that there isn't any speeding happening on those streets.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Through you to...through the chair to Councillor Eadie, first of all I'm a little surprised that that entire report is not in front of us now because I believe it started with a Council motion, but that's another issue. I'll follow that up later today. I'm certainly not in disagreement with that. I have done bump-outs in certain areas of my ward, residential streets, with mixed results. Some neighbourhoods love them and some neighbourhoods absolutely hate them. So I think the key consideration to that request is local consultation certainly with the ward Councillor and with the community, because I can't emphasize enough when the neighbourhood does not like it, they really do not like it.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Eadie: A follow up. Very true. I would ask though if, well, I'm going to ask if it's his experience in St. Boniface if some residential grid streets are wider than others, and I'm wondering maybe he'll get back to us with this answer if, where they were really upset about bulb-outs or maybe in the middle of the block narrowing it by about a foot or two on the wider, is that...if he could get back to me and let me know if that's where they hate them the most where the streets are already narrow. I'm not sure.

Councillor Vandal: Certainly I could take that under advisement and get back to the Councillor. I think the first consideration is safety. We have traffic engineers, traffic experts that work on these issues full time, so I certainly respect their information. They do the right research. They give us the recommendations, and safety first and consultation with the Councillor and the community. But I will get back to you on that issue.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I'd like to start by commending the City staff and the large complement of contractors that do a fantastic job clearing and removing snow throughout the city. We've had a lot of snow this year and I think they've done an absolutely amazing job. I've travelled to other winter cities. Despite the claims that calls I'm sure many of my office have received and all of you have received about minor deficiencies here

and there, we have by hands down the most thorough plowing program that I've witnessed anywhere in North America. The "Know Your Zone" Program I think has a lot of potential and there's still a couple of hiccups as that's progressing. One of them I'd like to ask if the Chair is aware of and willing to ask the Department to look further on is coordination with garbage days. The vast majority of the last residential plow, well in my ward 90 plus percent of it, has its garbage day, garbage and recycling day, sorry, it's recycling day. We all officially re-named it in this Council...recycling day on Wednesdays. Most of the residential plowing was done over three twelve-hour blocks between 7 a.m. on Tuesday and 7 p.m. on Wednesday, so three twelve-hour blocks, where there were circumstances where it became very conflicted with garbage days. Scenario one, where I particularly live, had a "Know Your Zone" period from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on a Tuesday. Plowing was not completed. Do I have to wait now before I can put out my cart or can I put it out after 7 p.m.? Can I park on my street now even though it's not been done? Certainly there is some confusion there because it wasn't done when that particular lettered zone was supposed to be done. Scenario two, a lot of people in North Kildonan were assigned a 7 p.m. to 7 a.m. Wednesday garbage and recycling...sorry a snow plowing period, but their garbage day, you have to have your garbage and recycling out by 7 a.m. Does that mean that everybody has to race out at 7 a.m. or whenever their street has been cleared in the middle of the night to put out their bins or, you know, is there some leniency or is there some other option? I found in some cases residents in that area where they were supposed to be done overnight between 7 p.m. Tuesday and 7 a.m. Wednesday, their snow plowing was done at 9 a.m. Obviously, you know, (inaudible) you're supposed to have your carts out on the street. And scenario three was there were actually people who were assigned snow plowing period during their garbage day between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Can we look at finding ways to better coordinate garbage and recycling day and even what you're supposed to do? As a Councillor I couldn't answer the question myself in my own mind what the answer was and if I put my garbage and recycling out.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes those are good questions, and first of all, I concur with you on the snow clearing. We have absolutely the best snow clearing in all of Canada; in fact, sometimes I wonder if there is not some...if we're doing too good a job on certain areas, but nevertheless I did email the Administration yesterday. They assured me that the whole "Know Your Zone" initiative is going to get evaluated once winter breaks. I've heard mixed reviews on it. Some people again think it's working very well. Other people don't like it at all. Certainly better coordination with Water and Waste is essential. I'm going to ask the question tomorrow. We have Public Works tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. I'm going to ask the question and give the direction to better coordinate with the garbage and recycling, or the recycling pickup. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just want to find out if the Chair is aware that City staff continue to operate and maintain all three of our sewage treatment plants and our water treatment plants and are trained and certified to do so as per Provincial Operator certification regulations. If you weren't, you are now and the rest of Council is as well.

Councillor Vandal: I do know that all three water treatment plants are City-owned, City-operated and do a fantastic job. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I could ask the question about that as well, but I think I'll wait for the Mayor to reply back to actually what my question is. So again, my first question to the Chair is, would the Chair be willing to be looking at, it's called the Office of Traffic Safety. We have right now on the plate, we have ideas that are being shot out from, I'd say the hip; ideas about modifying ways our street works. We have ideas just arbitrarily lowering it to 40. We have school zone issues that are going to be popping up. There's a whole bunch of issues popping up right now, but the point...my concern right now is what is happening is we're doing this kind of all piece meal, and my understanding of, if you really want to deal with traffic safety, there's four or five pillars that have to be coordinated together, from education to signage to modification. All of that has to be coordinated together, and my concern is if we keep doing this one-off shot approach that we're doing now, it actually like you say, won't actually work out properly because we may just do a modification but we didn't do the consultation, or we didn't do this, so I'm wondering if you'd be interested or the Committee would be interested in looking at modeling like Edmonton has and a few other cities have, where they take all those pillars together and they look at it in kind of a holistic approach rather than this one-off shot.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Absolutely, I will Mr. Speaker. I'll take that question under advisement and we'll bring it up tomorrow when we have our Public Works meeting. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd be interested to know if the Chair could tell us is there, or could we see some sort of a report, a performance assessment report perhaps, about Emterra.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Absolutely. Our last Public Works meeting about three weeks ago, the Committee adopted a motion to get a report on our waste collection private organizations, private companies that do that, not just Emterra but BFI as well, and I understand that's not going to be ready for tomorrow but it is coming at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Havixbeck: And could the Chair tell us whether that would include the Emterra fines and how that has been reported in the 2013 Budget, whether it's a revenue stream or whether it's a reduction in the expenditure.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is any fines levied against any private garbage collection is netted out against their contract, what we pay them to actually do the work.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. When and will the Chair...I'm trying to combine two questions there...share the list of streets for renewal, and I'd be looking specifically for streets that would have been renewed, local streets under the 2013 Budget, as well a specific list for the one percent infrastructure tax that would be dedicated. So I'd be looking for two lists.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Yeah, I'm actually surprised that Councillor Havixbeck hasn't received that. I know when I communicate with my local streets person; first of all he gives me a map of the conditions of all the streets in my ward, whether it's poor, fair, good or brand new. I have the map. I, in consultation with the Administration, choose which streets are going to be re-done based on our existing budget, and actually I've chosen the street to be re-done under the new one percent scenario, so I anticipated that was happening to everybody in this Council. I'll certainly follow up with the Director of Public Works tomorrow at our meeting and make sure that process is followed for everybody.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I know that a number of Councillors were in attendance before Christmas with the Highway Traffic Board about speed limits, and they since wrote a letter to the City and asked the City for the City's position. You kindly responded on behalf of the City, Councillor Vandal, as the Chair of Public Works and said that we have significant concerns with the list of increases as they proposed and that you offered the opportunity to meet with...if the Board was interested in meeting with you and the City officials, that you'd be prepared to do that to discuss this further. Have they been in contact with you since you sent that letter back on January the 15th?

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Actually they have. There was a phone conversation between the Secretary of the Highway Traffic Board and my assistant which indicated to us that they were not interested in that second letter in the politician's point of view. They were interested in the Administrative point of view on the changes that were proposed which was a bizarre response because we set the policy of this City Council, so I really don't know where the Highway Traffic Board, who is calling the shots there. As you know, Councillor Wyatt, because you were there in December, there were public hearings about a whole bunch of random speed increase opportunities across the City of Winnipeg. I know I was there for Provencher Boulevard. I think I can say with certainty that my M.L.A. on Provencher Boulevard certainly does not approve of the speed limit going from 40 to 50. I think I can say that with certainty...50 to 60 excuse me, and he's the Premier of the Province of Manitoba so obviously the politicians aren't calling the shots there or maybe I'm wrong. I don't know who is calling the shots and I don't know why all of this is coming forward, but the message was they're interested in the administrative perspective on all the speed increase scenarios that were brought forward.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
January 30, 2013

Councillor Wyatt: So, yeah where was it left then in that sense? Is there any kind of follow-up or what are they doing now? Do you have any kind of idea?

Councillor Vandal: The conversation...no there's been no follow-up since then. That was maybe a week ago and I think at one point it becomes an inter-governmental issue which...not trying to pass the buck, but we've made our positions very clear as a Council and I think the administration support our position, so it does become an inter-governmental issue between the Province and the City as to what's the end game here, who's driving this initiative and what are we doing. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: And that concludes question period for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. We have no Finance Committee report. No motions, no by-laws. We do have a question period. Councillor Mayes for Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker. All three of my questions actually pertain to the same topic which is what I raised earlier – Windsor Park Golf Course/Nordic Centre, a Winnipeg-owned facility that lies partly in my ward, partly in Councillor Vandal's ward. C.U.P.E. staff at that location and some of the other City courses have been calling for years for more investment to try and get people out to use those courses. This Council voted in July to look at a managed competition process. We're now aware that our staff are encouraging other levels of government, such as the Federal Government, to invest taxpayer dollars into that course and that's been announced, and I'm actually very much in favour of that investment by the Federal Government and by Cross Country Ski Manitoba. For one thing it would make it very much harder for any future Council to sell the Windsor Park Golf Course. I'm pleased with that policy direction authored by our staff, but my question is, given this investment of taxpayer dollars, are we still continuing to look at the potential contracting out of this site?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Thank the Councillor. I'll take your question under advisement and get back to the Councillor. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Mayes: Similar vein. My political hero, Jim Jontz, used to say "Don't socialize the risk if you're going to privatize the profit." We are seeing some discussion, as I understand it also, some other investments into Kildonan clubhouse, Windsor Park clubhouse. I have some concerns about that if indeed we are looking to contract out these locations. Part of this is just the math is so complex around those courses as we've discussed in July. There's the issues of the depreciation. Basically you can run these courses at a profit on pure operating but once you start factoring in some of the old costs, the old debt, the depreciation, the numbers don't work. In light of your comments Mr. Chair, from July, that we know golf is losing money and we know these dollars could be better spent elsewhere, can we get at some point an update on if we are going to be putting more investments into Kildonan and into Windsor Park and whether that would influence our decision on looking at contracting out or referring these to managed competition.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah thank Councillor Mayes for the question. I'll take the question under advisement and get back to the Councillor on that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Last question.

Councillor Mayes: Third question I think actually could be answered. I think the Mayor may have actually already answered this which is, we did debate this whole issue of the four golf courses on July 18 of 2012. The application to the Federal program that was signed off by our City staff would've been August 2nd. I just want to confirm that certainly it sounded like from the Mayor, the EPC Councillors, nobody on Council was aware of any move by our staff at the time. We were debating in July. Nobody was aware that the staff was seeking Federal taxpayer dollars to be invested into the golf course.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I've never seen a list in terms of what was being put forward by our staff. I know that the Federal Government rolled that out pretty quickly too. If I recall it was like the middle of July and the deadline was

August 2nd or something like this, so anyway...and I know it's consistent with our staff that they do try to stay on top of the different programs Provincially and Federally and you know, they do apply for programs or for funding for a lot what we've already, as a Council, approved in our Capital book to assist us to leverage those dollars. But I haven't seen the list so...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I know yesterday we just approved the budgets, and in my mind it's time to get going on the next budget, the 2014 Budget. Can the Chair outline briefly for us, or would he be willing to present a plan, for how we will be proceeding in the 2014 plan, inclusive of how we will be engaging and providing more consultation, particularly with all Councillors and with the community and citizens-at-large.

Councillor Wyatt: I thank Councillor Havixbeck for that excellent question. It's definitely true. We just passed the budget yesterday and when I saw Mr. Ruta and his staff after the discussion here I said to him, you have one day off, which is today, and we're starting Thursday. So no, that work is going to be underway and look forward to bringing forward something in the near future.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Back to a similar topic, I'm very concerned about the lists for the street renewal, and I'm looking at a City-wide list. Can the Chair tell us when we would see the one that would perhaps have been approved on a City-wide basis, not on an individual ward basis?

Councillor Wyatt: I haven't seen any City-wide list. I've met...some Councillors have met with Public Works staff to discuss the work, the good news that we can add other blocks. The Public Works Department doesn't politicize a list. They basically take the funding and then they divide it up based on...they look at actually a percentage. They do every year a condition index of all of our streets, lanes, and based on that the percentage of wards that...or the percentage in each ward for streets dictates the level of funding in those wards. So some wards have higher levels of funding for back lanes and streets than others just because they have a higher percentage of streets which are in poor condition and fair condition compared to other wards, and that's how they've done it because our funding has not...we've never had enough funding of course to do replacement cost on all of our streets on an annual basis and so, I'm sure they're working with the Councillor on that. As the Councillor is aware, for her ward, she has a lot of streets which are gravel and Type 2 gravel roads, as her former predecessor would always call them, and you know they receive a lot of funds through the Operating Budget of the City in terms of the support that goes in to...and I have some of them as well. So I kind of know what they take right? But I know you have even more in terms of grading, in terms of resealing, in terms of ditch cleaning, in terms of steaming the culverts. All of those things that take time and energy and staff in terms of maintaining those Type 2 gravel roads, those chip sealed roads. So I know the Councillor has more of them but then she's also getting more funds through the Operating Budget to assist her with those unique challenges. So anyway, I hope that addresses your question, thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: Could the Chair provide me, and let me be clear and unambiguous about what I'm looking for. I'm looking for a list of streets that would've been done under 2013 money and a list of streets, new streets, out of new money, the one percent new money. Could the Chair provide us with that on a City-wide basis?

Councillor Wyatt: I don't see why not Mr. Speaker, but I don't want to provide a list until every member of Council has had an opportunity to meet with Public Service and the Public Service comes forward with streets that they are recommending could be added.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Wyatt: Well, I mean it's like...I mean you get...Councillor Swandel is making a joke, but I mean, know what he's saying. I mean, you know, there are so many streets in every ward. You put a map upon the wall and you could put a blindfold on and pick a dart and you can hit a street that's in poor condition you know Mr. Speaker. It's just that plain, and you know, we work together with the Public Service to try to resolve those streets, and you know, Councillors are aware of the calls they get on some streets which are really bad. I mean, Councillor Eadie rightfully found Sutherland Avenue, I mean there was that terrible rail crossing there and it's a collector street and it's a local street and it's just, you know, tons of complaints in his community and he identified it with Public Works and they said yeah, it's in terrible condition, it needs to be replaced. So I think Councillor Havixbeck, I know you're eager because you're a huge

supporter of that local street renewal initiative and the one percent, and you really want to see that list, so I will endeavor to ask the Public Service, once they have had that opportunity, to forward it to you, so thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes thank you Speaker Nordman. Through you to the Finance Chair, given that he's been asked this question, it was very clear to me in May when I picked my streets under the existing program that we had, the 21 point whatever million dollars from the previous year continued into 2013, I selected my two streets and one back lane and they're on a list. It was very clear once it looked like the one percent was going to pass, I was asked by the Streets Engineer as every City Councillor would be asked, and so I did hear in the speech yesterday, somebody tried to...like I don't understand why we need this list. Each Councillor knows the extra street or back lane that they're getting and there is no devious plan. Are you are aware, Councillor Wyatt, Chairperson, of any devious thing to undermine a person's ability to get a street on the \$14 million new dollars that we passed?

Councillor Wyatt: "Street Gate". Anyway, no, you know, I met with the staff. They wanted to meet right away because they want to get the tender immediately. They want to be able to get out the door and I take their advice. They come with the streets and every Councillor I think maybe does it a little differently but the Administration comes and says, this is what we think should be done, and I say yeah. I agree with you and let's go forward. And so I met with the Public Works staff on Monday you know, so no...you know, I wish we had more funds but we're starting something now which I think is positive. Folks in the past have always wanted to see, you know, they want to see their taxes at work and they want to see improvements based on what they're paying especially if they're being asked to pay a bit more and, you know, we're able to now say that yeah, you're going to be paying a bit more in property tax but at the same time you're going to be seeing...and you know I pray Mr. Speaker, I hope that future Councils...it's going to take a while. I hope everybody...like I was talking to a community group on the weekend and I said it's going to take a while for us to actually catch up here. This infrastructure deficit on our local streets didn't happen overnight. It happened over decades, and based on the plan it's a 25-year plan. It's going to take 25 years to actually renew every broken down street. I just hope that future Councils have the will and the desire to stick to that plan one way or the other, whether it be new monies coming from the Province or Ottawa that can off-set any increases, but to keep to the plan because, you know, and it's going to take some discipline because, Mr. Speaker, early on folks will be saying well, where's the money to fix my street. Why aren't we fixing my street, and well, we're going to get there. It's just going to take time. It can't happen overnight, and if we go out with a whole bunch of money right away, we defeat the purpose because it would drive construction inflation through the roof and we would be able to do even less streets for renewal, so anyway. I think I answered your question. I'm not sure.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just a follow-up to that. Just the question is, did you know that there is a list of all the street conditions, poor street conditions, on a website that you can locate, that lists out all of, I believe it's \$3.6 billion worth of failing residential streets?

Councillor Wyatt: I wasn't aware of that, but I know I could go to Councillor Eadie's office and see them on a big map and they're all coloured, for his ward at least. But, no, I wasn't aware of that Councillor Eadie. Thanks very much. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if Councillor Wyatt would be available to attend a ceremonial ribbon cutting on Grandview Street. This is news to the residents on Grandview Street. It is the additional street that is being done in 2013. It wasn't originally scheduled to be done. It was not on the original plans. Would you be able to come to a ceremonial ribbon cutting to recognize that this is the first step, a very small step, but towards addressing some of our local street infrastructure?

Councillor Wyatt: It's a grand program, so I look forward to viewing the streets. So absolutely I'll come to Grandview Street and be honoured to be there. Yes, thank you for the invitation Councillor and we could go for a sod turning too if you want.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Browaty: Would the Finance Chair feel it is appropriate to invite all of Council to attend the ribbon cutting or sod turning? The Mayor and even Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Wyatt: Being the Councillor for North Kildonan, I'm assuming that road is indeed in North Kildonan, and I'm sure you could invite everybody but whether or not everybody wants to come to North Kildonan is a different story (laughter) but for sure I'd be happy to be there.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further questions for the Chair of Finance we'll move onto the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank. Councillor Pagtakhan.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED JANUARY 8, 2013**

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce the report and move consent agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. No motions. No by-laws, questions for Downtown? Seeing none. Ladies and gentlemen, we did receive an invitation about a announcement this, today at lunch time. The first of the number of honorary streetways is going to be done today between Redwood and Aberdeen. And it will be known as Kelekis Way and there will be transportation for us to go over to the announcement. Take out will be purchased and we will come back and enjoy a Yale burger or double dog so.

Councillor Eadie: I want a cheese dog...and large fries.

Mr. Speaker: You talk to the Mayor, you talk to the Mayor yourself. I'll accept a motion to adjourn from Councillor Eadie. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 11:30 a.m.