

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Tuesday, May 27, 2014

The Council met at 9:42 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 Swandel.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: I would like to introduce our pages for today's meeting. With us...is she here? Elizabeth Walker will be with us here today from Fort Richmond Collegiate and resides in the St. Norbert Ward. Welcome. Mayor Katz I understand you have several announcements to make.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Madam Speaker, yes I do. May is multiple sclerosis Awareness Month in Canada. As you may be aware, this morning I joined MS Ambassador Lizelle Mendoza and representatives of the MS Society of Manitoba, to raise the flag for multiple sclerosis Awareness here at City Hall. Tomorrow, May 28 is World MS Day and we're wearing red carnations to show support for all those who are courageously living with the challenges of this disease that affects the lives of 3,000 Manitobans and their families every day. MS is a complex and often disabling disease that targets the central nervous system. It affects certain cognitive and physical abilities and skills. There is still no known cure for MS and the unpredictable effects last a lifetime. I invite all members of Council to join me in wishing strength and hope to all citizens affected by multiple sclerosis. They and their families are not alone in their fight. Madam Speaker, through you, I would like to invite the MS Society of Manitoba Ambassador, Lizelle Mendoza say a few words.

Madam Speaker: Welcome, Lizelle.

Lizelle Mendoza: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. My name is Lizelle Mendoza and I've lived with Relapsing-Remitting MS since I was just 11 years old when I first had my symptoms. I'm now a full time nursing student and an MS Ambassador speaking to students and groups like yours about MS, its effects and my hope for a cure. MS often most strikes people in their 20s and 30s when they're completing their education establishing their careers and starting their families. Women are three times more likely than men to develop MS and every day, three people in Canada are diagnosed. An estimated 100,000 Canadians and 3500 Manitobans live with this disease. There is no known cause or cure for MS and symptoms vary from person to person making life with MS unpredictable. Treatments and services are improving, but not for everyone, everywhere. That is why it's so important that we take this opportunity to show how MS is impacting our community. May is MS Awareness Month and tomorrow is World MS Day. Your support on this monumental day means so much. By wearing a red carnation, the MS Society's traditional focal point, you show those living with MS in our province that the City of Winnipeg cares. During the month of May, we encourage people to share the story of how MS has affected them. My hope is that you are empowered to talk to at least one person today about multiple sclerosis and how the disease has affected you personally. Canada has one of the highest rates of multiple sclerosis in the world and our call to action today is to ask our government to develop a national care-giving action plan and to improve job retention and better coordinate income and disability benefits for people impacted by MS. Today, we can change the lives of thousands of people and together we can look forward to a tomorrow where everyone affected by multiple sclerosis stands side by side and looks into a future free of MS. Thank you for your support.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As many of you will know, the Heart and Stroke Foundation of Manitoba works tirelessly to raise awareness of and create healthy lives free of heart disease and stroke. I had the opportunity to meet with the Heart and Stroke Manitoba CEO Debbie Brown in March, to discuss not only the overall strategy to help Manitobans and Canadians lead healthier lives, but to work together with partners and encourage community members to engage in physical activity on June 7th, National Health and Fitness Day in Canada. So, it is my pleasure at this time, Madam Speaker, to announce that on Saturday, June 7th, the City of Winnipeg will participate in the Heart and Stroke Foundation's National Health and Fitness Day. For the entire day the City of Winnipeg facilities and indoor pools will

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 27, 2014

provide access at no charge during normal public use times. Times and locations for facilities are available on the City's website and I encourage all Winnipeggers to enjoy use of our facilities on National Health and Fitness Day and reduce your risk of heart disease and stroke through physical activity every day. Madam Speaker, I'd also like to recognize World Elder Abuse Day on June the 15th. Manitoba has recognized World Elder Abuse Awareness Day since 2006. World Elder Abuse Awareness Day is to draw attention to mistreatment of older adults and to encourage education and prevention efforts. It is sad that we need to have a day to draw awareness to something that should not be happening in our society. Elders have paved the way for us and built the foundation of our community and deserve respect. That is why on Sunday, June 15th, City Hall will be bathed in purple light in recognition and respect for World Elder Abuse Awareness Day. As well, Madam Speaker, National Tourism Week is June 16th to the 20th. National Tourism Week celebrates tourism activity that brings fiscal opportunities to our national and local economies. Statistics Canada Report done in 2011, convention delegates made an economic impact of nearly \$47 million in Winnipeg. As part of National Tourism Week, I would like to recognize the "Bring It Home" Program, an initiative of Tourism Winnipeg for their contributions to our city's tourism sector. The program encourages business leaders to host conferences and events in Winnipeg, attracting more tourism and making an economic impact on our city. Thank you to Tourism Winnipeg and the "Bring It Home" Program. And, Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to inform my colleagues on City Council that IAFF Canadian Trustee and the president of the United Firefighters of Winnipeg Local 867, Mr. Alex Forrest, has been chosen to receive the Mary Beth Dolan Emeritus Fire Service Medal at the Manitoba Legislative Building on June the 16th. This award honours individual achievements in fire services and is awarded to those who have demonstrated excellence, leadership, or outstanding achievement or to those whose contribution has substantially enhanced the safety of people in Manitoba. Alex has been selected to receive this award for his outstanding contributions to the fire service and passionate pursuit of presumptive legislation for all firefighters in all jurisdictions, to receive compensation when diagnosed with an occupational disease. I congratulate Mr. Forrest and thank him for his service to the safety of our citizens and firefighters alike. And finally, Madam Speaker, I want to take a moment to recognize the 70th anniversary of the landing of Normandy, known as D Day on June 6, 1944. Three hundred fifty Canadian soldiers were killed on D Day. Sixteen of those fallen soldiers, who ranged in age from 21 to 31, were from Winnipeg and it is important to remember and honour them for their courageous fight and sacrifice for our freedom on that terrible day on the shores of Normandy in 1944. I, along with a colleague from Council, have been invited by the Premier to join a delegation of public and private representatives in France from June the 2nd to the 7th and commemorate the battle of Normandy. The Juno Beach Centre intends to install one tribute marker for each fallen soldier on the grounds of the Juno Beach Centre in Normandy. On behalf of the City of Winnipeg, I have sponsored 16 tribute markers to commemorate the 16 fallen soldiers from Winnipeg. The Canadian maple-made markers are inscribed with the plaque detailing the soldier's name, regiment and hometown of Winnipeg. They are currently installed and will remain on public display through the anniversary year until November the 11th, 2014. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Katz. We now have a condolence motion for former Councillor Shirley Timm-Rudolph; moved by Councillors Wyatt and Browaty. Councillor Wyatt will read the motion and make some comments, which will be followed by moment of silence. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MOTIONS

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
 Seconded by Councillor Browaty,**

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Councillor Shirley Timm-Rudolph, which occurred on May 11, 2014.

Shirley served the citizens of Winnipeg as Councillor for the former Springfield Heights Ward from 1986 to 1992 and from 1995 to 2002, she represented the Transcona Ward.

This Council extends to her husband, daughter and grandchildren, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Councillor Wyatt: I'd ask all members of Council stand for a moment of silence, please.

(Moment of silence)

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move suspension of the rules to move a motion relating to that. All the members of Council have it is number, Motion No. 1, a reference PCS. I'd like to move suspension of the rules.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of suspension of the rules to hear Motion No. 1? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Wyatt.

Motion No. 1

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

WHEREAS former Councillor Shirley Timm-Rudolph dedicated her life to public service which included serving as Councillor for the Springfield Heights Ward from 1986 to 1992 and Transcona Ward from 1995 to 2002;

AND WHEREAS Councillor Timm-Rudolph was instrumental in the procurement of a man-made lake in South Transcona for use during the 1999 Pan American Games;

AND WHEREAS the man-made lake built in South Transcona is informally identified as "Lake Shirley";

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the man-made lake built in South Transcona be formally named "Lake Shirley Memorial Park", as per the attached Schedule A;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a \$7,500.00 contribution from the Transcona Ward Land Dedication Account be earmarked toward the Lake Shirley Memorial Park Fund for the establishment of a permanent cairn/plaque memorial and park signage.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, just to say a few words, I had the honour of knowing the former Councillor for many years. She was someone who was extremely dedicated, tenacious, and hardworking for her community over those years. She was passionate about representing first Springfield Heights and then the Transcona Ward. I remember I was not a member of Council, but I remember seeing many of the debates on many of the issues. She, no doubt, took the bull by the horns and following the rains of 1993 that were unprecedented, the South Transcona drainage plan, she called for a number of lakes to be built, but she, through hard work and wisdom merged those lakes into one, working with the Provincial Government. I remember talking to Jack Reimer, who was at that time Minister of Municipal Affairs and he was referring to how Lake Shirley came about and he basically said Councillor Timm-Rudolph came into his office and he was scared and the lake got done. She was...she was a strong figure and, you know, a lot of elected officials, when they opened different or start the construction on different projects as they know, as we know, they'll do it with, you know, golden-painted shovels. I was at the shovel, sod turning of Lake Shirley. Of course, it wasn't called Lake Shirley. Then, it became Lake Shirley in the community later. She didn't start the sod turning with a shovel, she started it with a bulldozer. She actually got on the bulldozer, a full-sized bulldozer and drove the thing. And, so she was full of spirit, energy, she did many other things, great things for our community, working to widen Regent Avenue; working to improve the community clubs and her mark and her legacy is great and she'll be greatly missed. She passed far too early. Former Councillor George Fraser gave a tremendous eulogy last Friday at her service along with her daughter, Tina, and I just want to thank all members of Council for supporting this motion before us today. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Wyatt, close.

Councillor Wyatt: I'll move that the motion be adopted.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, I rise... I have a motion before us today. Unfortunately, I have a situation where I have to go to the Highway Traffic Board, which is scheduled today to hear a matter in my ward that was before Councillor Swandel's committee. I attempted to get dispensation from them due to the Council meeting, but was unsuccessful to do that. I have a motion before us. I'd like to move suspension of rules to deal with it now and if the will is there to deal with that, I would appreciate it and we can decide and vote on it today.

Madam Speaker: Is that Motion No. 6?

Councillor Wyatt: Motion...sorry, EPC Motion No. 6.

Motion No. 6

Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Mayes,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City suspend the planned 3.5 unpaid leave days scheduled for December 2014 and that the administration be directed to do all things necessary to implement said adjustment.

Madam Speaker: Okay, it's moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Mayes. It's relating to the staff furlough days. All those in favour of the suspension? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Wyatt to introduce.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, this motion is being moved. This was well known and well publicized part of the budget. It's approximately a \$1.5 million cost that we will have to make an adjustment for in our budget. The reality is, Madam Speaker, we just went through the hardest, harshest, most difficult winter that I could ever recall, that according to the local periodical, was...the last one was 1898. Our City employees rose up above and beyond the call of duty in terms of facing the challenges that are out there and we're still facing them with the frozen pipes that still go on. We had snow that we'd never seen before, the amount of snow. We've had now the frozen pipe situation affecting thousands of home owners. In light of this, Madam Speaker, and in light of the fact that the three and a half days were called for in the middle of December or the end of December, actually, we know we're going to get another winter. If this is any trend with global warming or what not that this is a sign of things to come, I don't know, but at this point, Madam Speaker, I think it's something that should be amended in terms of the budget. So I'm moving this as an amendment.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I don't mind...I don't know if I actually agree or disagree with this, but I think in light of the fact that there's absolutely no information here with this motion, there's no report, we don't know how we're dealing with \$1.5 million, I wholeheartedly agree with the Councillor that our employees are out there working very hard as they do every year, but I've also had a conversation with a number of employees who like this concept. I think perhaps what we should be doing is engaging with the employees in a far deeper fashion and try to figure out what we should do, but to try to deal with this on the fly with a three line motion sort of just doesn't make any sense to me as to how policy should be developed. You know, we need to take this back; to refer it back to committee, I guess it would go to the Finance Committee and have them do some work and bring forward an actual report with a plan as to how we're dealing with this \$1.5 million. That's it.

Madam Speaker: Is it a motion to refer, sorry?

Councillor Swandel: Sure. I'll move a Motion to refer.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Next speaker is Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and my thanks to Councillor Wyatt for working with me on this. The days off had been an issue for me throughout the budget discussion, so I'm pleased to see we're taking a second look at that. I'm sure we will sit down and talk with at least, I can think of at least six major bargaining agents, ATU's representatives here with its president about how to go about with some more of the voluntary days or some other plans trying to find the savings that we're going to need, but the days off, I mean, they're at least, and Councillor Wyatt gives them good reasons why it became a problem. There's at least three other reasons, the people who are really hurt by this motion that are my former colleagues in the legal community because there was going to be a great deal of money spent on lawyers litigating, arbitrating or probably going to court over the aspects of the unpaid days off plan. We were going to spend a lot of money and we weren't going to get any of it back even if we won the case. Secondly, I think there was some issues of...WAPSO took a very strong position of go ahead and do that. You're still going to have to pay us. We're on salary, here's our legal precedent. So in essence, we're taking a half million dollar legal bet on that one and I'm not a great poker player because I don't bluff and I think that was a half million dollar gamble. We recently lost one of those gambles on the Pan Am Pool matter, an old bit of litigation there, so I certainly for one, am glad to say we're going to find some real savings instead of gambling that we might win on that WAPSO matter. And thirdly, there were going to be logistical problems, Chris Broughton from MGEU got up and said, "Great that you're going to keep the essential people working, but a lot of the people you may feel are non-essential feed in very closely with our ambulance and paramedic service so there were going to be problems with paramedic service." As Councillor Wyatt pointed out, you were going to have snow clearing standing by, so we might've had the need to bring them in on overtime, therefore, eroding some of the savings and the transit safety initiative that we were going to be starting in July, you're going to have some new hires from...it would be WAPSO members starting on the buses. The buses are going to be essential so then you're going to have people that have been around for 20, 30 years with WAPSO saying, "What is this? I have to take three days off, this guy he hired in July is going to be on, making full salary? I want that. You have to give me

training. I'm going to bump him. I'm going to grieve." So we're going to have all sorts of logistic on legal problems. In fact, I commend Councillor Wyatt for taking a look at this. We'll have to try and find the savings, but there were going to be a lot of legal and logistical problems. So bad day for the legal community, maybe if we pass this, but I think a good day for our operations, a good day for relations with our staff and I'll be supporting the motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Vandal followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Fantastic arguments put forward by Councillor Mayes and I want to just say, first of all, I'm going to be supporting this. I...but what perplexes me is that the same argument that Councillor Mayes brought forward this morning, he brought forward five months ago. Myself, Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Eadie, Councillor Smith and Orlikow, all stood and said that this was not the right way to deal with our civic administration, Madam Speaker. So, although I commend Councillor Wyatt for coming forward and bringing this forward now, the fact of the matter is it snows in Winnipeg every year; it gets cold every year and our public service is out there doing fantastic work every year, and we need to get serious as a Council to stand up and deal with our public administration in a serious way, a way that brings forward a plan, not only for the next six months, but for the next five years. These are all the very same arguments that were brought forward five months ago. I remember moving a motion trying to move \$25,000 back in the budget for our museums and I remember Councillor Wyatt getting up and saying, "You can't do that because there's...there's no...we don't know where that money's going to come from. There's budgetary implications and how dare you, how can we do this?" Well, this is two lines and again, Madam Speaker, I want to be clear, I'm going to support this because it's the right thing to do. It's the right thing to do this morning, it was the right thing to do five months ago. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Before I speak, could I just have the "Be It Resolved" read, please? What does it actually say?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: "Therefore be it resolved that the City suspend the planned 3.5 or suspend the planned 3.5 unpaid leave days scheduled for December 2014 and that the administration be directed to do all things necessary to implement the said adjustment".

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to of course support this motion and actually, I'm glad that Councillor Wyatt has seen the light on that one. But...and I just wanted to say, my concerns about automatic referral have been happening here at this point, but I don't know that we need to really refer this back and try to find the money. As I recall the debate around this particular issue, it seems to me that we had a fair discussion about the furlough program that the City of Winnipeg offers out to our employees, where they can actually pick a day where they take off and in some departments it's quite successful, and in other departments it's maybe not so successful. But you know, I think that the money can be found quite simply by looking at it in those terms, the terms of maybe trying to find the capability within certain departments to offer more furlough because I know some departments are basically told no, but there might be the odd employee that could take that furlough. I know that many of the employees of the City of Winnipeg, the ones I've talked to, they really appreciate that furlough program and of course they don't get paid for that day, but they really enjoy that extra-long weekend or whatever that is and they come back the following week very refreshed and ready to go and it was mentioned by Councillor Wyatt, the stress and strains of our employees. I have to say that the stress and the pressure on our employees to thaw out those frozen pipes, you know, like I was...I'm looking at the numbers and it was huge, unprecedented and for the City, dealing with what is basically such an extraordinary event demonstrates that our employees deserve to be able to decide when they're taking a day off and, you know, I don't think anybody's going to take a furlough when we're dealing with those kind of frozen pipes. They've done a great job and our administration has done a great job as well. It's easy in hindsight to pick on some decisions, but the reality is, is that our employees, whether it's at the direct service level right on the ground or whether it's management, they are all very good at what they do. And so...and as I understand it, the 3.5 days would also apply to certain middle managers and so on, and there's a lot of people who need to be there, co-ordinate and do that. So I appreciate the motion and I will support it today, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: I move that we refer this motion to Finance for a comprehensive report and financial analysis.

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote, please.

Madam Speaker: All those in...

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 27, 2014

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay, recorded vote. All those in favour of the referral, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Fielding and Swandel.

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 2, Nays 14.

Madam Speaker: Motion to refer is defeated. Next speaker, Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this, and this was actually one aspect of the budget that I disagreed with strongly and I in fact voted against the budget and you know I commend Councillor Wyatt for coming forward with this, I really do. I think that it takes some courage to realize and recognize that perhaps, you know, looking ahead into a year some unexpected things happened and perhaps back pedaling, I think it takes some swallowing of pride and some courage to actually come forward. You know, there were many things as well that I think he's had to swallow on the budgets in the past, the CRA allowance. Many argued that the additional...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck, let's speak to the item in front of the...

Councillor Havixbeck: Well, I'm making a point that I think that it's to be commended. You know, ward allowances going back to the original amounts, for example, and grants to programs that many Councillors use their ward allowances to support. You know, I think the City has a furlough program and I support employees using that furlough program and I think perhaps, we didn't necessarily get the information that was requested at the Finance Committee, for example, about who is using the furlough program, in what department and whether that could be broadened, if that's truly, if achieving savings. So we still don't have any answers and you know, I just heard yesterday that there is some 13 to \$14 million of unpaid parking tickets. I mean, if you allocated one person to be collecting some of those unpaid parking tickets, this would more than pay for itself. So I think there are plenty of sources of funding if we actually just looked for them, and you know, again, I commend Councillor Wyatt for bringing this forward, and Councillor Mayes of course. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? We'll call the question. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Next, we'll move on to delegations. Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I'd like to ask for suspension of the rules to hear two additional speakers for five minutes with no questions on the item of the LRT project motion. They both wish to speak against it and that's Stephanie Joyce of the Downtown Biz and Harry Walbert.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, so noted. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

MINUTES

Councillor Steen moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on April 30, 2014 be taken as read and confirmed.

All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: And now on to delegations. We have a number of delegations today, and first up is Mr. David Sanders. And you are in support of Item No. 4 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated May 7, 2014, regarding Bill C-23 Fair Elections Act - the public consultation. You have ten minutes to speak on this item. I do realize you have other items and we'll call you after on those.

David Sanders: Thank you, Madam Speaker, members of Council. With regard to the motion before you on Bill C-23 the Fair Elections Act and the public consultation, on May 7 Executive Policy Committee recommended to Council that the proposed motion regarding the need for country wide public consultation on the Federal Government's Bill C-23, the Fair Elections Act, be received as information, which means that EPC is opposed to Council adopting the proposed resolution.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Sanders, I want to caution you that you are being inaccurate with that last statement of yours and you cannot impugn motive when you appear as a delegation. Carry on.

David Sanders: As recorded in the minutes of the May 7th meeting, I wish to continue to register my strong support for the Council resolution proposed by Councillor Smith and Eadie. That the City of Winnipeg write a letter to local MPs and Minister of Democratic Reform, the Prime Minister stating opposition to Bill C-23, the so-called Fair Elections Act based on the provisions which are likely to reduce voter turnout and confidence in the integrity of the democratic process and that the City of Winnipeg call upon the Federal Government to conduct country wide public hearings to allow Canadians and experts to make submissions on measures to improve electoral accountability and transparency and increased voter turnout. I support that resolution notwithstanding the recent amendments proposed by the minister of committee presented to the House of Commons on May 5 and given third reading on May 13th. Bill C-23 was given first reading in the Senate on May 14th, but there's no good reason why the Senate could not now decide to ask its standing committee on legal and constitutional affairs to conduct the country-wide public hearings which should've been conducted by the Commons Committee and which I urge this council to support now. I just in case some councillors think that this kind of resolution may be out of order at City Council, I submit that it is well within the jurisdiction of Council to make representations to the Canadian Government as it has recently done with respect to Federal policy regarding the recent events in Ukraine, federal regulation of rail safety and the transport of dangerous goods, federal suspension of the proposed changes in Canada Post delivery, pending the results of the requested sustained and substantive public consultation process and that's Council's resolution. And also Federal Social and Affordable Housing Policy in programs, and the Government of Canada can spend \$10 million right now to send 500 Canadian observers to assist with the elections in the Ukraine, I really wonder why Parliament cannot afford to send a legislated committee on the road to listen to the views of all Canadians with respect to something as important as our own electoral laws. I do agree with the editorial board of the Winnipeg Free Press which said that the government needs to do what it should've done at the beginning of the process namely consult with Canadians about how elections will be managed. And this Bill C-23 now stands with the government's recent amendments, I have a number of continuing problems with it as do others. First is still the complexity ensure size of the legislation. Bill C-23 is a huge piece of legislation makes significant amendments to the Canada Elections Act, the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, the Telecommunications Act, the Conflict of Interest Act, the Director of Public Prosecutions Act, Access to Information Act, Financial Administration Act, the Income Tax Act and Procedure for Recounts. I rather doubt many people have read the whole bill yet or the 14 pages of amendments to the amendments published three weeks ago. The Library of Parliament's Legislative summary of the original Bill C-23, just the summary is 67 pages long, but it is by far the best reference work on this omnibus bill which I've seen so far. But after the Canadian Constitution, I don't think there's any more important law than the Canada Elections Act whereby we Canadians agree to choose who will exercise the enormous powers of the Government of Canada. Before the Parliament of Canada makes substantial changes in the democratic electoral process, there must be far greater consultation of the Canadian public and a genuine effort to seek out a natural consensus of opinions supporting the changes to be made. This method of debate on such a bill should've never been limited by the use of closure in the House of Commons. The matter of voter identification, there have been some amendments made, based on the notion that it's been widely spread voter fraud when the evidence is that there has been little or no such fraudulent voting in Canada. There've been reports of many irregularities and the proper documentation of voter vouching which suggests that the Chief Electoral Officer needs a budget for more and better training of poll clerks and officials, but I understand there've been no convictions or even charges of voter fraud. Now, the original bill would've done away with the ability of qualified voters to be vouched for by another citizen. There have been amendments, which now allow a voter with printed name identification to prove his or her residence by taking an oath in writing attested to on oath by another qualified voter and this purports to answer the problems of senior citizens, the homeless, first nations on reserve and others who may not have documents with up to date individual addresses or don't have addresses at all. The Federal Government quotes some 39 types of information which can be used but many of them don't contain addresses which is the question and all of which may be stolen, forged or obtained fraudulently. In any event, if you ignore the many ways that such identification may be produced fraudulently, it sounds eminently reasonable to require

voters to be able to produce some documentary evidence of their existence and residence. But it seems to me that the absolute best form of voter identification would be the sworn testimony of a person who knows the voter. Canadian Courts, that is how we prove identity, not by proffering computer generated utility bills. In my opinion insisting that voters go back home and find whatever identification they may have is just one more way of discouraging voters who are already disinclined to make the trip to the poll in the first place, and also think that the refusal to accept the voter identification card or notice of confirmation of registration will lead to even more discouraged voters. Canadians will have gone to the trouble of authorizing Canada Revenue Agency to give their names, addresses and nationality to Elections Canada for a listing on the National Registrars of Electors where they'll apply to the returning officer to be placed on the voters' list before Election Day only to find that they still have to prove themselves one again at the poll anyway. Frankly, I think a Canadian voter should be able to vouch for himself or herself with a written oath administered by the non-partisan election official at the poll and full view of the scrutineers appointed by candidates to observe the procedure. I believe that procedure is accepted for our own Provincial, Municipal and School Board elections in Manitoba. Concern that the powers of the Chief Electoral Officer, the Commissioner of Elections have not been increased to provide for the ability to promote voting by all Canadians, to hire staff and expert advisers independently to obtain any documentary evidence of election expenses or to investigate election law violations effectively. I think it was a travesty of justice for the Commissioner of Elections to have to report to Canadians recently that he can't find evidence of voter suppression in the last election not because there wasn't any, but because he has only very limited powers of investigation. The continued refusal to give the Commissioner the power to conduct serious and timely investigations of alleged electoral violations is indefensible. Other Federal agencies have and use such powers including even the Canadian Radio, Television and telecommunications Commission which is to enforce the new rules in this Act regarding voter contact calling services or robo-calls in the Canada Elections Act. The Winnipeg City Auditor has such powers as to obtain evidence and so do other elections officers, such as the Manitoba Commissioner of Elections. There's also the matter of advanced rulings and interpretation bulletins on new procedure in the bill which provides for the Chief Electoral Officer to issue such guidelines and bulletins but there are some timelines and while they've been reduced somewhat from the original Bill, they still require time which makes it impossible for the Chief Electoral Officer to issue such guidance quickly in the midst of an election campaign when it may be needed the most. And finally, on the matter of judicial recounts, there's a whole new set of rules for judicial recounts. During the last election, I served as the Candidates Voluntary Legal Council during a two day judicial recount. There were lots of legal advisers present, the total of three in the case of the candidate I represented, and we were all very busy assisting in the recount teams, recounting thousands of ballots simultaneously and we then advised the judge with regard to this examination of the many disputed ballots. I must say that the whole process was extremely fair, transparent and respectful of the rights and responsibility of all the quarries involved and though my candidate did not win, I was proud to be a Canadian that day knowing that we authorized the power of the state by ballots, not bullets, however, for some unknown reason the new procedure in Bill C-23 allows for participation by only one legal counsel for each candidate. This restriction is unnecessary and it may well detract from the ability to conduct recounts which are beyond reproach. So I respectfully ask that Council now approve this motion calling on the Government of Canada to take the time to consult Canadians and then bring forward better proposals for electoral reform, which merit broad public sport. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Sanders? Okay, seeing none, I'll ask you to stay down on the bench here and next up is Mr. Darryl Rankin in opposition to the same matter. Mr. Darryl Rankin, is he...are you here? Following that we'll hear from Mr. Sanders again and then Mr. Paul Hesse. Thank you, sir. You have ten minutes.

Darryl Rankin: Thank you. Today, I'm addressing City Council about democracy in Canada which is being mutilated by the Fair Elections Act. And the significant record of fraud by the Conservative Party in the last Federal election, a finding by a top court in Canada. I'm addressing you as a citizen who's participated in the electoral process for 30 years, as a citizen who has started with working people who are deeply interested in preserving democracy and in fact improving it. You would not know it if you followed media reports on or around April 29th, but a rally of around 150 people took place in the patio by this building on that day to say, Winnipeg says no to the Fair Elections Act. We heard from Idle No More, the Winnipeg Labour Council, the Canadian Federation of Students in Manitoba, a former representative of Manitoba, to the National Anti-Poverty Organization, the Four Directions Walk to End Poverty, and the Council of Canadians, Winnipeg Chapter. The next day, City Council voted 8-7, not to suspend the rules and allow a vote moved by Councillors Smith and Eadie on this matter most important to the people of Winnipeg. So today, I'm providing Council with an opportunity to stand with the will of the people as expressed in the principle of "one person one vote". Or to support or also to support the insidious attack on democracy that is contained in the so-called Fair Elections Act which is now in the Senate. Other municipalities have given their opinion on this Bill, notably Vancouver City Council who just condemned it. On past occasion is City Council, this City Council, has announced to provide or has provided opinions on matters of deep interest to its citizens not normally in its jurisdiction. Those include declaring Winnipeg a nuclear weapons free zone or to keep Canada out of the US aggression against Iraq in 2003. It's a popularly held belief that Canada's...since Canada sends its soldiers overseas to fight for democracy as it did 70 years ago. So it matters very much what Winnipeg says about our electoral system. Today, some of our members of this City Council on the Executive Policy Committee have already shown contempt for the people of Winnipeg who want your opinion on this matter. These

members have shown contempt for Councillors Smith and Eadie who wanted this motion considered at the May 7th Executive Policy Committee meeting for referral to this meeting so you could vote on it. Instead, by the device of accepting the motion that should have been voted on at this meeting as information, it is now merely a part of the EPC report from May 7th. Some of you already are treating the people who wanted your opinion of this burning issue with contempt. The question I have for you is, will you be counted as treating these people with contempt today at this meeting? Or will you build...I'm sorry, or will you hold in contempt groups representing aboriginal people, working people, university students and the poor, who are all deeply interested in preserving fair elections? So far, you have done everything you can to prevent this motion by Councillors Smith and Eadie from reaching this floor. But it is still here in the wording of the EPC report on May 7th. It is still before this City Council. You don't need to suspend the rules to consider it. All you need to do is to say that you're voting for or against accepting the EPC Report of May 7th based on your opinion of this disdained Fair Elections Act. If you do not say you are against the EPC Report and vote to accept or if you vote yes to receive or accept the EPC Report on May 7th, then it will be obvious that your support, that you support the mutilation of the Federal electoral system. If you cannot divide the report of the May 7 EPC Report I do not care what other business is in the report because this is the most important issue and the EPC created this problem by the ruse of receiving the motion as information. To me, the May 7th Report is unacceptable. Councillors, the ball is in your court. You can show contempt for the people of Winnipeg, for the contempt for the people who want your opinion, you can vote against aboriginal people, workers, students and the poor. Or, you can vote against this contemptuous decision by the EPC and say Winnipeg says no to the Fair Elections Act. I have a few more minutes I believe. So rather than dealing with procedure as I've just done, I wanted to spend a little bit of time saying what I wanted to say originally if this motion had been legitimately on the floor as a democratic norm. I'll start off in a Marxist way because I'm a Marxist. Bear with me. In Marxist terms, this Act says that the meek are getting ready so the Tories are changing the election rules. In more popular words, Harper's Election Bill is designed to preserve the status quo, the monopoly of the big business party's grip on power. Many will be sadly surprised when they try to vote for a lesser pulse of government next year. From the stand point of "one person one vote" the misnamed Fair Elections Act is a serious blow against democracy in Canada. In our electoral system a few hundred voters, votes, spread over a handful of ridings could make the difference which party wins power. The bill is expected to disenfranchise hundreds of thousands of people. Harry Neufeld, an election expert in Parliament, gave an estimate of 500,000 people. That's an average of at least 1,600 votes per riding or about one in 29 ballot votes in 2001. That's a serious blow. The Bill affects every eligible voter. Everyone will need to have appropriate identification as usual, but the Bill officially prohibits the informal use of voter information cards as ID. Many people will effectively lose their vote and a high proportion will not be Tory voters. Many aspects of the bill are not researched or discussed. For example, according to the Globe and Mail, the Conservatives introduced hundreds of pages to the amendments in April 25th saying they would back off a proposal to allow parties...political parties to...the power to appoint the officials who manage the ballot count which is an utterly preposterous reform so-called. Yet the Globe and Mail reports the amendments are silent on that on April 29th. What could possibly go wrong next year when the Tories are in charge of counting ballots in most ridings? The bill is designed to suppress the voting rights of certain kinds of voters. According to expert testimony in Parliament, it tilts the elections in favour of the conservatives. The bill favours parties backed by the wealthy and big business. The Tories are mutilating the principle of "one person one vote". Most harmed are aboriginal and immigrant workers, women and seniors, the poor and disabled and the youth and students. By requiring appropriate identification to cast a vote, the Tories know that poorer voters will be unpleasantly surprised when they try to cast a vote next year. The wealthy are more likely to vote and to have required ID. Now, you need to prove where you live without voter information card. People could use their drivers licence in some province. They could use health cards. Elections Canada, however, estimates that nearly four million adults do not have a drivers licence. There's very few pieces of ID that have your address on it. Neufeld's estimate of more than half a million could be very cautious. The Conservatives do not care how many people are affected because they haven't made no studies, no estimates of the number of people who are affected by the changes. How many people do not have enough ID? Do they have...do they carry the ID? What kinds of people are most affected? This is more than negligence. This is pure contempt for democracy. As the Globe and Mail editorial put it, Canada has "a serious problem of the government inventing false evidence of voter fraud." They provided no evidence of voter fraud. In fact, there's more evidence of the Sasquatch and the Loch Ness Monster than the...than a voter fraud in Canada that the Conservatives submitted in Parliament. A tweet by Conservative Senator, Linda Frum reveals the Tory mind set on the bill and this is probably submitted by Globe and Mail. Elections Canada should not have a vested interest in recording a high voter turnout. That's a conflict. This line of thinking can only lead to more voter suppression already skewed in favour of the wealthy, elections are becoming more corrupt. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Rankin? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I wanted to start off by just...just wondering if you are aware, Mr. Rankin that when I did ask to have the...this particular motion put off until the next meeting, that I used a...sort of a complex channel, instead of using an appropriate one which is the e-mail everybody on the particular committee to say that if somebody could ask for somebody to move it to the next meeting. So I'm just wondering if you are aware that

some of the comments you made, it was actually probably more of an error on my part and not using the proper channels.

Darryl Rankin: I was relying on the Metro news report that the EPC had trashed your motion, and if that is so, well, what you're saying is accurate, well, I hope that the EPC and City Council can remedy the oversight.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Rankin. Next, I'd like to call back Mr. David Sanders...okay, who is in support of the Notice of Motion moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Havixbeck regarding Council Endorsement of a Full LRT Project Connecting East Winnipeg via the Downtown and into the University of Manitoba. Mr. Sanders, ten minutes, sir.

David Sanders: Thank you, Madam Speaker, members of Council with regard to the proposed motion that you'll be voting on today, I'm speaking in support of it. The resolution is that the City establish a high level working group made up of railroad leaders, other transportation stakeholders and regulators, Federal representatives, Provincial representatives and City representatives to work toward the high level understanding of the costs and benefits of railroad rationalization to all parties.

Madam Speaker: Excuse me, Mr. Sanders. It's speaking to the wrong item right now. It's the LRT motion.

David Sanders: Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize. I was following the order on the agenda, but...I'm sorry you want me to speak to the LRT one.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

David Sanders: I'm sorry. I wish to speak in support of certain aspects of the Notice of Motion presented by Councillors Wyatt and Havixbeck at the last Council meeting on April 30th regarding Proposals for Southwest Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives. I strongly support the Councillors' first two statements that first Council has not formerly adopted final funding proposals for southwest bus rapid transit, and secondly the cost of bus rapid transit and the chosen dog-leg, the Parker lands dog-leg route appears to be escalating in price. I don't think we have up to date, credible, professional evidence which would justify a Council decision to proceed with a full light rail transit system today, but I certainly agree with the immediate implication of the Councillors' motion that Winnipeg should put a stop to the current efforts of Civic administrators, various consultants and industry of land developers to force approval of their preferred stage to project at this time. If someone tries to suspend the Council rules and walk on a motion approving the Stage 2 Project also know now as the capital integration project without notice that this, May Council meeting, I trust at least six...

Madam Speaker: Mr. Sander, you need to speak to the item and the next two pages, you're going into the capital integration project, so I'm going to have to ask you to stop. Okay, would you like to move on to the next item? Okay, the next two pages are not relevant to the item at hand. So if you have anything further to say about the LRT motion, then you can proceed.

David Sanders: Well, Madam Chair, the Clerk has advised that my presentation this morning can't be distributed to Council, but I have sent copies of...

Madam Speaker: Okay, at this time, I'm going to take questions. Are there any questions for Mr. Sanders? Okay, yes, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Mr. Sanders, how do you feel that the Capital Integration Program is relevant to the LRT discussion?

David Sanders: The Capital Integration Project is designing a route on which the Councillor's motion would have us build an LRT instead of bus rapid transit. Talking about the same purpose, the same route and the alternative, which is implied by the motion is to not build the bus rapid transit route, but rather build the LRT. I thought it was relevant.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Mr. Sanders, in any of the reports, were you able to find because I know you scour all of the reports. Were you able to find that the BRT rail line that has been built and the one being proposed and the ones there after are convertible to LRT?

David Sanders: None of the recent reports talk about that at all. There is no reference to LRT in any of the recent reports. Appears to be a foregone conclusion during the last six years, I guess.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Thank you. You may stand down. Next is Mr. Paul Hesse in opposition to the same matter.

Paul Hesse: Good morning, Mr. Mayor and members of Council. We're speaking against the motion.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Paul Hesse: With this motion, Winnipeg City Council risks continuing to waffle on rapid transit. This motion should not be supported. It does not make good sense. BRT is the mode the City used for the first leg; it's the mode you agreed to use for the next leg, it's the mode that's been studied; it's the mode that's been priced; it's the mode that's been involved in the functional design, studies and consultations that have been held with the public. It's the mode that's been approved for funding by the Province and it's the mode that was used in the application for Federal funding. So to switch now to LRT makes no sense. As City studies have shown LRT costs more to build, more to maintain, more to operate, and costs more for vehicles. Winnipeg Transit doesn't have a train garage, but it just built a new expanded bus garage on time and under budget. Transit doesn't own trains and it can't just build LRT on a freight train line. We do have buses. We do have an expanded bus garage. We do have an operating BRT system which was also built on budget. We so have Provincial funding, we have a request for Federal funding. We should extend the current rapid transit system now without further delay. And those are my comments on the motion. May I add any comments with respect to a notice of motion?

Madam Speaker: You can speak to the...what's in front of us, the motion at hand.

Paul Hesse: Then those are my comments. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, any questions? Thank you. Next is Mr. Zach Fleischer also in opposition to the same matter. Mr. Fleischer, you have five minutes.

Zach Fleischer: So, I'd like to first thank Winnipeg City Council for having me here. As I mentioned before, I think this is a great part of the democratic process, we're ordinary citizens of Winnipeg are able to speak to the City Councillors in such a candid manner and especially for the opportunities to have questions. I also understand that there is a Civic election coming up in October, and with that in mind, I do want to thank all members of City Council. I've been a semi-regular here for the past two and a half years and I want to thank everyone, especially Mayor Katz for allowing us to be here and helping us to work on some very important projects and this may be the last time that I get to speak here to this current incarnation of Council, so I'd like to take a moment to thank you all for listening to me and listening to my colleagues as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Zach Fleischer: We're discussing two motions here and what...I think that they're both kind of intertwined that the first is to have a referendum in the Fall as well.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Fleischer, you can't speak on the referendum. It's just on this motion on the LRT motion, okay? Thank you.

Zach Fleischer: So in regards to the LRT motion, I think it's a poor step forward. We've been debating rapid transit in various forms for many, many years. Longer than some of you have been alive and I think it's time to get moving. We need to, we need to get moving forward on this. If we look at a case study like the City of Ottawa where they built an extensive bus rapid transit system and over time, they started to expand into LRT because the ridership demanded it. What we need to do first is to finish what we have now. Finish the southwest corridor and then look at building in the LRT as I know was outlined in the Our Winnipeg Plan, down Portage Avenue to Polo Park and help and start to construct an airport link at that point in time. I think that...I think what we need to do is underscore the importance of rapid transit. Every other major Canadian city has it. We're falling behind. Build for the future, make sure that our...or a couple of months ago, I think it was Mayor Katz called folks like myself "the future of Winnipeg" and I think this is the time that we look at the future, we build for the future and we make sure that we are building for the needs of our current city and also for the needs of our future city as it begins to approach a population of a million. The best time to build rapid transit was 40 years ago. The second best time is now. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Fleischer? Okay, thank you. Councillor Gerbasi, would you like to move a motion to hear additional delegations.

Councillor Gerbasi: I thought I already...already did that.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all right, sorry. Stephanie Voyce is next followed by Harry Wolbert. They're in opposition to the same item. Stephanie Voyce is here on behalf of the Downtown Biz. You have five minutes. Thank you.

Stephanie Voyce: Okay, good morning, Mayor Katz, Madam Speaker and Councillors, thank you very much for having me here. Good morning. On behalf of the Downtown Biz, I would like to express our support in continuing to move forward with the second phase of bus rapid transit. As one of its core mandates, the Biz advocates for and promotes transit as an important transportation component for a diverse, vibrant city and downtown. The Downtown Biz has long been an advocate of transit, particularly since 20,000 people are using Portage Avenue bus stops. And close to 18,000 are using Graham Avenue bus stops each weekday in the downtown. We see transit as important, not only in reducing vehicle congestion, reducing parking demands and reducing parking demands and reducing emissions, but also as an enjoyable, easy and convenient mode of transportation for luring and moving folks in and around the downtown. In fact, we feel so strongly about the benefits of transit that we're challenging downtown workers to realize this themselves providing 250 free five-day bus passes for use next week during commuter challenge week. Our tagline is Bus is Better, and that is what we hope people will take away. Our hope is that free rides might give workers who already come downtown every day a reason to try transit and once they've tried it, they might become more comfortable using transit regularly and in turn reduce the reliance on travelling by car. At the same time, we're capitalizing on the week to remind people of what might be the most overlooked personal benefit to transit. Time. Our "What did you do on your commute?" marketing campaign get all the time savings of taking transit verses a car trip. You can actually catch up on life while taking transit, reading, checking e-mails, writing a grocery list, meditating, sketching and the list goes on. The point is it doesn't take long to realize how relaxing bus travel can actually be or how affordable it can be allowing people and families to put car savings back into the local economy and in our opinion, the freedom of travelling with transit can be found either on LRT or BRT. At this point with the BRT Phase 2 plans well developed, connecting key neighbourhoods to the downtown with an efficient and comfortable service, we see it as imperative that we continue to grow this model that will see increased opportunities for transit use in the near future. Every year that we re-contemplate the RT issue. It costs taxpayers millions and surely a city approaching 1 million people is not healthy, viable or sustainable without an advanced transit and rapid transit system. In our opinion, looking at LRT at this point, would interrupt the momentum. I mean good rapid transit services would be farther from realization for Winnipeggers. The reality is if you look at mature cities and their downtowns, as they grow, they have both BRT and LRT. Let's continue at this point with BRT in Winnipeg and we have no time to lose. As other cities have shown us, well planned, integrated rapid transit systems and transit oriented development alongside are key to our city's future for the health of people and the health of the city. The determination of bus or rail in our opinion is far less important than committing to a vision for our city where cars need not dominate and folks enjoy more bus and complementary modes such as cycling and walking. It is our sincere hope that bus rapid transit continues to have the investment and support needed to see it come to fruition in the near future. Thank you for your attention.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Mr. Harry Wolbert in opposition to the same item. You have five minutes, sir.

Harry Wolbert: Okay, thank you. Mr. Mayor, Council, my name is Harry Wolbert. I'm co-chair of the Winnipeg Transit Riders Association. I'd like to speak in opposition to the motion. I thought we had a plan. We had public consultations, we set aside some money. The Province is on the board with its share of the funding. We've applied for some Federal dollars. If we were to now change our minds and go with light rail, this puts in jeopardy, the Federal funding we've applied for. It means going back to square one and there are costs involved with that as well. Is that what we want? I don't think so. I hope that Council members, the Mayor, would proceed as planned with Phase 2, a slogan of mine, if you've been reading my twitter and face book post is let's get the job done. Right now, we have a road that leads to nowhere. We made a commitment to finish the project. I hope that Council will honour its commitment and show some leadership on the issue. Hopefully, today we can decide once in for all, light rail, bus, we can talk about converting later on if you want. We don't have a problem with that, but let's complete the project as planned. If we want to convert later or build other rapid transit lines that are light rail, that's fine. I don't have a problem with that. But I hope today, you know, the vote we're going to take, will decide things once and for all, and I'm hoping you know, some sound minds will prevail and we will go ahead with the project as it's been planned. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. You can step down.

Harry Wolbert: Okay.

Madam Speaker: We'll now hear from Mr. David Sanders again. He is in support of Item No. 5, the Report of EPC dated May 7 regarding cost and benefits of railroad rationalization.

David Sanders: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Having listened to the last two speakers, I really should register my objection to Council permitting people to speak in favour of the present plan, not for BRT, but not opposed to it. Now, with regard to costs and benefits of railroad rationalization, the resolution before you, there are all sorts of good reasons

for taking a fresh eyed look at the present cost and future benefits of rationalizing or relocating the railroads passing through the City of Winnipeg, avoiding the huge costs for continuing to build, repair and replace more grade separations, underpasses and overpasses both vehicular and pedestrian, for more and more major traffic routes, improving traffic safety by reducing the number of at-grade crossings and minimizing opportunities for collisions with vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians, improving community safety by diverting hazardous goods trains away from the populated areas of the city, acquiring rail rights-of-way for use as rapid transit ways whether bus, BRT or light rail, LRT and/or active transportation routes. Increasing the efficiency of the urban rail services through shared use of rights-of-way and easy access to intermodal transfer points such as Centrepont and the removal of obsolete spur lines and the assembly of underutilized industrial lands for redevelopment within existing employment areas of the city. The Canadian transportation agency oversees the Federal government's role in facilitating railroad rationalization and to quote, the Railway Relocation and Crossing Act, it is designed to facilitate the relocation of railway lines or the rerouting of railway traffic in urban areas in situations where a railway company and the relevant government body cannot agree. This Act empowers the Canadian Transportation Agency to order a railway company to do such things as remove railway structures, build new facilities. Stop operating on certain lines or allow other railway companies onto their trackage in urban areas. However, these powers may only be used when certain criteria are met including a determination by the agency that any such relocation or rerouting would occur at no net cost to the railway company and the agency may also recommend a grant to help offset the cost of relocation or rerouting, but only when parliament has previously set aside money for that purpose and financial assistance to help prepare a transportation plan for any such relocation or rerouting may also be available from the Minister of Transport Infrastructure and Communities, again, providing Parliament as provided the funds. With Federal and Provincial assistance and the co-operation of the railways, Winnipeg did take a serious look at the issues 40 years ago when a Winnipeg railway relocation study was commissioned following the publication of the Metro Winnipeg's...the Winnipeg Area Transportation Study in 1966/68. And these studies identified many opportunities to rationalize our urban rail facilities that facilitate economical redevelopment of our city. Since then the CN East Yard and the transfer track have been removed to make way for the redevelopment of the Forks site, and the Waterfront Drive, Steve Juba Park. But the huge CPR marshaling yards still remain in North Winnipeg and some trackage has been taken up on certain lines through the City, but by and large the many railways passing through Winnipeg remain in place requiring more and more, very expensive underpasses and overpasses to accommodate increased traffic volumes. So I do believe it is time commission a new Winnipeg railway location study engaging all concerned with a view to securing the funding necessary to relocate, realign and redevelop urban railway lands if warranted now. If so, such projects could qualify for federal financial assistance specifically from the New Building Canada Fund. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now move on to five items that Mr. Sanders is in opposition to. We'll start with Item No. 1 of Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated May 13 regarding Bishop Grandin Crossing Area Master Plan.

David Sanders: Thank you. I indicated that I'd wished to speak in opposition to the adoption of the area master plan in part because I'm not objecting to the proposed area master plan for the redevelopment of the former sugar beet lands in Fort Garry per se, but I do object to the apparent attempts to justify the plan as an example of "transit oriented development", and I do object to current attempts to use this site as a major reason for proceeding with the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor Project at this time. I point out that the area master plan before you has no approved connection to the southwest rapid transit corridor and the proposed Plaza Drive rapid transit station which will be a minimum walk of an eighth of a mile or 220 yards which is a life of two CFL football fields from the closest bus stop within the redevelopment area. So far, CN has been unwilling to allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross the Letellier line, rail line, upgrade, to access the Plaza Drive, rapid transit station if built. Transit bus service to the redevelopment site will be from Chevrier Boulevard to the north, Waverley to the west and by only westbound traffic on Bishop Grandin. There're no will in fact be no crossing Bishop Grandin, at Bishop Grandin crossing and there will be no transit bus access to the redevelopment site from Pembina Highway or the proposed rapid transit corridor except for by very circuitous routes using the three entrances well to the west of Pembina. You have a resolution before you, I would urge you to look to the end of that report, the administrative report for the part of the recommendation which is not quoted upfront and that is that a critical issue tied to the development concept for the site and the potential for success as a transit oriented development community is connection to the proposed Plaza Drive Station and rapid transit line and this is the administration's report without confirmation of this connection, the full development scenario as proposed could not be supported by the City. And we're talking here about a grade level crossing to the transit station at that location. The plan itself says it's also important to note that the development concept vision objectives and policies to bring this vision to reality is based on the fundamental premise of direct pedestrian and bicycle connection between Bishop Grandin crossing that is development area and the Plaza Drive Rapid Transit Station. Without this connection, a TOD transit oriented development based project and its associated characteristics and benefits is not possible. If you also look to plan page 16, the statement is there that CN was approached through the Southwest Rapid Transit Functional Design Study and currently is not amenable to a pedestrian/cycle crossing. Perhaps this is an issue for the Federal Government and the Canadian Transportation Agency. In any event, the City's Urban Planning Division's planning discussion also

states that access to transit plays a major role in contributing to a modal split, typically associated with transit oriented communities that separates from the traditional suburban community. A traffic impact assessment study was completed by Stantec Engineering. It concluded that an increased modal split could be achieved with 15 percent of trips generated by the development being absorbed by rapid transit rather than the current five percent Winnipeg average and suggests that this plan is therefore a prime example of translating the rapid transit policies into action. I'm sorry, but I find it very, very hard to believe that 15 percent of the residents and workers in the proposed redevelopment site will walk a minimum of 220 yards across the hydro right-of-way and the railway tracks, most to catch another bus, as apparently suggested by the Stantec Study. And I ask that the study is available for public review or is it to be kept confidential like the Stantec Study of Traffic Issues for the new fire paramedic station at 1705 Portage Avenue?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now move on to Item No. 9, which Mr. Sanders is in opposition to, Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated May 13 regarding Fort Rouge Yards Developer Cash Contributions.

David Sanders: Madam Speaker, this particular recommendation deals with supposed cash contributions submitted by the developers of the lands commonly known as the Fort Rouge Yards to be devoted to provision of certain amenities within the local community and the proposal is that it be held in an account in the Planning, Property and Development Department and that the Director of that department be granted the authority to approve expenditures with concurrence from the Ward Councillor. The community did ask how this is going to be 500,000 dollar community development fund be allocated? There was a public consultation process organized by the Ward Councillor and Lord Roberts Community Centre to discuss the matter and there is a report which is attached to your agenda, but I do continue to have some questions about the whole scheme. Phases 1, 2 and 3 of the yards of Fort Rouge development were to be completed by 2015.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Sanders.

David Sanders: Yes.

Madam Speaker: You are speaking out of bounds again, so let's speak to the item at hand and I don't see that in your next two pages at all. You're speaking about GEM Equities and other things so.

David Sanders: Well, I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, but we're talking here about the allocation of \$500,000 from the developer. One of my questions is, has the City received any payment as yet?

Madam Speaker: Continue. Let's wrap this up and move on to the next one because really you're not speaking to the item at hand.

David Sanders: And the recommendation is that the authority be given to the director and the Ward Councillor and my question is, shouldn't an expenditure of up to 500,000 be approved at least by the City Centre Community Committee as a group? And I was asking what the status of this development is and the loans should've been guaranteed by the City for the development, which so far hasn't taken place. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next is Item No. 10, which you are in opposition to, the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated May 13th regarding Expropriation of Lands, Polo Park Infrastructure Improvement Project.

David Sanders: Thank you. I will just speak very briefly to the fact that the proposal is to authorize the expropriation of the lands between St. James and Route 90, which is part of the project and there's references to the financing and I am questioning whether or not, in fact, there is going to be significant increase in the cost to the project, a census indicated that the Provincial share will not involve 50 percent of the property acquisition costs of some of \$11 million and therefore suggesting that the City's cost be as much as 25.5 million and I do ask since it was indicated there in the proposals for the Winnipeg Stadium sale that the purchasers would be contributing to the cost of off-site related infrastructure improvements, which is what this is. I wonder what if anything is being contributed by the developers of that site. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, next is Item No. 1, which you're in opposition to, the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated May 20 regarding Authorization to Proceed with Professional Engineering Consulting Services for an underpass of the CNR Redditt Subdivision.

David Sanders: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The reports indicate that the Plessis, \$77 million Plessis Road Twinning and Grade Separation Project is so far coming in on or under budget which sounds good except that if you read the fine

print, you'll see that the City's share of that cost is escalating and secondly, that the conclude the end date required for the Building Canada Funding on March 31, 2015, is not achievable. And apparently, the Federal Government has been asked to allow for a year extension for Federal funding. There was no indication that the Federal Government agreed to it, and I'm asking if they have agreed and if not, why not. In any event, the reports indicate the City will have to contribute an additional \$3.3 million, not yet planned for, and maybe a lot more from that depending on the extension of the deadline. In any event, the resolution before you, I do object strenuously to Recommendation No. 2. The Council approve the City, entered into the funding agreements for this project with the Province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada on whatever terms the Interim Acting Chief Administrative Officer may negotiate. As I suggested to EPC, any self-respecting City Council would expect the Interim Acting Chief Administrative Officer to bring a proposed tri-level government agreement.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Sanders, this is inappropriate and demeaning to our staff.

David Sanders: I thought I was just...

Madam Speaker: You keep your comments respectful, please. Carry on.

David Sanders: I thought I was referring to Council, not the staff.

Madam Speaker: Either one, doesn't matter. Do you have anything further to add on that item?

David Sanders: No, that's it.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so the last item is Item No. 3. You're in opposition to the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and River Bank Management dated May 5 regarding Public Safety Building and Civic Central Car Park.

David Sanders: Right, and I'll be very brief. Just indicate that this is a proposal to now in 2014, conduct a feasibility study for the future development, redevelopment of the Public Safety Building and parkade. And I do ask, you know, why we waited till now when we've known since 2009 that they're moving. And I also am concerned that without waiting for a Council decision on the future use of the site, the resolution asks that the department be given the authority to apply for subdivision of the site for the purpose of sale. Since the Ernst and Young Real Estate Management Audit and other frantic audits just requested by Council are to be released imminently, apparently for the June 25 Council meeting, I strongly recommend that the committee postponed making decision on any of these recommendations until after the audits are published and dealt with. And I do think that the committee should certainly hear this case or the Council should certainly reject Recommendation No. 4 and refuse to authorize an application for subdivision before any decision has been made on the future use of the site. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Are there any questions for Mr. Sanders on these items? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, there was a series of some critical comments about the Plaza Drive BRT Station, my favourite of the BRT stations, in that under the Mayor's leadership last year, we announced... Can I ask you, are you aware that the Plaza Drive BRT Station is going to respect the history of the sugar beet lands area. There's going to be commemoration of the Japanese prison...Japanese individuals who were relocated to Winnipeg from B.C. during the war, put in a lot of work in the area of the sugar beet land, that's an initiative that we've undertaken to the City for that particular BRT Station so, a lot of criticism about it here today, but are you aware that we are doing that heritage project at the Plaza Station?

David Sanders: Councillor. I wasn't aware of that and that sounds wonderful, but it still hasn't connected to the development.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Yes, Mr. Sanders. Thank you for showing up today, I do appreciate your comments, especially with the...I guess my question is have you read the transit oriented design handbook that the City of Winnipeg published that... it's kind of like a check mark on the sugar beet lands? Is it transit oriented design or not? Have you done that check mark?

David Sanders: I'm looking at the plan. When I look at that plan, it doesn't qualify as a transit oriented development in my view.

Councillor Orlikow: And I agree with you.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Mr. Sander, did you read your entire presentation?

David Sanders: No.

Councillor Havixbeck: The entire presentation that you provided? Which sections did you not speak to?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck, questions will come through me to the delegations.

Councillor Havixbeck: Oh, sorry, I'd like to know from Mr. Sanders which sections he didn't present that we actually all received because it's a 20 page document.

Madam Speaker: It's important to follow along when people are reading. I believe he circulated it.

Councillor Havixbeck: Okay, well, then I'll ask my question. My question is that in his statement he indicated that last year's funding requests of the Federal Government was denied. Does he have a reason for that or is he...does he know that for a fact?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Sanders.

David Sanders: I know that for a fact it didn't get through the screening. I checked with the infrastructure office in the Province of Manitoba and Canada and noted that application was made and having read the requirements, I can see that there are many things missing, many of which were then ordered by the City under the new consulting contracts following August of last year and September, in which they're rushing to complete now, not in time for this year.

Madam Speaker: Anything further? Thank you, Mr. Sanders.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 7, 2014**

Madam Speaker: Next, we'll move on to committee reports. First up, we have EPC, Mr. Mayor on the report dated May 7.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 5.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour?

Councillor Eadie: Four.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of one, two, three and five? All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor.

Item 4 - Bill C-23 Fair Elections Act – Public Consultations

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, I'd love to hear from Councillor Eadie.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Councillor Smith is still at the table? It was moving fast so I called for it. I would give leave to let Harvey Smith speak to this motion first. Is that okay or no?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, let me tell you this. I think we should not go along with EPC's recommendation to just file this receive as information. Let me tell you, there has been no demand by the citizens for this Bill. There's no...what is wrong

with the voucher card that in effect people get notification that they are on the list? You know, it seems reasonable to in effect do...when we spent, when we're spending \$10 million to go ahead and send 500 people to Afghanistan, surely we should study how our elections are held. We have a declining turnout all the time, and it seems to me reasonable to go ahead and examine our own system, and we should not support EPC because let me tell you this, election is important. It decides for the issues, decides what party, what policies are going forward, and so it's important. Five hundred thousand people did not vote in the last election. We should find out why. We should find out how we can in effect encourage greater voter turnout. This Bill does not do anything. In fact, it hinders possible turnout. So, I hope that we look at this and say, look it, we should study...we should have a real close look at our elections and make changes that will facilitate, encourage people to vote rather than discourage them. So I hope that we follow Vancouver's example and we support the motion that myself and Councillor Eadie have put forward. It's important to us as a city. If people have faith in the election, it strengthens the democratic process, and I don't think this bill does it. And I think we should, in effect not support EPC's position. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know many people are questioning why are we debating this at the City Council level and Vancouver saw fit to discuss this, and I just want...having been involved in...I didn't get really that political for many years, but since 1998, I've been involved in elections in almost every position, as candidate and so on and each level has its elections rules and finance rules and different mechanisms for dealing with trying to get people to vote. And what really happens though is there is a trickle-down effect, actually. What happens is we...well, we've seen over time that the Federal Government took, for example, and the Provincial Government decided to exclude corporations and unions from making contributions to elections, which you know, that was a good debate and discussion and okay, well, fair is fair, no corporation, no union and that's fine and then it did happen at the Municipal level, it was a trickle-down effort. It got to our level along with limited amounts of contributions. And in both the federal and the provincial election rules, political parties can fundraise year in, year out, day in, day out and raise the kind of money that they need to run an election at the time an election comes. Lo and behold, we are stuck with these limitations that they gave us and you know, I'm not saying that they're wrong, the limitations, however, the problem being is this trickle-down effect doesn't recognize that municipally, you can only register on June 30 as a City Councillor and if you're in a hotly contested race, you've got to raise \$27,000 in the Mynarski Ward to run a race like that and it's very difficult to do, very difficult to do. It would be nice to be able to run a fundraiser, you know, a couple of fundraisers every year so that you can raise it, you're not going to people for large amounts of money, there's more and more people who are not disengaged with the political system we want to do that. So what you have is this trickle-down effect. Now, I know that the City...I don't believe we do have a vouching system where people can vote. However, that was something I would like to see trickle-down and I've got to really end my discussion on this because even as a City Councillor this Federal Act demonstrates something. As an elected official, when you are out on the street and you're walking around and every Councillor around the table including the Mayor knows this, when you are out, whatever is happening at the other levels, you're always dragged into it. And anyway, I was on my way to City Hall one day and I came to a bus stop at Jefferson...Seven Oaks and Main. And there was some homeless guys there, you know, they were breaking the law, they were having a beer in the bus shack, but really, they came up and they talked to me because they recognized me. And this one gentleman was telling me about...and he's homeless, he was telling me about how his partner is in the Health Sciences Centre and she is going through some really heavy health care illness problems and he was quite disgusted with how the emergency room at the Health Science Centre looks in terms of the garbage laying around and I'm not sure who caused it, but you know, here are some homeless people who care about what's happening on issues that are political and are dealt with in this country. But, what we are saying here is: I can't vouch for him. Like he really cared and you know what, he wants to have something to say about how all of our political...all of our government services are delivered, and he should be able to. And it would be great to see this kind of stuff trickle down so these people can actually vote and make a decision because it's not that they're not intelligent, it's not that they don't know how to vote, it's not, you know, these people, they have no address and many of them, as a matter of fact, try to get some identification. You know, if you're living out on the street, you get rolled, somebody steals all your ID, how do you get a vote? That happens. It does happen, people, it happens in this city all the time. And so, this thing is relevant and it's really too bad we didn't get to debate this before the Federal Government passed it because there should've been more consultations so that we could hear the stories of the one similar to the one on the bus stop. So even though it's probably too late, I'm still going to be voting in favour of this motion that was moved by Harvey Smith, who has spent a much longer career in the political system. I heard stories of how he talks about democracy when he grew up in the lower mainland of British Columbia. He got started as a young man and if he believes that there is a problem with this, there is a problem and so I support this wholeheartedly and I hope that all of you will as well. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm...first of all, let me say that this is a comprehensive piece of legislation that's already been adopted and before it was adopted there was some significant changes made to this legislation which certainly improved the legislation, but by no means, do I want to give the impression that this is a good piece of legislation, but let's be clear, it's already been adopted. There hasn't been...there's been no consultations, there's been limited debate in Ottawa, but it's been adopted so what we're doing here is largely academic. And I just happened to feel when we talk about democracy or when we talk about getting people to come out to the polls and citizens over to Ukraine to make sure that people are properly identified and make sure that people at the elections are legitimate, and what I want to say, I think...I think...I've kind of followed this issue because...for obvious reasons. What I find most offensive about this legislation is that it actually prevents Elections Canada from going out and promoting people coming out to vote. It actually prevents Elections Canada from going out and doing voter education. And I ask you, Madam Speaker, what sort of government would actually implement this sort of thing? It's...I was going to say it's very, very American, but...but that's not right either. It's very, very Republican, but that's not right either. It's very, very Tea Party, Madam Speaker, and that...that concerns me deeply. Whenever you put limits on the Elections Canada that you can't go out and promote voting in the next election, we should all be very concerned. Could you imagine we have an election here April 22nd or 24th, I forget what day it is, could you imagine if this Council decided to tell Richard Kachur and Marc Lemoine and the City Clerk's that there is going to be no voter education for October 22nd. There's going to be no voter promotion for October 22. Madam Speaker, it's unheard of. I could speak more to this, but it is a comprehensive piece. It's been amended. It's been passed, but that's just the point I wanted to make, it actually prohibits Elections Canada from going out and doing voter education. Granted it did grandfather some programs that were in the schools. Thank God for that. The programs that did voter education for students are being grandfathered and that's only because every credible voice on voter education and on democracy spoke out against this legislation, Madam Speaker, and I think...I think we need to have these conversations getting people to the polls. I think it's incredibly important. We don't do a very good job of getting people to the polls of the City of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker and we have to improve on that, and that's what I'm going to say about this initiative. It has been amended though, it's comprehensive, it's amended, it's passed, it's not some people call it the Unfair Elections Act. It's not completely unfair at this point, it's simply a bad piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was the one that move that we file this as information and the reason I did that is because I saw this as just sort of a baby with the bath water motion. There are some good features in this legislation and, you know, I have friends who come from all political parties. And I don't think any of them haven't lived through election experience can sit in front of you and say they haven't experienced an election where they haven't had a concern about who was voting or whether the identification was correct or how people...people were showing up at the polls. I don't think it's specific to any political party. And what we've seen here is this sort of game of partisanship and trying to create polarity on the issue. I mean, it just...I don't know if it was just by accident, but the people for the majority that spoke about this this morning and seemed to come from the left extreme of the political spectrum. I don't know where Mr. Sanders comes from, but you know, the others were obviously here from the left. You know what, it's so...like this...this is not an issue to polarize on. We're...you know, the issue of democracy is something that we should all hold as sacred and Councillor Vandal made a good point. We sent people off to other countries, other parts of the world, you know, it's not just as observers of democracy and promoters of democracy, and some of the things that they observe and they promote are....what they're looking for and they're promoting, and some of the things are actually in this legislation. So let's not throw the baby out with the bath water, but don't forget too, we also send soldiers from this country over to other countries to fight for democracy. So let's not take it lightly. Let's not talk about this, try to make this a partisan issue or try to create some polarization. Quite frankly, I think the issue of proper identification is a pretty minimal standard to have to achieve. You know, there are some people who might need assistance in getting their ID and maybe that's where government can step in to ensure that people have access to ID. But to ask somebody to show up and say, "Yes, I am the person who has the right to vote." That's what we ask when we go into other countries to promote democracy. I don't think that's a difficult standard. You know, some of this, you get down into the micro, the games of elections. You know, it's...you start trying to create issues and, you know, it's that stuff that happens as we're driving towards elections. I want to make a comment too...about you know, people not showing up at the polls and they need to promote democracy. I sat here today. I chirped I think at the end of...or I might have even been off the floor, but you know, we moved a motion here to deal with a \$1.5 million budget issue on one sentence on a document. It was only two of us that were in objection to that. It was Councillor Fielding and myself. You know, Councillor Fielding is a diehard Conservative. I happen to be a card carrying Liberal, voted for all three political parties in my life as I tend to look for leaders, I don't look for brands. I'll tell ya that type of behaviour will drive more people away from the polls than anything in this act. If we're going to continue, you know, with campaigns of "I hate everything" governance by twitter and behaving the way that we behave in here, there will be less and less people coming out to the polls until we achieve something close to anarchy and people rise up and say, we've got to stop this madness.

Councillor Vandal: Now, you're a Communist.

Councillor Swandel: Well, I learned from a Marxist this morning. But we've got to consider that. Is it the election process that's keeping away from people, for people away from the polls? I don't think so. I think it's our behaviour that's keeping people away from the polls. You know, we need to do better. We need to behave better. We need to be more responsible. You want to draw people to the polls, stand up, do your homework. Know what you're voting on. Don't...you know, don't get 20 phone calls and say, I've got to change my mind. Go to a level of detail that you know that it's your decision. It's not a Conservative decision, not a Liberal decision or NDP decision. You know, it's a decision that's in the best interests of this city in its entirety. And when you can do that you're going to see people respect you and they're going to come out to the polls to support you, but if what you are doing is every day when you wake up, stick your finger up in the air or stick in your iPhone up in the air and check what's going on twitter and that's how you're making your decisions, you're not going to have people coming out to the polls. Why would they? Why do they want to be involved with people who do that? That's not leadership. We've got a myriad of issues that are really, really important to this City to deal with. When we start participating in that type of destructive process, destruction of value, you know, lack of vision, lack of strategic planning, you know, that's what drives people away. You can put all the rules you want in place, but until you behave like leaders, you won't get people coming out. Stand up after you have done your homework. You know, that's how you drive people out to the polls. Give them something important to vote about. I'm not saying that this issue isn't important, it is an important issue, but our motion that's in front of us is a baby with the bath water motion. Read through this, I think it was Mr. Sanders who referred to a summary that was 60 something pages long. I'll guarantee you, none of us here have read that. I certainly haven't. And I certainly haven't read the hundreds of pages that go along with the 60 something page summary. So let's smarten up. This motion was filed because it's a baby with the bath water motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll try to be brief. A lot of points made on both sides, I just want to say a couple of things about process. I want to thank Councillor Eadie for saying there have been some reports that he wasn't allowed to speak at EPC. It was more of a misunderstanding. I'm sorry we didn't get a chance to hear from Councillor Eadie and Councillor Smith. It was a misunderstanding. It wasn't attempted to muzzle anybody. I don't know that would've changed anything, but really, I think it's important to hear from Councillors at all committees in delegation and especially at EPC. So, glad we got that sorted out. The only other thing I want to mention is there was talk of City elections and trickle-down effect. I want to put in a good word if I may for the City Clerk's, who I think really are trying to promote turnout here. I'm in a unique position to say this because I attacked them before my election. It was either you delaying this by-election for political purposes and on and on. And one of my friends, Chris Sigurdson, who's a school trustee, very wise fellow said, "Have you considered maybe they're actually doing this because they want to increase turnout and they want to have more election workers? They're not actually, you know, out to...they don't spend their time attacking you." And I thought that's probably true and after I got elected and worked with the City Clerk's, I came to realize, they are trying to do everything they can, I think just for turnout. We had a Saturday vote in my by-election because the by-election Councillor Orlikow got elected at had roughly 25 percent turnout in the dead of winter. Mine has slightly lower than that, but it was an experiment to go on a Saturday, would this increase turnout. You know, we opened up different voting places. You can now vote in advance in four different ways. There's a roving advance that goes into seniors homes. You go into a mall. You can get the ballot especially printed off for you, particular to your jurisdiction. I mean, I know in Ward 1 in Louis Riel School Division, there's...you would think that's all St. Boniface, but there are a couple of polls in the EK ridings, I mean, there's different school divisions. You're really running two separate elections at once, which is even trickier, running a School Division election with all different criteria for half...if you haven't lived here for six months, you can't vote. There's all these different rules here, so you are really running two elections simultaneously at the same polls. You've got different wards. I overlap all four wards in the Louis Riel School Division. Councillor Vandal, I think, overlaps several. You've got people voting in different ridings. It's not an easy election to run. I do think the City Clerk's are trying their best to get turnout up as high as they can, more advanced polling locations, that kind of thing. So it's not perfect. It's far from perfect, but I think at least at this level, we are trying to increase turnout and let people have their say at the polls.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. That's a very good conversation we just heard. It's been already said, Madam Speaker, that this law has been amended and passed. That's the way it is, whether you like it or dislike it. That's the way it is right now. So let's talk about here at the City of Winnipeg. I think we want to be as democratic as possible. We want to get as many people voting as possible. For many, many decades, I heard people and the media talk about low voter turnout. Councillor Mayes just discussed it and I remember when I ran, it was the second highest turnout we've ever had, and it wasn't the kind of turnout we all should be proud of. It should be the 75 percent mark. That's not the case, but what are we doing in the City of Winnipeg to encourage people to vote? Well, let me tell you, in the City of Winnipeg, we accept vouching. If you're homeless, we let you vote. And in 2006, I think if you all remember,

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 27, 2014

we actually changed fundraising so that if an individual makes a contribution, they get 75 percent of their donation back. I would say that's encouraging people to participate in the democratic process. I think it's unfortunate and I must commend Councillor Eadie for telling everybody that it was a disconnect in what happened. There was nothing untoward whatsoever, and I do thank the Councillor for pointing that out. But the reality is, this is done. You can talk about it as much as you want. You can get on your soap box. It's not changing, it's done. So let's not beat the horse. Let's do everything we can in the City of Winnipeg to get as many people to come out and vote. That would be our step and the lead by example for everybody else. Because whether it's been Federal, Provincial, Civic elections, by-elections, they've all been low turnouts and this is what the existing legislation that exists, it's been low for a long time, this isn't anything new, but we have focused on making things much better here at the City of Winnipeg. And that's our job and we should continue to do that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour of the item? Recorded vote? All those in favour, please rise. All those in favour of receiving as information, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Smith and Councillor Vandal

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 10, nays 6.

Madam Speaker: Item is carried. Next, Mr. Mayor, on the report of EPC dated May 14th, 2014.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 14, 2014**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 3.

Councillor Eadie: Three, please.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of one and two? Opposed? Carried.

Item 3 - Strategic Economic and Investment Grant - Price Industries Limited

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I would like to hear from the Councillor who stood this down and then respond.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I needed to speak to this for various reasons, but I want to start off by just saying that I'm not against this particular initiative per se. Some may debate whether or not this project from Price Industries is really in need of a...if it's really considered to be a economic incentive grant kind of project, but what...and I will support it, but my concern is just this. I know that it's conditional upon the Province agreeing to do the tax incremental financing from their side of the property tax bill. It's just that I'm looking at this and it looks to me like one of their operations is on Raleigh in the East Kildonan area and the other, I believe it says Egesz, which would put it over in the...up near Oak Point Highway in the Tyndall Park area. And so, I was reading through the rationale, there's good solid rationale. It's going to provide new...expand jobs and bring employment for the people who are...well actually, there's good employment opportunities that can happen there for the people who live in those neighbourhoods. There's a lot of residential neighbourhood around these particular areas, so I think it's a good one. But, there is a number of really good economic initiatives that happen in many neighbourhoods and so when I look at this and I have to say to

myself like why these ones, and not Neechi Commons, in the North End where the buildings are in really bad shape. You have a huge investment in not only in the building in the capital project that went in there, but it hires many, many people from the neighbourhood around it. It's about economic development, requiring an incentive, I think. Because, really, taking the risk in a neighbourhood like that is very difficult and it needs some help, and the Provincial is already on board. So when I'm looking at this particular economic incentive, I have to ask myself, why? Why this one that we're promoting as a City and why not help Neechi Commons? I ask you that question. When you're all voting on this, think about it. I don't understand why. And, yeah, it's a different kind of business. That's fine, but the point is, is that all business is risky and they could all use some assistance. We want to expand our economy. It's actually doing quite well. We hear from Economic Development Winnipeg, how well we're doing as Winnipeg, whenever you see the economic reports that we get from our administration. Things are looking pretty good for the City of Winnipeg, I'll give us that. But when I look at specific targeting to try to help people or help business, I don't understand why this one and not that one. So I will be voting for it, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to make that point. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, Madam Speaker, let me make it very clear the City of Winnipeg has a commitment up to eight hundred thousand dollars. It's not taking one nickel out of our bank account. The way this is set up and I commend the department as well as those working on the economic strategy here. What's basically happening is, this is coming out of incremental property taxes. Right now, we're getting next to nothing on vacant land. They will be making a \$10.5 million investment. There will be incremental taxes, which they will be getting the first five years. And then, for the next 10 years, the City will get 100 percent every even year and the proponent will get a hundred percent every odd year. So it's actually bringing in money into us. So that's number one. And keep in mind, this was brought to us by Yes Winnipeg, just to try to address one of the comments that Councillor Eadie made was that we looked at Neechi Commons. The department looked at it. The realities are and I believe the Councillor should be aware of it, if not, there was next to little incremental taxes for the City to give back based on what they're asked. That's the only reason. This is all motivated and basically funded by incremental property taxes and that was the reason that Neechi Commons did not get much because there just wasn't very much improvement in the incremental taxes. So you know, don't pick any organization in this situation. There was significant and from my point of view, I think everybody would like to encourage quality, high-paying jobs. And I don't care what part of the City it's in, okay? Wherever it's in, it's something that I would very much support high quality, high paying jobs, to me is very good whereas right now we're getting zero dollars. It's vacant land. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour of Item No. 3? Opposed? Carried. Okay, so noted. Mr. Mayor on the report of EPC dated May 21, 2014.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MAY 21, 2014**

Mayor Katz: I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Item 1.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. I think next we have the notice of motion regarding the composition of EPC. Mr. Mayor to introduce the motion.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTIONS**

**Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz,
Seconded by Councillor Steen,**

WHEREAS as legislated by the Province of Manitoba under The City of Winnipeg Charter, the Mayor is obligated to appoint members of the Executive Policy Committee of council;

AND WHEREAS under The City of Winnipeg Charter, Executive Policy Committee shall be composed of (a) the mayor, who is the chairperson of the committee; (b) the chairpersons of the standing committees of council, if any such committees are established; and (c) any other members of council appointed by the mayor;

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 27, 2014

AND WHEREAS under The City of Winnipeg Charter, the mayor shall determine the number of members of the Executive Policy Committee of council, but the number of members must be less than 50% of the total number of members of council;

AND WHEREAS under The City of Winnipeg Charter, the duties of Executive Policy Committee must be to formulate and present recommendations to council respecting policies, plans, budgets, by-laws and other matters that affect the City as a whole, as well as recommend to council individuals for appointment as statutory officers, and where necessary or appropriate, the suspension or dismissal of statutory officers;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City Council request the Province of Manitoba to amend The City of Winnipeg Charter effective as of the next organizational meeting of Council in November, 2014, as follows:

Mayor's appointments

59(1) *At the first meeting of council after a general election, the mayor must appoint*

- (a) *a deputy mayor;*
- (b) *an acting deputy mayor;*
- (c) *three members of the executive policy committee of council; and*
- (d) *from the executive policy committee members appointed pursuant to clauses 61(1)(b) and (c), the chairpersons for the standing committees of council, if such committees are established by council.*

Executive policy committee established

61(1) *There shall be an executive policy committee of council composed of*

- (a) *the mayor, who is the chairperson of the committee;*
- (b) *three members of council appointed by the mayor pursuant to clause 59(1)(c); and*
- (c) *three members of council appointed by council.*

Size of executive policy committee

61(2) *The executive policy committee shall consist of seven members including the Mayor.*

Mayor Katz: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'll just...that City Council request the Province of Manitoba to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter effective as of the next Organizational Meeting of Council in November, 2014 regarding the composition of the Executive Policy Committee. The purpose here is quite simple. A proposal that's been put forward was for the Mayor to select three members of Executive Policy Committee and for Council-at-large to select the other three members. As hopefully, everybody here on the floor of Council is aware of, this was brought in during Mayor Susan Thompson's term as Mayor and it continued through Glen Murray's term as Mayor. It seemed to be embraced by everyone. On many occasions, you have heard comments about how members of EPC stick together. Au contraire, just look at today, you see members of EPC voting in different directions, it happens every single time. They vote what they believe is in the best interest of the City at that point in time and their constituents. By the same token, I think I've always said that it's the Mayor's job is to build consensus and I believe whether you have three or six, your job is still to build consensus. This would bring everybody to the table; I think it makes a lot of sense. This should definitely be embraced by everyone as something positive for moving on down the road, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, might we also have another motion similar. I move that this matter be referred without instructions to committee.

Madam Speaker: To which committee? EPC? Yes. All those in favour of the referral?

Councillor Swandel: Can we just get some clarification?

Madam Speaker: Can we refer it back to the same committee, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Mayor, you are allowed a three minute rebuttal if you would like to speak on that as to why it shouldn't be referred.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I am not aware of what the Councillor's motivation is to refer it from my point of view. I think this is something that has been discussed for a long time. I'm more than happy to move on this right now. And obviously, in the end, it'll be Council's decision, but this is something that I think comes up on a regular basis. I would appreciate the fact that, you know, we discuss it; we vote. whatever Council's will is so be it, but from my point of view, to say something that I am very supportive of, and I hope to move forward.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, is the question on the motion to refer? All those in favour? Recorded vote. All those in favour of the motion to refer, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Mayes, Orlikow, Smith, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Nordman, Pagtakhan, Steen and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote is yeas 9, nays 7.

Madam Speaker: Motion to refer is carried.

Councillor Swandel: Motion referring to EPC, not to Governance.

Madam Speaker: Yes. Okay, next is a notice of motion regarding LRT. Councillor Wyatt to introduce the motion.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I'd like to move referral to the appropriate committee as well in terms of this item without instruction.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour?

Mayor Katz: Recorded vote please, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all those in favour of referring to EPC or the appropriate committee?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Mayes, Nordman, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steen and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt to introduce the motion.

Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Havixbeck,

WHEREAS Council has not formally adopted final funding proposals for South West Bus Rapid Transit;

AND WHEREAS the cost of Bus Rapid Transit, and the chosen dog leg, appears to be escalating in price;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg's growth in the last ten years has been impressive and shows no signs of slowing down;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg should now build LRT, considering other cities of similar size (and smaller) are building LRT and Winnipeg in in direct competition with other Canadian cities;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council endorse a full LRT project connecting East Winnipeg via the Downtown and into the University of Manitoba;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this project be made a priority for the new Building Canada Program, for funding from the other levels of government and to be built at the earliest opportunity.

Councillor Wyatt: Next time, I'll ask the Mayor to vote for a motion to refer. Yes, the motion before us is very straightforward. It's really coming down, in my view; I wanted it referred simply for the very fact that I think that there needs to be a little bit more work done. I did it as a notice of motion as a courtesy to the Council to give some thought to the matter and then to refer it to the standing committee to allow what the standing committees are for to do their work. It was...it was supposed to go to EPC apparently, but we couldn't refer it to there, to the Standing Committee of Public Works and that would've been the thing to do. I believe that there is due diligence here that needs to be done. I really believe that in light of the recent developments pertaining to the other proposal that is not before us here today in terms of the BRT, I think there's serious questions that have been raised in terms of the cost of the BRT, in terms of the alignment of the BRT, in terms of what the true numbers are that we are actually spending on, and I think we need to kind of have a true comparison to the two different systems and to make a decision. Now, some will say that this is delaying, let's get on with rapid transit; let's just build it; let's just finish it. Well, you know, I would support rapid transit. I believe that rapid transit is a good thing for our city. I don't believe that we should not be building rapid transit. The question is right now as a city, you know, we are growing and you know, ten years ago, when we did the rapid transit task force, nearly ten years, and the Conference Board of Canada came out with projections in terms of the growth in the City of Winnipeg. Nobody at that time believed them to be quite honest with you in terms of projected growth of Where Winnipeg was going to be going. And their numbers and projections have been accurate. The City is now exceeding 700,000 people. The Capital Region, you know, we're pushing upwards of 800,000 in terms of the entire Capital Region. We, you know, within by 2031, its projected by the Conference Board that we're going to add another 180,000 people by 2031. So the City of Winnipeg itself, you know, will be in the range of about 900,000 people not including the Capital Region. So just think about that. Just think about that population growth that's happening in a relatively short period of time. And just think now that we're spending upwards of...I'm not too sure what the number is now based on what I saw in this recent report. I think it's very, it could be upwards of 600 million just on the BRT itself even if you're...if you especially, if you have to contemplate a grade separation down at Pembina, I don't know how the Public Works Department and Transit can justify that we cannot have...we cannot have on grade crossings at two small, two lane collector streets running through Fort Rouge and the Parker neighbourhood, yet when it gets down to Pembina, it's okay to run across six lanes of traffic on grade. That's okay. That's not going to be an issue. When we ask the question at seminar, the director said he'll stack the buses while waits for the light to turn, well so much for rapid transit. You know, I think we have to make a decision folks, if...and if, and we have to make the decision in terms of whether we're building a rapid transit system based on BRT or LRT. And the reason I'm raising this now is only because I think that future councils are going to be making a decision in the near future to go the LRT route because of the demand, because of the growth in the City. And if we're building it to be converted later to LRT, why shouldn't we just do it right now? And we know that there are systems out there that are turn-key operations and we know that there is vendors and manufacturers who have the ability to deliver those types of systems to the City. The Provincial government right now, Madam Speaker, is collecting \$200 million a year, point of sale, inside the City of Winnipeg from the citizens of Winnipeg they never collected before. Yes, they're giving back \$50 million a year, wonderful, in terms of their sales tax back to infrastructure, but 150 million a year is leaving the City of Winnipeg from the residents and from the citizens and from the shoppers here inside the City of Winnipeg, \$150 million going into highways; into the rural municipalities outside of the city. Now, we're proposing to build BRT and proposing to build it based on from what I could gather, a property tax increase and potentially fare increases. Madam Speaker, I think we need to take a step back. We need to go say, we need to go to the other levels of government and we need to have a frank conversation about how we're going to be paying for these massive costs and if we're going to be looking at investing in the long run, I think we should invest in a technology that other cities right across this country are now doing. They're investing in LRT across this country and...and they're doing it for a reason because it has the ability to attract new ridership and it has the ability unlike BRT to attract development, transit-oriented development, far more successful than BRT. We know that as a fact. It has the ability to handle far more ridership on a per hour basis than BRT can and it has the ability to do a public private partnership in a way that BRT can't. The operating system, the actually turn-key operation, you can't do that with BRT. BRT, there's no vendors available that do the same thing, it's just not there, Madam Speaker. I think there's a lot of things that need to be considered so I...you know, before we start to spend whatever the number is, 400, 500, 600 million on BRT, I am just saying at this point that this chamber is here to take a sober second thought and look at this, and yes, I am the author of the rapid transit task force of 2005 along with Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Pagtakhan, but I'll tell you what, I never thought in nine years that the City would grow at the rate it has and the growth that's going forward to the future and I think we have to recognize that. And we have to address it, otherwise we will be a city struggling in terms of transportation as we go forward. You have it on your agenda today, another development. A secondary plan for hundreds upon hundreds of multiple family and single family homes being proposed in East Winnipeg in Councillor Vandal's ward right off the Fermor and Lagimodiere, right by the Mint. We have all these new development. I've never seen the traffic like I see today on Bishop Grandin and ever since Sage Creek opened up and the amount of traffic volumes that are coming up Lagimodiere in my end of town, you know, thanks to the growth of Sage Creek, the Capital Region, East Winnipeg and I know that the growth and the pressure on transportation is

growing also on the west side of the city. We are approving all these residential developments, but the actual infrastructure, the actual...the gridiron, the actual core of the infrastructure system is not being built and we have to make a decision. Are we going to build the freeways and expressways that Councillor Fielding wants us to build or are we going to be building an alternative form of transportation which is environmentally sound, which makes sense that can be lasting and will be a legacy? This is, Madam Speaker, the decision of a generation. It is no different than the decision made in 1912 when the citizens of Winnipeg said, "No, we're not going to build an aqueduct to the Winnipeg River, we're going to build an aqueduct to Shoal Lake." More expensive, far more expensive, but they made the decision and thank goodness they did. No different than the decision that Roblin made to build a floodway around the city. He was mocked, pushed out of politics, but now he's a hero. We can make the same decision here today. We can go the route. I'm saying that we want to...that's why I asked for referral. I realized that the motion doesn't...isn't...is...you know, it's just a motion. I want work to be done on the idea. I ask for it to kindly be referred to the committee to allow for that due diligence to be done. I believe due diligence has to be done before we vote up and down on something like this, but if it's the will of this Council to kill new ideas and to simply slam the idea of moving our city forward, then vote against this. If this is the will, if the of this Council to simply say, you know what, we're just going to...we're moving ahead, come peck or high water and that's it. Although BRT, no matter what the costs are, that's what we're going to be doing, no matter what the growth projections are in our city, I would love to see us go down the road of LRT for just a very reason that it will ensure that we have to keep building LRT because it will be a success and Winnipeggers will want to see more of this verses more of expansions of expressways and everything that Councillor Gerbasi has been fighting against ever since she was elected in this chamber. So, Madam Speaker, ironically, I think...I don't...it appears the motion does not have enough support to get the support here today. That is why I move referrals for work to be done on it, and bring it back and let us have a look at exactly apples to apples, a comparison in terms of LRT versus BRT in today's city. When you have cities, Madam Speaker, like Kitchener, Waterloo, right now, building LRT, you have Calgary, Kitchener, Waterloo, smaller than us. Calgary, Edmonton, you've got Ottawa converting their BRT to LRT. You have major city after major city. We are a great city. We are a great city. We just came through one of the toughest, harshest, most brutal winters, in a history of our city. This city deserves the future. This city is a great city and we deserve as the Mayor, I think himself once said, we deserve to have the best, Winnipeggers are the best and they deserve the best and LRT is the best, and I am quoting Sam Katz. I rest my case. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Yes, seeing the hour, I suggest that we break for lunch. We'll reconvene at 1:30.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
May 27, 2014, at 1:30 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Welcome back, Councillors. We have an amendment to the notice of motion. Councillor Havixbeck, if you'd like to read it out.

Motion No. 8
Moved by Havixbeck,
Seconded by Wyatt,

THAT the matter be referred to the Executive Policy Committee;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Public Service, by compiling previous reports and studies regarding Rapid Transit, and considering Winnipeg and its capital region's projected future growth, conduct a cost-benefit analysis of a fully-integrated, city-wide, long term LRT system to be developed over the next 60 days and delivered to Council.

Councillor Havixbeck: I'd like to move motion with instructions that this matter be referred to Executive Policy Committee, and be it resolved that the Public Service, by compiling previous reports and studies regarding rapid transit and considering Winnipeg and its Capital Region's projected future growth conduct a cost benefit analysis of a fully integrated city-wide long term LRT system to be developed over the next 60 days and delivered to Council. Madam Speaker, I believe I am entitled to debate this item at this point and introduce it and as Councillor Wyatt said before our break at lunch, this motion is not thorough and not complete and it was intended to be referred and integrated into whatever was being submitted as an application. That report is coming to public works next week and the intent is that this matter be considered by Executive Policy Committee. So I believe I have time at the end to close on this motion and I'd be interested to hear if there is some support to referring it now to Executive Policy Committee.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Isn't this simply a referral with instructions? So do not we have to suspend the rules to...before we debate it? Or you can just....I just...I'm not sure I understand if you could clarify.

Madam Speaker: Now, it is a motion to refer with instructions, which is debatable. So now, I suggest we continue on with our list of speakers and we can vote on the referral and then go back to the clause if we need to. Sounds fair? And next is...yes.

Councillor Vandal: Point of Order, Madam Speaker, is a motion to refer always takes precedent? So should we not vote on the motion to refer now?

City Clerk: A motion to refer with instructions is debatable and so you can allow all the people to weigh in on it before you vote on it. And so we vote...

Councillor Vandal: It is debatable, but I would suggest...

City Clerk: It does take precedence, but you have to allow people the opportunity to speak to it. And in past practice, what you've done is you've allowed people to address both the item and the amendment simultaneously.

Councillor Vandal: Okay.

Councillor Swandel: What amendment? There are two things here. One, the debate's already been opened on the original item, so we can't be talking about that in the concept of a motion to refer with instructions.

City Clerk: Why not?

Councillor Swandel: Because now you're going to allow people to speak again?

City Clerk: Correct. When somebody passes another motion, you have the opportunity to address that motion. But we've only had Councillor Wyatt speak so far.

Madam Speaker: That's right.

Councillor Swandel: Hopefully...I still have the floor, Councillor. Hopefully, we'll get through this so I can vote this down and get some support and we can move on with the business of the day.

Madam Speaker: So, we're going to carry on with the list that we had prior to the lunch break. Mr. Mayor, the floor is yours.

Mayor Katz: Just for clarification, Madam Speaker, I assume what everyone has the opportunity to do is to speak to both. Is that what this whole...is about?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Mayor Katz: Okay.

Madam Speaker: If no one wants to speak, we can certainly call the question.

Mayor Katz: I might be for that. Okay. Madam Speaker, I will then start. I do find this procedure rather strange, but it is what it is. First of all, I guess this would be a perfect example of procrastination; suicide on the installment plan. Madam Speaker, I heard the word, "the numbers", no one knows what the numbers are. Well, with all due respect to the good Councillor, we know exactly what the numbers are. The numbers are \$590 million. The numbers are the Province is committed to \$225 million. P3 Canada, \$140 million has been the request, and the City of Winnipeg would be the balance of the 225. The only numbers we don't know are what some Councillors were throwing out last month about 700 million, 800 million, numbers that have no basis whatsoever. Those numbers we didn't know. As far as this project, we know what's involved, there is the Pembina underpass. There's the southwest rapid transit corridor, there's the associated land drainage and there's a contingency. It all adds up to \$590 million. And let me make it very clear, Madam Speaker, the \$225 million from the Provincial Government, and they're hopefully to be approved \$140 million from the Federal Government, are for this project only and no other project whatsoever. If we don't use those monies for this project, you can wave good bye to that money. Now, little history lesson. 2005, the great debate raged. BRT verses LRT. Well, we put together a rapid transit task force, which Councillor Wyatt chaired. I was a strong proponent of LRT after about a year of this, these people working hard and we had some experts in the industry, the decision came down

and I remember Councillor Wyatt saying to me, BRT is the right thing to do. BRT now is the right thing to do, we should be doing BRT and Madam Speaker, we moved forward with the first stage of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. And we moved forward with that knowing, and it was said then and I'll say it again, that what we were building could be converted to LRT if and when someone found that precious commodity called dollars and cents, the funding that is required. We are very close to having all the funding in place today to move and complete this corridor. I would like to think that every member of Council would like to see this completed once and for all and then go east and then go west and then go north, whatever the case may be, that future councils will decide. But, the realities are, this is an opportunity that should not be wasted. This is an opportunity that if you want to think about building Winnipeg for the future and making sure our young people stay here, we better do rapid transit now unless someone wants to wait another 40 years or 50 years. I was asked the question by the media, you know, wouldn't it have been nice if when Steven Juba was in power they built the monorail. I said, "Yeah, it would've been great and not only that the City would've grown faster and not only that it would've cost a lot less money if you did it then." But we're dealing now and it's up to this council to make the right decision now. You can't continue...and I can't believe 60 days? It's taken years to get to this stage. You're asking for 60 days to get a report back? Come on. Who are you kidding? Procrastination. Suicide on the installment plan. This has got to stop. This council has to do the right thing and move forward. And keeping in mind once again, our administration has basically said the first go around on the Southwest Transit Corridor Phase 1, we can convert that when we want if we have the funds to LRT. That opportunity is not lost. Now, I'm very cognizant. There are a few members of Council who have never supported rapid transit. I respect their opinion. They've been consistent throughout. I understand that. But for those who are part of this and work hard to make it a reality, and now have some other grandiose scheme that has no substance, no numbers, no support, no government funding whatsoever, let alone trying to embarrass the City to the Province and the Federal Government, come on, give your head a shake. That's not the appropriate thing to do. This is a good thing for our city. Is LRT a good thing? It's a great thing, no question and a lot of cities have both. But let's get something done that we can get done and afford right now and have the funds for it as opposed to, trying to do something we don't have the funds for. And, Madam Speaker, I want to make it very clear. We talk about funding like every project. The City has to find the funds for this project. Every year, Madam Speaker, we increase cash to capital. This was the decision that EPC and Council moved. We increased our capital, our cash to capital by \$2 million. There's nothing that prevents us from increasing our cash to capital by 3 million, 4 million, 5 million. We have that opportunity. And we also have five or six years to build that up to meet the financial needs of this project. It's time for members of Council to move forward. The other proposal will be coming forward next month. We're going through the process, it's been done. All the numbers are there. And I certainly hope that no member of Council says the numbers aren't there. They're clear; they're transparent; they're extremely obvious. It's been vetted through every single possible scenario. So let's get this done and let's not continue to stall for whatever your reasons may be because that's all I see here, is stalling. Let's make Winnipeg a great city. And I did say that. And rapid transit will do it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Swandel. Do you wish to...?

Councillor Swandel: Am I speaking to both? I wasn't sure how we can speak to a motion to refer with instructions and the items at the same time because it was getting referred to with instructions and the item doesn't exist.

Madam Speaker: You have the floor. Would you like to speak at this time?

Councillor Swandel: I'm not sure what I'm speaking to, but okay, I'll give it a whirl, I guess. As far as the motion to refer I think is just a silly tactic and I'll just vote against that when it comes along. On the item that's in front of you, you know, two words jump to mind right at the beginning and that's cost benefit. We studied this. We studied this to death. You know, I see a lot of flaws out there with what we're doing, but I don't see them as flaws that we can't resolve as we move forward. But from a cost benefit perspective and from the analysis that we did starting way back and in the 90s, I was working for the former chair of Public Works at the time, watched some of this get developed and put together and it was a really detailed analysis done and looking at planning for this prairie city, and this unique city, not planning for Ottawa; not planning for Vancouver; not planning for Calgary; not planning for Curitiba, Brazil or Adelaide, Australia or Portland, Oregon, but planning for Winnipeg and planning a transit system, a rapid or improved transit system for Winnipeg and all the information drove you to the place obviously that would fit best for Winnipeg was bus rapid transit. And why it fit best for Winnipeg is because we are a prairie city, we are spread out. We don't have the type of densification that you know, Toronto has or Montreal has or Vancouver has or Hong Kong has. You know, Karlstad apparently has some densification problems, Councillor Steen reminds me. You know, so we have come up with this concept of bus rapid transit as being the best for the City of Winnipeg and at that time we described it as a series of on-road and off-road improvements that would enhance our transit systems people getting where they're going. You know, I'll fight all day long about going through Parker Lands or when you're looking at costs of 70 something million dollars to deal with rail roads and not looking at that in the context of rail rationalization. It's actually more than that when you consider the fact that if the railroad wasn't there, some of your...like your overpass at Bishop Grandin would cost much less for the bus rapid transit corridor, not just the rail portion, but the corridor itself. So, you know, when you get...when you're starting to

play with those kind of numbers, I think we've got to do a lot more sensible thinking as we go forward, but do we stop moving forward because we're coming into an election and some politicians out there want to say some ideas that have already been explored. They make no sense from a cost benefit perspective. They make no sense from a planning perspective. They don't fit Winnipeg. At some point they might, and...but, you look at these cities that have these light rail systems. They're short runs with very dense populations, but somebody referred to Ottawa today. A lot of people don't realize this, but Ottawa is spread out over a couple thousand square miles. Most of the rapid transit used in Ottawa comes from people who can't afford to live in Ottawa anymore. They live outside. If you go look at the bus rapid transit system in Ottawa, you see these huge seas of surface parking where major highways come into the city. That's what you see in Ottawa. That's their plan and they needed to address the needs they have. And the reason we spend all so much is because they preserve a whole bunch of green space. That's their unique planning. That's their city planning. Then our city planning, we've got your most obvious corridors is this going out to the University of Manitoba because you've got the two way traffic, it's counter flowing, you know, it's like every day, well, rush hours coming downtown, university traffic is going out to the university and say, you know, vice versa at the end of the day. It makes sense. When you...you know, you can...if you can bring other pieces into the hub as we go forward, that makes sense too, but you know, this...getting into this stuff, it's just, you know, the idea of light rail, the idea of subways were even explored at one point time. The math tells you right away, it just doesn't work, just doesn't work. Just doesn't work. You know, you look at some of the other reasons that other cities have these things. There are legacy projects from Olympic Games or Pan Am Games or some other, you know, expo or whatever it might be. You know, we've got...come a long way. We've got to the point where we're ready to do this. We've got money, you know, sort of set aside for the planning. We started doing the planning. We've done a lot of work on the planning. It's time for us to move ahead. We've got to move ahead sensibly. You know, the Mayor was very correct when he said that the Federal money, it's the P3 money that's there that's sitting available for us right now for this project. You know, can we find another P3? I don't know. That's a question you have to answer down the road, but I'll take the bird in the hand right now. I'll still argue some of the detail, but I'll take that bird in the hand all day long. It's \$140 million, and so we could act, you know, irresponsibly because Wyatt says so. I don't think I've ever gone there. Why would I start now? You know, I don't know if Council Wyatt wants to kill a good idea. Councillor Wyatt might want to kill the idea bringer, but I...you know, there isn't any good idea here. The point is that this idea has been flushed out for many, many years through many, many experts, through many, many politicians. Light rail doesn't work financially. It doesn't meet the cost benefit test. This is nothing more than a political stunt, you know, to stand up here and you'll accuse people of hiding from great ideas. We don't hide any great ideas. We embrace great ideas. We have some silly ideas that are based more around political grand standing than they are around getting things done for the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, we'd all love LRT. I know lots of the people I talked to, Manitoba produces a lot of electricity. Well, we sell a lot of it, so but it would be nice to have LRT, but the reality is we can't, cost benefit or whatever you want. The only street that I know of in this city that has enough density right along it to run something would be Henderson Highway and even that isn't anywhere near as dense as some of the cities that my fellow councillor just mentioned. So and this proposal is looking at running it from the east side of the city where it's very spread out. Transcona is a great place to live, a great place to be, but you know, like there's not that much density out that way. Like I don't see where the funds are to support the LRT. The...one of the other concerns, yeah, it's a cost of money, but I want to talk about Ottawa because I'd be getting these e-mails about some so-called failure in Ottawa. Well, the problem with Ottawa is they are so successful with their BRT; they've got to build LRT because they need to move more people. They've had some small mistakes in other areas like an o-train or whatever that was. That was a mistake, but their BRT system, if you read the information about what the real problem is, it's just the amount of people using that transit and maybe in the future, once we get that many people using the transit line. There would be enough financial support to build an LRT. But you know, I'm not even sure that we'll ever be at that point to be at an LRT because we keep spreading out. You often hear me arguing about, you know, we do have to have growth, there has to be green fill development, there's no doubt about it, but the way it's going in this city, we're just spreading out in all directions too fast and we're not really concentrating and trying to really push it and force more density in certain areas before we go ahead and build these things. The road, regional road system we have, it looks like we're with it and it's nice to have a BRT system to keep the buses off on a faster lane dedicated to transit for people to get from where they need to go. So there is another point I like about BRT. At this point, you know, Winnipeg builds buses. We have a very successful company here called New Flyer in Winnipeg. They build buses. They're working on new age buses. They're working on buses that actually run on battery. If you have a dedicated lane and you're running a bus on battery you get the torque. You can get up to your 80 kilometres an hour even faster with that torque, with the electricity, which is you know, that's good. So, for the BRT as well, I point out that I think, like I'm not talking in terms of cost benefit because that's a whole bunch of financial calculations, but you know, there's a lot of utility with a bus rapid transit system. This, just this Phase 2 to finish this off from where it starts now to out to the University of Manitoba and the investors stadium, I think it is, sorry. It's important. But it's not only the BRT buses that run on it. They're running, even today they're running out of service buses down there. They can travel fast so you don't have to deal with traffic. You might even have

less hours needed for drivers because they're getting those buses back faster. They're getting them to the mechanics faster. This kind of thing can happen. I took a visit last year. Today is my birthday, last year my birthday on May 27th, I took a bus.

Mayor Katz: Point of order. Happy birthday, Ross!

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. But, no, last year, I took a...I can't remember whether it was a 98 or whatever it was and you know, you can catch these or different buses that will take you from downtown into places like Lindenwoods and different places. Well, what happens is there isn't a lot of people getting on those buses once you get passed a certain point in downtown. Let them hop onto the BRT. They get down there faster into those neighbourhoods where they need to go. And so for me, there is a whole bunch of utility we get with that BRT and that BRT, the...you know, I know everybody in Transcona wants an LRT, but you know, when we get down that far in the future, we may still be faced with the fact that the cost benefit as Councillor Swandel said, won't be there and we may have to still connect a BRT and move that forward. I agree it would be nice to just get rid of all the railways and utilize that for the rapid transit system, but the reality is those are huge costs, that are not really happening. We've got committees now looking at the rationalization of railways. I think that's important. My colleague, Councillor Swandel also mentioned the Winnipeg Beach line in one of our debates, you know, that would be great. Would be great to use as a corridor, you could...or build housing, active transportation trails and so on. But with the BRT, we have that utility where we're moving all those buses and I think that's basically where we are today. I have no problem with the numbers. The numbers, I believe, are what they are. For somebody to say well, let me step back, Phase 1, the same people who did Phase 1, most of them are the same people working on Phase 2. Why are you challenging the numbers? That Phase 1 came in on budget. It came in on it. There was no fiasco. There was no controversy around it. I mean, there was at first because whether you go BRT or LRT. Here we are again, but the reality is, is that the people who are planning these things, they know what they're doing. There's a contingency there for about \$70 million. Most of that contingency is related to another...this is a...our BRT is a combined project and we'll debate that next week, but really, those numbers are sound, most of the contingency I think is more related to other projects as part of that so this BRT, let's just get this done. We'll be debating the actual move forward with the plan. I should mention though, I'm not necessarily a supporter of P3s, but you know what, that's just...if that's what we've got to do, if the Federal government wants to pay the extra money for a P3, let them do it. We're paying for a BRT system that's going to work for us well into the future until the point where we have enough density for LRT. On the...and I have to agree...I don't know, how can...like, a motion to refer, I know it has instructions, so it's debatable, but a motion to refer is totally contrary to the motion itself. It's hard to debate. But you know, it's an unrealistic motion. Like I can't believe that it was even introduced. Sixty days, like really? Anyway, I'll just leave it at that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to start by thanking my colleague, Councillor Wyatt. He dreams big. He thinks big whether it's in Transcona or city wide. I do appreciate some of the vision and some of the stuff he comes up with is out of left-field, a little bit out there, but that said, unless you dream, you know, you really don't get anywhere. Unfortunately for me, the reality is, we don't have the money to do this. We don't have the money to do Phase 2. Twenty million dollars a year for 20 years for BRT starting in 2020, that's money that's not going to be able to be spent on other road projects. That's money that won't be able to be spent on parks in your communities, on many, many other infrastructure priorities, programming amenities that we want and need in this city. That money is not going to be there because it's to be paying for a little bus route from Jubilee to the University of Manitoba. Sure, a rail route would be very nice. But again, we have a transportation master plan with a whole plethora of other things that we need to do which still aren't funded. It's been commented that, you know, Winnipeg needs to be known for something, and we have done so many things great over the years. We had the first, you know, 911, our three digit emergency dialing system, I think it was 999 originally. We have innovation in our creation of buses was New Flyer Industries. A lot of the technologies that come out there come from here. What's wrong with Winnipeg being the best medium sized city in Canada? Affordable taxes, great parks and great communities, great festivals like Folklorama and Jazz Festival. We have some of the highest rates of second home ownership anywhere. We're 45 minutes to Lake Winnipeg, beautiful beach country. We need to do more to preserve the lake of...the water quality of Lake Winnipeg. I think we should be the best middle-sized city with one caveat, with an N.H.L. Hockey team. I would be very clear about that. The notion...we have a football team? How are we getting there by the way? Never mind. Comment was made, if we don't do this, we're waving good bye to money from other levels of government. Do you suppose for a second that the federal government wouldn't be willing to put their money behind some of the other priorities we have in our transportation master plan. Could you say...would our regional minister say no to the idea of spending that money on Marion, spend that money on widening of St. Mary's Road between St. Anne's and Marion, which is also in the plan? I think that's a far higher priority than Phase 2 of a silly bus line going from Jubilee out to the University of Manitoba. Some people suggest, speaking of the Bombers, the whole notion that this is going to be the gift from above that's going to fix all the transportation issues leaving Bomber games. Thirty three thousand people leaving any one location at a time, you can't

get them all onto buses that are going to go down one corridor. It's not going to work. It's not going to be enough to alleviate those problems. I'm sorry, is it going to help? Perhaps a little bit. But it is not the end all solution in any way shape of form. The whole notion of "bird in the hand" for 140 Councillor Swandel, again I think there's definitely an opportunity to have that money repurposed. Again, rapid transit is a nice amenity, but again, we need to have so many roads, our arterial road network, it is failing us whether it's because of the condition of the roads or the capacity of those roads, when we have a whole list of other projects that we need to do, there's only one taxpayer at the end of the day whether it's, you know, the portion from the Province or the Feds. We're paying for it no matter how you look at it. It's like having a house where the foundation is failing. Do you deal with the foundation on your house or do you build a swimming pool? Ladies and gentlemen, I would argue what we're proposing here with this motion and even with BRT at \$590 million is like building that swimming hole in your backyard when your house is failing. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The motion in front of us today is really asking us to scrap our current project, to complete the half-finished BRT line to the university and to really go back to the drawing board. It asks us to send a message to our Province and Federal government, our funders, that we want a rethink of this project and we want to start over as if the whole idea of building rapid transit just started yesterday or today. Given the funding we already have in place, the work, the planning that has already been completed and the need for Winnipeg to build rapid transit, this is simply silly and irresponsible. Council is definitely a place for public debate and discussion and it is part of a democratic process to bring forward any subject that any member of Council chooses to bring forward. Having said that, I would point out that sometimes the very real purpose of a motion is to create confusion and chaos. If this motion does pass, it will not mean moving forward with LRT, it will mean stopping rapid transit development indefinitely. Council has had a difficult time lately with losing the public trust due to a variety of issues that have led to numerous audits and that makes it easy to sow the seeds of confusion and doubt. It saddens me that this fragile situation seems that have been manipulated to fuel opposition to such a positive project that we've been waiting more than 30 years to complete. Reigniting the LRT/BRT debate is a very smart tactic if you want to divert transit funding elsewhere. My guess is that based on the comments made to date, that that is one of the reasons behind this technique of trying to defer rapid transit is to divert money to new roadway projects and other priorities in other parts of the city. This motion is really just a way to say, "Kill it, start over, wait till another day." Reigniting the BRT/LRT debate at the 11th hour after all the years of study, consultation, analysis and funding in place is really a Machiavellian tactic. If this motion passes, it does mean we would be forgoing this round of P3 funding, losing a potential 140 million in Federal funding and jeopardizing the 230 million of committed Provincial funds. Each year we delay...we're...that means tens of millions at a minimum in escalation of costs, and moreover we would see the loss of benefits that come with rapid transit such as economic development, sustainable transportation, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, reduced congestion and better quality of life. We know that LRT is significantly more expensive than BRT, so it's hard to make sense of an argument that says we should switch to a different mode that costs more in order to avoid tax increases. The reason the cost of rapid transit is at its current level is because instead of it being the year 2012, it is being built in 2019, in 2019 dollars. These costs are accurate to bring in the project on time and on budget, just like Phase 1. There's no imaginary cost escalation as it has been there inaccurately portrayed. The project is also integrated with important existing infrastructure needs like the Pembina underpass. I believe that most of Council recognizes that a healthy city must invest in public transportation and attempt to be sustainable and livable. Yes, the city is growing, which is why building new suburban roads without building rapid transit will only cause further congestion and frustration for the very suburban dwellers who want to travel downtown to the employment or other activities in the city. The BRT/LRT debate by the way was the main reason Winnipeg City Council in the 80s did not proceed with their rapid transit plan while Ottawa did. And now, as we've discussed Ottawa has an extensive BRT and is building more LRT as well. They're replacing some of their BRT with LRT just as we could do over time, but they, Ottawa, has a very effective and extensive BRT system. Ironically, the mover of this motion is the very person who led the rapid transit task force, who unanimously recommended that the southwest transit way from downtown to the U of M be completed with the mode of BRT. He also promised to fund this project in budgets and boasted of us moving forward repeatedly. People are getting dizzy trying to figure out what is going on with their City Hall with this kind of flip-flopping. LRT has been considered and compared to BRT and BRT has been recommended in Winnipeg for this particular transit way as the best approach over and over for a number of reasons. The project Council has supported is a high-end BRT line with the key thing being the separate transit way which removes buses from traffic and in which the buses can travel at high speeds, speeds equivalent to LRT, the stations or LRT style stations, which provide modern comfort and convenience. If we were to have a fixed rail system on this first small piece of rapid transit in our city, passengers would have to transfer at each end, which would not be convenient. The BRT plan allows residents from every part of the city to get on their feet or bus, connect with the RT section without transferring. The separate transit way allows for infill development along it as any mode of rapid transit would; meaning increased tax revenue and a more sustainable future. It is the 11th hour now. We have the funding commitment on the table that has been successfully negotiated and it is being jeopardized by this kind of grand standing. We have an application with the Federal government for this project, not a different one and we just completed a bus garage expansion which would, assuming that we were going to see rapid transit expansion using buses. The

motion suggests we go back to the drawing board; ignore the work and evidence in front of us; defer moving ahead. It recommends starting over with a different project which we're not going to study in 60 days and come up with a city-wide LRT plan unless you are dreaming in Technicolor. The motion suggests we defer moving ahead and we...start talking again about a project which we know has not been recommended; justify the...and the costs would be multiple times the current project. The connection to the U of M from downtown makes perfect sense especially with the new stadium, 40,000 students and 30,000 stadium goers from every part of Winnipeg can benefit from a separate and complete cycling route and rapid transit line to the university. The problem of congestion on Pembina Highway is dramatically going to worsen and we ignore this at our peril. Young people want viable transportation choices. If Winnipeg grinds its transit development to a halt, it would not be helpful in keeping those young people here. Expect to see an exodus. Winnipeg will be a laughing stock if Council gets this close to the finish line and then fumbles the ball and ends up with a half-finished project. We already are the laughing stock because we're even having this debate today, I can tell you. I can hear the laughing from here. Councillor Wyatt calls this a decision of a generation. Supporting his motion today will delay rapid transit development for another generation and I don't think any of us want that on our heads. I urge Council and the public not to be drawn in by this motion, which frames the issue falsely and has the real intention and purpose of stopping rapid transit development in Winnipeg and keeping us stuck in the past. In case anyone isn't aware of this, the City of Calgary has now approved a plan, which will construct seven new BRT lines and a new LRT line by 2021. BRT, seven new BRT lines in Calgary, one new LRT line. Winnipeg is still fighting to complete our first BRT line by 2019. Please tell me how I could explain any further stalling and delay in our City moving forward on our first rapid transit line to my constituents, to my children and to the rest of Canada. I am optimistic that Council will see through the games that are being played here today and will show the leadership that is required to keep moving forward on this important project. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Fielding: Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker and thank you Councillor Gerbasi. You're very passionate about the subject. I thought parts of it were a little thick, but beyond that, you know, it was entertaining. I enjoy...I think I'm going to miss that guy over there, Russ Wyatt. He is a...what's the expression...he's an enigma wrapped up in a riddle. You never figure that out, but you know, he's always so...entertainment here. In terms of the motion, I'm just...I'm still not a hundred percent sure what I'm going to do with this. I'm leaning towards the LRT motion and I, of course, looked for a third wave. I know Councillor Browaty moved, I moved seconding a motion with him in terms of referendum piece on the BRT. Talk a little bit about that. I also will talk about the LRT that's there. For me, it's...I guess it's \$590 million. You know, for me, the big factor here is in terms of what the road conditions are right now. In my opinion, they're in horrible shape. You don't have to drive from here, there, everywhere to know what conditions they are. My concerns are when people come into town what they actually think of this. People driving back and forth. That's a lot of the calls that I get from constituents on the day to day basis in terms of it. I personally think that we need to invest in existing and new infrastructure. I think that's got to be the number one priority here in the City of Winnipeg. If you look at the condition of our roads, it just tells...striking to you. I started an on-line petition. I had over 2200 people that signed the on-line petition right off the bat. So I personally think that's the way to go. If this debate allows us through the BRT/LRT to delay it and have some people have a further discussion on that, I'm open to having that. I do support the referendum which I will be supporting next month. Some talked about financials. Well, the talk is about \$225 million from the Provincial government, \$225 million from the City government and the rest from the Federal government, \$140 million. So to be fair, people are saying this money is going to vanish. Well, let's talk about this. The money that's in play right now, that will not vanish, I guess you could argue that the Provincial dollars they could stall with their money in terms of the \$225 million they're going to contribute to the project, but our money is fully in play. We can expend it however we want or decided to do it, and also the Federal government's money, are we going to have an application in for the P3? That we've got P3 money from the other levels of government, the Federal government before. I was in Ottawa recently, I talked to a lot of the government MPs on a regular basis. They want to know what our priorities are, whatever our priorities are, they'll support, so if you had put a P3 in for something like Chief Peguis Trail or wherever you decide to do a P3, they would support this. So to say that that money will vanish is just simply not true and if you understand the way the P3 funding, if they needed a...level, they decide which they're going to support and they go forward, so to say that this money would disappear is not. I guess you could argue the Province could withhold their \$225 million. The other concern that I have and this isn't necessarily in this report, is terms of the dollars and cents, the 590, there's some project that was left out of this money that was there that I have some concerns with, the others in terms of some of the results. Now, sometimes it's not popular to say, but I'd like to say these types of things, but if you look at the first phase of rapid transit, \$138 million. What did we get at the end of the day? I mean it's a great system. I spent all of September and part of October going on part of the bus rapid transit system when it came from my home to City Hall because I had some issues with my car at that point so I got experience on this, but at the end of the day, what it's proven is, it's proven out that you're not getting anywhere quicker in terms of the money that was spent. That's just a fact and no one can dispute that. Also, we're talking about, we're talking about rapid transit, I think if you're going to take a look at that system and I do believe that it's important to get people on mass transportation system, there is an easy system that you can use, you can install in every single bus and you would have rapid transit throughout the whole city

for a fraction of the cost. You could probably do it for \$10 million. You install it, it goes in every single bus, it synchronizes with existing lights, what has been used in major cities is to reduce commuter times upwards of 40 percent. So if you use items like this, it's going to cost you a minimum amount of money and you can focus on the priorities that our citizens are talking about specifically in terms of the road system that's there. I also would like to talk in terms of the finances. Well, you know, I was a part, I was the Chair of Finance when we established the debt servicing that, you know, I was with the Mayor and the CFO for the City. We visited with the bond raters, both bond raters, actually we did it twice not just in New York City, but also when they came here. And I can tell you there is money. I think that you could nuance the debt servicing or the debt strategy that we have right now to get some more money out because revenues have increased, but overall, you can't do everything at the same time. That's why you need to really prioritize for it. Now, in terms of the motion before us, in terms of the LRT, I'm more open to the LRT right now. I'd have to see what the dollars and cents are. My main concern is getting the streets, existing and needed infrastructure fixed. That's my number one priority, but I would be open to the LRT because I actually think that LRT is something that would actually get people into mass transportation. But let's face facts. There's a lot of people, I know Councillor Gerbasi mentioned this of getting people and you know the fact that people are going to move out in mass quantities and people are moving out of the City of Winnipeg because we don't have rapid transit. I don't believe that for a second. And I also don't believe the fact that everyone is going to take a bus. You know, I lived in St. James. We...I took a...I car pooled to university, you know, for four years while I was there. At the same time, there's going to be a lot of people that do that from North Kildonan and they can do it from St. James. They're not going to all jump on the bus that's there. So I think we need to focus on everything and I think investing in infrastructure, current infrastructure's there. I'm going to hear a little bit more what the debate has to say. I'm leaning more towards the LRT option to delay it and get some more information back and then we can make some more information. So when that, Mr. Speaker, I'll probably have more to say next month I think when we do have the referendum discussion that Councillor Browaty so wisely raised a few days back which I will be supporting. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Swandel: I just have a point of order, I realize there's been some discussion going on here. Turns out I know it's going to surprise everybody, but I was right. We are actually out of order because the mover or seconder of the original motion if they've already spoken, they can't move the motion to refer with instruction. What I will suggest at this time, Madam Speaker, I move that we suspend the rules to carry on as we have been just to get to the end of debate in the interest of time otherwise we've got...we'll go through some kind of a song and dance to get someone to second it again and start all over again. So the interest of time I might suggest at this point that we suspend the rules to carry on as we have done to this point so far in the debate.

Madam Speaker: Okay, those in favour of suspending the rules to carry on to finish the debate? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Mayes and then Councillor Pagtakhon.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I swirl all the metaphors around us, some of them good, some of them bad, but many different metaphors talking about what we should do with this item. I think the best one though was what Councillor Gerbasi said, which is, it's the 11th hour. There's a reason why this is coming on now and there's a reason why we shouldn't be engaging in a lengthy discussion about LRT right now, which is because we have a very large proposal before the Federal government, which we've spent years putting together with the Provincial government and which we now need approval on to finish Phase 2 because we've done Phase 1 on time, on budget as a rapid transit way. It's time to get a final decision made on Phase 2 of a BRT. This is not a debate about whether LRT is a good thing or not. Minneapolis, for example, has just done an LRT project. In fact, they're doing more. Despite the fact that if you look at the front page story from a few months ago, they had a report on the 15,000 potholes they've had over the past five years not including this extremely challenging winter. So for those who say "well, once we clear all the potholes that's when we can start doing mass transit because that's what they've done in other cities". No. In other cities, they have potholes like we do and they're also doing rapid transit project like Minneapolis or you could develop what Councillor Swandel was saying, other cities have done this as part of a legacy project with athletics with major games. I remember going to the...see the Commonwealth Games in 1978 in Edmonton. They'd just opened up their LRT. They had the new stadium. They had the new arena. They had the new rapid transit system. Now, we caught up with them on the stadium. We caught up with them on the arena though I'm told they might be about to lap us some build another arena, but we're finally on the verge of catching up 36 years later on having a mass transit system. They've been expanding theirs. It's up to 15 stations, but here we are, we can actually aspire to be at the same stage as Edmonton in terms of having a rapid transit system. Now, it would be nice to have an LRT like they do, but there's a financial issue and there's the issue of we are at the 11th hour in terms of Ottawa, in terms of the Province. People have been getting up and saying, "Well, no, the Feds will just do what we ask them to do." Well, I don't know that that's true. I mean I've had a lot of talks with Madam Glover, who's the MP for a good part of my ward about the Bonivital Soccer Project. She very much wanted to fund that with the Province and the City. She very much was supportive of women's soccer, the Women's World Cup, which is coming here. The Feds just couldn't do it. They didn't have the right spending envelope to

do it. So the fact that they just want to do whatever we tell them, I don't quite buy and even if they did, the Province has indicated that they want to do this project. And I think this is the project that it's time to do a rapid transit extension down to the university. In terms of, we also have, well, there's always...we should be spending it on these other road projects. Been here two and a half years. I never have heard mention of the St. Mary's Road widening from St. Anne's to Marion until today here on the Council Floor. Supposed to be a medium term by 2021, suddenly everyone thinks we've got to hit the gas and get going on this. Good news, I suppose, perhaps, but that's part of a larger debate. In fact, you could do that. That would be a good debate. Should we put 60 million into that or should we put it into the Vandal line as I refer to it to the...the light rail line that could come down to the southeast along the existing right-of-way, the Emerson line, I believe it is...that goes along Archibald and comes down into the new Precinct K. Chance to do transit oriented development. Maybe, we should be having that debate in a year or two. Do we want to do LRT down there? Do we want to do LRT down there? Do we want to do a BRT down there? People want to jump the cue on the other lines in order to serve the southeast? Who am I to quarrel with that? If you want to use that as part of the debate about should we widen streets or should we put that into rapid transit I think that's a good debate, but to introduce it now when the project's not even on the books to 2021, when we're repaving that very set stretch of street in the next year or two to say, "Well, you should be using the BRT money to widen St. Mary's" suddenly. It sort of falls out of the sky as far as I'm concerned, an entirely separate debate. Maybe it's a good project, maybe it isn't, but it's the idea that we should hold off on BRT because we have these road widenings we want to do within the next seven years, I think is a little much. We've done Phase 1, let's get on to Phase 2. Paul Hesse spoke very well earlier today on a couple of pretty blunt points. We have buses, we don't have trains. We have people, John Callahan from ATU was up here and I've met with John on this and he said, "You know, we have people trained to fix buses. We're actually pretty good at that and we've got bus garages. We don't have people trained to fix trains and we don't have train garages. You've got to put these things somewhere. So the incremental cost of going to LRT would really be substantial. And I want to end with a comment and Harry Wolbert who I've known for 40 years this year got up and spoke and spoke well about why this is the hour to do the BRT, and you know, we...so we met in 1974 and you know, one of these studies on the table here is from 1973 if you look in the background material, southwest expansion 1973. So we were in seventh grade. We are 50 plus year old men now. We still haven't built this thing. It's more than 40 years later and people are saying don't rush. It's time to get going. It's time to do the rapid transit Phase 2. It's not rushing anything. Before we are 90 years old, I'd like to see some more work done here and I think with all due respect to the concept of LRT and to the movers, it's time to not consider this further, let's get on with it, let's get the BRT done.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You know, it was indicated earlier that our city is growing by leaps and bounds and the good news, Madam Speaker, is that it's going to continue to do so for many, many more years. In the last 18 months, Madam Speaker, you know this very well, at Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan, we approved three subdivisions totaling almost 1900 doors and these are homes that are coming on stream in the next two to five, seven years, Madam Speaker, and the fact of the matter is, we need a bus rapid transit within our system within the City of Winnipeg. I had the good fortune of serving on the bus rapid transit task force back in 2005, nine years ago, chaired by Councillor Wyatt, also joined by Councillor Gerbasi and many industry experts, financial experts, development experts and you know, those are days and months and weeks I will never get back, Madam Speaker. And a heck of a lot of work was put into that and there was a huge public consultation afterwards with the former director and, you know, this Council heard all the feedbacks from the students, all the different groups across the city, just huge public consultation, Madam Speaker, and the fact of the matter is we were all very supportive and we joined in the support of moving bus rapid transit and we did that the first leg. It's now time that, Madam Speaker, that we do the second leg and get on with the program. This bus rapid, this motion here, Madam Speaker, talks about, it says here, whereas Winnipeg should now build an LRT. I find that kind of ridiculous, and this referral motion that we should stop and consider for the next 60 days, another ridiculous thing. Madam Speaker, we need to build a bus rapid transit system. In fact, in northwest Winnipeg, Madam Speaker, all the good folks that are coming here, new Canadians that are starting their own businesses that are finding employment within our city that are paying taxes. They're going where is our leg for bus rapid transit? Where's our leg for rapid transit? We need to see something up there. There's all kinds of discussion happening here, Madam Speaker, just north of water front drive with the Canadian Museum of Human Rights opening with all the development and the condominium development that's happening, Waterfront Drive in the Exchange District, Madam Speaker. There's a huge focus now on Higgins Avenue and the connection, the possible connection was respect to our rapid transit system connecting into eastern Winnipeg and through the north and through northwest Winnipeg, Madam Speaker, and all the huge development opportunities that come with transit oriented development. So I just want to encourage all my colleagues here, you know, to say this notice of motion, this should be supported, should be killed and to not support...I definitely won't be supporting the motion to refer, Madam Speaker. The silver lining here is that we are talking about a form of rapid transit, but I think that the most feasible one here that we've heard from the people and the good news, Madam Speaker, is that Winnipeg is very well known for working with our government partners both Federally, Provincially and right here with the city, the bus rapid transit is achievable, it's feasible, it's affordable. Let's get it done.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and support the idea of bus rapid transit and the extension of the second phase of the development. Outside of the Mayor and Councillor Smith, I'm the only one old enough to remember here Mayor Steven Juba, and in fact, I met him a couple of times. And the reality of his dream in the day of a monorail and he used Disneyland, not Disney World, Disney World wasn't even built, but Disneyland in Anaheim, California, as his fondest wish for the City of Winnipeg, was scoffed at widely. But looking back on His Worship Mayor Steven Juba, he was a bit of a visionary and as it's already been commented on here, Lord knows it would've been great if we'd moved ahead at the time to make it and we'd be ahead of the pack instead of, you know, bringing up the caboose. So at this point, I don't think there are any further comments. It's time to stop the dialogue and put some shovels in the ground and get the job done and I'll be supporting the project.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This debate kind of reflects my opinion on this whole project. We do have a deadline of June 2014, but we have to have our P3 application in. That already to me is pretty sad that we have one month, do or die. You've got to agree with it on June. That's it. There's no amendments, so no time for any of that. The business plan is writ. So when June's meeting comes, you're in or you're out. That's it. There isn't to convert the LRT because we have to re-change the whole business plan and then we'll miss our deadline for the P3 application. So again, this is a nice comment. It's a nice thing to talk about, but where were we a year ago; two years ago? Why are we here today really at the last minute? Some Councillors, we have two groups I see and it's three groups. There's one group of Councillors and the public. "I don't care what you say, this thing is sliced bread. You have to do the BRT second leg. I don't care what data you show me, I...you have to get it done". Then you have the other group. "No matter what data you show me, well, you can't do BRT. It's a bad idea" And that group that is getting squeezed in the middle is a group that's trying to find the answers and really wants to finish BRT, but make sure it's done in the best way possible for all of Winnipeggers. Does that say LRT? Does that say BRT? Well, again, the LRT debate, wouldn't probably be a bad debate, but again, we've had a couple times. That should've been a lot sooner than right now. So that's the bottom line. We're too late in the process for doing that. I like to have that discussion, if someone said to me though today right now based on what I know, "Hey, John. We're going to do LRT down the dog leg, on the Parker dog leg." What...absolutely no chance. There is no return of value on that at all. Maybe, Pembina, there's return of value, but I do not see it down...and I'll explained this on the June meeting when we had the discussion about what route we're going to...if we're going to accept the business plan or not. But at this point, we've had the debate about BRT/LRT. The City has chosen to go the BRT route at this time based upon the route that we selected, again Transcona may be a very wise idea to put it down our LRT. I have no idea because I'm not sure where the route's going to go. Unless you can get some substantial transit oriented design around it, LRT doesn't make a lot of financial sense. So I'm not sure how the route does go up to Transcona. Maybe there's some wonderful areas of land, but again, we're not having that debate today. The debate today is to look at LRT. Again, I didn't second this motion, the motion that came forward, because we can have a discussion, but afterwards. Right now, we need to stay focused on the debate that we're having in June, not distracting with these kind of motions at this time. Are we going to do the second leg of BRT? What are the benefits of that? What are the budget impacts of that? And how do...how confident do we feel that we can manage this project going forward? Those are the questions we have. To start muddying the waters with an LRT and BRT debate today, you know what, that's all just muddying the waters. We've got to stay focused even though I know there's really polar camps about this BRT route. Again, we need to stay focused. The administration has put in front of us a BRT route; the second phase, southwest BRT route. We also have the environmental impact assessment for the Parker lands, which is 140 pages, the business plan, I...it was 60 pages. We've had all these documents that you...we should be focusing and about this BRT route, again, we need to stay focused. The administration that's put in front of us a BRT route, the asking the questions about things such as what are the maintenance costs? What are the overall costs? Is it actually TOD design or not? These kinds of questions that we need to be focusing on. To have a debate about LRT and BRT right now, it distracts from the real debate and the real debate is on...in the June's meeting, where we decide are we going forward with this based upon the administrative recommendation and that business plan. Do we feel confident that this is the way to go? Or don't we? And that's Council's prerogative and we'll decide that in June. But this really is not the time to be having LRT/BRT debate at this point. I think, for myself, I did read all the information that we did have before regarding what density numbers we need for an LRT and definitely the Parker route doesn't have it. Pembina may have it, but we haven't chosen Pembina. So if you really want to do LRT or if you really don't like the Parker dog route...dog leg, then you know what you should do on June, just vote against it. And that's the truthful way you can do it. We may have different reasons why we're choosing against it, but that's the business plan. So if you really think this BRT route is bad because LRT or because of the route system is bad or whatever, then you just vote no for the business plan. If we...if the Council votes for it, then it moves forward under BRT, and we go for it. However, if you vote, if we get majority of the votes against it, the business plan fails, the application fails then we can go back and rework it. That's...again, that'll be Council's decision to make in June, not today.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Havixbeck to close. Correct, Mr. Clerk?

Councillor Havixbeck: Am I technically closing now? It's..

Madam Speaker: You're closing on the motion.

Councillor Havixbeck: But it was Councillor Wyatt's motion, right? He wasn't...okay, okay, like...yeah.

Madam Speaker: She amended the motion, so she is closing.

Councillor Havixbeck: Okay, thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, it's been interesting hearing everybody's comments and I really appreciate the openness and you know what struck me was very accurate in what Councillor Orlikow said about this group in the middle. The impetus for this motion was, for me, the fact that I could not hear and read in writing anywhere that said this was convertible someday because this motion will fail today. This motion will fail a year from now. Likely this motion will fail in five years. But somewhere down the road a Council will want to convert what we do. And I think it would be irresponsible, incompetent on our part, to support something that cannot be converted down the road. We've heard it verbally. We heard it. We heard it at the Finance Committee meeting last month. We heard it can be converted. Why not put it in writing and in a report? I fail to see why that is so difficult. One of the other issues that I have with this is that the intent of a rail system is to connect and every report I've read has talked about the growth in the Capital Region. The Capital Region. That's a huge area. I hear from people in Headingley who would like to get on and get downtown. I hear from people who would like Handi-Transit extended out there. So if they're willing to pay into something and if they're willing to help our city leverage, the support of the other levels of government, then we should have them at the table and we should stop thinking about this in our own little bubble. I went to the AGM dinner last week. I was...there was Councillor Nordman and people were excited about this motion. They talked about connecting West St. Paul and Selkirk, Lockport. That's the city I envision. All those people are coming into our city. All those people are using our roads and infrastructure because it's all infrastructure and putting wear and tear on it and not paying into the system. So you know, saying we can convert it later, I'm not convinced of that and I've seen too many reports and too many decisions we've made fall short. So the impetus for me on this motion was to get something in writing saying we could be doing it and I'm still not seeing that. This issue about funding, I'll tell you the last time I heard about funding and the need to get something done because we would lose Federal government funding, it was on the firehalls and you know what, we wrote for an extension and we got it and we wrote for another extension and we got it. We don't have a gun to our heads and I'm tired of making decisions with incomplete reports or reports that I would like to see more information on because we can't get the funding, because we don't have a report in. The most basic questions for me are still not answered about the rapid transit and whether it's a debate on LRT or BRT, how much do we increase ridership by? I got a revenue answer at our Finance Committee meeting, but no one will tell us. When will we ever recover this? No one can tell us these things. These are basic things that constituents have asked me about. I'm really seeing here today though a lack of openness to revisiting this. We have talked about growth in the capital region that has superseded what we expected and so if it's defensible, if it's sound, it should last through that debate and I want a system that is sound and defensible. Are we trying to kill it? Those words were used over and over and I would say au contraire, no. We continue to hear about the growth. We continue to hear about the need for this. We see other cities have success. We have to do what's best and work with what works in Winnipeg. And I'll tell you in the council seminar what struck me was what Councillor Orlikow referred to about the dog leg. And there was no written piece of information that said that this would be able to be routed with LRT. So how can we build a system that can't be futuristic and change down the road? So Madam Speaker, you know, I know this LRT/BRT debate is going to continue on into the future. I would like to know at what critical point will we as a capital region decide that we're going to move forward and make the shift? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt to close.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to keep my comments short, but to the point. We announced in our transportation master plan, BRT in 2011, 275 million. We announced in our capital budget in December of 2012 for the December 2013 capital budget, a total budget from...that went from 275 to 350 million. According to my math, a year and a half later, the project has now risen when you exclude the contingency and Pembina Highway underpass which includes the land drainage, approximately about 510 million for the BRT. So it's basically shot up since 2011, Madam Speaker, in a way that I...you know, it's hard to compare other than maybe the Police headquarters in terms of the price and where it's going. Frankly, Madam Speaker, and we found out in the Council seminar, this does not include the buses. This does not include the increase to the fleet. We found out that the increase to the fleet is approximately 12, buses alone which seems low to me, but nevertheless, that was what we were advised by the director. We also found out in this Council seminar, just to put on the record, that there is no underpass planned for Pembina, six lanes of traffic coming into south, the south lands there at the University of Manitoba. And that when I asked the director what

would be the cost to build a tunnel because that's really what you would build with an LRT, which it...if it is convertible and he agreed. You would put a tunnel there, you wouldn't have a train going across six lanes of Pembina, you would have a tunnel, he's just kind of says, "I don't know, 50 million", so it could be 50, could be 60, could be 70, so yeah, add that to the bottom line. At this point, Madam Speaker, I think it's worth us stopping and saying, "Look, we're at the point right now as a City where we're growing or we could have an opportunity as a Council before the next Council comes to do a little bit of due diligence, a little bit of homework and see if we are actually making the right decision. It could be done quickly and we could come back with some numbers and efficient numbers in terms of what would be the cost benefit analysis in the long run and let's keep in mind here, Madam Speaker, that for a decade a better part of a decade, more than that, actually. This chamber as well as previous councils fought over and over and over again, and this mayor spearheaded a lot of those efforts to set aside a municipal sales tax or to get a portion of the existing sales tax and after all those efforts and after all that fighting, what did the provincial government do? Without any announcement without asking any municipality, they announced an increase in the sales tax. They wiped out the balanced budget legislation to do that, which required a referendum, a referendum for them and they took the 150 million, point of sale inside the City of Winnipeg, at least 250 million, point of sale in terms of revenues in our stores and in our shops, everything that is spent here inside the City of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker, 50 million on an annual basis coming back, 150 million to fund whatever they want to fund. You know, Madam Speaker, and we're standing up for joy and waiving we got 225 million? They'll make that back in a year and a half off of us, Madam Speaker, off the citizens of the city. I'm saying that there's more than enough funds there today in light of their decision. They made the decision We are stuck with the sales tax probably. They made their decision. We have the one percent is there. There's 200 million coming out of the City every year. There's more than enough money, Madam Speaker, to address our bridges and roads that we need to fix and there's funds also to plan new strategic infrastructure like LRT if you borrow and you do it over the long run. It means a plan and some vision and those are my comments and I said I would keep it brief so I want to live up to that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now vote on the motion to refer with instructions. Recorded vote. Motion to refer with instructions. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck and Wyatt

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Mayes, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Steen, Swandel, Vandal and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 4, nays 11.

Madam Speaker: Motion to refer is lost. We'll now move on to the vote on the original motion. All those in favour? Okay. All those in favour of the original motion...notice of motion regarding LRT, please rise. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Fielding, Havixbeck and Wyatt

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Gerbasi, Mayes, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Steen, Swandel, Vandal and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 3, Nays 12.

Madam Speaker: Motion is lost. Okay, now we'll move on to Motion 5. It's a notice of motion from Councillor Smith or Councillor Havixbeck, pardon me, and Councillor Smith. It is a referral to the next meeting of Council.

Motion No. 5,
Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,

Seconded by Councillor Smith,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is one of the last cities in Canada to hold the current model where the Mayor appoints all members of Executive Policy Committee, with associated pay increases;

AND WHEREAS there may be more responsive, service-oriented governance models such as the City of Calgary that Winnipeg's governance system could be modelled after;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg adopts the following model for governance:

The Council establishes its policies for governing the city based on information provided by four Standing Policy Committees:

*Protection and Community Services
Finance
Transportation
Infrastructure Services
Operations and Environment*

Committees should meet once every month at City Hall and be comprised of Councillors and are responsible for approving and recommending policies to City Council. The general public is invited to the Committee meeting to make presentations. Any decisions that come out of these meetings need final approval from the Council as a whole.

There should also be civic committees, boards, and authorities that help to create policies in specialized areas, such as parking, the preservation of heritage sites and buildings, and planning and development matters. These civic committees, boards and authorities will be comprised of citizens.

City Council should meet four times every month. Two meetings will be regular Council meetings, where issues from the four policy committees are discussed and debated in the Council Chamber. The third meeting is a public hearing, where planning matters will be discussed in the Council Chamber. The fourth meeting will be similar to a Council Seminar and the agendas will be set by Councillors, the Mayor and citizens including special interest groups.

Every Council member will serve on each Standing Policy Committee throughout their term and will chair one of the committees during their term on Council.

One-half of pay increases currently given to Executive Policy Committee members will be distributed to all Councillors.

The Community Committee model will slowly be disbanded. The Planning and Development items will move to the Planning Committee and an alternative to awarding grants will be provided in near future.

Madam Speaker: We have a Notice of Motion No. 7 from Councillor Browaty and Councillor Fielding regarding a plebiscite. This will be referred to the next meeting of Council as well.

Motion No. 7

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

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has identified significant infrastructure funding shortfalls resulting in very poor road conditions and significant delays on the arterial road network throughout the City;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg needs strategic infrastructure improvements and new infrastructure to support population growth already experienced and projected in OurWinnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the future opportunity to relocate major rail facilities to Centreport Canada provides opportunities to repurpose current rail right-of-ways, including overpasses along key corridors, for Rapid Transit;

AND WHEREAS the relocation of major rail lines also provides opportunity to improve safety to residents throughout the City while the amounts of dangerous goods transported by rail continues to grow;

AND WHEREAS a non-binding plebiscite would give Winnipeggers an opportunity to become involved and engaged in one of the most significant spending decisions faced by a Winnipeg council in decades;

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 27, 2014

AND WHEREAS taxpayers should have the right to be heard directly on a matter this significant;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City Clerk be ordered to add the following non-binding plebiscite question to the October 22, 2014 civic election ballot:

“Do you support the spending of \$590 million on the Capital Integration Project (Phase 2 Bus Rapid Transit to University of Manitoba/Jubilee Underpass Expansion) while current regional street renewal budgets remain significantly underfunded and the following major projects remain unfunded:

-	Kenaston Widening, Ness to Taylor	\$129 million
-	Marion Widening & Grade Separations, Archibald to Lagimodiere	\$70 million
-	Louise Bridge Replacement	\$100 million
-	Arlington Bridge Replacement	TBD
-	William R Clement Parkway, Grant to Wilkes	\$60 million
-	St. Mary's widening, St. Anne's to Marion	\$60 million
-	Waverley Underpass	\$150 million
-	Chief Peguis Trail Extension, Main to McPhillips	\$110 million”;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT future City councils strongly consider the outcome of the plebiscite in making future capital budget decisions;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT future City councils work with the provincial and federal governments and the major railways to look at opportunities to relocate rail lines to Centreport Canada.

Madam Speaker: Okay, we'll move...now onto by-laws under EPC. Mayor Katz.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time, By-laws 53/2012 and 54/2012.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 53/2014 and By-law 54/2014.

Mayor Katz: And I move that By-laws numbered 53/2014 and 54/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 53/2014 and 54/2014.

Mayor Katz: I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 53/2014 and 54/2014 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Finally, Question period for the Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mayor Katz: Oh my goodness.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes thank you Madam Speaker. We were discussing incremental financing earlier on a report and in terms of the Neechi Commons, we worked on a number of different scenarios and had to wait to get an assessed value of what the new construction was and I just looked into it and originally it was valued at approximately \$400,000. It is now a building that is worth 2.9 million approximately. It's generating...in smaller numbers than when we were talking. It's generating incremental property tax for the municipal level of \$18,000 a year; smaller numbers over 10 to 20 years if you allowed them to do incremental financing, both the social aspect as well as the business which is what Yes Winnipeg is asking to do. You could do over 20 years...that's \$360,000. That would help them with their business plan to get established because as you know, getting established and moving forward such an entity as that is important, but there was a proposal that is supposed to go to Neechi Commons and I'm wondering if the Mayor knows what's happened with that. I talked to Neechi Commons. They said nothing's happened. What's going on?

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Eadie, I thank him for the question. I very vividly remember in the beginning, which is going back awhile, where we discussed the possibility of incremental tax financing. We spoke to the department. They did their assessment and said the property value is not being increased very much. Based on these new numbers that I'm hearing from Councillor Eadie, I'd be more than happy to look into it to find out, to validate those numbers and to see if there is some opportunity there. The last time we were told no, but I'd be more than happy to follow that up.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question?

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'm wondering if the Mayor would be willing to ask for both incremental financing related to the social as well as the business aspect of it which administration said that they weren't supportive of incrementing, which we are doing on this other project we voted for.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, as I said earlier, I will be pleased to talk to the Director and have him look at these numbers and look at the big picture, whatever that might be in the end.

Madam Speaker: Third question?

Councillor Eadie: Final question. I'm wondering if the Mayor would commit to a better description of seminars for City Councillors so they can know whether or not they need to appear because I almost didn't show up at a meeting the other day because I didn't know what it was about but it was a very essential one to attend and so would the Mayor be committed to making sure that when seminars are called, there's a better explanation as to what it's about?

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, I thank Councillor Eadie for bringing that up because it's been extremely disappointing on the attendance sometimes for seminars. I've seen anywhere from 4 to 6 members of Council show up for many seminars. It's very pleasing when we have 12 or 13 or 14 members of Council and if there is any question as to what that seminar is, they are more than...there's an opportunity to contact yours truly or whatever the case may be. We certainly could give him the information but I think 99.9 percent of the time, it's very clear what seminars are for. Sometimes Council members have already had the opportunity to know what is going on, so that's why they haven't reviewed it, but I'd like to think that every member of Council would believe that every seminar is important enough to show up to.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Madam Speaker. Last month the Mayor said that the audit of the real estate transactions would be before Council this month and in fact, we have heard since September that it is imminent. This item was approved by Council in October 2012. The last email we received was about a week ago from the Auditor. Is this final that we will, in fact, receive this real estate audit next month?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, as Councillor Havixbeck knows, this is not within our control. This is within the Auditor's control, so all dialogue should be with the Auditor. We can only repeat what the Auditor tells us.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further?

Councillor Havixbeck: Sure. The Police Headquarters and Quantity Survey are due fairly soon. I'm wondering if the Mayor knows what the delivery date of that will be to Council.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, I don't know the delivery date but it's something that I believe could be done in a short period of time. In my opinion, all these audits are taking longer than we would have expected. I would hope that that should be coming forward this month. I see no reason for it not to, but once again, it will be the City Auditor who has the final say and control.

Madam Speaker: Third question?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes thank you Madam Speaker. Yesterday we had a Council seminar in which 15 out of 16 members of Council attended, and I would like to know which version of the report, the legal opinion, was and whether it included the change order issue which came out of the report afterwards and was not included in the report.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk. Yes. I believe this question would be out of order... considering what was discussed at the meeting. It was a privileged meeting and you are aware of that Councillor. Any further questions? Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Madam Speaker. I've got a few questions related to the Bombers. Number one, I asked this last month. ...Board member. There are some recent reports in terms of our appointment, I believe it is to the Bomber Board. I guess you could clarify that. I believe it is Bomber Board as opposed to BBB, and there's a back and forth and I thought it was kind of astonishing. The Bomber Board had rejected our appointee to that. I know Jeff a little bit but it's not really a Jeff Rabb issue, it's more the fact that, you know, we're obviously the funders, one of the funders of the new stadium, so I'm just wondering has there been any communication back and forth in terms of the appointee as there is a new appointee going forward or would it be your opinion to re-appoint Jeff Rabb to that committee?

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker through you to the Councillor, as I think we all know, the appointee...the appointment was made. That was done on actually January the 31st. Almost nine weeks later the Bomber Board basically said no to that. I can tell you right now that the by-laws are being reviewed to find out whether the Bomber Board even has the right to reject because I can be very frank with you. A selection from either the Province or the City, which has been going on for a long time, has never been subject to review by anyone on the Bomber Board. It's been accepted as someone who is representing the City of Winnipeg, so that is being looked into right now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Fielding: Second question, we got a news release earlier on in the day in terms of the transit proposal for the Bomber games, so I guess if you can allude a little bit further in terms of the negotiations on that and where it stands today.

Mayor Katz: I can tell you that a letter was delivered to the Winnipeg Football Club basically...I don't want to assume everybody has seen it but basically it said that the City of Winnipeg has been a big supporter of the Winnipeg Blue Bombers. As you know a lot of the approximately 80 or 90 million dollars of the funding we're paying for from our property taxes...re-generated on the old site. In addition to that, you know, we do give them a...we contributed \$10 million, 7.5 to the project, another 2.5 to that wellness centre at the university. We also support them through the entertainment tax as well which is being refunded, and I believe the words in the letter which came from our Acting CAO was that one of the reasons that they are in a robust situation from their financial statements which were just recently made public, was a lot to do with the fact that the taxpayers have made significant contributions, and you know whether it's the Province or the City, it's basically the taxpayer money. Based on that, the decision was made that they'll continue with the exact same plan that they had in place last year, which was obviously you know, once you got through the first half of the season it was working very well, and also there is a...any scenario that takes place with a crowd of 15,000 or more, they have to abide by the plan that's put together, so that is the status as of right now. I can also tell you that some members of Council, specifically EPC, did make an offer to sit down and try and bring closure to this. This was probably a month ago, and have a meeting with the Board but the Board declined that opportunity so what it is today is what it is and I don't have anymore to say unless there's more question on that.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thanks Madam Speaker. Mr. Mayor back on December 17, Council passed the following as part of the budget, "That Council approve a grant to the YMCA-YWCA of Winnipeg in 2014 of \$1.75 million, contingent on the

City of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba and the YM-YWCA of Winnipeg agreeing to cost share, one-third each, three recreational facilities over the next 11 years, with planning for the first facility in the southwest part of the City of Winnipeg to commence in 2015 with the estimate cost and timing of this full initiative as follows", and then there's a breakdown of the three facilities and it goes onto another clause that says the City of Winnipeg provide projections in terms of the first phased facility in the southwest and 3, that in terms of both those clauses, be subject to a funding agreement including a public access agreement satisfactory to the City of Winnipeg and the Public Service report back to Council for approval. It's now been six months since we've had this before us. Could the Mayor give us an update in terms of the status of this report coming back to Council so that this matter can be resolved? The longer we wait the greater we jeopardize the estimated capital costs. This is a tremendous project. As the Mayor recalls, this was something that was highly announced in the budget that was brought forward by EPC led by himself and it was well accepted by the...widely well accepted by the public in terms of the YM-YWCA component part of the budget. As we as a City have fallen behind other cities with regards to indoor recreational facilities, there is a real need to build these types of recreational facilities across the City. Could you give us an update in terms of where we're at and how soon we can see something in terms of the motion that was approved by Council?

Mayor Katz: I thank Councillor Wyatt for the question. Madam Speaker, what we put forward I think was a wonderful idea in three different quadrants of the City and one already has it, and we would have these wonderful modern world class facilities which I think would be a big benefit for all our citizens right across the City. The realities are, as the Councillor did read the motion, it did require three partners and I can tell you when the Provincial budget was announced, there was no funding for this project. I can tell you that I have had conversations with Minister Chief who told me right away that this is something that they believe has some merit and they're still working on it, but at that particular point in time, they were not ready to move forward with it. I know that there also has been dialogue between our people and the people from the Y about putting together an MOU as far as the specifics. I would be more than happy to get Councillor Wyatt whatever details. I can't bring him up to date on something I'm not aware of but I certainly could do that very quickly, and I'd be more than happy to.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question?

Councillor Wyatt: Thanks, and I thank the Mayor for their information and response. In light of the fact that you're absolutely correct. The Province is a major player, a needed player in terms of this, and the fact that they are reluctant to give a formal commitment and it has been now six months, could the Mayor formalize the fact that with Chief, in terms of a letter to him requesting Provincial commitment and let us know one way or the other whether they're a part of this project or whether they're not a part of this project.

Mayor Katz: I would not take that route Madam Speaker. I will be very frank with you, is that I am happy to have a conversation with the Minister. This is an important project for the City of Winnipeg. They have a process they have to go through. It's not just I ask him, he writes a letter says yes or no. There's a process as well as getting into the budget, but I certainly will try and get an indication that they are genuinely looking at this for their next budget. That's something I'd be happy to do.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Third question?

Councillor Wyatt: In light of the Council motion that was made and the need for the Province to be part of that, so we can expect a report shortly to Council in terms of that, in terms of that commitment and whether or not the Province is involved or not involved?

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, as I said I will endeavor to get as clear an indication as possible. I would remind Councillor Wyatt that this Council also moved a motion to move forward with BRT but as you know, it's not as simple.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow?

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Madam Chair. The wisdom of this morning's event where we actually went back on that three and a half day furlough or layoff or whatever you want to call it. It was a wonderful idea and I'm now that we see some extra resources coming back into our system, my question is, after this brutal winter, we all know how brutal it was, our boulevards and our sidewalks are a disaster, especially with all the frozen pipes, the sand, the curbs. It just...the snow plowing...It is a disaster. Is there any initiative on your part or from the administration that you are aware of, where we're going to be...I know the department is doing the best they can with the resources they have. I just don't believe they have enough resources to tackle this issue right now. Is there anything from administration that you are aware of where we're going to be putting some extra resources into trying to address this?

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 27, 2014

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Orlikow, I thank him for the question. As we all know, this winter went a lot longer, which means we were much further behind with our spring cleaning etc. He is absolutely correct. Our curbs have taken a beating. Everywhere I go through the City of Winnipeg I see the curbs are being repaired all throughout the City of Winnipeg. I would be more than happy to speak to the Director and see if there are certain things that we might be able to do to move things along quicker. By the same token, it's a matter of resources, both manpower and dollars and cents, but I'm happy to look into that for sure.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. So the school...the list for the schools that are approved from the Province for the reduced school zone limits just came in this morning. So my question to you is, are we expecting to have the reduced school zone limits this September?

Mayor Katz: I thank the Councillor for that question. Madam Speaker, we are in a very unique situation. I think this Council...and I'm going by memory...unanimously supported reducing the speeds in school zones. Unfortunately the Province has come up with certain guidelines that right now make it impossible, physically impossible, for us to meet those conditions they've imposed which means I think it's about 65 or 66 schools could not be in a position where we could actually put in reduced zones, and there's about 171 that can. I can tell Councillor Orlikow through you that the department is working on that right now. Things have changed drastically. The types of signs that we have to put in need much more structural support. There is a whole list of signs. There could be four or five signs on one structure because we have to list the by-laws and everything and they've also put in conditions. They have to be 100 metres before school property. Well sometimes you don't have 100 metres before a school property, so it certainly has been made extremely difficult. I believe that the...a lot of people working with the Province find this to be overboard but the realities are, it's where we are right now. I am going to have a conversation with the Minister to see if we can do something. I think it would be a shame for 65 schools or so to be left out of this. It's already a year past and we certainly want to get it in to place for the school coming up in September of the coming year, but the bottom line is our department is working on this right now. When I say working on it, I mean they are actually making the signs, etc., and they'll start putting them up. They will be covered until all the rules and regulations have been approved etc., but the bottom line is, is that what we had hoped to do has been made impossible by the rules and regulations put forward by the Province.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Mayor? Okay. We will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE
 STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
 DATED MAY 13, 2014**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of May 13, 2014. I'd like to inform Council Item No. 6 has been withdrawn by the applicant and I'd like to move adoption of the consent agenda items 1 through 22.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, 3, 12, 15 and 17.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All those in favour of 1 and 2, 4, 5, 7 to 11, 13, 14, 16, 18 to 22? All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Browaty: 3, 12, 15 and 17, just to confirm?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Browaty: So, five, okay.

**Item 3 - Subdivision and Rezoning – Land located at Sugar Beet Major Redevelopment Site North of Bishop
Grandin, west of the Manitoba Hydro Corridor
File DASZ 3/2014**

Councillor Browaty: I'll simply introduce the item and respond following any questions or comments by any member of Council.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm in support of this beet land application. I believe this is moving forward with at least the start of over 1200 housing units to go on the beet lands. I know there is a lot of discussion and problems related to crossing over and dealing with...getting out of the beet land area. However, I just wanted to flag this because while it may not meet the check marks of transit-oriented development, there is another report there that talks about having an ability to cross over the hydro and railways in...adjacent to that. And what I would point out is we talked about the BRT with this and beet lands is one of the lands that was sort of saying that that development will help to support paying for our BRT route that goes by there. Now, while it may not be TOD, if there is a path to get from the BRT to the beet lands, that means there may be a possibility as well, to run a bus route through there. And when I was talking about the utility of the BRT is if you have rail on it, you can't run a regular bus on it. But, if you have a BRT route you can run a regular bus through there and a route that might come through the beet lands. Well, you know, it's maybe 400 meters or more from a planned station. This beet lands project I think is really important for that area of the city. It's not part of my area of the city, but it's definitely dealing with some land that's really been vacant and left there. I remember being, doing a United Way speech at Manitoba Sugar when they were there, I believe, that's where it was many years ago and it's been...that land is not really doing nothing. So I think this is great and I just wanted to point out that there are possibilities of connecting busing through that community. Well, I guess it's dependent on reaching agreements with Hydro and different people there. But anyway, I'll leave it at that. I'm supportive this particular project.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Browaty to close.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. I'd like to thank Councillor Eadie for his comments. It's a positive development for that part of the city, and in many ways, filling in an empty part of land that was a bit challenging to develop and certainly a good news story.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item No. 12.

Item 12 - Sale of City-owned property – 547 Selkirk Avenue

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Again, I'll just introduce the item and respond to questions at the end.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. This particular property at 547 Selkirk Avenue is adjacent to what used to be the Merchants Hotel and what is now called the Merchants Corner. I would like to thank the Mayor as well for being involved in transferring this land over to what is going to be called the Merchants Corner Project. It's a combination of housing and education. It's been a bit difficult to attract retail and commercial in to it, but really, this particular project has improved already Selkirk Avenue and they haven't even renovated and built the housing and brought the education in. It does create a daytime, primary, economic driver for Selkirk Avenue business so it is a very important for daytime business and we need another primary business that will take us more into the evening along Selkirk Avenue. But Selkirk Avenue is at...I think at a point where it could start to turn and the City of Winnipeg in this circumstance, this is actually selling the land to the Merchants Corner group for basically one dollar and this will help them achieve a better...building a better place for people to go and bring more people on to the Avenue. So, Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank the Mayor and I'm very...well, I wouldn't say proud, but I'm very happy that we were able to contribute to the Merchants Corner, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty to close.

Councillor Browaty: I have nothing further to add to Councillor Eadie's comment.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item no. 15.

Item 15 - Secondary Plan for Precinct 'K' of Complete Communities – First Reading
File SP 3/2014

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I stepped these down. Can we combine 15 and 17?

Madam Speaker: Sure.

Councillor Browaty: Absolute pleasure. I will certainly respond to you, Councillor.

Item 17 - Precinct J (Dawson Trail) Plan
File SP 5/2013

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Now I know my ABCs, J, K whatever that is. I will certainly respond to any questions or comments from Councillor Eadie. And any member of Council following at the end.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just...I need to speak to this because there is a number of issues that I've been dealing as...with a City Councillor and a number of issues that we've all been dealing with as City Councillors for the whole city. And I just...I'm taking the opportunity here to make a very short point here that it is important, we need growth in this city. There's no doubt about it. No doubt about it, and every year, the new property taxes that come in as a result of all these building up of new precincts is important. But over periods of time with reassessment, it's not necessarily a good thing. It is a good thing when those properties come on, Councillor Swandel is very good at pointing out that they all pay a water bill, which is helping to offset the cost of old infrastructure within the city, but you know, we have growing pains in this city. That is the reality. We just had a BRT debate where they say, "Well, we've got to fix our old streets." And then we're talking about having to build Chief Peguis Trail or maybe there's a better use for the Federal money, so on and so forth. Our city, I've seen lots of precinct plans going through and they are all over, all around the city and we're having to extend our regional infrastructure to meet the demands for this and I think, I believe that it's time, we've got to start slowing down and have a little more control and decide where this is going. I remember a comment from one Councillor who was talking about, had never...hadn't taken a drive down Bishop Grandin since Sage Creek was built. Well, since Sage Creek is there, Bishop Grandin, it's just like the traffic is crazy. I have friends who work down in that area and they try to get through there. It is just the amount of traffic is massive and this is going into this quadrant of the city where Plessis Road underpass is still under development. We have all these issues to deal with and you know the question is, like where is the money coming from? Yes, incrementally, we'll start getting money and yeah, eventually we'll be able to afford to extend regional roads and so on, but we need to have...we have to stop and say, we as a City need to have a better plan, more of a control to say, let's...let's build up...let's...let the private sector build out in these areas when it's timely for us; when we can do it; when it is possible. North Kildonan, for example, has grown out. There's no new development areas in the North Kildonan Ward. Transcona has a lot of room to develop and there's a lot of stuff happening there. But you know, North Winnipeg is basically almost developed all the way out. There's need for infrastructure there. We've got a brand new situation over in Charleswood. It's a huge development going on. We need to actually put controls, so I just want to pull this off and say that I can't support these going ahead without us having a better plan to deal with all of the demands that come out of this growth. It's growth that's not planned. It's just...it's happening all around the city and it's causing us problems. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just had to stand up and make some corrections. What Councillor Eadie is not saying, Madam Speaker, is that they not only pay the rates and utilities, but they also pay taxes that create a positive cost benefit. So those taxes that are being paid by new development are paying for the sins of the past. So when we have aging infrastructure in other areas of the city, it's those taxes that are derived from new developments, which are pretty low cost for maintenance and renewal right now, and those taxes are helping to cover the costs of the older neighbourhoods and sins of the past. You know, we just went through a whole exercise with Our Winnipeg, a plan and a process that's been acclaimed across North America and I think around the world as one of the best planning processes, as one of the best plans a city can have right now. And in that plan, we talk about growing up and growing out, not just growing up, but growing up and growing out because we know we have to have new development in order to keep the diversity of housing that we want to or the market wants. That the citizens want in our city. We also know we need to have it to be completely sustainable in all three lenses that we look through; one of those lenses being the

economic lens and the other two, of course being the environmental and the social lens. So, when we do these plans and these neighbourhoods, they were a part of Our Winnipeg. That's why they have the designation as precincts. They are in the plan. That plan is also supported by a transportation master plan. The roads that are being talked about that the Council refers to are in the transportation master plan. Things like the extension of Bishop Grandin, things like, you know, Councillor Vandal and I were just talking the other day about Marion and Archibald, you know, dealing with Marion-Dugald, that connection and you know, there's other...when you get into the north of the city, Chief Peguis, then we just did one extension and there's another one that's in the master plan. You get out into the west side of the city; you've got the Bill Clement Parkway extension, and so many of the major street works are in the plan. So this is all part of the plan. I mean, we've argued the times of the plan. We might be moving faster than what the plan says, that's an issue of rate of growth. If we're seeing the rate of growth and Councillor Wyatt just put out this morning on the table that we're expecting 180,000 new residents in the city or a growth of 180,000 residents in the City of Winnipeg by 2031. That's 15 years, 15, 16 years away. I don't know that I buy those numbers. I've looked at 1960s planning documents that refer to a population number that we were going to get in the 80s and we still haven't gotten to those numbers, so I'll take that with a grain of salt. But you know, we do have...this is part of logical planning. It's part of sustainable growth. You look at...at these plans and all the transportation pieces are being addressed and the density is being addressed and the access and the egress is being addressed. It's all in there, so this is good planning. And you know, at the same time, you're going to see in our city, you're going to see a lot more applications for increased density and I know in Councillor Gerbasi's Ward, there's quite a number of new multi-family opportunities going on; on a large scale and small scale. A lot of duplexing or triplexing, but also, you know, mid-rise condo projects and apartment projects. We're seeing it in downtown. You know, there's a number of you, just look around, you'll see couple of cranes in the sky. They're doing residential both rental and condo projects in downtown Winnipeg, and you know new developments, we're seeing that drive towards density, we're getting more density out of the land and we're creating complete communities and you know that's the other piece we had in Our Winnipeg, was Complete Communities, so you'll see that in these new precincts as well, that it's doing exactly what Our Winnipeg has asked us to do. So I just wanted to make sure that you know Councillor Eadie understood all of those facts that all Councillors understand those facts that we're not just driven towards the ideology or ideologically, sort of utopian planning principle. Our plan reflects what Winnipeg needs and what Winnipeg is. And our plan is a good plan and the plan is in the plan. Couldn't stop myself. So there's a lot of positives in these reports. So you'll see that we are actually fortunately following a plan. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to speak to Councillor, both these precincts are in my ward and one is by the Southland Park and the other one is south of Island Lakes, Royal Wood and I can tell you that part of the requirements of both of them is that they come forward with cost benefit analysis. Those cost benefit analysis are viewed by our administration and if they do not show, for example a positive net benefit tax wise to the City of Winnipeg over a 20, 40, 60 and 80 year period then we have a problem. They shouldn't be coming forward and I know that precinct, the Dawson Trail Precinct and I opened up the cost benefit analysis. City of Winnipeg Project revenue at 80 years equals \$407 million. That includes all modalities of housing, single family, multi-family, commercial, permits, frontage levies; our project cost at 80 years is \$223 million for financial benefit of \$185 million over the 80 years and our net present value of \$62.7 million. Now, these are different precinct plans. They're in different areas of St. Boniface. In fact, I would argue a lot of those folks don't even think they're living in St. Boniface because when you grow up in those areas, you hang out. The town centre is St. Vital Mall, so you actually think you're in St. Vital, but constitutently or politically, it is the Ward of St. Boniface. We have...we have made purviews for...I know on the Frepont Land, which is south of Island Lakes for...there is room for a rapid transit line eventually which is going to go up the Emerson rail line I think that's very important. Councillor Mayes and I have spoken to the transit department for that. That's good planning for the future. There's nobody expecting that rapid transit line is going to occur in three years or in five years, but we know as we grow out and as we grow up, that we're going to need to get people out of their cars and on the Dawson Trail Lands, I believe it's 70 percent of that housing development is multi-family. So, the point is...the point I wanted to make when I stood up is that this is...Councillor Eadie is right, the traffic there is...there's way too much traffic. I get complaints every day about the wait times for people trying to get into the downtown trying to get to work, so the time is right for a significant improvement in our transportation infrastructure in that quadrant. And I've been pushing the Marion-Goulet improvements for a few years now, fought to get it into the budget. I noticed Councillor Browaty put it in his motion that we were going to be debating next week, next month, excuse me, but I think with Building Canada coming forward, that the time is right to move, Marion-Archibald to actually get something done in that corner. We know that with the...with these two precincts we are talking thousands of new residences. Thousands of new single-family residences and close to a thousand in multi-family residences and that is...that is significant growth for the area and for the City of Winnipeg and if you add that up to Councillor Pagtakhan's ward and Councillor Havixbeck's ward, we haven't experienced this sort of growth in a long, long time and I think that this is all in the City of Winnipeg. We recoup all of the taxes. Granted, we are going to have to do some transportation improvements and I think there's room for a new community centre in Frepont. There's...there's provisions for a new school. This is real growth and I think we're going to crude benefits of that real growth. It's all within the City of Winnipeg and we just have to follow up with major

transportation improvements that are bought into and are supported by the other levels of government. I'm hoping that all of that comes together as a package to move forward sooner rather than later in this quadrant of the city, but these are precinct plans. We're going to be hearing, the subdivisions, the rezoning at subsequent Riel Community Committee meetings within the next few months, so there's going to be a lot more information coming back before this council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steen.

Councillor Steen: Madam Speaker, I agree with Councillor Eadie and all this speakers here. It's becoming a big issue in Elmwood too to get to downtown because we're getting a lot of developments in Transcona, but...and we built a very nice bridge, but we didn't do more lanes so the problem is getting bigger. We've got cars coming through our area and it's all about balancing these projects with they have to be able to get to downtown because it's rush-hour traffic. It seems like downtown back and forth is the issue. There is the plan for Louise Bridge and I hope that will be a four lane bridge so it would be...can take more traffic and the Chief Peguis Trail will help when that day comes, but I can't say I disagree with either...either speaker on this so. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thought we were building momentum to move that southeast rapid transit right along. Councillor Steen is defending his Elmwood constituents saying their line, next line should be going up there, and that's...that's appropriate. The...Councillor Eadie has made a good point and he's saying, "Look. There are costs to growth, but he's also retaining their benefit throughout. We all pay for the frozen water lines in the old development in say some of the older parts of the city like Wildwood had problems with frozen pipes. We all pay for separating the combined sewer system in the Calrossie area. We don't just say, "Oh, it's only the...growth is going to pay for growth and age can pay for age." Sage Creek isn't going to pay a dime toward the old sewer lines; it's not going to pay a dime toward the old sewer problems. So Councillor Swandel was talking before in here about the sins of the past and I think that's important to remember that yes, there are costs to expanding out, but there are also benefits to expanding out and when it...there has been planning on these two precincts and I want to commend Councillor Vandal for the work he's put in on this. And I've been to a number of meetings on Precinct K. As Councillor Vandal said that the poll there is often towards St. Vital; the public meeting on Precinct K was in my ward actually, it's on from Schoharie Leo Remillard and this has some...actually some important opportunities in terms of development of a trail system along the Seine, part... regional park system along the Seine and it has been alluded to regional rapid transit line coming down the...I think it's the CN line that runs through the southeast part of the city. At EPC, I pulled this item specifically to ask Dave Wardrop "is there any planning that we're doing here that would preclude the mass transit stations of the mass transit line going ahead?" and "no" was the answer. "We have that in mind". There is planning here with forethought for the future, so I don't think it's fair to say there's no planning here. There has actually been a lot of work put in by the area Councillor to try to look at issues like the mass transit and the green space. And as a final, and I know Councillor Swandel will attack me savagely if I start saying, "I" too much. I'm going to praise him on something. Befuddle him by praising and by saying, "We had a motion at the last meeting that we all passed, unanimously passed that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to earmark up to two million of proceeds from the City, Qualico, River Park South, joint venture to what the Jonathan Toews Community Centre Field House Expansion. So what is that? That is taking money from a new expansion that we as a city doing as a joint venture in South St. Vital. It's half in Council Swandel's ward, half in my ward, taking some of the proceeds of that, that benefit, putting it toward an expansion and a community centre that's more than 25 years old, Jonathan Toews, to build a field house that will be a huge benefit to the seniors in my ward. The new parts of my ward and the old parts of my parts, the Old St. Vital area, they're going to get benefit out of that. The young people, the seniors, people in Councillor Swandel's ward, who live in St. Vital are going to get benefit from that. It's a good example of where growth is producing a dividend for the city that can be used to help expand along with the Province who have worked very hard on this. That field house, that community centre. So important to point out, yes there are cost to growth, but in this case, we can also for...care for get some benefits as we did at Jonathan Toews that we all voted for at the last meeting to use that money that's coming from growth to get social benefit. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Eadie for taking this item off the agenda because I think we often have really big decisions that are...have a lot of impact going forward in the future. We just pass them on the consent agenda without a lot of thought and what we are approving today is two more new, very large precinct plans for more growth in our city and as people have point out, there's positives and negatives to new growth. But we do have a city plan which was criticized by some of us at the time. Yes, it has us growing up and growing out, but it has no mechanism for kind of prioritizing that growth, and I think that's our...continues to be our biggest problem in that we are seeing the massive...through these precinct planning process that the private sector does the planning so that it happens super quick. It takes us ten years to do a neighbourhood plan in the inner city whereas these things get

whipped off because these guys are bringing forward their own developments. So we're seeing massive amounts of planning all around in that part of our city plan in the growth and expansion areas and very slow, you know, I'm glad to see some, but our planning resources for the rest of the city and the growing upward part is happening very slowly. So, we don't really...this is happening at lightning speed and I think what Councillor Eadie...I agree with him for bringing this up that...well, the question and there's obviously a difference of opinion of whether growth does pay for growth. We had a seminar a little while ago and the majority of Council listened to what our administration said including the Mayor who was saying, "we have to make sure growth pays for growth. We have to have a mechanism to get the funding that we need so that we can pay for all this transportation infrastructure and other infrastructure that comes from all this growth, but we don't have that mechanism yet", so we're...here we are and I can understand Councillor Eadie's concern about just automatically passing everything through another massive precinct plan two on this agenda and I share his concern and I think there's a few of us who do. I appreciate the fact that we're doing planning. Obviously, I am a strong believer in planning our communities and let these new plans I'm sure, have some very positive attributes in them, but we are still designing. We're still...if you look at the amount of development that's happening throughout the city with our mechanism of this massive amount of planning out here, a little bit of planning in here, that we're going to have a massive unsustainable transportation problem going forward and I don't see the answers anywhere as to how we're going to deal with that. Look at the challenge of getting one bus line completed, 2019 and people are talking. I hear Councillor Mayes. I love his idealism. I agree. I want to see a rapid transit line in Councillor Steen's ward, in St. Boniface, down Portage Avenue, everywhere, but we've got to have, you know, the widenings and the this and the that. You know, we're having a referendum because we have to widen everything and all these other new roads that these things are causing and I know we do cost benefit analysis, but we've seen with the example of Waverly West being an example to show this, that yes, we have a cost benefit analysis, but it doesn't include the full costing of everything that ultimately comes outside the scope of what you can really charge the developer for. There's a need to expand regional road systems, needing to build all these things, needing to have transit. I mean, Sage Creek, I remember Councillor Vandal's predecessor bragged to this Council that you know we didn't need to have transit, we're just going to build this place and it was great. It's just now we've provided transit service since that time. Would you like to speak in delegation? Since that time so the point is we do need to provide additional services that do not always get calculated into these cost benefit analysis and we've seen that over and over. We've seen that and I'm sorry, I think it's still, a very thing to question whether growth pays for growth. A lot of people are saying it doesn't, including our own administration. So unless we set up a mechanism that it starts paying for growth, we better slow down approving a new precinct plan or two every single Council meeting that's massively going at lightning speed and as Dan said, we're going to see the subdivisions next time, in the next month or two. We're going to see all of this. We're seeing the Charleswood massive development there. Now, that means we're going to have to...there will be more and more pressure to build those roadways, but right now it's empty land so you know and all those suburban, edge of the city dwellers are going to want to come downtown, and you don't want to come to the Bombers game, and you don't want to drive through our neighbourhoods which is totally what they should be able to do, and they're going to need a mass transit system for that. They're going to...and they're going to...we're going to need to do this properly. So I do appreciate the effort. I know our staff has supported these planning processes and that's what our plan says and they're doing what they're supposed to do, but the problem is we don't have a mechanism to cover the full cost of this growth. We do not have that and we're going at lightning speed with the growing out. We're moving some positive direction in the moving up and a lot of it's happening in my ward, so I'm well aware of it. But, it's not at the pace that it needs to be in comparison to the other kind of growth we're having. So if it's not paying for itself, then the argument is flawed and the strategy is flawed, and the plan is flawed unfortunately even if the intention is very good. So I appreciate very much, Councillor Eadie, even though we're all...are tired and would probably like to go home. I think it's important that Councillor Eadie keeps us thinking about these decisions to continue to expand our city with a largely low density. I know there's a little bit more density, but we're still mostly talking of lower density car oriented development. Let's be honest. It doesn't pay for itself and we're going to have to start dealing with that. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. I hate to break it to Councillor Gerbasi, but not everybody wants to live in a condo in Osborne Village. It's just...you know, not everybody wants to live there. Sometimes some folks want to live in the suburbs, Councillor Gerbasi, some folks want to...some folks want to live and live in other parts of the city.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. Would you like to speak on the item?

Councillor Wyatt: I'm sorry, Madam...yes, I just...Councillor Gerbasi got everybody stirred up here, and everybody...So you know, a bunch of you guys, let's read some...Yeah, exactly. Let's stir it up. Let's...let's, you know, Councillor Gerbasi and...Madam Speaker, we cannot stop the growth of the City and nor do we want to. We want to see the growth happen and we want to facilitate it. I think what the City is struggling with is in terms of funding the issues that Councillor Gerbasi is passionately spoken about and Councillor Eadie, the total and in terms of the transportation master plan which I have a copy in front of me, the total by 2031, 2031 being long term, when this was passed in October of

2011, the total was 1.382 billion so 1 billion 382 million, actually 83 million, yes, and by the way, that does not include, because they didn't know the estimate then. It does not include Louise Bridge. It does not include Arlington Bridge. It does not include Councillor Gerbasi's Osborne Street underpass which she is passionately fought for in the past which is ironic considering that she's arguing against other underpasses. And it does not include the grade separation CN main line between Taylor and Sterling Lyon, so you know, it's amazing...which would be Waverley...it's amazing in terms of the challenges that we're facing here. There's no doubt about it. Councillor Swandel mentioned the growth and I was using the Conference Board of Canada, which was by the way published in Our Winnipeg, 180,000 by 2031. The transportation master plan used more conservative numbers going from the City staff. They estimated the city would grow to approximately 850,000 people by 2031. Still they said that was an extremely aggressive...31 percent increase since 2006 in the population of Winnipeg, 31 percent. And the rated growth is unprecedented. The rural report stated. The report also stated that there be a hundred thousand new households required by 2031 and over 120,000 additional cars, on the streets of our city by 2031, I mean the challenge that we're facing now in the next 16, 15 years is massive and so the question comes back to it and you know what we can't. We don't want to discourage the growth. We don't want to stop...the City...we have to make a choice or are we going to grow? Are we going to not grow? Are we going to decide we are going to be a city that's going to stay the same size and everything is fine, and that's it. I don't think so. So then how are we going to meet these challenges and these financial challenges and that's really the issues here. It's not a question of whether you're approving this Precinct J or Precinct K or whatever it is before us today. The reality is how are we going to fund these financial challenges facing the City? And Councillor Gerbasi and others have spoken about the need for development of "pay for development". Well, it's ironic. It's ironic that the request that came from this Council and this Council and the Mayor led that charge to the Provincial government, development cost charges. It was the Provincial Government that shut it down and the Provincial government that's stopping those development cost charges from proceeding. Development paying for development. Now that can only cover part of these costs. Let's be realistic here, Madam Speaker. It will not be able to cover all of the costs. There is no way. If you do that, the development will not occur, it's just...end of story. The reality is we live in a province that has raised the sales tax undemocratically, breaking the balanced budget legislation without having a referendum as required and collecting now out of the pockets of everybody who shops inside the City of Winnipeg, another \$200 million a year. Yes, thank you for the extra 50 you're giving back to the infrastructure of the City, but where is the other 150 million on an annual basis that should be going into the infrastructure that should be building the roads and the bridges and yes, rapid transit to make this City work and continue to grow. That's the issue here, Madam Speaker, not whether or not this is a bad precinct plan or not. This has to go...or else you're saying the City has to stop growing. The City has to...that's what you basically are saying. This...I look forward to a unanimous vote, Madam Speaker, on both of these items. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty to close. Councillor Browaty, you have the floor. Thank you.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to everybody who made their comments on this particular file. Again, it's been pointed out many a time that the Congress Board of Canada, no matter who we talk to and what the numbers are. We are in the very enviable position where we're projecting growth. Can you imagine if we were dealing with stagnation if our tax base is decreasing, situations we'll be talking about here today? My very good friend and I don't want to pick on him too hard on his birthday, but Councillor Eadie seems to want to have it both ways. If we didn't have this expanded tax base where do you think we'd be...what do you think would happen to house values in the North End? They'd be increasing and people who've been living in these houses for a long time would be faced with even a larger share of the City's property tax burden. Yes, I appreciate that because he's out there complaining that because of the success and the demand for housing in our city, property tax values are going up there and it's making harder for people who've been there for a long time to afford their property taxes. That only will get worse if we didn't have this growth, and the accommodation for people to want to live the way they want to live whether it's in suburban developments on the outskirts of town, whether it's growing up as we're seeing throughout our city. We've seen new...I've got a high rise apartment block going up in North Kildonan these days. It's wonderful news and that certainly helps the tax base. So again, I thank everyone for their comments today and I move the Precincts J and K again, they are consistent with Our Winnipeg and they're certainly, you know, today's modern version of suburban community. Thank you. Madam Speaker, in regards to Councillor Gerbasi's comments, we have...it's clearly more challenging, more difficult in terms of planning to do planning with existing neighbourhoods verses green field development. And we spent many millions of dollars, many hours of staff time, consultants' time, whatever, going through and doing very through plans that she's been very supportive of, I appreciate that, but again we spent much attention and taxpayers dollars when it's a new development, it's developer dollars, but again, it's probably one of the best planned out and secondary plans and overlaid plans and I know you've, you know, spent a lot of time and effort on it and you've been part of that, so anyway, I just wanted to make sure that comment didn't go without a little bit of a comment.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour of Item 15 and 17? Opposed? Carried. Okay, we have no motions for P and D. We'll move on to by-laws.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move that By-law No. 48/2014 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 48/2014.

Councillor Eadie: Nay. Recorded in opposition.

Madam Speaker: So noted.

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

Councillor Browaty: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move that Items 47/2014...okay the following items here read a first time, Item 47/2014, 61/2014, 62/2014, 63/2014, 64/2014, 65/2014, 66/2014.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 47/2014, By-Law No. 61/2014, By-Law 62/2014, No. 63/2014, By-law 64/2014, By-Law No. 65/2014, By-Law No. 66/2014.

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-laws numbered 47/2014 and 61/2014 to 66/2014 both inclusive be read a third time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-Law No. 47/2014 and by-laws numbered 61 to 66/2014 both inclusive.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 47/2014 and 61/2014 to 66/2014 both inclusive be read a third time and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried. We'll now move on to question period. Any questions for Councillor Browaty? Councillor Eadie.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. Given our recent debate, I wouldn't want people to think that I...anyway...I do know a couple of things contrary to a particular Councillor who keeps trying to make it look like I don't know what I'm talking about, so...but...I'm just curious. Because the Chair of Property, Planning and Development is overseeing all these precinct plans and I wasn't saying that the precinct plan was a bad one, but I know, my question is simply, in the cost benefit analysis, when you're looking at market values of housing and how much property taxes it generates and so on and so forth, have they factored into the cost benefits the re-assessment and the driving up of old neighbourhoods? My study wasn't able to break it down by neighbourhood because our systems don't allow you to do that, but if you look at all the neighbourhoods, I'm telling you right now that St. James is picking up costs for Sage Creek. I can tell you all that stuff, so my question is simply, can Councillor Browaty tell me is the re-assessment process factored into the cost benefit analysis? It is?

Councillor Browaty: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, second question.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 27, 2014

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Can you tell me what the factor is then when we're looking at the current markets? Are we projecting...like...these are guestimates I would imagine, are they?

Councillor Browaty: We have experts that forecast these types of things. The reality is, when you have a brand new subdivision, their needs for improved infrastructure and that...all these things are paid for at the beginning by the original developer and the original home buyer. In older neighbourhoods where we have old infrastructure, we have huge costs to bring things back up to full...we have infrastructure that is definitely failing.

Councillor Eadie: Final question?

Madam Speaker: Third question?

Councillor Eadie: Third question. So is the cost of the regional infrastructure required factored in? I know the developers pay for what's needed in the precinct itself but can you tell me if the cost benefit analyzes these transportation issues that we're dealing with, because you know what? Chief Peguis Trail needs to be built now too. So does Bishop Grandin needs to be fixed. Osborne needs to be fixed. Waverley underpass doesn't exist yet. Can you tell me please? Is that factored into the cost benefit analysis?

Councillor Browaty: What I can tell you is that in a brand new subdivision, where you have homes valued at four to five hundred thousand dollars, they are paying property taxes to the tune of about four or five times as much as a hundred thousand dollar home in the north end.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Chair? Okay. Then we'll move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. Councillor Mayes.

**REPORT OF THE
 STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
 DATED MAY 12, 2014**

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll move the report dated May 12, 2014 items 1 and 2 inclusive.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, we have a motion no. 4, which is from Councillor Havixbeck and Vandal. It's an automatic referral to Protection and Community Services. It's report...it's a motion on community centres summer programming.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
 MOTIONS**

Motion No. 4

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

WHEREAS many if not all community centres are often closed during the summer months particularly in neighbourhoods where children and youth could benefit from centres being opened.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the public service be requested to prepare a report that identifies which community centres are currently kept open throughout the city and what costs and issues would need to be considered to keep some community centres open during the summer months, identifying which target centres would be most beneficial for our children and youth and that this report be provided for Council consideration within 60 days.

Madam Speaker: Okay, that is it for motions. We have no by-laws. Question period. Any questions for the chair? Okay, moving on. Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED MAY 6, 2014**

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to...I know that there's a couple of things going on today that people want to get out of here. One is of course Councillor Eadie's birthday and the other of course if we drag this out, we might delay Councillor Vandal's nomination, his coronation to run for MP in the St. Boniface riding, so I will try to drag this out past 7 o'clock which is when you are supposed to be there, Councillor. We get to the right place? I'd like to introduce the report of May 6, 2014 and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Swandel, the next report.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED MAY 20, 2014**

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of May 20th, 2014 and introduce the report...move adoption of the consent agenda Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay and we have motion no. 2 from Councillor Havixbeck and Councillor Orlikow regarding frozen pipes. This is an automatic referral. Yes, Councillor?

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

**Motion No. 2,
Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,**

WHEREAS it is a fact that as of today's date, there are still 522 properties with frozen pipes.

AND WHEREAS other cities including Brandon, Manitoba and Regina, Saskatchewan have long resolved their frozen pipe issue in their respective cities and it is a fact that thawing equipment is available and sits idle.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT that the public service be directed to immediately contact these and other municipalities to obtain the equipment to thaw the remaining properties who are still experiencing frozen pipes.

Councillor Havixbeck: I'd like to move suspension of the rules to hear this item here today given its level of urgency.

Madam Speaker: Is there a will to suspend the rules?

Councillor Havixbeck: I have a motion so.

Madam Speaker: Is there a will to suspend the rules to deal with the item today? All those in favour? All those opposed? Motion to suspend the rules is defeated. This will be an automatic referral. Motion no. 3 is motion from Councillor Havixbeck and Councillor Smith regarding frozen pipe research. This is also an automatic referral to the committee. Okay, move on to by-laws, Councillor Swandel.

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

WHEREAS it is a fact that, as of today's date, there are still 522 properties with frozen water pipes;

AND WHEREAS other cities including Brandon, Manitoba and Regina, Saskatchewan have long resolved their frozen pipe issue in their respective cities and it is a fact that thawing equipment is available and sits idle;

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 27, 2014

AND WHEREAS there has been no agreement to have regular or even periodic updates about the frozen pipe situation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Service be directed to provide a comprehensive report including the following information:

1. The municipalities contacted, contact person and dates relative to borrowing other municipalities' thawing equipment;
2. The cost incurred to date for:
 - overtime as it compares to this time last year
 - water running continuously by affected properties
 - reimbursement to date for pipes thawed by private contractors and
 - additional equipment costs;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

1. That the Public Service be directed to research and consult with the home building industry and provide Council with suitable options suitable concerning to what depths new development should be required to lay pipes;
2. That the Mayor write the federal minister responsible for municipal infrastructure issues to request immediate funding for all City of Winnipeg pipes being replaced this year toward laying these pipes to the new required depths;
3. That a long term plan be developed and brought forward to Council in the form of a Council Seminar in July 2014 for review and input;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the public administration provide Council with this information within 30 days.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 56/2014 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-Law No. 56/2014.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. I will move that By-law No. 56/2014 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-Law No. 56/2014.

Councillor Swandel: I will move that the rule be suspended and that By-Law No. 56/2014 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Any questions for the chair? Seeing none...Councillor Havixbeck.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Havixbeck: Can the chair please tell us when he estimates that the frozen pipe situation throughout the city will be finally resolved?

Deputy Mayor Swandel: June 17, 2014.

Madam Speaker: Anything further?

Councillor Havixbeck: Madam Speaker, I mean, with all due respect. I think that the sarcasm that's displayed in an answer like that is really uncalled for. Can the chair tell us whether he is aware of some kind of concrete plan to ensure that the five hundred and...well, our last count is 522 properties with frozen pipes...will be thawed sooner than that?

Councillor Swandel: Madam Speaker. I'd just like to take this opportunity to point out to you that political grandstanding on an issue as important as frozen pipes is far more offensive than a quick quip response in question period. Our employees at the City of Winnipeg have done nothing short of performing miracles in addressing an issue that every city that's experiencing this climate this year have had to deal with. For the Councillor to go out of her way to find possible areas where things may have been missed or might have been missed and to embellish them and to add innuendo. You know, using terms like "522 properties having frozen pipes". The reality is we have less than a hundred properties that don't have water provided to them right now Madam Speaker. And the reason they don't have water provided to them, some of them are because they have other alternatives they've looked after themselves. You know, the majority of properties, of the 522 of them I think are in the motion, the vast majority of them have water service. They've been hooked up to other pipes. You know, so what's going on here Madam Speaker, it's back to this sort of silliness of political grandstanding that what's going on here is somebody's tried to take an issue that is being addressed by our employees who have gone out of their way, they've gotten every bit of hose that's available in North America to connect to other people's houses. They've gotten every machine that they can get their hands on when they were able to get their hands on it. Right now the ground is starting to thaw and we're about to see the rest of the properties relieved. I've heard this Councillor, Madam Speaker, refer to numerous phone calls. I would ask that when the Councillor gets those calls, forward them to me. I will phone the person directly and I will find a solution to their problem within the context of what this city can do. What the City can do Madam Speaker is that we immediately, for every individual in this City, and I think it was your wisdom that brought this forward Madam Speaker. We were able to open up our aquatics facilities for people to bathe in. Right away, immediately. And within the short time of that we were able to start hooking people up to their neighbours' properties for water. At the same time, when it was 30, 40, 50 below out there, we had people working around the clock restoring these services and we were prioritizing them based on the needs. If there were health needs, if they were seniors, if there were children. We did it. We responded at a level that nobody could keep up with. So for somebody to try and characterize our people as somehow doing something wrong here is just so incomprehensible to me. I don't understand how you can do that. So if there are people that are calling the Councillor and they have these issues, have them call my office, because I will get on the phone with the Director of Water and Waste; I will visit their house personally. I think the Mayor's done that already with some people. Visit their house personally; find out what the issue is. If the issues with these people are in need and we've missed them, we'll find out what the need is and we'll get that addressed as quick as we can.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further?

Councillor Havixbeck: No.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. The Province of Manitoba has introduced new rules and regulations on cosmetic pesticides that come into effect next year. Through you to the Chair, could the Chairman identify if these rules and regulations apply to the City of Winnipeg and if it will cause us not to be able to use products on our parks and playgrounds and fields to allow the fighting of things like dandelions that cause problems for people with allergies and asthma.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel?

Councillor Swandel: I'm not sure I totally understand. Are you asking if the products...whether or not we'll have an alternative product available?

Councillor Browaty: Sure.

Madam Speaker: Clarification Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Whether or not a)...I'll ask as a sort of a two-part question but a) whether or not the ban applies to...I know it doesn't apply necessarily to golf courses. Does it apply to the City of Winnipeg and our open spaces, a) and b) are we going to use alternative products and do we have any idea what those costs are?

Councillor Swandel: A great deal of our public spaces, especially where children play, we're already restricted from using a number of these products for obvious reasons. They're sort of joint use areas around schools and those types of things. There is obviously, Councillor...Madam Speaker...a move away from using pesticides and insecticides that could contain certain chemicals, so I guess the short answer is, yes it will have an impact on some of those places but all alternatives will be explored, are being explored and I think they've been doing jointly with the Province, but I could certainly get the department to provide some more information to the Councillor. It's not a file that I'm right up to speed on right at this particular moment.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further for the Chair? We will move on to Standing Committee on Finance. We have no report for Finance, we have no motions. We do have a Chair today. Councillor Wyatt. By-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Wyatt: I'd like to move By-law 57/2014.

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

Clerk: By-law 57/2014.

Councillor Wyatt: I want to move By-law 57/2014 to be read a second time, Madam Speaker.

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

Clerk: By-law 57/2014.

Councillor Wyatt: And I'd like to move that the rules be suspended to allow By-law 57/2014 to be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Any questions for the Chair? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We had a motion earlier today to basically change the budget decision about the 3.5 days. Now we have to make up that 1.5 million. I'm wondering how another line in the budget, the \$2 million that we were supposed to get savings from ASD initiatives is working and I'm wondering if you can explain how well that process is going, because that was a pretty high target and last year and probably the year before it probably wasn't anywhere close to being achieved, so I'm just wondering how big the hole it is in our budget or is that line, if you could give us an update on how that's going.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the Councillor, the June meeting of the Finance Committee will be the meeting where we usually get our first update in terms of the first quarter for the year, so we will have an update in terms of the first quarter results in terms of City expenditures and where we stand in terms of the budget; this year's budget in terms of our costs and revenues and the balance. So should have a better idea very shortly when we have that meeting.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Okay, seeing none we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management. Councillor Pagtakhan.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED MAY 5, 2014**

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce report of May 5, 2014, and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 to 3.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have no motions. We'll move onto by-laws, Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, Madam Speaker. It's my please to move

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to move By-law No. 34/2014 and 55/2014 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 34/2014 and By-law No. 55/2014.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll move that By-laws No. 34/2014 and 55/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 34/2014 and By-law No. 55/2014.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 34/2014 and 55/2014 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question period. Question period? No questions for the Chair. Councillor Steen will move the Council adjourn. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 4:03 p.m.