

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

The Council met at 9:35 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Smith.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Visa. We'd like to welcome a guest in the gallery today, lots of media. I'll call on His Worship Mayor Katz to make a statement, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1960, in Sharpeville, South Africa, a peaceful protest against Apartheid came to a tragic end when police opened fire killing 69 people and wounding many others. In 1966, to commemorate this tragic event and to encourage and promote harmonious race relations, the United Nations declared March the 21st as the International Day for the elimination of racial discrimination. The City of Winnipeg's model is a Latin phrase, "UNUM CUM VIRTUTE MULTORUM" which means one with the strength of many. We are a multi-cultural mosaic, one of the city's defying features and the greatest assets. Together we are building relationships and communities, which will in turn create a society that embraces the elimination of racism and prejudice. I urge all citizens to commemorate this day by participating in one of the many events happening across our great city. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Before we get into the meat of our meeting today, I have an announcement that is a sad one for those of us here at City Hall. One of our long time commissioners, Mr. Joe Mallet, has passed away. He served Council diligently for almost 10 years. We all remember Joe's smiling face and peppy walk as he came across the lobby out there and we will certainly miss him so we'd like to offer our condolences from all of Council and all of City Hall, to his wife, Lois, his daughters, Nicole, Melanie and their families in this time of their bereavement. Just for those who are interested, Joe's memorial service will be today out at Neil Bardal's complex on west Notre Dame at 2 o'clock.

MINUTES

Councillor Steen moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on February 27, 2013, be taken as read and confirmed.

All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: All right. We have several delegations joining us today and I'll ask Mr. Alan Freeman followed by Mr. Bill McDonald, Mr... let's see there's also Harry Wolberg and Cal Dueck will speak in that order. So Mr. Freeman, please join us. You have 10 minutes.

Alan Freeman: Is this working? Mr. Mayor, members, thank you for hearing me. I moved to Winnipeg in December 2011. I became a permanent resident in May, 2012. From 2001 to 2011, I worked for the Mayor of London, England in the Economics Unit of the Great London Authority. I worked on culture, the living wage and economic development. I'm an enthusiastic supporter of rapid transit. With my colleagues I provided economic and planning projections for many London transit plans starting with major extensions to the bus network and the congestion charge. My team helped evaluate projections for transit revenue, job and wealth creation and environmental impact. Transit is critical in its own right and it's also pivotal to development, poverty reduction and emission control. We understood this when we created

the Stratford for transit node at the centre of major deprived area, the sight of the 2012 Olympics and the place where Eurostar, Crossrail and the London tube and bus map network all meet. I feel there are questions needing answers to ensure the new development meets its objectives and is financially robust. I hope my submission assists you by placing these questions in the public domain. I hope it helps the public by getting the answers from you. City procedures made me choose between presenting for and against, which I would prefer not to have done. It is because I don't yet have these answers that I opted to appear before you as an opponent. I think the project will work better and you will have a better relation with the citizens you elected to serve if they hear your answers. My concern is that the effects of this investment like any other should be considered so that benefits can be fully realized. Needless detriment can be avoided and unavoidable detriment can be limited and compensated. This calls for evidence I couldn't find in the report. It may well exist, it should then be made available and accessible to the public which will lay the basis for informed dialogue. My main concern is that sound transit investment, depends not just on the land costs but ridership projections. That's where the revenue comes from. If an investment leads to less than the hope for changing ridership, that alters its true cost to the public. This may show in later fare hikes or subsidies. Suppose when the fundamental study, functional study is done, you find that ridership will be significantly lower in the chosen alignment than it would've been for the rejected alternatives. The true cost of your choice will then be higher by the revenue loss over its life time than the costs on which this decision has been based today. I cannot judge if this is true from the information I have found in your report. You have that information. I think you should make available and I hope you take account of it. My second concern is the link between investment in transit and expected development which works both ways. Development usually benefits the City in its own right and transit investments help secure those benefits by making that development more possible. But the investment also depends on the development because that's what produces the extra fares which ultimately pay for it. The less sure we are about the development, the more transit oriented development turns into development oriented transit. How sure are you that the developments described in the report will take place? How much does the alignment depend on them? What will be the cost impact if these developments don't happen? Again, the report does not say enough for me to judge. I am simply a member of the public. It does however lean heavily on the prospects for new development from what I have read. A sound decision should stand on its own two feet on the basis of existing and known developments. It is then not at risk from decisions not yet made. This also allows for flexible dialogue around legitimate concerns about the impact on open areas because development options would remain genuinely open. My third concern is unintended traffic effects. When you assess how a new development affects ridership, planners expect new systems to become attractive because journey times are shorter of course, but transit decisions are comparative. In London, the bus and the congestion charge strategy were integrated. We had to make it easier to travel by transit and difficult though it was, harder to travel by car. That's one reason dedicated bus lanes, for example, a part of the transit plan is armoury. When rapid transit takes buses off the road, paradoxically it makes it easier to travel by car. This can unexpectedly reduce ridership. This makes the argument against lane reduction on Pembina which I saw in the report, less persuasive. Actually, restraints on additional alternative traffic routes may well be needed in order to secure the shift to transit that its financial required and I understand from the framework plan is desired by the citizens and this Council of Winnipeg. This could be said right to the functional stage but that for that reason, I believe the option of additional traffic reduction measures must also stay on the table. Again, you have information I do not. I am however concerned the report veers towards treating private traffic reduction as an unequivocal bad. I urge you to ensure that the widest possible range of traffic management measures which may be needed to get riders on to the buses remain on the table. My final concern relates to the way impacts are assessed. I do not live next to the Parker lands, although I walk my dog there. But I share concerns that Winnipeg should preserve as much urban open space it can. My job as a cultural economist in London, which was my main job, taught me the internet age has transformed the way that cities work. Creative individuals and enterprises both in technology and the arts are the key to the modern successful city. Winnipeg is well endowed with a vibrant creative scene. I believe it could've, could become one of North America's great creative centres. Creative industry works on a whole-city basis. Those same students that would go on the buses and use the transit route, they will stay to make this city prosperous if it is attractive in every sense. Pleasant to live in, pleasant to walk in and cycle through, to skate and ski in, to enjoy sport, experience nature and delight in a cultural life with no equal on the continent. The built and natural environment must see to that. Every piece of heritage, every patch of land or waterfront, every piece of the jigsaw that makes up our culture in the broadest sense, is as much a part of our infrastructure as a bus or a snow plough. If one part goes missing, we all lose, not just the people next door but everyone in the city and their kids, and their kids, too. That's a cost. It's a hidden cost but it's a real cost. The British Treasury requires every public authority to assess all possible impacts of every year investment, positive and negative. I was surprised to find that requirement is not standard for Winnipeg or Manitoba planning decisions. You might say this isn't the way things are done here. That doesn't mean that they're being done right. I hope a proper accounting for all costs and benefits become a normal part of planning and public dialogue. I hope it begins with the functional stage of the assessment of this project and includes the environmental impact of all options, including the options of enhanced protection of urban spaces or compensations for loss and supplementary traffic management which I have suggested all remain on the table until the functional stages complete. This will rebuild the trust in dialogue which I have found to be below the level called for by such a necessary project or deserved by the people of this great city. It will ensure that Winnipeg's first rapid transit pays off in every sense of the word and the future may even thank you for it. Thank you for hearing me.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions for Mr. Freeman? Seeing none, thank you, sir. Nice presentation. Bill McDonald.

Bill McDonald: Good morning, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Speaker, neighbours of the Parker lands, Councillors and ladies and gentlemen. My name is Bill McDonald and I'm the CEO of the Winnipeg Humane Society. The Humane Society is located at 45 Hurst Way. We are located immediately west of the Parker lands and our neighbour to the east is the Brenda Leipsic off-leash dog park. Our shelter is located on eight acres of property and our building footprint occupies just under two acres. Our 42,000 square foot building has LEED's silver status, LEED standing for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design. At one point, the Winnipeg Humane Society building was the largest green building in the City of Winnipeg, now only surpassed by the new Hydro building, not that far from here. We are very proud of our building and property being a green facility and it's surrounded by trees with walking trails and we have a huge pond in our back yard that's full of goldfish. It was the vision of former CEO, Vicki Burns who was the driving force to save as much green space as possible and to make our building green. She had the vision to look into the future and see what kind of environment the Humane Society should exist in. We bought our property in 2002 for 500,000 dollars and in 2005, the former owner offered the Society, 750,000 dollars to buy it back. We, of course, did not sell it as we knew we could not find another eight acres of treed property so centrally located. We held to our vision of providing green space for our animals and our clients. Next door to us is the Brenda Leipsic dog park. Brenda had a vision as well. She wanted our citizens to have access to green space and to enjoy it with their pets and I can tell you that the Leipsic dog park is well used and enjoyed by thousands of citizens and dogs every year. So here we are today on the very edge of destroying one of your colleague's visions, that of the dog park, but it is more than a simple dog park. It is the holding of the space as green space that would be lost if the proposed university transit lines run through the dog park. The Humane Society shelter was built to last for 75 years and I can assure you that in 75 years when I'm eligible for retirement, the green space surrounding our building will still be green. Your decision about the Parker lands should be about 75 years from now and it should include green space. A city is not only about development, sometimes it should be about not developing and I would urge you today to think about 75 years from now and that you preserve the Parker lands as green space. Once it is gone, we'll never recover it. You have been presented with alternatives, the existing Letellier Line, the rail line is a viable option and should be reconsidered. Yes, it will be a shorter route, more accessible to Pembina Highway and yes, more costly. But don't make decisions today based on what it all costs. Have some vision and think about 75 years from now. Think of what green space there may be this close to downtown and if you take up this green space, I would argue that future citizens will very much regret your choice. They will question how much time you spent in determining the value to society of keeping the Parker lands green. I would suggest that the Parker lands are so valuable to all of us as green space now, that any decision to destroy them has to be stopped at all costs, maybe even the costs associated with the Letellier Line choice. I would urge you to reconsider your decision not as a decision for today but a decision for the future when none of us are here. Think of it this way, the Greeks believed that, and this is a little quote, "A society grows great when old men plant trees whose shade they know they shall never sit in." So, please help create a great society and leave some shade for our future citizens. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Question from Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Bill. Just I want to pick up on one of your comments about the Pembina Line costing more than the Parker dogleg. I guess, are you aware that the lands, the Brenda Leipsic dog park and all this other green space, part of the reason why that the Parker leg is less costly is we valued those lands at zero cost, so I guess my question is do you believe those lands are of no value?

Bill McDonald: No, I don't believe the lands are of no value. Green space is invaluable, if you will.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none, thanks Bill. Oh, Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Bill. I heard you on the radio yesterday, by the way, and I agree with you. Are you aware that the Parker lands are privately held?

Bill McDonald: Yes. I know all about the swap for the...I guess it's the Fort Rouge land, the companies traded so that rapid transit could get to Pembina Highway through the rail lands so. It's always been a combination of private land, Hydro, City, so on.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for coming today, Mr. McDonald. I just...I think we're sort of on a one way path here that we're already all the way down the road with doing this even though some of us are going to argue against it today. Do you see any opportunities or is anybody engaged with you to date on how to plan so that you can incorporate proper amenities and to protect and preserve some of what you have existing today?

Bill McDonald: I guess I have two main concerns. Firstly, the dog park. And when you look at what the City has done and I applaud the City for creating dog parks. They are huge benefit to our citizens. I could quote articles and books about health and how dogs lower blood pressure, for example but I won't go there today. The location of the Brenda Leipsic dog park is critical in that the next closest dog park is actually at Kings Park way down Pembina Highway, close to where you live, Councillor Swandel. The other one is the Charleswood off-leash dog park so really you're denying the citizens of the Parker area and all of River Heights access to a dog park if this dog park disappears. So, I would be pleased if there was some kind of arrangement made, a trade, et cetera, that would leave the dog park at some place in the Parker lands. It really doesn't matter where. My second point that I said about the forest itself. I am not an environmental expert but I have been told that this aspen forest and a long grass prairie that's associated with it next to it under the Hydro lines is probably the last unique open green wild space in Winnipeg. You would have to go outside our existing areas of development to find anything similar. So I would be pleased if someone came up with a plan to save the dog park, maybe not in the same place, but maybe contained within the aspen forest, to save it as well. I can tell you anecdotally, our staff lot is on the east side of our building where the dog park is, and even on days when it is 32 below and a windchill of 40, there are cars there. People are using that dog park more than ordinary parks because they want to get their pets out and exercised. And we've had...people think it's our park as well. They don't give the City any credit. They think it's the Winnipeg Humane Society dog park and it was really Brenda who drove this park forward and got it in place and I'm sure if Brenda was here with us today, she probably would be parked in the Mayor's office bending his ear quite a bit about attempting to save her dog park. So, hopefully you can come to some kind of accommodation that will save the dog park and save some of the forest.

Mr. Speaker: Second question, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I just want to touch base a little bit of this information regarding Councillor Vandal's question regarding the land, the Parker lands being privately owned. I just...I'm not sure if you are aware that it actually isn't privately owned. Gem owns...so are you aware that it's actually Gem Properties owns the forest part, CNR owns a piece, Hydro owns a piece and where we're going to put that rapid transit corridor likely is actually City of Winnipeg property, are you aware of that?

Bill McDonald: Yes, that's Plan B that runs right along Parker itself and then swings south at the corner.

Councillor Orlikow: Correct. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I think that's it, Mr. McDonald. Thank you, sir. Appreciate it. Councillor Orlikow would like to suspend the rules so we can hear two more delegations. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Harry Wolberg. Five minutes, Harry.

Harry Wolberg: Okay, I'll try and be brief. I'm here on behalf of the Winnipeg Rapid Transit Coalition. I'm here to advocate on behalf of my members. I'm not here to advocate on behalf of the environment or dogs and cats even though I love dogs and cats, I got a cat the other day from the Humane Society. I love animals but I'm here to advocate on behalf of my members and there's been much discussion over the last several weeks within my association over which of the three routes should be chosen, and we've decided that Route 1B is the best route for many reasons. If we were to go down Pembina Highway, we feel that it wouldn't be a true rapid transit route. It would be too many stops, be more costly, it would mean moving the tracks closer to residences. There are many reasons why we feel that 1B is the best route. We hope that some of the...at least some of the wetlands can be saved but if we had to pick and choose between saving the wetlands and rapid transit we would choose rapid transit. There have been enough studies, enough discussion, it's time to act, it's time to decide. It's been 30, 40 years now, we've waited long enough, let's get the shovel in the ground and get the job done. We have a route to nowhere. We started a job, let's finish the job. I spoke before EPC and EPC unanimously voted in favour of Route 1B and I'm hoping today that council will have the courage and

show some leadership on the issue, and vote unanimously in favour of Route 1B. Even though I'm here all by myself, there are many people behind me. We have hundreds of members and we all support Council voting in favour of Route 1B as the preferred route. So, we're standing behind our mayor and council to make the right decision and choose 1B as the preferred route, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Mr. Wolberg. Cal Dueck. Cal are you here? Five minutes.

Cal Dueck: Mr. Mayor, Mr. Speaker, Councillors, Winnipeg. Jeffrey...my name is Cal Dueck. I'm with the Parker Wetlands Conservation Committee. Geoffrey L Halroyd, a scientist from Environment Canada says that the science is unequivocal. The prairies are going to hell in a hand basket. Professor Nicola Koper from the U of M says the prairie grasses are one of the most critically endangered eco systems in the world. They are one of the most critically endangered eco systems in the world. Manitoba has been fortunate as it contains most of Canada's tall grass prairie yet has lost the greatest percentage of all its tall grass prairies more than any other state or province. The status of all remnant tall grass prairie patches in Manitoba is, therefore, of extremely serious conservation concern. This is a scientist from the University of Manitoba, a well-known scientist. She says that it's an extremely serious conservation concern yet the rapid transit report glibly dismisses this prairie grass as just a patch of grass that has no environmental concerns. Who are you going to believe, the transit report or a well-known scientist from the University of Manitoba? We may have one of the largest remnants of tall grass prairie left in Manitoba right here in the City of Winnipeg and yet, some of you are casually contemplating voting to destroy this natural heritage. It's a heritage that belongs to our children and grandchildren. The wetlands of Parker Avenue as far as we know are the biggest wetlands found anywhere in the City. There's approximately 80 acres including the City-owned land, Hydro-owned land, 80 acres of grasses, forest and wetlands and about half of this is...serves as wetlands and prairie. So we have a wetlands here of approximately 40 acres as you see on the Google Map when you look at it. It diverts millions of gallons of water from the Red River. What will happen when you drain this property? Are you willing to tell the people down the river "hey, we've got rapid transit, you guys got flooded basements. We don't care." Sure, the overall...in the overall scheme of things, this one drainage may not do that but are you willing to risk that? Are you willing to throw the dice, to gamble that it won't? It may be the proverbial straw that breaks the camel's back. Let's not play Russian roulette with this. Scientific literature is unanimous. Draining wetlands is the worst possible thing we can do for flood prevention. The Manitoba Government has recognized this and consequently has fairly strict rules about draining wetlands. We believe that they have every intention of enforcing these rules. We also know that the wetlands are the jurisdiction of the Province, not the City. The wetlands, grass lands and forests are the lungs of the city. When we destroy them, we destroy our own health, but even more, we destroy the health and well-being of our children and grandchildren. When your grandchildren or great grandchildren come in wheezing and puffing because they can't breathe and the smoke smothered air of the city to quote, Dr. Seuss, are you going to proudly thump your chest and say, "Listen here, kid, we got rapid transit. We got it cheap and we don't care that we had to destroy natural lands because of it so get over it." I believe the students in the City of Winnipeg will not stand for this kind of future. I believe they will stand up and say that they will not ride on a system that deliberately destroys the natural environment that we are responsible to pass on to them. And finally, by voting to send the buses screeching through the Parker Wetlands, you are voting to destroy the last remnants of the Métis towns known as Rooster Town and Tim Town. Up until the late 1950s, the land between present day Grant Avenue and McGillivray Boulevard, just west of Pembina Highway supported a vibrant Métis community known as Rooster Town and its suburb called Tim Town. The homes in this area were old boxcars and corrugated Tim, covered shanties scattered among the aspen bush, tall grass prairie and wetlands. What it lacked in city services, it made up in community spirit. By 1959, the City drove out all these residents and destroyed its shanty communities. The University of Winnipeg, the Louis Riel Institute of Manitoba Métis Federation are actively involved in collecting stories. The Parker Wetlands represent the last remnant of the natural landscape that supported this unique community. If City Council pushes forward with its agenda to have the lands developed as a part of the rapid transit route, it will destroy the last physical vestiges of this part of the Métis history and the unique opportunity to establish a city park that pays tribute to Métis culture, history and lifestyle.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Dueck, you are going to have to wrap up.

Cal Dueck: Okay, I've just got a couple more minutes. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Well, one minute. You've got 60 seconds.

Cal Dueck: I believe we have lots of people who are interested in hearing me wrap up my speech and.

Mr. Speaker: Continue, sir.

Cal Dueck: If City Council pushes forward with its agenda to have the Parker lands developed as a part of the rapid transit it will destroy the last physical vestiges of Métis history. Any time we lose another chunk of wet lands or forest, we lose another part of our souls. This is why we have almost a thousand signatures to date asking you to consider another route. This is why we would soon, will have many more thousands of signatures on this petition. This is also why we believe that the provincial government will not take kindly to have the wetlands drained. This is why we think students will refuse to ride a bus that destroys natural habitat. This is why we believe the federal government will in fact consult the Métis community before it dishes out any more money. A wise man once said what does it profit someone to gain a whole new rapid transit system but lose their own soul? So here I believe is the conundrum that's facing you as a Council. If you vote to study only the Parker route, you may discover that the Parker route is in fact not available to you. What do you do then? In that case, the City may have lost its last chance for rapid transit in a long time. However, if you vote to leave the Letellier Line on the table as an option to be studied then we may still have the possibility of a vibrant rapid transit system. And I ask you today, please don't destroy the chance of having a rapid transit built in Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, sir. That concludes our delegations for this morning. So, we'll move into the main meeting. We have the report from Executive Policy Committee for March the 6th, Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 6, 2013**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: Stand down 1, okay. Any further? Seeing none, we'll vote on 2 and 3. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 1 – Review of City Council Governmental Structure

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'd love to hear what the Councillor says and we'll try and address any concerns or issues.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm concerned that this report is just sort of being shuffled and no study, clearly, is being done. I'm also concerned about how we at City Hall are being viewed by citizens. People for the most part are tired of the same thing, the lack of transparency and accountability. This motion is simply a suggested review or was a suggested review of the current structure of Council that appears to have been summarily dismissed by both the Governance Committee and by Executive Policy Committee. As everyone is aware the most important document that we pass in the year is a budget. As we saw from this past process where we tried to amalgamate, both the Capital and the Operating Budget there was minimal opportunity for those not on EPC to have any input. In fact, EPC spent months at least since July on these documents. Why should a Councillor who is an EPC member's contribution be any more important than those that are not on EPC? The non-EPC Councillor had two hours to hear about both documents, which I might add is half of what is normally provided given that the amalgamation occurred. Why should non-EPC Councillors be in a position to only hear about rather than impact and provide input into a budget that impacts their ward? Why is everyone not afforded the opportunity to have real and full input? There are better

practices and processes elsewhere and I'm committing to...I'm committed to having them looked at. Thus I've done some research which I provided all members of Council on the way other councillors in Canada are structured. I'm requesting that we further this exploration with the ultimate objective of enhanced participation by Councillors in the budgetary process. In our system, if one is not part of the EPC, there is limited opportunity to participate. I recommended that this review occur. Some examples, the City of Calgary with a population a little bit more than ours of 1.25 million has a mayor and 14 councillors. We have a mayor and 15 councillors for a population much smaller. All councillors are elected and there is no EPC, no formal EPC. Roles in other cities are rotated. Citizens elect their Councillor. When they vote for their City Councillor, they don't vote for a Tier 1 or a Tier 2 councillor. I would...there is a cost to our current structure too, that is being overlooked. Each Executive Policy Committee member receives an additional \$22,000 on their annual salary for a total of 132,000 in salaries plus \$48,000 of additional discretionary spending. That's \$180,000. We cut around 350,000. That could've been money that could have gone to the arts groups this past budget. So I would respectfully ask that you ask the administration, we go back and we... ask for report in no more than 60 days. I have done some initial research that could be a starting point and that this be reported back to the Governance Committee. Council is about inclusion, not exclusion and this is the cornerstone of realizing true participatory democracy at City Hall, where all councillors have an equal opportunity to make their contribution and we need to operate like Knights of the Round Table. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you are all familiar, every budget we have...usually have a discussion about process and I'm usually up here saying that we should have a more collaborative process and Councillor Fielding is up here saying, "We didn't used to have one when Glen Murray was Mayor, blah, blah, blah", but the fact is that was ten years ago and there was...there was...but my point is, my point is is that our process is getting worse over time as opposed to better. It can be improved. There were some good things done here and there over the years by different people but I think it is clear to everyone that we need a better budget process. I think that's obvious by the fact that Councillor Wyatt has ensured there is money in the budget for this and talked about it. So I think there is an understanding and I think it's an acknowledgment with all these years of discussing this that we do not have a good budget process and what's...this year was worse than ever. Councillor Havixbeck has pointed out a few of the problems. You know we were expected to vote at a Standing Committee and we hadn't even had the budget...a look at it. It was less than 48 hours and we had to decide to...what we thought about the budget. Ridiculous. And so basically, non-EPC councillors and the public essentially, are pretty much on the side lines in the budget process, on the outside looking in and I think that needs to change. I mean, we shouldn't have to be Sherlock Holmes trying to look for clues to figure out what is in the budget so we can quickly vote on it. I mean, it's absurd and it isn't done this way in other cities. So I just wanted to say that. We have been told that Councillor Wyatt...by Councillor Wyatt that we will be having a better budget process in the coming year and we know that there are some funds set aside for this. But what we don't know is whether or not this will be a truly collaborative process with all members of City Council or whether it will be a pricey public relations exercise. Will it be public and council consultation? Or will it be a public information campaign? You know, we just don't know anything about it. We learned recently, it was in the media, that the City spent \$30,000 selling the budget after it was already passed in advertisements. And I'm not sure how that benefits the public or input into a budget process. It would be really helpful if the Chair of Finance would give us some clue as to what he has planned for this new budget process or what he has in mind or even have some discussion about that. And I agree with the principle behind Councillor Havixbeck's motion that we need a better budget process and we should be reviewing alternatives. I'm not sure if the exact wording of it and saying 30 days is enough time to have a meaningful strategy and consult with everyone who would need to be consulted with about the strategy. It is partially a political issue so there...people have to talk to each other about it. So, but, I agree totally with the principle that we need to do something and EPC's response to the motion to receive it as information which means file under recycling, we all know that, could not, it could have recognized rather than that, it could've recognized the intent and the initiative taken by the Councillor and responded to this in some way. They could've even modified it a little if there was something about it they didn't like but what they've really done is continued to be silent about what this new improved budget process we've heard about is going to look like. And that's why...I will not support simply silencing this motion with no course of action laid out in its place. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: I seconded this motion because I think it's a reasonable one. I don't know if 30 days is enough time but I think if we're interested in the democratic process. We should be all supportive of this motion. Let me tell you this, I'm not just concerned with the budget I'm concerned with everything that EPC does. You know, and other councillors are left out of the game. It's...this motion is a reasonable motion and to receive this as information is like shooting ourselves. We will have a better Council, a better democratic process if all Councillors are involved. So I support this motion absolutely. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Speaker Nordman. I believe, what is it now...since the current structure has been in place since 1998 I believe, and there was an EPC before of course but the current structure and how the City operates has been in place now since '98 as I remember so that's some 15 years ago. And I think that this particular motion was simply asking for a report to find a better way for us to work democratically, not only just for the budgets but I envisioned looking at...well, on the budget first, I just would mention and it seems to me that it's a model that works in terms of discussions that the current person who is responsible for running the budget process, we had discussions in 2011 where we were talking about the Mayor of Regina who actually consulted with each City Councillor in terms of dealing with what is the budget, and as I understand they usually have a unanimous budget passed at the City of Regina because of the model the model that the Mayor has...uses in terms of consultation and collaboration with all of the Councillors and what their needs are throughout the city. Because while we have individual wards, each ward is part of the greater city and this city can be much greater when we are looking at the overall needs. I would point out in the last budget process, the...one of the problems, Councillor Smith had an issue with a swimming pool and you know, at the end of the day, what we did is we tack on a little bit of money to do a study. Well, as I understand it this particular swimming pool has always been questionable in terms of, it's getting older and it's needing money and when you do a direct consultation the ability there would be for Councillor Smith as the example, to actually say listen, we need to be cognizant of this swimming pool and making sure that we're taking care of what will, well, would end up becoming a bit of a disaster in having to shut down the pool so, there are better ways to do the budget consultation but I would point out, you know, if you got rid of EPC, one of the things you could still do is we still would have Standing Committees and I often hear from many councillors, we don't understand why we don't have a Human Resources Committee. I understand that EPC does that as part of its function to some degree and so does some of our other Standing Committees but ultimately I think the City would operate much better if you replaced EPC, create a Human Resource Committee and the Mayor who now has a \$700,000 extra for policy development in his office could be able to speak and reach out to each of the Standing Committee Chairs because the Mayor would still pick who the Chairpersons are and those are chosen people to be the leadership of our City Councillors and there has to be a Chairperson of each of those Standing Committees, but there is and should be better ways and we should be studying better ways for us to work together because I think in a lot of cases we agree with many of the things that this city needs to do. There's always many different interests that City Council needs to balance. It's not like a school division where the interest is solely to graduate students so that they can get on with their economic and social lives in our city and throughout the province. With the city, there is many interests to balance and I think that there needs to be a better way for us to balance that out at the political level so that we can work better towards a greater City of Winnipeg, one that everybody can be proud of. So I actually will be voting against just receiving this particular motion as information. It should've resulted in a report and I'm very disappointed that we didn't examine it and I would agree with Councillor Smith that probably 30 days was not enough but we really should be after 15 years evaluating how City Council is working and coming up with some ideas to make it work better. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly do appreciate the comments of all those who spoke. Unfortunately, not everybody I guess knows the facts, Mr. Speaker, so let me share with you. The process, the establishment of the process that we had are including EPC was established many years ago in the '70s under the purview of the provincial government. And if anybody on this floor doesn't know that, they should know that. That's number one. So that's where it all started, Mr. Speaker and EPC has been around for a long time. Unfortunately, as many have claimed, EPC exists in many other cities and I think the real unfortunate part is how members of this council who were members of EPC, it was

a perfect system when they were on EPC. All of a sudden, it's no longer perfect when they're no longer on EPC, I think that's very unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. The reality is we have a system that's been created by the provincial government. If anybody here is not happy with it, they know where the provincial government keeps their offices. They should be speaking to them and those changes can be made. Everyone should know, the City of Winnipeg is a creature of the Province and that's where any changes should take place, Mr. Speaker. With that, I will rest.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we'll call the question. Recorded vote, all right. All those in favour of Item 1, Review of City Council Governmental Structure. Please rise. To receive as information.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Orlikow and Smith.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 5.

Mr. Speaker: Motion carried. The report.. we'll carry on for March the 13th from EPC, Mayor Katz.

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

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 2 and 4 to 12.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none. All those in favour? Opposed. Carried.

Item 3 – Winnipeg Police Board - Appointments

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Chair of Protection and Community Services would like to say a few words so I'll let him speak.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move that we lay this item over for 60 days. There has been some discussion in the media in terms of background checks and how that process works. I understand that the Chair of the Police Commission, Mr. Rick Linden is doing a review on that. From my own personal perspective, I very much a hundred percent support our process. I think it makes a lot of sense. With that we do respect the fact that they have the authority to do this and there is...there wasn't a procedure policy, there wasn't anything in the legislation, I guess that was missed I guess when the legislation was formed, in respect to that so we do want to hear what Mr. Linden has to say and on a second front, we have had one of the members withdraw their name yesterday and as such I'm not sure that we have actual the amount of...because the legislation says that you need seven members to form the Board, what we'd like to do is obviously go through a process to get another Board Member that's there and hear what Mr. Linden has to say. So we think that up to 60 days layover would allow us to do that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just...I don't know if the Mayor will know this or Councillor Fielding perhaps could pass this on to the Mayor but there were some timing issues with this legislation as to when the Board had to be created. With this layover I'm assuming we're still within that window of time, so perhaps we could just get some response to that.

Mr. Speaker: Sure. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, the issue was creating the by-laws. We have fulfilled that commitment and as we already know we're still waiting regarding the provincial government. But in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I think we should all be aware of the fact that it was in the middle of April, 2009 when the provincial government made these decisions and wanted to move forward on this. As you can see, that's almost four years from now. So since the Attorney General has raised the scenario about who should be doing the review of potential candidates which I think I've already expressed I was completely surprised by those comments, considering they had actually agreed with this process but now they've asked Mr. Linden to look into it. If you wait it four years, I guess another 60 days isn't going to hurt anybody and hopefully at that point in time everything will be black and white.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of laying it over? Opposed? Motion is carried. We do have...no, we don't have another...we have a walk on, yes. Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 20, 2013**

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. I'll move that the rule be suspended and that the Report of Executive Policy Committee dated March 20th be considered.

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

Item 1 – 2013 Mill Rates for the Education Support Levy and Special Levy

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that the item be adopted.

Mr. Speaker: No comments? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Recorded?

Councillor Swandel: Make sure it gets recorded in case there's an inquisition.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS**

Mr. Speaker: All right, motions, we have three motions here. I think they are all automatic referrals. Yes, they are all automatic referrals, so we will forward them and we'll go to by-laws. Mayor Katz. Oh, yes. Councillor Eadie, go ahead.

Councillor Eadie: Just, was there a motion on the audit report? Was that not an amendment? That's not automatic referral. Isn't that an amendment to the...

City Clerk: No, it's a stand-alone motion referring to a request to do an audit on the waiting pools.

Councillor Eadie: Oh, so, but I thought I read in it that it says to amend the work of the auditor over the next...

City Clerk: It's still automatic referral.

Councillor Eadie: Is it? Okay.

Mr. Speaker: Automatic referral on all three of those. Mayor Katz, by-laws.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Fielding,

WHEREAS the City Auditor has submitted to Council a Safety Review of the thirteen City of Winnipeg indoor aquatic facilities, which assesses safe operating procedures and practices of the facilities;

AND WHEREAS the review has identified a series of recommendations for improvements;

AND WHEREAS the review did not include outdoor aquatic facilities, the majority of which are in the Riel Community Committee;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Audit Plan for 2014 be amended to include a Safety Review of the City of Winnipeg outdoor aquatic facilities.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg's core area and shoulder neighbourhoods are seeing the private sector close up their grocery operations such as Zellers in The Bay building, Extra Foods on Main Street and Notre Dame and Food Fare on Arlington.

AND WHEREAS many residents do not have home rental and home purchase options other than in the core area and shoulder neighbourhoods while also not being able to afford a motor vehicle;

AND WHEREAS attracting people to live in the core area / downtown and in shoulder neighbourhoods requires full service options to make their lives comfortable;

AND WHEREAS New York City has determined that there is a lack of grocery shopping options in some areas within the five boroughs as described at <http://www.nyc.gov/html/misc/html/2009/fresh.shtml>

AND WHEREAS New York City's incentives are based on locating grocery operations in the grocery deserts of their city;

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
March 20, 2013

AND WHEREAS their incentives involve both zoning and financial options;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service investigate the New York City incentive program to determine the possibilities to assist residents who find themselves living in grocery shopping deserts.

Motion No. 3

Moved by Councillor Eadie,

Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

WHEREAS the integrity of all city employees making decisions related to the public interest is left questionable by conflict of interest and code of conduct scandals;

AND WHEREAS the current employee Code of Conduct results in a reactive approach to dealing with abuses leaving City of Winnipeg residents exposed to potential financial harm and health problems;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has delegated the responsibility for various pieces of legislation to the City of Winnipeg which is expected to protect residents in the home and commercial development building processes and tax assessment processes as examples;

AND WHEREAS by-law enforcement involves city employees making decisions on a day to day basis;

AND WHEREAS elected City officials must follow a process of disclosure in order to establish a proactive approach to potential conflicts similar to those mentioned in the City of Winnipeg's employee Code of Conduct;

AND WHEREAS the Code of Conduct sets out the Chief Administrative Officer as the administrator of the employee Code of conduct, and where a City of Winnipeg Charter statutory officer must report conflicts to a Code of Conduct Committee made up of Executive Policy Committee members;

AND WHEREAS there are methods of holding disclosure documents in confidence for management use only;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Chief Administrative Officer investigate and report back on recommendations to establish a disclosure process in the employee Code of Conduct for City employees making decisions related to provincial legislation and city by-laws;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Policy Committee pick three of its members to make up a Code of Conduct Committee to engage the Winnipeg Public Service in investigating a disclosure process for the City's four statutory officers under the City of Winnipeg Charter to be utilized under the employee Code of Conduct.

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

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that By-law No. 23/2013 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 23/2013.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-law No. 23/2013 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have some more.

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

Mayor Katz: I move that the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 43/2013 and By-law No. 44/2013.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 43/2013, By-law No. 44/2013.

Mayor Katz: I move that By-laws numbered 43/2013 and 44/2013 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 43/2013 and 44/2013 both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 43/2013 and 44/2013, both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question period. Oh...

Mayor Katz: Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: What?

Mayor Katz: With your blessings. One more by-law.

Mr. Speaker: One more by-law. Okay, I don't have that one.

Mayor Katz: Two more by-laws.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead.

Mayor Katz: That's correct. Mr. Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended and the following by-laws be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 49/2013 and 50/2013.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-laws No. 49/2013 and 50/2013 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 49/2013 and 50/2013.

Mayor Katz: And I move that the rule be suspend and By-laws numbered 49/2013 and 50/2013 be read a third time and that same be ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Wyatt. Oh, we haven't got that far yet, okay. Mayor Katz, question period. Councillor Wyatt followed by Councillor Gerbasi, Sharma, Smith.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Mayor, tomorrow the federal government is going to be bringing down their budget. Minister Flaherty and the municipalities across the country, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the big city mayors have been lobbying for funds for more resources for infrastructure to address the challenges that we are facing as a city. The fact that the federal government collects the largest share of gasoline or fuel taxes, depending on the price of fuel it's upwards of \$6 billion on an annual basis. Only \$2 billion of that is actually turned back to municipalities in terms of the gas tax for infrastructure, and the need that we've been calling for, as municipalities, for a sustained infrastructure program that would be long term and that the gas tax would be indexed for the future. Do you have anything in terms of what your thoughts are in terms of what's taking place tomorrow and any hope of any kind of outcome with regards to the Federal Budget?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Wyatt I thank him for the question. He is absolutely correct in the fact that there is an "ask" obviously and the "ask" is to be indexed, which should be an automatic scenario. On top of that, as we all know, every municipality is facing a crisis situation. I believe we're all expecting to see an increase, but unfortunately Mr. Speaker, whatever that increase that's announced, it's not going to address our issues. It certainly will help but the facts are Mr. Speaker, when you announce whether it's 60 million or 70 million or 80 million dollars for Building Canada funds, which of course the City, municipalities have to match, that's not the answer to our problem. The situation that exists today Mr. Speaker goes back 150 years when, back then, the system worked. The majority of the population lived in rural provinces. Now the majority of the population is in the city using all the city services, and that's the dilemma today, and what really needs to change Mr. Speaker, over the last many decades we've heard this great debate. We've heard it and read it and watched in the media and it was regarding the debate of Federal, more Federal money coming to the Provinces. That's been the debate. That debate has to change Mr. Speaker. The debate today should be money from both Federal and Provincial governments coming to the municipalities. That's what it's all about. I don't know how many times Mr. Speaker you've heard me say, out of every tax dollar collected in the City of Winnipeg, and you know it by heart Mr. Speaker, 65 cents goes to the Provincial Government, 27 cents to the Federal Government, 8 cents to the City of Winnipeg. You don't have to be an Einstein to figure out it doesn't work, and that's something that has to change and hopefully that will change, and if it doesn't change, then the other levels of government need to give municipalities the same power that they have, the power to tax. That's the only way it's going to solve our real problems, Mr. Speaker, otherwise it's going to get worse.

Mr. Speaker: Second question, Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes Mr. Speaker. The Federal Government's going to argue the fact that they are in the red, that they don't have a balanced budget, the last balanced budget being really going back to Paul Martin under a Liberal Government where there was a commitment to assist municipalities. Is there any effort in terms of the initiative by big city mayors to take this to the Prime Minister and to say Prime Minister, enough is enough. Cities are the centre of Canada's economic engine, or economic growth, that we need resources to ensure that the economy will continue to grow and we can renew our infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to speak for all the big city mayors, but at first I will speak on behalf of myself. As the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, I have done exactly that, and when I made a presentation, Minister Fletcher was travelling through the country asking for comments and feedback and I did make a presentation. As a matter of fact, I actually gave him the specific example it's time to take a bold step, and the bold step was to change that 65 cents, 27 cents, 8 cents, and change it to 57, 27, 16. Feds stay the same, there's obviously 8 cents going from the Province to the City. Mr. Speaker, that would give us close to another \$800 million to address our problem in a serious way, and that's something that has to happen. And as you can see, you know, because a lot of people forget not every province gets transfer payments. Our province gets about \$3.4 billion in transfer payments, and we get about \$200 million of that. So I guess what I'm saying, the money is there if someone wants to take the initiative and hopefully they will. But if they don't take the initiative, then we have to find another solution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Mr. Mayor, we've been lobbying the previous government, lobbying this government for quite a number of years now, and if the results are tomorrow disappointing, what steps do you foresee yourself taking with the big city mayors in terms of going forward on a go-forward basis?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as you know over the past several years there have been many ideas that have come forward; for example, the idea with the A.M.M. getting an existing one point of the seven points of the Provincial sales tax, which would be just over \$200 million in the Province of Manitoba, but \$140 million for the City of Winnipeg. We've talked about getting a share of the Provincial gas tax which we don't. Getting part of the registration for motor vehicle registration which obviously all relates to our infrastructure because those are vehicles driving on our infrastructure. We also have talked about getting the rebate of the Provincial sales tax, which is about \$10 million just like we get the rebate of the G.S.T. We've asked that, why would a government pay a tax to another government? And just to give you some numbers Mr. Speaker, with \$10 million, you could leverage approximately \$140 million with 30 to 40 year money at today's interest rates, and that's long-term consistent money. There are many ways to address it. No matter which way you land on, you need the cooperation of other levels of government, and I can tell you that every big city mayor is looking to solutions. Some of them are getting cooperation in other areas, some are fighting hard, but the facts is, this is something that faces every city, every municipality, in the country. The older you are, the worse case it is.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that the Police Board has been laid over for 60 days, I think kind of...this is what has spurred my question because it provides an opportunity, because EPC's going to have to consider a new appointment to that Board, and the decision of who was going to go on this Police Board was made by EPC and presented to us without discussion with all of Council but that is our process. First of all I just wanted to say in my preamble, I am very supportive of having a Police Board. I think it's a clearer governance structure in terms of, for the Police Chief, and it brings us more in line with other jurisdictions in terms of governance for our police, and I've been very supportive of a Police Board happening for some time, but the devil's in the details really matters who is on that board, and my only concern is not about any of the individuals' qualifications. Clearly I'm sure they are all excellently qualified people, but it's not only the qualifications of the individuals, you're looking at the balance of the individuals, and when I look at the civilian appointments that were put forward, they are all from the business sector; a hundred percent of City citizen appointments are from the business sector, and I'm wondering that now that there is a new opening because of one of the candidates has withdrawn, that that can be considered to bring some more balance to the civilian appointments so that they're not only from the business sector. That's my question.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, I thank her for the question. Just some clarification, Mr. Speaker. Number one, EPC did not decide who will sit on the Board. Council, at some point in time in the future, will decide who will sit on the Board, has to be approved by Council, that's number one. Number two, and specifically relating to the background of these individuals, I think, Mr. Speaker, as you know, we consulted with the Provincial Government. They came up with two individuals that were recommended which were not from the business community, so that's number one, so that's how we're looking for a balance. If they had gone in a different direction, then I'm sure, you know, the Councillor would have gone in a different direction as well. I can tell you that to the best of my knowledge, and I'm not privy to all this information, but I do know that approximately 80 individuals applied to be on the Board. Obviously, I believe now what will happen is Councillor Fielding will be going through that to find an individual, and they're looking for people in different backgrounds. As you can see, if you look at the original seven, you've got a pretty good variety of people coming from just about every background, and that was the case to cover everything. After the Province covered those areas, we were going a different direction it appears.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Second question?

Councillor Gerbasi: And another point I'm going to bring up, and it's not...again, I just want to say before anybody gets upset, this has nothing to do with qualifications. Everybody who was chosen was highly, highly qualified, but there is an issue of public perception around connections to the...I'm mean, let's admit that one of the candidates was the co-chair of a political campaign of the Mayor last time, and I think that puts people in concern the vice-chair, as it was in the media, was the Mayor's campaign co-chair in the last election, and the whole purpose of the Police Board is to de-politicize this, and so I think there's a concern, an ethical issue here. It's not about the qualifications, it's about that connection, and I wonder if the Mayor can comment on that?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I don't know, Mr. Speaker, I could say that's rubbish, I could say that's unadulterated nonsense. If the Councillor is here to say that Mr. Paul Edwards, a Liberal, the leader of the Liberal Party, a lawyer, the individual who on Broadway introduced the bill to have a Police Board is not qualified, I'd be happy to look into it. If for any other reason she is saying that individual is not qualified, it's nonsense. I think it's very unfortunate that any councillor would even bring up something like that on the floor of Council, but you know, things like that do happen here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Gerbasi: I didn't say he was not qualified, but in any case... My third question, I'll move to a different topic. We all know Zellers is closed downtown, and a lot of residents are very, very concerned. They are speaking out about the need for a downtown grocery store. I'm pleased that the Downtown BIZ and CentreVenture, on behalf of the City, are working on a strategy to secure a downtown grocery store and Councillor Eadie has moved a motion which was automatically referred which I seconded, looking at some other potential strategies and other areas of the City where we have food deserts and that sort of stuff going on where people...we want people to live and they don't have proper grocery stores, so I just wondered if you could comment on those efforts to secure a grocery... particularly for the downtown, if you could comment on your efforts and if you're supportive of these efforts to secure a grocery store where it's needed in the City so that we can have residents living downtown and helping with downtown revitalization.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I thank Councillor Gerbasi for that question through you, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately, I guess you don't know all the details. The realities are, Mr. Speaker, the initiative of looking for a grocery, which was taken on by CentreVenture, where do you think that came from, Mr. Speaker, okay? I am, as they keep reminding me, the sole director. We all know the issue. We know we want density, we want more people living downtown. We know it's a chicken and an egg because you have to have the people to attract the private sector to supply the services. We do have a solution and we believe through CentreVenture leading this, with all the other stakeholders, they will move a lot quicker than political process, and that's why they're out there doing exactly what they do and I very much encourage that process and I'm totally supportive of it, and I hope to see some solutions they have in the very near future. We've heard this over and over. I get emails and calls from seniors living in the area with what's going on in the private sector about grocery stores closing. We know the supply that's out there, we know the demand that exists. We know we need something large and permanent to grow our downtown and get more population. Those are all facts, Mr. Speaker. There's nothing new there. Now it's time to find someone who's prepared to come downtown. And I believe there are members of the private sector who are prepared to open up that type of establishment in our downtown, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Speaker, I know we strive to be a leader when it comes to accessibility and universal design, however I feel one of our public spaces falls short and that affects accessibility for people to our building here at City Hall. Can the Mayor ask our administration to look into the Concert Hall access, particularly in the tunnel, the stairwell that connects City Hall to the Concert Hall. This access, Mr. Speaker, is more important now given the fact that our civic parkade is closed. Citizens that park indoors at the Concert Hall wanting to visit us here at City Hall and who require an accessible route have no such viable option through the tunnel. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Sharma, she's 100 percent right. I've walked that area on a regular basis, and there's a stairwell; one side goes up, one side goes down. It's not accessible. I think that's a very valid point. I think we should follow that up. We know we want to have an accessible community, not just access to City Hall but right through our entire community, and that area is privately owned. It's owned by the Concert Hall, but I think we should definitely have some dialogue with them and that's something that I would be happy to pursue and get the Department involved and have some serious conversations. I know that the Councillor is also on the Access Advisory Committee and they may want to look into it as well, but I would be more than pleased to do so. That's constructive criticism; it's a very good point, ever since our parkade has been shut down, and I thank her for that suggestion and recommendation and I will follow through on it.

Mr. Speaker: Second question? No? Councillor Smith followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Smith: Through you to the Mayor, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering what we're doing about the Public Safety Building. Can you give us a firm idea where this administration is heading in regard to this building?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I believe will happen, and I put this on the record in the past, I'm happy to put it on the record again, when the new facility is complete, which I believe would be sometime in the spring of 2014, and then they'll be moving over to Graham Avenue, it would be probably an ideal situation for us to bring some of our departments into that facility and we could have what they've been talking about for decades now; more a type of campus scenario where all the City departments are located within close, very close proximity to City Hall and the Admin Building. Keeping in mind, if you're using that facility for offices as opposed to police, it doesn't have to be bomb proof, which means it's a lot less expensive to do what has to be done. As we all know, there is a scenario where we can really only use that for basically civic initiatives. Then what would happen, Mr. Speaker I believe down the road, the parkade that exists right now should basically be put out for an R.F.P. and let's see if we can get developed on that site. We'd like to see more in our downtown, Mr. Speaker. That's what I believe will happen but in the end, Council will be the ones making that decision.

Mr. Speaker: Second question Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Are we going to proceed with the cladding of the building? If we're planning on using it for office space for City departments and so forth, should we not be concerned about the cladding at this point? Why should we stop right now with it?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as I tried explaining, the type of cladding you would put on would be different depending on what the use is. For example, the Convention Centre a few years ago, and you're probably very familiar with this Mr. Speaker. I think you were on the Board at the time. They did cladding much less expensive than what we were planning to do there. The cladding is dependent on the use, and I believe, I've been told by the experts, we could do a different scenario that would cost us a lot less money, so it makes sense for us, at Council, to determine what will happen there and then we know the issue we have to address. We've already...I think today, we're looking at a situation about approving an extension of a lease for some of our departments, for giving them an out, so when we're ready they can move over here, so I think our departments are on top of this issue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Good. Last question Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Mayor, if those are your plans for that Public Safety Building, shouldn't it be useful to do the cladding right now, because you know what the purpose is going to be. Rather than wait and the costs go up.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll say it one more time, these aren't my plans, Mr. Speaker. These are recommendations by our department which the good Councillor will have to vote for or against if and when it happens. That's number one. In the meantime, the Department is doing its due diligence right now and I believe if Councillor Smith would like me to get back to him on exactly where they're at, I'll be happy to do that, but I think today I've shared everything that I know and I think we are moving in the right direction. I think a campus type environment would be terrific. It would cost a lot less money than the numbers we were getting from the Winnipeg Police Service.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes thank you, Speaker Nordman. I wanted to mention, and thank actually Councillor Sharma for mentioning the problem with the tunnel at the Concert Hall end. Just over a number of years, the Access Advisory Committee has looked a couple of times at that particular end of the tunnel and looking for accessibility, and as I understand it, and there has been in the past with our Universal Design Coordinator, Judy Redmond, going back I don't know how many years, but a discussion, dialogue with the Concert Hall about options to make it accessible, and technically one of the problems is to establish an elevator and they would have to do some kind of construction at the top to come down and extend the building in some way and it had a good bill, so my question really is, I'm wondering if the Mayor would look at, when investigating this, whether or not the City could provide some kind of grant to the Concert Hall who has said in the past that they can't afford to make that kind of accessibility happen.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Eadie through you for the question. I think the first thing I would do is have everybody explore the options. Whether it's an elevator or as you know, we've seen situations where stairwells are used and you can put your...you get on a wheelchair and go down it on the banister. There's many ways. It's not an area that I have expertise in. I would like to hear from the experts but the recommendation is, we all know there's going

to be a cost and we all know that someone's got to bear that cost. And if it turns out being City Council, then I'd be happy to bring it to the floor of Council through the proper process.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I wanted to thank the Mayor. He sent a letter to the Province requesting an ability to utilize some of the money that gets deducted from our Provincial grants for prevention type of programs for the City of Winnipeg. Could the Mayor tell us what the response was back from the Province in regard to being able to utilize some of that money from a City perspective for prevention kind of organizations within the City of Winnipeg?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Eadie, yes I did write the letter. As of yesterday, I do not believe I've had a response but now that he's brought it up I'm sure more than happy to follow it up again and I'm sure it's forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. My final question is we have grocery store problems, not just downtown. It's all over the City and we really need...it's in Councillor Smith's ward, it's in my ward, it's in the downtown area, and I'm wondering, I'm hearing in the dialogue about the issue of downtown that I'm concerned that they are getting a much bigger priority in terms of dealing with the lack of grocery shopping deserts as I call them. What we have happening in our core area and shoulder communities is what happened with the banks. The banks moved out of these areas and left a lack of ability for people to do banking. I'm wondering if the Mayor sees this as a bigger problem than just the downtown area in terms of having grocery options in our core area and shoulder communities.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm very much aware of what's happened in other neighbourhoods with banks and grocery stores, and as you know, these are all private sector scenarios. I think it's important for us to communicate with these industries because everybody is entitled to that same type of service. You don't want people who may have to go, you know, two or three miles who don't have a vehicle. That's just not right. So we're looking at that. By the same token, you've also got to make sure that you walk a fine line here. As you know, these are services that are provided by the private sector, so maybe we could come up with a model in the downtown that may work in other areas, but I think once we create something, it's something that could follow, and maybe incentive to others, but at this stage of the game, we're just starting this process. But I certainly am cognizant of exactly what Councillor Eadie is referring to.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, after the Mayor's State of the City address, he made some comments that led people to believe that he would be running for Mayor again. In these times, as we get closer to elections, it creates a great deal of instability as those around this table tend to act in different ways as we get closer to election dates. I wonder if the Mayor could confirm for us today if he has indeed decided to run for Mayor and perhaps bring a little more stability to the Chamber here and to some of the behavior that goes on in the months ahead.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the good Councillor to call my wife and have a serious conversation with her (laughter).

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Swandel: Perhaps I should put that as a "yes" or "no" question. Is the Mayor running or not running?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as I've said on many occasions before, that as long as I see progress in the City continuing to grow, and serious issues being addressed, I am more than happy to continue the run. By the same token, if any Councillor on this floor has the intent to run, they are more than welcome to come talk to me and let me know why they might make a good mayor and maybe I should consider not running. I'd be happy to listen. But so far no one's called me.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Swandel: Perhaps I'll call the Mayor's wife to see if he's as good on the dance floor as he is at dancing here in the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker: Four minutes left. Seeing no further questions. Mayor you get a reprieve. We'll move onto the next Standing Committee, which is Finance. There is no report, there are no motions, there are no by-laws. Do we have a question for the Chairman of Finance? Councillor Havixbeck to Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Chairman, at our January 30th meeting, I asked for a work plan for how we would be undertaking this year's 2014 budget. I just want to re-iterate my question. When will we have this plan, and understanding of course that the Chairman has had a personal situation with a loved one passing, and he knows he has my deepest condolences, however I still would like the answer to the question.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll take that under advisement and get back to the Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks. Second question.

Councillor Havixbeck: I guess it is Question Period, not Answer Period, so I would like to also know the answer to when will we begin consultation with the Arts groups, with the general public and with our departments. I believe our departments get going on their budgets in the typical process around May, because our C.F.O. imposes a deadline of around July 15th. May, believe it or not, with this weather, is just six weeks away, so I'd like to know if the...when we will begin consultation and whether that will have some input into what the departments are doing.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Again, I'll take the Councillor's question under advisement and get back to her.

Councillor Havixbeck: One last try.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: At our January 30th meeting, I also asked for a City-wide list of those streets that would be re-done under the existing monies that would have been in the Public Works budget, and those under the new one percent infrastructure tax money. I guess, you know, I've received an email from the Chairman who suggested I contact the C.F.O. or the Director of Public Works directly myself, so I just want to clarify, is that correct and in fact what he would like me to do.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: That's what I would do.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for Finance? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Maybe I could show the rookie Councillor from Charleswood how to do this. Must be coming up to Spring Break, I'm feeling giddy. Last year, at some point, we had both Council...an EPC retreat and a Council retreat to discuss strategic planning and some ways of improving how Council at all levels, and in particular from the Standing Policy Committees, could be more involved in the budget process. Those, I believed at that time, were going to start moving forward and engage the Standing Policy Committees very early in the year in that process. I have, to date, not seen anything come out of that strategic planning process, neither the EPC strategic planning process or the Council strategic planning process. I'm wondering if the Councillor can indicate to us if we will be following along the lines of what the recommendations of that strategic planning process and some of the budget analysis that was done subsequent to that and engaging the Standing Policy Committees early, much earlier in the year in the budget process.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, my recollection of the strategic planning process is there was...it was a process driven largely by the Mayor and the Mayor's Office and that there was no definitive conclusions that came out of strategic planning. I think certain Councillors had certain ideas or notions of what they wanted to see out of the strategic planning process. Clearly the Councillor for St. Norbert has his views, but there was no conclusions drawn from it. The Mayor could correct me if I'm wrong, but maybe that's a question in terms of strategic planning directed more to the Mayor than to myself, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting, given that as part of the budget working group, the good Councillor was involved with Councillor Fielding and I in trying to push that agenda forward which came out of those recommendations, but perhaps we'll leave that at that.

In this year's budget, \$700,000 was included to assist the Mayor's Office at EPC with some policy capacity, policy development in strategic planning capacity, I think communications capacity, all of which we will agree is much needed. Can the Chair of Finance let us know if those monies have started to be spent? I haven't seen any of those new bodies around the building, given we know the urgency of getting into the budget much earlier and some of the work that has to be done. Has somebody been hired or are we very close to hiring somebody to at least be a policy advisor in the budget world?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Again, Mr. Speaker, like Councillor Swandel I am a member of Council no different than him. The budget is passed by Council, the monies were set aside with the office reporting via the Office of the Mayor...Mayor's Office, so again it would be a question to ask of the Mayor in terms of where that stands right now and I think that would probably be the best way to explain how that office is going to be managed. So...thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Oh? Alright. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: It would appear that our Chair of Finance has no knowledge of the budget process. We're going to have to probe a little further here. Perhaps the Chair can give us some indication, just perhaps at a conceptual level, of where a budget process might be going and how early the process will be started and how early Councillors at all levels, and particularly the Standing Policy Committees, might be engaged in that process.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Again, Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question under advisement and get back to the Councillor. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: One more.

Councillor Swandel: I've got eight minutes if nobody else wants to jump up here. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that perhaps process is being developed. Could the Chair of Finance confirm that a process is at least being developed?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Again I would take that under advisement and get back to the Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, is the Chair considering hiring somebody to give him advice rather than taking stuff under advisement?

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, you know it's interesting when we look back how things can look through different lenses. You know I recall at one time when the Councillor for St. Norbert was Chair of Finance at one time too, and I don't recall any form of public consultation, Mr. Speaker, anywhere inside the City of Winnipeg. We have committed Mr. Speaker, to undergo and do public consultation City-wide, and I've heard a lot of stuff said in this Chamber earlier in terms of the debate on that motion moved by one of the Councillors who was on EPC for over two years but chose not to move a similar motion when she was on EPC, and you know, to do another study, and that was what the motion basically said. You know, Mr. Speaker, I heard a lot of discussion about how the previous budget process was not a

process which listened or was consulted. I disagree with that, Mr. Speaker. I strongly disagree with that. I think worked quite hard along with my EPC colleagues in the last budget process to try to address any concerns that we heard, and especially when Councillors came forward. We couldn't read the minds, Mr. Speaker, of City Councillors. We couldn't read the minds. We had to ask...they had to come forward and speak to us, and some Councillors did. Councillor Smith came forward speaking as passionately as he did about Sherbrook Pool, and we and the Mayor heard him, and the Mayor listened and I remember it was in this Chamber, in this room when we heard all the delegations on the budget, and Councillor Smith came forward and actually said, "you know, this is a concern to me, Mr. Mayor. I need you to listen". And the Mayor listened, and EPC listened and \$200,000 was placed in the budget to try to sort out the issues with regards to Sherbrook Pool, a closure which nobody could have foreseen Mr. Speaker. And Mr. Speaker, I believe, I think the Councillor was the one who said it himself on the floor of Council, that it was the first time, Mr. Speaker that he actually voted for both budgets...Councillor Smith...an historic moment in this Council Chamber; Councillor Smith voting for both budgets; an historic member of Council and a proud member of Council. I say that as a compliment. I know we often laugh at history but it's not, you know, he's given a lot to our City and service to our City, so Mr. Speaker, you know, listen, we heard also from the Councillor in terms of Mynarski who had a concern and he spoke eloquently year after year about local streets and the need to do something in terms of local street renewal, and we as an EPC moved forward with a program which really is the first time we as a City has ever done anything like this, to set aside one percent which we hope will be the beginning of a long-term program to fund local street infrastructure, Mr. Speaker and to start to renew the infrastructure with regards to local streets. We know it's not enough for infrastructure, we know we don't have enough funds, Mr. Speaker to do all the regional streets and the bridges even, the rapid transit wish...

Councillor Swandel: Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. The Procedure By-law "Replies to Questions" under Section 14(11) states that "Replies to Questions shall be brief and to the point, and shall not provoke debate". My question as to whether or not he was hiring any advice, not a filibuster to wear the time out because he's getting tired of suggesting that we take everything under advisement.

Mr. Speaker: I'll take it under advisement, Councillor Swandel. (laughter)

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker...(inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Carry on, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm attempting to answer the question, Mr. Speaker. You know, and so we established and we listened, you know, Mr. Speaker, and it could be argued, well, you know this was something that other Councillors felt as well but that one Councillor, Councillor from Mynarski, him and I have had many conversations. He was very passionate, you know, about that, and he's...and because you know he even had a map of his ward, you know, coloured, all the streets coloured in terms of the state of the street disrepair, and you know he took it to even the consultation on Broadway, Mr. Speaker. We had another Councillor come forward with a suggestion that she wanted an issue addressed in one of her parks in Crescent Drive, and we as a Council, we moved for the discussion of 2014 budget \$850,000 to try to address the issue that Councillor Gerbasi identified in what is a large, I think it's a regional park, in our City, and she just happens to be the Councillor where this regional park is located and she had, you know, she brought this idea forward and it was a concern and we listened, Mr. Speaker. Councillor Orlikow had previously moved a motion calling that the monies set aside for the waterpark be divided equally amongst all the wards to be invested into recreation and infrastructure for recreational purposes, parks and playgrounds, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there an answer coming for Councillor Swandel?

Councillor Wyatt: There is an answer. But I'm just getting to it.

Councillor Swandel: Is there a ruling coming on the Point of Order?

Councillor Wyatt: And there is an answer, Mr. Speaker and I'm getting to that but...

Councillor Swandel: You could stop him now and you'd be more than generous to your colleague here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Carry on, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, you know, Councillor Orlikow came forward with regards to a concern, Mr. Speaker and he made a motion at a previous Council meeting prior to the budget process with regards to the waterpark money and we, because of the situation in Elmwood where a community club burnt down because of a fire that nobody could have foresaw that. We stepped up with a chunk of those funds to go to that purpose but the balance of it divided amongst all equally, amongst all the wards of the City, \$271,000, Mr. Speaker per ward which I

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
March 20, 2013

understand all the Councillors are now working feverishly to get into their community to re-invest in recreation and playgrounds and the like. Mr. Speaker, you know, we have, in terms of the budget, the last budget, I mean, we...it was a...yeah, it was a short process in terms of three or four weeks, but I mean, I find it ironic that everybody's standing up making a big deal of that when the Provincial Government, less than a year before, bringing forward a \$14 billion budget, passed it in less than two weeks, forced it through the Legislature in less than two weeks. And what sort of public consultation was there, Mr. Speaker?

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, on this Point of Order, which I have been very generous in letting you sit there and allow our colleague to do what he's doing, which you know and I know is contrary to the rules. Are we going to adhere to the rules? Question Period is a very limited time. It's to elicit information. My question was brief, it was direct, it had no preamble, it was concise and clear.

Councillor Gerbasi: Challenge the speaker.

Councillor Swandel: I don't want to challenge the Speaker. I would expect the Speaker to be an honorable gentleman and apply the rules.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Swandel. Councillor Wyatt, will you please, you know, with the 34 seconds left, answer Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Wyatt: What was the question? (laughter) Alright. All joking aside, Mr. Speaker, I understand Councillor...I understand, I understand, I understand that Councillor Swandel had a question and Councillor Swandel deserves an answer to his question and I can tell you right now, Mr. Speaker that the issue that he raises in terms of resources, we're right now looking at different options. There's been nothing expensed at this point and but it's something...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel moves extension. All those in favour? opposed? carried.

Councillor Wyatt: ...which we will be able to advise Councillor Swandel and members of Council in the future. Thank you.

Councillor Swandel: That's an embarrassment to this city.

Mr. Speaker: That concludes our Finance Committee report and Question Period. We will now move to the Policy Committee for Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management. Councillor Pagtakhan.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED MARCH 4, 2013**

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce report and move adoption of Item No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no comments, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have no motions. We have no by-laws. Do we have a question period for Councillor Pagtakhan, the Chair? Seeing none we will carry on to the Standing Policy Committee of Property and Development and move to Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED MARCH 12, 2013**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of March 12 and move Items 1 to 4 as consent.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no comments. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have no motions. We have some by-laws.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 45/2013, 46/2013, 47/2013, 48/2013.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 45/2013, 46/2013, 47/2013, 48/2013.

Councillor Browaty: I move that by-laws numbered 45/2013 to 48/2013 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 45/2013 to 48/2013, both inclusive.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 45/2013 to 48/2013 both inclusive be read a third time and the same be passed and order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question period for Councillor Browaty, Property and Development, sorry. Any questions for Property and Development? Seeing none, we will move on to Standing Policy Committee on Protection Community Services, Councillor Fielding.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED MARCH 11, 2013

Councillor Fielding: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move a report of March 11th, adoption of consent, Item No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith would like to stand that down.

Item 1 – Neighbourhood Liveability By-law No. 1/2008 – Heat Violations

Councillor Fielding: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very interested to hear Councillor Smith's comments. I do want to say that this was kind of a collective decision. We've got a very wise committee, Councillor Smith, Councillor Eadie and of course, my good friend Councillor Steen collectively decided on this and Councillor...this actually...Councillor Smith deserves a lot of credit. Part of the element that this comes from his motion coming forward and I think we see a way forward to look at it in the broader context and we'd like to see this addressed obviously before winter but I will stand down and let Councillor Smith...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Let me tell you this. I'm very pleased with the Executive Policy Committee in supporting this going forward. Let me tell you this all the renters in the City of Winnipeg will be pleased with the direction that we've got here. The fact is, when you are cold, when you're renting and you are cold. You know, you put the oven on with the stove and you put more clothes on and even renters that are pleased with their landlords should be happy with this because the property can be sold and they have a new landlord. The fact is, this will...we had 300 violations in 2012. I think when we have this...as a procedure, it will cut down the number of concerns. We'll be able to reduce that from 300 to very few, to a handful. And we'll save the City money as well and make all landlords realize that heating is

important and they have to maintain that heat. So I'm really happy that this is going forward and I'd like to congratulate EPC for doing the right thing. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? To close, Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Sure, well said by Councillor Smith on these items. You know, we're looking at this whole process in and itself. We want to make sure that question that's answered specifically about temperature, we're hoping that the weather gets better over the next little while, but I'm not positive on that. But obviously, we want to make sure that any answers come back before winter where people are impacted by temperatures. I think a big part of the equation, too, is talking about garbage and grass. I mean, you've talked to 10 people down the street. They're going to name one person in their community that isn't taking care of their properties and it impacts everyone in the community, not about their rents. So I very much in support of this, you know. I want to see what our administration comes back with. I think administrative just on the surface of it, agreed with it but I think it's a step in the right direction. We're going to see what comes back in October, but it sounds like we are taking this issue. We see the complaints that have increased so we know this is an issue. We want to make sure this is addressed to ensure that people that...you know, get to enjoy all their neighbourhoods, it's not just that one person is not taking care of their properties, or as Councillor Smith had mentioned in terms of heat, that's an element of it but also garbage and that sort, so looking forward to bringing this back. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have no motions. They have no by-laws but we do have question period for Standing Committee's Chair. Councillor Havixbeck to Councillor Fielding.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Chair, is it true there is still no contract for the construction of the building of Fire Station No. 11?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Without sounding like a broken record, I'll have to take that question under advisement and get back to you. I honestly don't have an answer for you right now but I will get the information for you, Councillor Havixbeck, and the rest of Council.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Havixbeck: It's related to the first. The station had a concrete base poured last summer and that was paid for last summer. The exterior appears built for the most part. Is it true that no further payment has been made to the contractor since the concrete foundation payment?

Councillor Fielding: Well, you know further to this once again, I will refer this...I guess what I would suggest is that probably is a question for Municipal Accommodations, who I believe is running the day-to-day operations of the project, so I know I'll consult with Councillor Browaty and his Committee and Administration in terms of getting some of the answers back, and whomever's department it is in terms of responsibility. I believe it is Municipal Accommodations. We'll get that answer back to you and Council as soon as we have all the answers.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: What is the date that the audit of the fire halls will be completed and a report provided to Council?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Well that is obviously being handled by the Audit, the Auditors, so that's probably a question the Auditors can answer better than us. Our role through Council was obviously it was passed unanimously I believe, to

look at the fire hall issue and some other audits in terms of real estate. That process, as I understand, is well underway, but really that is a question that the Auditor can answer because they're the ones that are administering the project as opposed to myself who hasn't been involved in any of that in terms of the day-to-day of it, so...

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions of the Chair of Protection and Community Services? Seeing none, we'll conclude the Question Period and we'll move to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Vandal.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED FEBRUARY 26, 2013**

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will move Item 2 as consent and a short introduction to Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of Item 2? Item 1.

**Item 1 - Transportation Master Plan Amendment - To reflect the recommendation of the Southwest Rapid
Transit Corridor Stage 2 Alignment Study**

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker. I know this is a...there's going to be a few people speaking to this so I wanted to give a brief introduction. The recommendation we're going to be debating this morning and discussing this morning is the best professional advice, the best professional recommendation of our administration who have been studying this issue for quite literally years in partnership with Dillon Consulting as well as Stevenson Advisors on the real estate side. In very short form, Mr. Speaker, this recommendation has been put forward and approved by Public Works Committee as well as EPC because number one, they are simpler implementation and what does that mean? That means believe it or not, Mr. Speaker this is the recommendation with the least impact on adjoining residence. This is the recommendation with fewer traffic disruptions both during construction and upon completion. This is the recommendation with the simpler land assembly process. This is a recommendation with improved connectivity to the neighbourhoods further west such as Lindenwoods, Linden Ridge, the entire Ikea region. This is the recommendation with significantly less expensive acquisition costs as verified by Stevenson Advisors and this is the recommendation with the least expensive capital costs and when you are talking about a \$300 million project where there's only one-third of the dollars that are there by the City of Winnipeg thanks to the leadership of Councillor Russ Wyatt at Fiscal Issues and the Executive Committee and ultimately all of Council. That is a factor that's very important so, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to stand down and try to answer the questions at the end of the discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Who's first? John Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. All right. I have to actually, first of all, I want to thank my Council colleagues who are...and I tried to change it up. I tried to change it up a bit because there's so many lenses you can look at this whole model. So I have presented to Public Works, I have presented to EPC and for all who would like to go see those presentations they are at orlikow.ca because those ones will tackle a lot more in depth. They talked a lot more in depth about where I believe some of the flaws. Well, I believe I know some of the flaws are actually in the report and some of the conclusions drawn, but today I have seven and a half more minutes to give you a brief overview and with a different lense today. Today I'm going to be talking about what could be. What could be and what are we missing? So first of all, this second leg of the southwest BRT, let's be very honest. Councillor Vandal said \$300 million, those are on Class D estimates. We're probably looking at somewhere about half a billion dollars by the time this thing is done. Well, that's an incredible opportunity, an investment opportunity for all of Winnipeg, not just for transit but for all of Winnipeg. So that's the way I'm looking at it. So what do I see? An investment opportunity to redevelop a regional corridor, improve transit services and increase ridership, improve traffic flow along Pembina and protect green space. If you imagine a new Pembina, especially from Jubilee to McGillivray consisting of multi-use commercial, residential buildings under...underutilized lands a bus corridor going down the existing rail corridor rather than over green space. Cafés, restaurants, peoples walking about, public spaces, the possibility that a pedestrian overpass across Pembina from the

BRT stations. Buses, a lot of buses getting off Pembina and that overall feeling a pride associated when redeveloping one of the cities' busiest and least attractive regional corridors. I am convinced that this can happen, but to do so, requires BRT. It is a catalyst for that development. Some of the reasons that I'm convinced that the Pembina route is the best option are development opportunities. There is potential to redevelop, underdevelop lands along the Pembina route. The Parker development doesn't require BRT to be developed. It shall be developed. Pembina redevelopment does require BRT. The City would be missing a once in a life opportunity to redevelop underutilized properties, along one its busy, busiest regional corridors. Land use options. Well, one of the big questions we always seem to forget is what else could those lands that we're going to be running that road through be used for. Councillor Vandal talked a little about the lands, well, which was the corridor will be going through is, it will be going through green space, it will be going through a forest, it will be going through a park, it will be going through a public garden. What else could we have used those lands for rather than putting a road through there? That discussion was never really brought up. Buses however, a bus road will be perfect down the Letellier Corridor. Did anybody take a peak on that corridor? It's completely underutilized land. I can't see anything else actually would go into that corridor and is there already. Mr. Speaker, there have been some issues raised about the Parker route which I like to address. The first one is active transportation. Again, there is a concern, a legitimate concern that they will not be able to put a dedicated bike corridor down Letellier Line. How again, Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is an opportunity to use buffer bike lanes down Pembina as has already been done, further down Pembina and this will be made a lot easier when those buses are removed off Pembina. The additional 1.5 kilometre detour along Parker route will dramatically limit amount of commuter cyclists who will then, will leave Pembina to go take a 1. K loop around. Again, commuter cyclists need to go from A to B, not A, C and then back to B. It won't work. Again, we're going to still have that same active transportation problem there, not saying that the Parker won't be a nice trail, but again we could accommodate trails do other things. So that's why it's important. In regards to route chosen, residents of the...okay, sorry, next one is the rail line moving closer. I did hear that the rail line moved closer. Let's be honest here, people, it's one train a day. That's what we are talking about so when we get this sort of hyper active, oh the train's going to be so close. It's one train a day. It's not like thousand trains going by, so let's be honest here. Regards to the road chosen though, however the (inaudible) we chose runs to the Beaumont and the Maybank neighbourhoods will be negatively affected. Parker, Letellier Line, there will be negative effects. To pick and choose just some of them, it's kind of irresponsible in my opinion. The neighbourhood understands there will be some negative impact. I'll get to that back. But that again, why I believe is important that we involve the neighbourhoods throughout the functional design process. However, this motion was previously denied. Traffic. The Pembina route could require up to four road crossings to be closed and or rerouted, however, there's been no assessment on that if that could be done. It can be done. I've been there. I've done my own counts. I've seen the count. You could reroute, close two streets, re-route one and actually open up a new one. This all could happen. The report has null and void on it. However, this is unfortunate because of one of the reasons why the Letellier Line isn't chosen is because of that. But again if it's that important, we really should be trying to explore.. look at it. And the flip side, though, we are asking the Parker Beaumont route to have an overpass that's going to take all this traffic from the west end of the, the southwest part of the city. Drive it down Hurst Way, go through Hurst and then possibly down Beaumont on to Pembina. You want to talk about negative impact on traffic to the neighbourhood? That will crush the neighbourhood. I've asked for a simple removal of that possibility, both committees, both committees have denied that today. So these are two examples that show the routes will have a negative effect on the neighbourhood, however, it's my judgment the Parker route will have a far greater negative impact. The City's missing an opportunity to protect the neighbourhoods from either side, the impact of local traffic. The Parker dog leg is easier. It's always easier to develop on green space. But there are challenges to this route as well. It is not a true TOD as the planning for the development and BRT need to be done together. The Parker BRT route is nothing more than putting a road through. It is. Unknown impact on the wetlands and green space, we still don't know except we do know that we're going to lose green space, a forest, we're going to lose gardens and we're going to lose a dog park and we're going to lose many other things, we know that. Letellier Line, it's wide open. It's just...it's not used anything more than a rail. The traffic impact on the neighbourhood associated with the Parker route closing act would...the Parker route had a whole negative impact because we are also going to have to be closing off access points from the Parker side. So again, there's huge access problems we are going to be having for neighbourhoods who live on the west side of the neighbourhood. Then again, we talk about that Beaumont overpass, be driving, funnelling all that traffic that was moving around through one street, would be a huge impact. The lack of ridership. Well, there won't be a lot of ridership. We talked about that today because there's not enough density along there. Maybe in 25 years, but presently there's not enough density to pick up extra ridership on the dog leg. We also have environmental concerns of having an extra 1.5, 3 kilometre loop back now times that by the

number of buses that will going through that route and then you add up the fossil fuels that are being burned so there is an environmental impact. The speculative nature about how the...development is going to happen is questionable. And again, we talk about the over, the over...the alternative land uses that are possible for the Parker lands never explored. I remain committee to my earlier motion that allows the functional design at southwest BRT to move forward in a first phase functional design with the participation of the community. However again, this motion was not supported. I remain unconvinced of the conclusions drawn from the final report.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Orlikow: On the southwest BRT route which I mentioned before including projections of the additional property tax revenue, land valuations and the inability to re-route streets to allow at-grade crossings to be closed. These are some things that were fundamentally flawed, I believe, in the final report. My main concern is the City has not done its due diligence or identified how it will even pay for this project at this point. Whether it's more debt, increased ridership fees, I don't know. We do have it in our budget but again you'll see a little star. It's not actually calculated in our budget anywhere. So we actually haven't figured out how we're going to pay for it yet. Therefore, there are too many unanswered questions. I remain unconvinced that Pembina or a hybrid option is not the best option both operationally and economically, and I will not be supporting the motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I look around our circle at Council and I see people who have been in business in a past life, maybe who have a family member in business now. I see others who had parents in business and I still...I just see people who are still in business and have worked their entire careers in their family business and I have to ask how many would expand the current business or create a second location without knowing whether they were making any money, whether customers were happy, whether they had any indication of whether the next phase, location, expansion would be successful. I don't think any of us would. We are approaching the one year anniversary of Phase 1 of rapid transit, April 7th. Those of us who were supportive and able to attend were at the opening and the announcement of its opening. Why would a report not include a year in review? That includes perhaps a rider survey, whether the levels of ridership increased, decreased, stayed the same in this time period, what routes are seeing marked changes in volumes of riders? Have we met revenue projections? Are we below, above? All of this information would appear to be missing, absent but we are making a decision to commit this as a priority for this year and based on what, I ask. So I ask especially those of you who have worked in business, would you spend hundreds of millions of dollars of your own money to expand your business when you didn't know the answers to these basic questions? Likely not. So how could we in good conscience given the report we have, commit this kind of money so blindly? Common sense would dictate that we need to ask riders how they are feeling about the current rapid transit system in our city before we commit to the next leg of it. I can tell you that in listening to people from Charleswood, they tell me they are now taking five buses from Municipal road to get to the University of Manitoba. We have thousands graduating from Oak Park High School, just this week I spoke with a constituent from Charleswood. Her husband, a well-regarded developer having recently done significant work in our downtown, and she was appalled that all these young people are coming out of the same community and will have to take the same five buses twice a day to get to and from the University. Something is wrong when this goes on and something needs to be addressed before we move forward in committing more money out of this year's budget or sometime in the next few years. Other transit riders tell me it takes longer to get to their destinations now with the rapid transit link in Charleswood. Things have been less reliable for them. How could I in good conscience support something like that? We have all received numerous e-mails over the past few weeks, phone calls, that there hasn't been adequate consultation. This many people are upset. Don't we need to take a second look at it? The route is still questionable. I raised it in my speaking notes but Bill McDonald did an excellent job of raising former Councillor, the late Brenda Leipsic and the dog park, and there's still confusion about that in whether the dog park is being moved, where it fits in this. I don't know that anybody can answer this question definitively and if they can, I hope that they would for me. I support the notion of rapid transit if done carefully, prudently. In fact I know full well that some of my former colleagues from EPC did not support it but then now appear to be supportive of it so I hope they would shed some light for the rest of us about how they can in good conscience spend hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars on this over crumbling roads. I'll support most things that are good for our city if there is a solid backing, solid findings, but there are still many fundamental things missing from this report. Finally, I would be remiss if I didn't mention

that this, in this report, the end of the rapid transit line is the gates of the University of Manitoba. Isn't the whole point of this extension to get to the University of Manitoba? Some 30 to 40,000 people carry out their day to day business as well as getting to the new stadium. Why does this report not show the complete alignment? What are people supposed to do when they get to the University of Manitoba? I can just hear it, people going to the Bomber game, walking in from the gates, grumbling about politicians and administrators. There are more questions than answers, and for these common sense reasons I cannot support this and I suggest we send it back to the drawing board to get some of these basic answers. We rush decisions with incomplete information because of other levels of governments' funding requirements instead of exploring other options. Maybe just sending it back for 30 or 60 days might get some new light on it. We could always put in preliminary applications for funding subject to better reviews or request extensions. We often are operating like we have a gun to our head with these things. Instead I see time and time again where we rush, provide incomplete information and end up in awful scenarios. Owning land, not owning land where we built fire halls. We are not learning from our mistakes. We end up spending far more on audits of fire halls and land deals when we were...if we were more careful at the start, many errors or missing information would be protected. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today we are choosing the general alignment of Phase 2 of the southwest transit way connecting Jubilee to the University. This is a decision that affects the whole city and the future of our city. But we all need to look at the big picture here. This is the first major spine of a rapid transit system and next we will look north to the eastern part of the city. We have agreed as a council at least by majority that we are committed to build rapid transit and connect the universities, the downtown, as part of a city-wide network to provide alternatives to the automobile. We have committed to focusing on more infill, transit-oriented development for far too long we focused on greenfield developments, sprawling our city outwards with low density, car oriented designs. The City of Winnipeg recently received an award for its transit oriented development guidelines by the way. This is an opportunity to practice what we preach in our new city plan. We need rapid transit and safe active transportation network to deal with the growing congestion on Pembina Highway. It is how we will make our city more sustainable, how we increase transit ridership and get people onto buses and bikes and out of their single occupancy vehicles. We have 40,000 students at the University, we have a 33,000 seat stadium along this route which is connected through the BRT network with buses that can go on and off the bus way. We have had massive suburban growth in the south part of the city which could be serviced as well with 40,000 people coming to Waverley West and newer neighbourhoods with poor transit service that can be connected through feeder buses in this whole quadrant of the city and beyond. After 40 years of discussion, the City currently has 3.8 kilometres of rapid transit built. We should've invested in this 30 years ago and we didn't while other cities like Ottawa, Calgary and Edmonton did, better late than never my friends. But we are not deciding today whether or not to build this corridor or whether to go with BRT or LRT or whether to wait forever because to become a modern city. We have already decided to do this when we agreed to fund our share in the next budget which is more than a third actually. Now, we are simply deciding which general alignment to choose? Should it be the Letellier down Pembina Highway, which turns out to have some limitations? Or Route 1B that has a one kilometre jog out and hugs along the side of Parker Avenue? We need to make this decision before we can move on to the next stage which will be detailed design, detailed cost-benefit analysis, environmental studies, further public consultation and securing the funding in place. This alignment decision has been studied specifically for a full year led by the steering committee of the University of Manitoba, provincial staff, Winnipeg Transit staff and 100 plus page report from the consultants and included opportunities for public input. A challenge to all this process and I understand has been the public feeling in recent years of a lack of trust in City Hall processes. Even though an audit going back five years of property transactions is under way, I understand people and all of us are uneasy. Given recent events from the fire halls to the water parks and ethical concerns, it is quite understandable that people would doubt a decision of this council's making. Adding to that, the complexity of transportation decisions, the plethora of misinformation out there and the numerous number of people among politicians and the general public who have recently become transportation experts. And the simple fact that we are bringing in change such as infill development and new transit routes near existing neighbourhoods, however, in spite of public unhappiness with City Council processes and the challenges of bringing in big changes that affect neighbourhoods, the work of this Council must continue. I don't doubt we need better communication and better collaboration but it would be a terrible mistake to defer rapid transit development based on mistrust and fear rather than based on the facts of the situation and we do have...I disagree with what's been said earlier. We do have the information we need in front of us to make an informed decision to move it to the next stage so we can get down to that

detailed design and resolve the issues that have been raised and secure the funding we need. We have to make a decision about where this is going to go before we can start that. And if anyone here seriously thinks having it up and running by 2018 is rushing things, as I have heard said, it is time to give your head a shake. Every year this takes, it will cost citizens more and be harder to do. So the decision today is between these two routes. 1B on Parker does not cut through the forest as option 1A did. It cuts Parker Avenue, and this has been approved so far at the previous committees. Here are the deciding factors that make this a clear choice. Connectivity is better with 1B. We have the potential to connect buses without transfers to a slew of neighbourhoods that could get on to the BRT line and get to the U of M and to downtown leaving their cars behind. Alignment B allows us to address travel patterns and involves more than just origins and destinations near Pembina Highway. It's not only about the infill development. By having the alignment extend west we enlarge the service area for rapid transit to include not only Lindenwoods, but also River Heights, Tuxedo, Charleswood, Ikea and the surrounding area and the planned Ridgewood South community and that's information from Winnipeg Transit. The BRT system allows connectivity without transfers. It is great for riders to get on a bus in one part of town. Every part of town, there are students that go to the U of M and when they get to the bus way they connect and go 80 km/h to the University. It makes sense. 1B Parker has fewer intersections compared...greatly fewer compared to the Letellier. Speeds on the Letellier can only reach 60 kilometres and there are multiple points of interactions with buses, cars and pedestrians. The Parker route will have speeds of 80 km/h and only three intersections as opposed to eight or nine. 1B is one kilometre longer but the time travelled would be the same without the complex intersection problems. Another crucial piece is active transportation. With 1B, there can be a separate commuter path complete as part of the transit way all along separating traffic from cyclists so cyclists can go safely to the University and stadium without risking their lives on Pembina Highway. This is a key part of the goals to reduce auto use and provide healthy life style options. I know for sure a lot more students would take their bikes if they didn't have to risk their lives every day to do it and they felt safe and comfortable. One kilometer more and I'm a cyclist myself, my kids are university students. They're all begging for this to happen because they want to ride their bike in relaxed, safety and comfort without dodging cars. The day can't come soon enough for this. The Letellier Route Option 2 was conceived before active transportation was seen as an essential part of sustainable transportation. There is no room for active transportation pathway alongside the transit no matter how you look at it. Cost is another important factor. Significant expropriation costs would be incurred just to have room to build the stations along Letellier. Forty million dollars is not chump change in Winnipeg when it comes to a major infrastructure project and that's...and there could be a lot more, not to mention the Letellier would be more disruptive to existing properties. The development potential is rated higher for 1B Route. Complete Communities, the City's newly passed development plan identifies this area as intended for major redevelopment. It is designated for infill transit oriented development. The Parker lands are mostly in private hands now, a detailed area plan...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: A detailed area plan is required before any development can proceed. That is where the issues of preserving the forest and green space can come in. Transit corridor or not, that land may be developed as it's been stated. It just makes sense...it does make sense to have infill development well served, and designed for optimal public transit use. Environmental stewardship and we heard a lot about caring about the environment today and I agree with that wholeheartedly, but it is about green space. But it is also about climate change reduction by supporting sustainable transportation options and better land use decisions including higher density transit oriented development near existing services, near existing communities so we have to practice what we preach if we really believe that and green space needs must also be considered at the same time. There have been arguments made about transforming Pembina Highway by putting BRT on the Letellier. I believe this is a bit of a red herring. Frankly Pembina is now and will continue to be a corridor well served by Transit with potential for increased transit oriented development and increased density. We would all love to see the single story fast food joints and ugly surface parking lots transformed into a mixed use high density transit area. I love what's being talked about here and Complete Communities document already concedes of being ready for those changes over time as those businesses evolve but that's something that's going to be far down the road with or without BRT, regardless of this alignment decision and it can happen if there was will, political will and from the businesses which are anyway...I just think that is a bit of a red herring. I think there's nothing standing in the way of that if Council wanted that to happen. Is going to continue to be well served by Transit and the...and then in terms of ridership, ridership is higher in the 1B Route. The existing transit riders are going to continue to ride and we are

committed to continuing to provide a high level of service on Pembina Highway which makes it...I'm not done and I'd like a little...to indulge Council for...to finish a few more paragraphs.

(Inaudible talking in the background)

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, thank you. The existing transit riders...where was I? Sorry...It is essential that there continue to be a high level of transit service on Pembina Highway and that has been committed by public transit and Pembina Highway remains a highly serviced transit corridor with just the regular bus service, it is suitable to transit oriented higher density development and there will be points on Pembina to connect to the BRT in certain points, so I think that's a bit of a red herring. In deciding a transit route, there are a number of.. In conclusion, there are a number of factors to be considered. Based on the advice from the experts we have at Winnipeg Transit, the U of M and the Province as well as the consultant we have been told that Route B makes ones...one the most sense when you look at the constraints and the realities of the two routes from a transit operational point of view, 1B provides better ridership potential, better connectivity, fewer intersections and active transportation and also more potential for infill development. I agree with citizens affected by future potential development that there must be proper area planning done in consideration of the natural area. It is my understanding that such a plan will be required before any development proceeds with or without the transit route. These lands are set aside for development now and the focus may need to be on the planning of those lands and I just in...finally, Winnipeg is decades behind other cities in rapid transit development. There was enough evidence in front of us to move forward with this decision to make on the alignment and the longer things are delayed, the more it will cost citizens. The longer they will have to wait for decent transportation alternatives and the next stage of detail design will answer the questions and issues that have been raised today that need to be sorted out but we can't do the level of detailed cost benefit analysis, environmental review and planning for two separate routes. It's impractical, unaffordable and unreasonable. We simply must decide and move forward and I thank Council for their indulgement...indulgence.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Longest I've ever been quiet since I got elected. This is one of the big ticket items you get to debate here which are important and I welcome the chance to speak about it and express why I'm going to be voting in favour. It's actually the third time because Councillor Vandal and I were on Infrastructure and then on EPC and then, and again here today and I want to repeat some of what I've said and add some new things. First, I'd like to commend Councillor Wyatt who I think championed getting the funding for bus rapid transit in the budget but what we're not voting on today is the concept, we're voting on alignment and why one alignment should be preferred over the other. I'm sort of reminded of a comment of a former colleague of mine in the Brandon School Board, old Jim Murray, who would get up and say to people at some point, "Do you think we're just doing this to jerk your children around? Do you think we sit here and have these ideas and we just randomly do these things?" And there is a bit of a flavour of that here as if it's self-evident that we should be going down the Letellier and for reasons that we're corrupt or crazy or lazy or incompetent, we decided irrationally to go with Option 1B. So I want to talk a bit about why 1B is the recommended option. There are a couple of potential options that were out there. When I first got elected and I ran in part on getting this rapid transit extended down to the University, I got elected and I ask Dave Wardrop, "Why don't you just come down to median of Pembina and his answer and he gave, which gave a great detail at Infrastructure was it doesn't work. There's too many level crossings. It would be considerably slower as a result. It would be more dangerous as a result and just as importantly, there isn't enough space in the median to put two lanes, two stations, you're going to have to expropriate out the other way and start taking away the sidewalks and get into the cost of possibly expropriating so down the median, not a viable option. What about 1A and I here, I give some credit to Councillor Orlikow who I think is always opposed to 1A and as Councillor Gerbasi said, that one had far worse environmental impact, so we rejected 1A, I think to the credit of the experts of the Councillors. What's left? Letellier or 1B. John said Letellier is perfect, I don't think he meant that entirely because we've heard some of the problems from Councillor Vandal, Councillor Gerbasi who said, "Look, there are more level crossings. It would not be quicker. It would be more expensive and there is certainly not room for alternative transportation pathway there. You simply can't do it." Maybe you aren't putting the train into someone's backyard but you're certainly, you'd have to expropriate, it would be more costly, it would be slower and as things are configured now, Letellier though on some superficial look because it's a shorter line, would seem on a map to be the preferred option. It's not from the expert advice we're given. The preferred option in terms of ridership, in terms of cost and in terms of

timeliness is the dog leg, is 1B so we come to 1B as the preferred option. I also want to say John pointed out an issue here today saying, well, there is the Beaumont-Hurst overpass and this has been raised at the other committees and rejected and I...both want to praise and criticize John and that he's put this issue on the consciousness but this isn't the idea of they'll be...there needs to be an overpass at Beaumont and Hurst to accommodate vehicular traffic, not conflicting with the bus way. Frankly, that could happen anyway. We had quite long discussion I think at EPC with the Chief Operating Officer and we discussed this at Infrastructure as well so it's not that we're endorsing the idea of the overpass here. That may not happen given the way the Parker lands will be configured or there may be a request for it to happen. It's not dependent on this vote today. It's a valid concern, I think John's raised, but it's certainly not that we've rejected that concern or in some way cast the cement in place for an overpass as a result of this vote today. So the some of the concerns that were expressed today as well were...well, Province doesn't like you to drain wetlands, this is draining wetlands therefore, Province will be opposed. A, if the Province were opposed and I haven't heard from anybody with the provincial government except, other than to commend this option, but B, if they're opposed, this has been in the papers, you know, we would've expected them to be here or get some e-mails or calls from the Province or B, they won't give us the 130 million dollars and they'll...they'll nix the route that way. So, I don't think standing up here saying you're draining the wetlands therefore, you're violating what the Province would prefer. Frankly, I don't accept that argument. There was also an argument which I think I first heard last night, which I wanted to spend a few moments on which is...well, this was a shanty town, this was a Métis shanty town in the 50s and therefore, you're callously moving ahead with this proposal and ignoring Métis history. Frankly, I first heard about this concern, I think in an e-mail yesterday to be blunt, Councillor Vandal and I met on Monday with the Union Nationale Métis. We talked at some length about Vermette Park in the south, in my ward, south of the Perimeter and the importance of the history there to the Métis community. I want to commend my predecessor, Mr. Steeves, Councillor Vandal, Councillor Swandel who voted about four years ago at community committee, not to declare that land surplus that they kept Vermette Park as city park land. That is obviously a piece of Métis history we are committed to preserving and enhancing so I really frankly reject out of hand, the suggestion that somehow we...by voting for 1B, you're indicating you don't care, you don't...disregarding Métis history. I reject that argument. A number of Councillors, spoken Councillor Gerbasi made a number of good points about the need to move forward on this, Councillor Vandal as well. Councillor Swandel at committee has raised some concerns about how is this going to get into the University and I think some of those are legitimate concerns that we'll have to look at in the future. So I know Councillor Swandel has yet to speak here today but how this will access the University frankly is not dependent on whether we come down Letellier or come down 1B so I'm preceding today as Councillor Gerbasi said to vote for the general alignment which is 1B. I think what I want to conclude with is...and John has certainly made some good arguments in terms of the issue of the overpass and representing his constituents, but I think there's sort of a moment here that we have to seize the day and to move forward. I won't try to use the latin we've already had enough of that for one day, but the moment is upon us here I think to move forward with this proposal and I moved away from Winnipeg to go to university in Ottawa in 1981 when we were a little past the Steven Juba era but there was still talk of a monorail going down to get down to U of M. I went to Ottawa, started working there in '84, '85 when they were putting in the new-fangled bus lanes for buses only. Here we are, it's now 20, 30 some years later almost, we finally got Stage 1 opened last year, almost 30 years later. I don't think we are rushing. Councillor Vandal spoken about this. I don't think to move, to vote on this today, to get the alignment, to get the studies, to get this finished by 2018, I don't think we're rushing. I think the time is now to move forward and lastly I want to commend one of my election opponents who's here and who spoke, Harry Wolberg, who I think showed some courage and got up and said, look we, the rapid transit riders that he speaks for, his group do favour Route 1B. He talked about now is the time to show some leadership to make some decisions. I agree with him on that and I'll be voting in favour. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. Actually, did I actually hear Councillor Vandal say the Ikea neighbourhood? That's kind of interesting now that we're changing the names of (laughing). Anyway, I just wanted to speak out on...I'm not going to be voting for this particular set alignment. We're deciding to set it on one alignment so that we can do a functional study and commit in...get everything ready to proceed in terms of building and getting, putting the money in place. There's a number of issues that I've heard around this and I would also like to start off by saying there have been a lot of experts, put time and the administration has put a lot of time into trying to figure out which is the best alignment. What should we do, doing a number of calculations and Councillor Orlikow has pointed out that some valuations have not been made which is and I've seen this in the fire hall decisions as well. Somehow we don't put a value on land that the City owns.

We have that park space, it has a value. It's not factored in but I don't know that the value that it has is going to say you know, whether one line is more affordable versus the other one. They are Class D estimates so anything we do do will end up costing quite a bit more and that's why we're doing the functional study to find out what the amounts of money are that we're really going to have to spend. But I don't know why we are tossing out the Letellier Line right away here. There's a couple of things I keep hearing about. You know, transit oriented development and there's all these opportunities along the 1B line and yeah, you know, there's a lot of opportunity for businesses and developers. They're going to build on this land anyway. Most of this land will be built on eventually at some point and we do have a Complete Communities and when they come forward with their development plans, we ask them to, you know, mix density and so on and so, because this city does have a problem in terms of needing to build up more density and actually, building up more density. There's a number of other things that we can do besides running a BRT or any rapid transit to help build more density, but I want to say on the Letellier Line, there's all this discussion about you know, the businesses. You know, business is about opportunity and if we do run the bus rapid transit down the Letellier Line, there is opportunity for business to make more money than what they are making, based on what they're utilizing those lands for right now along the Letellier Line. So if we were to decide that bus rapid transit was to go down the Letellier Line, I know that there is lots of opportunity for lots of money to be made and the business private sector will be there to figure out how it can capitalize and the most, make profit, so for people to say that there's no development opportunities along the Letellier Line, I disagree with that. It just...you know what, wherever the line goes, there will be opportunities. So let's not you know, get into this whole, this one has more opportunity than the other. I think that there is just as much opportunity to see good development happen along the bus rapid transit and on Letellier Line. Now I really don't understand why and I know it would cost a bit more money because you know, you have to spend money on human resources to study this, but really I believe that we should be doing a functional study on true alignments. The one for the Letellier Line and the one for 1B. You know, we are voting on the alignment, but we're voting on the alignment so that somebody can do a functional study as Councillor Mayes is trying to say we are only voting on alignment. We are voting on a path to proceed to do functional study and I think I agree with Councillor Orlikow that we should be looking at a functional study of closing up streets, the 60 km/h is based on having four...as Councillor Gerbasi said the 60 km/h is more based on having four crossings. What are, like...anyway, I think that we need to have a functional study done, a real serious analysis done about what are the possibilities for the Letellier Line that go beyond because you can do transit oriented development right along Letellier. The what ifs, so the Beaumont overpass or underpass or whatever, you know, we are making statements about the Letellier Line that may or may not be there. We have to do a functional study in order to determine that, so goes with 1B. Councillor Mayes keeps pointing out well, you know, there may or may not need to be an overpass, well you know what, the reality is you have to a functional study to determine that. So, I don't know why we're dismissing Letellier. That's why I'm voting against this particular option to just only have that alignment. I heard some other concerns. This is for the whole city, bus rapid transit is important and then will be...we're already starting to look at how we're getting people from Transcona through on rapid transit as well and I think that that's a real essential thing to do and it's a bigger part of the city. We do need and will have bus services that feed communities like Charleswood and other places. I'm interested to hear that it's five transit buses to get to the U of M from one particular spot in Charleswood. I'm wondering if they've even analyzed...usually it's a max I've ever seen is to get anywhere is three buses to get...transfer twice which is also not convenient and discourages bus ridership. The last point I want to make about the Letellier Line, there are a lot of people who have destinations along Pembina Highway other than going to the University of Manitoba. There's a whole host of residential east of Pembina Highway. There's a whole number of businesses that people ride to and want to get to. You know, if I want to go to the former Norlander Hotel to go dancing or whatever and I live up in West Kildonan, I'm going to drive, but you know, if I had a good bus option, I wouldn't have to drive, I could have a couple more extra drinks, well, I'm not going to drive but...anyway, but for most people, you know, if you have that...there's a whole bunch of destinations all along the way that are already there for rapid transit along the bus line. The future development, some 20 or 25 years ago, I know that John's put a lot of study into this. The development of lands around Parker land and the transit oriented development. That's far down the line, down the Letellier way, there's already a bunch of destinations. We can get more riders and just the people who want to go out to the U of M. We need to provide rapid transit for people trying to get to those other destinations. I know that the biggest crowd is the University of Manitoba but let's not forget that there are destinations all along the way that could be used and the...oh, the one other final point I wanted to make. While you can't have active transportation down Letellier, I would point out this, you know, active transportation ways are impact on the environment is so minuscule, we could still have our act...like if we're going to spend the money on an active transportation trail, we can still put it down 1B. Why not? If people are willing to ride the extra one kilometer to be safe from being....

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: If people are willing to ride the one kilometer to be safe, away from the traffic. I don't understand why in developing the Letellier Line, we couldn't just put in an active transportation trail along 1B. Nobody is going to be...we're spending the money anyway, so why not? I don't understand why we couldn't do that. So for me, the only reason I'm voting against this is we really need to do a functional study of the Letellier Line as well as the functional study that they're going to do for 1B and I'm not saying to take 1B off the table. I'm saying we need to really have a functional look at what's going to happen with both before we make a decision and while it might cost a little extra money to do a functional study for the Letellier, I think that that's money well spent to make sure that we are doing the right thing going into the future. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors, we're past the 12.

Councillor Swandel: I don't know what the will is here and how much we might have to debate going forward but I have Mr. Mallet's service this afternoon. I'd certainly like to get to that at two o'clock. I'm wondering if we can get an agreement to proceed with the rest of the agenda at this time?

Mr. Speaker: My thoughts exactly, Councillor Swandel. You are the last speaker so, that's right. We only have 12 minutes left so carry on.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to make a number of comments here and hopefully convince you to land on where Our Winnipeg suggests that we should be landing. I want to first make a comment about best professional advice. The best professional advice we have here is based on a very tight set of criteria. I go out and I talk to professionals with very, well qualified professional advice. I talk to people in the mathematical world, I talk to people in the planning world, talk to people in the transit world, this would not be their advice if you widen the criteria. And I think we have to understand that and as I conclude, I'm going to drive in a little bit closer to on what that means and how it relates to Our Winnipeg and the Complete Communities and our sustainable transportation strategy. The math doesn't work in this for a number of reasons. The Hydro lands have been given basically no value, but yet in the Dillon report, there's talk about relocating Hydro towers and the ability to manipulate some of that land and create some of that land as being useable land. The City has a number of right-of-ways in here and that if they were closed, they would certainly be useable land. So there's a piece missing on value of lands when you analyze anything going through the Parker lands but in particular coming down the Hydro corridor. The value of the risk associated with moving the lines in the Dillon report which is very, much more comprehensive document than what was presented at committee and here today, it actually talks about there being a great deal of risk than if the lines have to be relocated at the City's expense. There's a great deal of risk involved in that cost. They put a cost in there but they say that it's a pretty weak number. There's a great deal of risk in there. That has not been properly taken into consideration. The report, the Dillon report also states that the cost of overpasses have been left out of the 1A and 1B alignments as they don't...that an overpass at the McGillivray can't be accommodated on the Letellier Line so therefore, those costs have been left out of the 1A and 1B alignment. You know, I believe you can accommodate an overpass at McGillivray depending on what your alignment's going to be right at that location but you would still want to do an overpass at McGillivray if you're using the 1A and 1, 2 alignments. And you should incorporate that cost, so those are just a few things that should be considered in the cost. And that's a big swing when you start putting an overpasses as a cross something as wide as McGillivray Boulevard in that section. There's also no commentary in here about the risk related to the timing of the absorption of the lands. They put you know, sort of some TIFF value in here. When we look at the Fort Rouge lands to date, no sewer work is done, no undergrounds are done, no roads are in place yet, minimal work has been done on the land. We're not seeing great absorption there. We're not seeing absorption at the rate that we would be anticipated. So when we look at arguing that the Parker lands being valued to this equation that they're going to be developed and that's going to be TIFF. There's no factoring of risk in the rate of absorption of those lands. There's also...there's no value placed on the fact that the parker lands will be redeveloped no matter where the rapid transit corridor goes. You know, having it come down, you know, I suggested the other day coming down McGillivray but also just on Pembina Highway, between Jubilee and McGillivray, there still is a close proximity to those lands and easy access to that corridor that would enhance the value of the Parker lands as having close access to high speed transit. When you look at the Letellier Line

in particular between Pembina and McGillivray, there's no...there's a cost put in there to relocate the lands. They don't talk about relocating the buildings and redevelopment opportunities and the TIFFs. They just have taken a very myopic perspective at it...is if we're doing exactly the way those buildings exist right now, then we've got to relocate the railroad track. We're going to move it nine metres closer to the houses. I'm sure it's not appealing to the people living in the houses but certainly it's not, it doesn't have to be like that. If you are redeveloping, you can pull the buildings out to Pembina Highway. You save that cost of relocating the lines and therefore get another piece of value that needs to be brought to the equation. A couple other pieces here, shift the LRT, the Dillon report is very clear and I know this is something that the Mayor championed earlier in this that they want to build a system it's easily adaptable to LRT. There's a good commentary in the Dillon report about how better suited to LRT shift the Letellier piece is as opposed to the Parker lands. Planning, from a planning perspective, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, the Parker lands will get developed anyway. For Pembina Highway provides opportunities for redevelopment to deal with functionally obsolete buildings. You can't argue this. I mean it's obvious even Councillor Gerbasi alluded to it. The Pembina Corridor is a proven need for housing to meet the changing demographic that we are dealing with. There's just seniors in that already built neighbourhood screaming for empty nester housing. You can't build it. There's nowhere to build it, but if you're doing redevelopment, there's opportunities to think social pieces into the equation. So I think the Complete Communities redevelopment opportunities exist on Pembina and they don't exist on the Parker lands. The Parker lands...within 1 to 1.5 kilometres at Pembina Highway on McGillivray, looking at some of the ecological pieces, it's just a counter to what was said earlier and we are able to plan around the ecological pieces and it's a positive on the Parker lands. I think we can deal with wetlands, we can deal with dog parks in Waverley West, we save forest, we looked after wild life, we created new wetlands. There's ways that you can do that. That really comes to, down to my main point here and that's how we usually do planning and how Our Winnipeg and Complete Communities tells us we should be doing planning and we need to be doing it from a much higher level. Our Winnipeg states that Complete Communities should be the City's land use and development guide. And when you get into Complete Communities, it talks about integrated planning, it talks about...in one section ensure a more effective implementation efforts by establishing a collaborative planning role within the City of Winnipeg and externally is an integral part of planning implementation. And what...both these comments are driving at is that we shouldn't be looking at things in isolation. We shouldn't be looking at just rapid transit. We're also looking at a whole land drainage piece in isolation. When we're bringing these reports forward, we should be looking at the overall piece. We talk about area structured plans, we won't let anybody develop lands that are of this size or projects of this magnitude without doing some sort of a precinct plan or an area structure plan. That's what we do now. In this case here we're seeing some drainage plans being made, some transit plans being made but none of the development of the land plan is there and when you integrate those pieces together, you actually can make informed decisions and that's what we are missing here is that high level planning. We're doing this in isolation and everybody around this table has made comments, you say that everybody's right or everybody's wrong, and you can make that comment because we haven't done the high level planning. We're not integrating our planning here. We're looking at transit in isolation. And you know, I talk about...you'll get out to the southwest transit corridor. It's a corridor you know that we should be talking about it. It's a planning area. It's not this rigid piece of where this thing has to go.

Mr. Speaker: ...favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Swandel: You know, ultimately I can't rationalize this with the Plan Winnipeg three lenses, the social, the economic and the environmental, I think it fails in all three categories. There's issues at the University, you know...the one comment I will make is the corridor is the corridor, the access to the University is the access to the University. The buses have access to the University. The corridor doesn't necessarily have the access to the University, but we are talking about doing some precinct planning around transportation out there, seeing as this is coming, seeing as we've got the Southwood Golf Course lands there for redevelopment. We've got other issues, existing issues with the University Crescent Bishop Grandin interchange there. It's a dog's breakfast. There's been comments made about section or Plan 1B being the preferred route. This report does not recommend this. This report recommends going through the Parker lands, so 1B, 1A, it's all on the table, just going through those lands, that's you know, and I've mentioned it to Councillor Vandal. He said, well, that's the piece, so that was in the detailed planning, but we know from the report that 1B is a preferred route. So this is not 1B, this report, this you know, what is it 11 or 12 pages that we have here, which is really a summary of a report. And I'll close again and with just saying Mr. Speaker, our best professional advice here is coming from a very tight set of criteria. This should be about a service area, not one alignment versus another. When I expand the criteria and involve other professionals, this is not where we would land, and I think if we all

did the same thing, we expanded the criteria, we took a look at it as a service area, then we would be coming to different conclusions. I don't know that this is a mistake but I do know that it's contrary to the planning processes put forth and both Our Winnipeg and Complete Communities and there's talks of tools and Complete Communities checklists and all those things in there if you pull them out and if you put them in front of you and you start to use them and analyzing this, you could see how clearly wrong this is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Seeing none, Councillor Vandal to close.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This has been a good discussion. It's been a long time coming, about 40 years too long but the reality is, Mr. Speaker is that any option that we would be discussing here this morning, any recommendation from our administration there would have been opposition who would've brought forward vehement, passionate, somewhat rational arguments as to why that chosen alignment was not that the right one, Mr. Speaker and that's the reality. If you go right down Letellier Line, you're actually going to have to move a railroad track, is it nine meters closer to homes? Could you imagine the citizens that would be in this Chamber if this was the recommendation that was being put forward. Now Councillor Swandel says you can easily solve that by just moving the buildings closer to the other building on the other side closer to Pembina Highway and that's easy to say, but who's going to move those buildings, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, the reality is I'm going to try to address some of the concerns. Pembina Highway, buses will still be running down Pembina Highway. Those of you who think that all buses are going to be turning on towards the, once this is implemented in 2018, which is not too quick by any means. Buses are still going to be going down Pembina Highway, and if there's opportunity into the future to run a bus rapid transit line down Letellier all the way to McGillivray then I've talked to Dave Wardrop but that opportunity is not closed. That opportunity is still there if it makes sense but you actually have to pull the trigger at one point. I'm always surprised and I don't know why I am when people stand up and Councillors stand up and they talk about rapid transit like it's an unproven modality that's never worked anywhere else and what we've done is a waste of money and we should be stopping and studying to see if Phase 1 was actually worth it. Well, Mr. Speaker, Phase 1 is half a loaf. If you actually ask the people that are on rapid transit now, they're going to say, well it's actually quite good but it stops at the end of nowhere. You've got to do the whole loaf, Mr. Speaker. I've said in 2000, 2001, 2004 that what we are doing, the phase, the first phase is always the hardest because it's pioneering and it's always the hardest for a politician to do what is pioneering because you're going to get criticized, Mr. Speaker. We should've started this phase 40 years ago, Mr. Speaker, then we'd be going out towards Elmwood or St. Boniface, Transcona. This is the first spine. So those that criticize them, Mr. Speaker, it's easy to criticize because we've got half a loaf. We've got to keep moving. It's a good argument. There's not a lot I can add. To me, bus rapid transit is all about connectivity and this is the route that's been chosen by the experts with the most potential for connectivity to those neighbourhoods in the area that are going to go to the U of M that are going to go downtown, Mr. Speaker, and that's not Dan Vandal saying that that's the Transit Department, that's private consultants and a private real estate firm, Mr. Speaker, who've done their analysis so I will move this forward and it's been a good discussion and hopefully this is the first of, the second of many phases on RT. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Vandal. Seeing no further comments, I'll ask for a vote on the Item 1. Recorded vote. All those in favour of Item 1, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Gerbasi, Mayes, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Steen, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Smith, Swandel.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 5.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
March 20, 2013

Mr. Speaker: Motion carried. Hey, we have a few things left here and we will be able to adjourn quite shortly, ladies and gentlemen. We have no motions for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, no by-laws. We have Question Period. We have a question for Councillor Vandal from Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: I'll try and be brief, Mr. Speaker. I just would like the next meeting of the Infrastructure Committee to take a look at getting a review of how the zone system for snow clearing is operated in the City this year. It's something that I think is already being talked about by...I got a good response from the Chair and from Mr. Sacher, so my request is that we take a look at that at our April meeting of Public Works.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: I agree. No problem.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments, questions for Public Works? Seeing none. We'll move onto the Alternate Services Committee report from...yes, Councillor?

REPORT OF ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY
DATED FEBRUARY 25, 2013

Councillor Gerbasi: I wanted to quickly stand down 4.

Mr. Speaker: Stand down 4, okay.

Councillor Swandel: First you actually have to introduce it.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Sorry, I thought you were at that point.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, please introduce the Alternate Service Committee.

Councillor Wyatt: I'll move reports and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items, Items 1 through 3.

Mr. Speaker: All right. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item 4.

Item 4 – Winnipeg Golf Services (SOA) – 2013 Business Plan (Selection Report)

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I'd be happy to hear comments from the Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know everyone's anxious to get to lunch. I just had a concern that I did try to get an answer from administration and they weren't really able to give me much of an answer. The Advisory Committee for this is being...what's the word, ending, abolished in the motion in front of us today and it basically, the only information I could get is that it hasn't been effective or something like that and I guess I'm just wondering, you know, I'd like to know before we abolish something, why hasn't it been effective? Could it be made effective? You know, why are we making this decision? There's a real absence of information so I wanted to put that concern on the table at

least and see if there's anything that the Chair can respond on that. I'm a little uncomfortable voting to abolish something without a further explanation. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Was there anybody else who would speak to this...at this point in time?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes? Do you...

Councillor Mayes: I just think it's worth to make clear, this is not the vote on the proposal that was before ASD. This is merely the business support. I've had a number of people contacting me, this is not the vote on whether maintaining the courses as City-operated, its business plan.

Mr. Speaker: Business plan, correct. You're on, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, thanks. Mr. Speaker, the business plan before us today is being brought forward. It's consistent with the work that's going on right now. I realize, noted by Councillor Mayes that this is not in terms of the issue that...with regards to the...looking at managed, modified managed competition, but is the business plan that's before us today and the recommendation is the Advisory Board and...they feel, the administration feels that it has not aided the...in their ability to do the work, the...if you look at unfortunately, it has existed for some time, but the actual amount of golf that's taking place has dramatically fallen at all of our courses, some by half since 1993. The amount of usage by citizens is down and it's why we are looking at different options now with regards to the golf courses. So you know, it's served its purpose and unfortunately the demand for golf is not...even though our city is growing and the population of Winnipeg is growing, the exact opposite is actually the case even though we as a city have tried to hold the line with regards to green fees, and green fees only represent a portion, not even all of the agency's revenue, a portion of the revenue, so you know the challenge we're facing with our golf courses is that there's a lot of options today out there in the market for folks to golf and to use golfing facilities. A lot of very, our golf courses are targeted to the mid-market range or lower mid-market range and there's a lot of competition right now in that area, and it's just not...we are losing money and the fact that this business plan as you can see is increasing the line of credit by a million dollars, it reflects that fact because of the fact that we have to do something with these courses. Council attempted unsuccessfully to get out of the golf course business completely by selling the courses. There was a hue and cry and a lot of...well, a lot of...I would say fear based on misinformation and lack of information unfortunately and I think that's you know just as much on both sides, Mr. Speaker, because of the lack of information going forward to the public that could've been there, making it clear of why you know, there could've been some other options for redevelopment or repurposing of golf courses and still you would have a lot of green space, but anyway we heard from the public, we decided not to go down that route as a council, but now we're looking at the option and the business plan speaks to that of looking at having the private sector or even the union has the opportunity to bid, to come forward and to operate golf courses, Mr. Speaker, in the city instead of the City of Winnipeg directly operating these. We can't continually, sustainably manage these with the kind of losses that we're having. Knowing full well, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of recreation we have a lot of demands on recreation and in terms of priority or level of priority with regards to the need, recreation needs in our city, this is literally down towards you know, there's going to be folks out there who say, "No, I'm a golfer, I love to golf, you can't do this." But in terms of actual demand and need in our city and priority, it's towards the bottom end of that priority list. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that kind of addresses Councillor Gerbasi's question. There's no...it's kind of gone its full course and unfortunately the Advisory Board didn't create the energy or the enthusiasm to turn these numbers around and it's been around for quite a long time so. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions at this point? No? All those in favour of Item 4? Yes?

Councillor Gerbasi: I'd like to be recorded in opposition, please.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Gerbasi is negative.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
March 20, 2013

Councillor Eadie: I'm in opposition as well, please.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie also, and Councillor Smith. We'll do this one more time. All those in favour? Opposed? And we have three recorded in opposition. That concludes our agenda for today, ladies and gentlemen. I'll ask Councillor Fielding to move adjournment. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 12:34 p.m.