

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Wednesday, June 25, 2014

The Council met at 9:41 a.m.

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

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Vandal

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mayor Katz, I understand you have an announcement to share.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Madam Speaker. Earlier this week the city of Winnipeg lost a dedicated Winnipegger Kevin Walters. He was the Manager of Manitoba Music and Sound and lost his battle with cancer after dedicating much of his career to our local music and entertainment community. Kevin worked tirelessly to promote local musicians, film makers and entertainers and to always keep the spotlight sharply shining on our City. Through his co-ordination of Royal Visits, his work on the Junos and Culture Days, the Red River Ex, the 2010 Manitoba Homecoming Year celebrations, or any of the countless festivals or shows he worked on, Kevin left his mark of enthusiasm and passion for Winnipeg on memories of City celebrations that we will all cherish for years to come. He worked closely with the City on many events and his dedication to our community will be sorely missed. I personally had the pleasure of knowing Kevin and spending a great deal of time with him. He was one of the best supporters and promoters of our City. He will be dearly missed and on behalf of the City of Winnipeg and City Council I extend our deepest sympathies to Kevin's family. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mayor Katz for recognizing such a prominent Winnipegger. Now I would like to call Mayor Katz to the podium and Councillor Grant Nordman. We have a special presentation to make on behalf of City Council. Are you surprised? I am extremely proud to have the privilege of serving as your Council Speaker for the last seven months. The role of Council Speaker commenced in the City of Winnipeg in November of 1989 and our 1st Speaker was Councillor Jae Eadie. I am the 7th Council Speaker and the 1st woman to hold this office. While I enjoy undertaking the role of Speaker I can honestly tell you that it is a unique position with numerous challenges, especially at this time of the year. To this extent I would like to recognize the service of our previous Speaker, Councillor Grant Nordman who served in this role with distinction and honour. I would like to present Councillor Nordman with a commemorative gavel which I hope will remind him in later years of his service to Council. Mayor Katz if you could do the honours, please.

Mayor Katz: Served in a wine box, by the way. So this is in honour of recognizing you for your service as Speaker and basically says thank you very much but most importantly, I want to point out to everyone that the impact this gavel has in that chair, it will not duplicate at home so don't use it there please and thank you and congratulations.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you.

MINUTES

Councillor Steen moves that the minutes of the meeting held on May 27, 2014 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We'll now move on to delegations. First up is Mr. Mark Cohoe in support of item one of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated June 3, 2014, regarding the Capital Integration Project, Southwest Transitway stage two. Mr. Cohoe, you have ten minutes. Welcome.

Mark Cohoe: So thank you. As you know, Bike Winnipeg has been following the development of the rapid transit corridor for years. We have participated in the consultation processes; we have identified issues affecting cyclists and provided suggestions for improvement at various stages during this process. We have also been actively involved in consultations concerning the redevelopment of the Pembina underpass and we strongly support the need to move ahead with stage two of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor and the associated redevelopment of the Pembina underpass. We believe this project will have many benefits, not only for cyclists and for the city as a whole. Given that we can't afford to maintain the roads we have now, it's far better to develop our city in a manner that will maximize the benefits of our existing infrastructure, including the roads, water, sewer lines, schools and community centres and that is exactly what the completion of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor will accomplish. Rapid Transit is and will continue to induce higher density developments and increase the City of Winnipeg's tax base; reduce expenditures for the construction and maintenance of infrastructure and divert traffic away from congested streets and on to alternative modes of transportation like buses and bikes. And along the Pembina corridor that's extremely important. The master transportation plan is projecting a 50 percent increase in traffic up to the year 2031. So if we don't get a handle on how we manage that traffic, we will be doomed for years to come. The development of the rapid transit corridor has already and will have positive influence on the following developments: the Parker lands, certainly the rapid transit corridor will offer the development of a far denser developed neighbourhood than would otherwise have been accommodated. If we look at Bishop Grandin Crossing with the precedence of that Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor, what would have been nothing more than a big box retail store, an office outlet is being developed into a modern mixed-use urban commercial and employment district with park land, plazas based around the principles of transit oriented design. The Southwoods lands where the U of M is going. With presence in the Southwest rapid transit corridor what would otherwise would be developed as traditional low density suburb, similar to what surrounds that, will again see the development of a medium to high density neighbourhood, compatible to the Transit Way that will encourage people to get out of their cars and into sustainable modes of transportation. The Fort Rouge Yards, the development of this is far higher because of the presence of the rapid transit. Certainly having the transit corridor there means we are impacting that neighbourhood strongly as well. The Winnipeg Winter Club is yet another example. Across from that, of course, there is an apartment going in, a high rise apartment. And that is directly related to the 1st stage of the rapid transit corridor, will also benefit from the 2nd phase. For people travelling between downtown and the southwest part of the city, the city... the project will provide a number of alternatives, simply putting more cars on the road. We'll have Park and Ride facilities that will encourage commuters to park more conveniently and take transit downtown. Cyclists will have the option of parking their bikes at transit stations or loading their bikes on to buses. Cyclists who aren't comfortable riding on Pembina will have a safe, convenient alternative on the bike paths adjacent to the transit way and a large number of people commuting to the University of Manitoba, which is over 30,000 commuters, the 2nd highest density destination within the city, will have similar options. Part of this project as I'm sure you are all aware even though it's sometimes forgotten in the media are the improvements to the Pembina underpass. I'm sure you are well aware that we have been coming out to City budget meetings since 2006 to push for improvements to that underpass and that intersection. That's one of the most troubling intersections that exist in the city right now. But, with this, cyclists and pedestrians who want to get through the Pembina underpass either travelling north and south or east and west between...who currently face a major barrier at the Pembina underpass. They have proven this junction will connect the current cycling routes between Jubilee and Harrow, between the north and south sections of the transit corridor and along Pembina Avenue itself. Experience with other major improvements to cycling infrastructure in Winnipeg and elsewhere mean this will result in a large increase in bicycle traffic and corresponding reduction and pressure from cars along these routes. This project will improve the value of the entire "AT" network in Winnipeg and the city will start to reap the benefits of investment and previously disconnected pieces of the network and put simply, the progress on the Pembina underpass when this goes through will take what is one of the worst intersections for pedestrians and cyclists and make it into something that's one of the best; that's a model for cities across the continent. The project will also increase density and thereby increase the efficiency of providing city services. Experience with the 1st stage of the transit corridor demonstrates how it results in increased housing and commercial development and when the 2nd stage is completed the whole transit corridor will become much more attractive for development. And this will moderate the demand for suburban development; is much more efficient obviously to provide City services from police, fire protection, to water and sewer services and when there is a higher population density and certainly we have the services in place. This helps us use those rather than build new services. Again, the project helps reduce exhaust admissions and air pollution, so for every five kilometres of car travel, that's adds about 1 kilogram of CO2 to the air, so increasing travel by transit and active transportation, the project will improve air quality and help reduce greenhouse gases being released into the atmosphere. And finally we feel there will be a strong economic development associated with this development that will help improve our tax base and increase the sustainability of our city. Commercial developments are already planned for areas adjacent to the transit corridor and

these will be further stimulated when the project is completed and these developments will also increase the value of existing developments in the area and thereby increasing the City's tax base. Everyone gains when residents reduce the average number of kilometres driven. Money saved on transportation stays in our economy where it is reinvested to create more jobs, improve housing and increase the tax base and simply put it's called a "green dividend". So again, the Province obviously this project takes advantage of matching Provincial funding contributions at a cost of 509 million. We as a City are contributing 225 million. That's in 2019 dollars as well so it's definite value for money. Any effort to delay this we are looking at construction inflation that can easily add another \$65 million to this project so we do urge you today to vote in favour of moving ahead with this project. Let's get this rapid transit corridor completed. Any questions?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Cohoe if you stay on the bench we'll take questions in a few minutes. Next is Ms. Stephanie Voyce in support of the same item. Following that will be Mr. David Sanders. Welcome. You have five minutes and then we'll take questions.

Stephanie Voyce: Thank you. Good morning, Mayor Katz, Madam Speaker, Councillors and guests. On behalf of the Downtown BIZ, I would like to express our support for the P3 Capital Integration Project to ensure that the funds that are needed for rapid transit are secured now, to see the Southwest Transitway stage two move forward. At the Downtown BIZ we work every day towards a downtown that is a thriving and outstanding destination and place to live for all. We know that there are many ingredients for a successful city and a successful downtown and we believe that rapid transit is a big part and a key ingredient of achieving a complete mixed use, vibrant, sustainable, walkable and lively downtown neighbourhood. As our city approaches 1 million people, more and more people will be accessing the downtown, whether it be to visit downtown's businesses, heritage and cultural venues, events and more. We feel rapid transit, a strong system, is really the answer. It is not only important in supporting economic development in the downtown, in reducing vehicle congestion, reducing parking demands and reducing emissions, but we also feel that it is truly an enjoyable, easy and convenient mode of transportation to and around the downtown. Rapid transit is already underway in our city. We feel we must carry on with our vision for a well-planned and integrated rapid transit system as this is key for the health of our people and the health of our city. And downtown, after all, is the heart and soul of our city, so we at the Downtown Winnipeg BIZ are very much behind rapid transit and notably the Southwest Transitway stage two at every step of the way. Thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Cohoe, if you could return and...are there any questions at this time? Mr. Cohoe? If both of you can come forward. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Madam Speaker. I was going to ask a question of Mark. There has been...I guess I wanted to hear a little bit more about how important the active transportation component is of this project especially lately we have had a lot of discussion about safety along Pembina Highway, there has been talk about the fact there is the jog-out so it's in the a complete straight line, I still, as a cyclist myself, I am really excited about that but I want to know if you could characterize the impact on cyclists it would be when this is it completed.

Mark Cohoe: Sure. I think it's a huge impact. We know from asking our membership, from speaking to people that one of the biggest barriers to cycling and one of the biggest concerns that people have that prevents them from cycling is cycling in traffic. So an aspect of this is to create the separated pathway that will lead, basically essentially from the end of Harrow Street through the Pembina underpass, down...it will jog through the Parker lands which is also a connection out west towards the Sterling Height and the existing Thundering Bison Trail. It gives you a grade separation over McGillivray Boulevard that you are not dealing with what's a pretty long right turn lane at Pembina and McGillivray and one of the critical points is that it includes an overpass, a grade separated overpass for cyclists that takes them over Bishop Grandin, as well as a grade separation at the intersection of Pembina and Jubilee. That is a huge improvement to what exists and means that, for instance, cyclists in the Earl Grey area will have a safe, convenient connection through to South Osborne which is the district that is very much growing and becoming sort of that mixed use corridor, urban mixed use corridor that we really do want to see in that...Complete Communities is pushing for. And also it means that we'll connect through, for instance, to the Sherbrook area which again is another area of the city that is developing and for students who are commuting to and from the university, it's a huge difference. I know I was in the university 20 years ago and to go out there now and to see the number of bikes that are there is staggering and what a difference it has made, and we can redouble that by creating this. So I think when we look at the numbers of people this will encourage to become active, it's going to be a huge number. I think it will be thousands of trips a day that will be converted into bicycle trips.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Is it also possible that this could be cleared in the winter as a path for easier, because right now it's very difficult to cycle in the winter in Winnipeg.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
June 25, 2014

Mark Cohoe: That's a great question. Certainly the experience in other cities is that separated trails are easier. Oulu, Finland is a prime example. They have a network that runs through their city, basically it's trails that are essentially a hierarchy. Sort of an alternate street network. They maintain that through the year and 30 percent of their population can bike through the winter so the numbers... it really does create that possibility and it's also, obviously, the student group is the group that is most likely to bike through winter as well, so it creates that benefit and as you suggested, winter clearing along Pembina was very poor this year.

Councillor Gerbasi: My last question is for Stephanie. I want to ask if you could outline a bit more, you are here as a staff person for the Downtown BIZ, but you are representing the opinion of the Board of the BIZ and maybe you could just clarify the position of the Downtown BIZ and who they are, speaking to us today, representing a strong support for finishing this project.

Stephanie Voyce: Sure. The Downtown Winnipeg BIZ acts every day on behalf of 1400 businesses in the downtown, who are members who pay a levee to have us promote and enhance the downtown on their behalf. Of course to create more and more reasons for people to visit and live downtown, towards that vibrant 24/7 downtown that really represents what our city is. So we have a transportation committee that looks at how we advocate for an improved transportation modes into and around the downtown, that of course, goes back to our Board of Directors, representative of a group of business folks in the downtown that sit on our Board. And we not only look at transportation but marketing advocacy, parking, place-making, so it's a quite a diverse layering of aspects towards the improvement in the long term of our downtown.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Your question is for? Stephanie?

Councillor Smith: Stephanie.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Smith: I want to ask you, is Councillor Gerbasi a member of your traffic committee?

Stephanie Voyce: No. Councillor Gerbasi is a member of our Board.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Okay, thank you, you may return to the gallery. Mr. David Sanders? Welcome. Mr. Clerk, we have some handouts. The same, you are in opposition to the same item and that's what we'll discussing first and you have ten minutes, sir.

David Sanders: They all have them already.

Madam Speaker: You may begin.

David Sanders: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My name is David Sanders and I'm appearing as a private citizen to speak in opposition to all of the recommendations of the Winnipeg Public Service with respect to this huge commitment which would have the effect of delegating to the City's unelected senior administrators, all Civic authority to negotiate and approve this \$1 billion scheme for stage two of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. In my opinion, if Council approves these recommendations today, it is will be in complete dereliction of it's duties to oversee the administration of our Civic planning authority and the management of this community's present and future financial resources. Approving these recommendations will represent a complete abdication of Council's authority and responsibility for Civic decision making. I'm attaching excerpts from the Executive Policy Committee meeting of June 18 when Councillors Browaty and Nordman were absent and Deputy Mayor Swandel, who also have the Chair of the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee, voted against these recommendations and so as of this moment, these completely, in my view, irresponsible recommendations have been endorsed by just four members of EPC: Councillors Mayes, Pagtakhan, Wyatt and Mayor Katz. Councillor Wyatt gave many very good reasons for rejecting the recommendations but in the end he still voted for it. Councillor Orlikow appeared before EPC to recommend the attached eight amendments to the proposed motions, I've included them, in which he proposed to retain Council control over final approval of each major decision. I'm also attaching a copy of my June 18th submission to EPC plus excerpts from the minutes of the so-called public meeting held by the IRPW Standing Policy Committee on June 3. The minutes show that Councillor Vandal was absent, that Councillor Swandel voted against the recommendations and that just two members of that committee, Councillors Gerbasi and Sharma, actually voted in favour of this ill-conceived scheme. So unless they reconsider their

position this morning as I am urging them to do, there will be at least six votes in favour of these recommendations to proceed with the project. It appears that at least five Councillors, Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Orlikow and Swandel will be unwilling to approve the recommendations as presented and so the fate of the matter depends on three of the five remaining Councillors: Eadie, Nordman, Smith, Steen and Vandal and I hope each of them will find one good reason to stop this political juggernaut. Certain documents have not been reproduced for this Council agenda, which is more for this than EPC and one is the notification of the public hearing which is required to be held by the Provincial Public Private Partnerships Transparency and Accountability Act. There's a list of delegations received with that June 3 public hearing there was one in favour, 19 opposed and three just to provide information. And I'm providing a copy of my 14 page submission to that public meeting as I was able to read only four pages during the ten minutes allotted to me, which is our practice and I have attached a copy of Mr. Innes' Bus Rapid Transit analysis technical critique which I submitted on his behalf. And as noted on page three of the June 3 submission on May 22 and 29 I submitted official applications for Access to Information for a number of key documents regarding the design, cost benefits and value for money assessment for this project. Now, at the time I wrote this I said so far I have not received a response from this open government, more than 30 days after the first request was submitted. These are documents which had to be published before the June 3 public meeting but were not and which had to be submitted to the Federal P3 Canada fund this month and apparently were. But the P3 Canada fund office can't tell me anything about it and directs me to ask the City. Yesterday afternoon I did receive a response to my first May 22nd request in which the Transit department has refused to provide any of the four reports I asked for which include the value for money, cost benefit analysis for this project. Think about it. Once again I urge each and every Councillor to demand the production of these documents now and to read them before allowing a vote on any of the recommendations to approve this scheme. And I urge you to call the administration's bluff because I think that's what it is. Do you all know that the City administration has apparently submitted this project for Federal funding from the P3 Canada fund already? Before it's approved by Council? In my view that's disrespectful to Council and the citizens that you represent. Since the official report on the IRPW June 3 public meeting will be published, once it's been published which has to be done by July 15th I do intend to advise the Provincial minister responsible that in my opinion, the City has failed to comply with requirements of section 5 of the Public, Private Partnership Transparency and Accountability Act, that is by providing the information that I have asked for and has been denied in advance of the public hearing. And I don't see how the Province could advance any of its 225 million promised for this project in these circumstances. And for those of you who may still be concerned about doing your due diligence on this \$1 billion scheme, I'm enclosing references and a copy of the table of contents for an excellent booklet entitled "Asking the right questions", a guide for municipalities considering P3s which was written by Manitoba's own John Loxley, published by CUPE and the guide contains a great many crucial questions, most of which are unanswered and the few documents the City administration has been willing to share with Council or the public so far. And do you know the City also requires a Manitoba Environment Act license prior to construction and operation of any part of stage two, including the proposed relocation of Manitoba Hydro, MTS and other utility services which is recommended to you today. And since the City has barely mentioned it publicly, you might be forgiven for not knowing but the City's consultants prepared what I view as a seriously flawed, environmental review and assessment report and they submitted it to the Province on your behalf or rather on our behalf. The deadline for submission of public comments was back on June 9 and I am enclosing a copy of my submission to the Environmental Approvals Branch on that date in which I requested that the Province reject that report as incomplete and inadequate. I want you to know that I have always been a supporter of public transit and a supporter of rapid transit and a supporter of the downtown-University of Manitoba connection in particular. So what's wrong with this project before you today? The City has failed to produce credible evidence and analysis which would enable the citizens, Council and the Provincial and Federal Government authorities to evaluate the viability, risks, costs and benefits of the revised Southwest Corridor project or the P3 procurement method which is proposed. No cost benefit analysis had been produced to justify the report to the cost benefit ratio of 1.37 or stage two of the Southwest transit way. If the cost of stage 2 is 407.8 million as reported then if that's the case the consultant says there must be benefits of \$559 million. What are those benefits? And who all will receive them? When? How has the City measured the benefits of, and I quote: "improved travel times, reduced delay, reduced pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, health benefits, increased tax base, etcetera. There are no figures on those and any other reports made public and whatever reports there are...the department refuses to make public. And if the cost benefit ratio is only .71 to widen the Pembina underpass by just one lane in the northern direction, and including a bike path, which then will require the demolition of the CN main line rail bridge over Pembina Highway and the construction of a new CN rail bridge and a new transit way bridge over Pembina at a cost of 72.5 million, the consultant is saying that the benefits which someone, not sure who, someone will receive, will be worth only 51 million and if that's really so, why would we invest in that project. Does the City have other such projects in the works with a less than one cost benefit ratio? Think of the money we could save by not building them. Is there no economist in the employ of the City? Without providing any supporting traffic and ridership data...there is none, the City suggests that ridership on the completed Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor will increase by 12 to 15 percent and that travel times between downtown and the University of Manitoba will be improved by a total of nine to 16 minutes depending on the time of day and an estimated additional cost of more than \$1 billion and I wonder if it isn't time to publish the rider statistics for the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor so we can be realistic about this? This project has really been sold as a catalyst for transit oriented development, although the assumed benefits have not been quantified publicly. On July 13th, 2009, City

Council approved a land swap with Gem Equities whereby that company obtained 58.7 acres of unserviced City land north of Parker Avenue in exchange for 8.95 acres of serviced land in the Fort Rouge Yards required for stage one of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. To facilitate transit oriented development in Fort Rouge, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities has offered Gem Equities 15.7 million in financial assistance including 10 million in loans guaranteed by the City.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Sanders can you wrap up please.

David Sanders: Well, Council all has my complete presentation and I appreciate it's somewhat more than ten minutes but if I can sum up, nothing, nothing has been built yet because of the presence of stage one of the plan for stage two and at EPC, the Director of Transit actually defended the Parker lands route by stating that and I quote "development will occur there regardless of the corridor." If so, his secret cost benefit analysis cannot attribute the developers benefits to the construction of the \$1 billion boondoggle and its economic justification simply disappears. I recommend Mr. Innes's paper on LRT and request that this committee and City Council just say no to the administration's recommendations at this time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will take questions at this time Mr. Sanders. Are there any questions? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. My first question is related to the issue of the non-release of detailed reports and various analysis and stuff. My question is, do you...does the delegate understand that there could be some implications regarding the competitiveness in the ultimate bids that come down if the detailed information was released?

David Sanders: I understand if there is such information in those reports it would be important to redact it but to deny access to the whole report is to deny the whole process, the whole principle of Provincial legislation and to keep everyone in the dark and I don't accept that. And I don't accept really the original principle because I'll be surprised if there is anything in those reports which would in any way materially affect the ability of the City to make the best arrangements in an open bidding process.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Eadie: I heard my name mentioned in regard to a vote on a motion to amend the report that's before us today. Does the delegate know something I don't know? As far as I know there is no motion to amend these reports at this point.

David Sanders: Councillor Eadie to the Chair, no I was only referring...your name with respect to those who I'm not sure how you intend to vote today. The reference to amendments are the amendments that Councillor Orlikow proposed at EPC, a copy of which is in my material here and the amendments he proposed relate to retaining control by Council over final decisions on all these matters.

Madam Speaker: Anything further Councillor Eadie? Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Smith.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, you've indicated that you are in favour of Rapid Transit to the University of Manitoba and as far as I can tell...well you are using terms like billion dollars boondoggle but as far as I can tell you are in favour of a Light Rail option. A: do you know what that would cost because I heard that it's at least close to 300 percent more for Light Rail as opposed to BRT according to our study. What's the alignment you would favour and what's the cost benefit associated with LRT?

David Sanders: I would favour, based on what I have seen so far, the Letellier route alignment, the direct alignment, which has always been the recommendation for some 40-50 years and makes most sense. Do I have the costing for the LRT? I don't. I presume you are not relying upon the 2005 Rapid Transit Task Force data which appears to be the only published material at all at City Hall.

Madam Speaker: Anything further Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: Yes, I'm relying on the Winnipeg Transit Master Plan which is publicly available and is I believe is from 2011 and provides benefit...well, provides a number for the LRT so I am not relying on the 2005 number. Mr. Innes's report includes, quote...I need better glasses here. Quote from the Toronto Transit Commission's Director of Planning said in the September 18, 1969 Globe and Mail that "transit experts are starting to wonder whether the conversion to buses by most American public transit bodies was a good idea after all" and he said "today our Civic

administrators wishes to further perpetuate these disadvantages by pursuing a so called Bus Rapid Transit System" Now, Mr. Innes has been a harsh critic of us for relying irrelevant data, so I'm left with a 1969 quote from the TTC and you are aware they are still using buses and never went to a Bus Rapid Transit system in Toronto. They are continuing 45 years later continuing to use a bus, streetcar and subway network.

David Sanders: And street cars as well.

Councillor Mayes: My question is are you aware that they continue to use street cars and the buses have never been taken off the road.

David Sanders: In Toronto, no, I understand that.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: David, I can understand your frustration in not getting any answers when you ask questions of the administration. And you are concerned about not having a cost benefit study. I think they are valid. But, delay is going to increase the cost. Are you not concerned about the...us embarking on something and not completing it and then dragging on and on with increased costs?

David Sanders: No. I guess what makes me probably most angry about this is that I see us messing up this opportunity right now to do this properly. But better to wait a little longer and do it properly. It's not as if the Federal or Provincial governments are going away and better to wait a little longer and do it properly and do the right thing rather than spend a whole lot of money on the wrong thing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Yes, Mr. Sanders thanks for your presentation. Your terminology of the billion dollars boondoggle that you raised about the BRT, the second phase of it. With the financing model that's before us, we know it's a P3. Do you think there is, is there any irony in the fact that a lot of the people that are supporting this project and have been a big proponent of this project are supporting this, yet the financing model is something they have haven't supported for years and years in terms of a P3 fund. So what is your opinion on that?

David Sanders: Can you repeat that? I didn't hear your question.

Councillor Fielding: I said, the financing model to make this project work, the billion dollar boondoggle you mentioned, is a P3. We know there has been a number of my colleagues who haven't supported P3s for a number of years, whether it is a partisan issue or not, I don't know. Do you feel there is irony in the fact that to make this deal happen that they have to embrace the P3 model to make this boondoggle happen, the billion dollar boondoggle?

David Sanders: I'm not sure if it's irony. I think it is...I am unhappy with the fact that the Federal government will only approve the \$140 million if the municipality uses the P3 method. I don't think that's appropriate at all, okay. And secondly, if you will read...it's an excellent set of recommendations. Professor Loxley on P3s, he points out among other things that our Charleswood Bridge, we are paying 11 percent interest. That's as a result of the P3 financing arrangement there. There are no doubt, pluses and minuses to it and that is what the studies are supposed to demonstrate and those are the studies which the Transit Department will not release to you or to me or the general public. And I would like to see them and I would like to see assumptions that they make and they are not in these reports.

Madam Speaker: Anything further Councillor Fielding? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Mr. Sanders, I just want to follow up on the integration project. I believe that the attempts to make this conversation about LRT or BRT are well over and we need to be talking about the actual presentation in front of us. So for a Councillor you would assume for a Councillor to be able to make this very large, substantial decision. Just correct me if I'm wrong. We should be availed, at least Councillors should be, if there is a problem, the Councillors should be availed to all the data that supports the conclusion that is the administration have made. Is that correct?

David Sanders: Absolutely. Not the least of which the engineers will prepare a matrix for valuation of all transits and there are values built into those matrices and in the case of the original alignment for the Southwest Corridor, the first study, the engineers decided the thing of least value was the environment. I don't think this Council would agree with that. And one of the things that most important was public participation. And the public view was the Letellier line was

the preferred route but they ignored that. I think the Councillors should take the time and the energy to say to the professionals: "if you are professional you can explain it to me".

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Next we'll move on to hearing from Mr. Sanders again and Mr. Zach Fleischer if you can make your way down in opposition to the notice of motion moved by Councillor Browaty and seconded by Councillor Fielding regarding the plebiscite rail line relocation. Mr. Fleischer. This is the notice of motion. The plebiscite motion by Councillor Browaty. You have ten minutes sir.

David Sanders: Madam Speaker, I am appearing this morning again as a private citizen to speak very briefly and in opposition to the attached motion on your agenda, moved by Councillor Browaty and seconded by Councillor Fielding. Yes, we have failed to keep up with the need to repair, replace and extend our regional streets, bridges and underpasses, our public transit and our new active transportation systems. Proper signage for the new active transportation systems would be a good idea. Ideally we would ensure most inter urban trips could be completed in less than 30 minutes in a safe, economic and environmentally responsible manner. Winnipeg has now grown too large to be able to achieve the maximum 20 minute trip time sought 40 years ago but we should still be smart enough to maintain a compact and well-connected community which is easily accessible by all citizens and yes it's time for a serious review of the previously identified opportunities for relocating or removing railway lines and yards within the city to reduce the need to build more and bigger grade separations, like under discussion today, to obtain rights-of-way for public transit and active transportation routes, to free up lands for infill development and to reduce the risk posed by the transportation of increasingly amounts of hazardous goods through populated areas. Last month Council had already agreed the City should establish a high level working group made up of railroad leaders, other transportation stakeholders and regulators, Federal and Provincial representatives and City representatives to work toward a high level understanding of the costs and benefits of railroad rationalization for all parties and yes, as I have already argued, Council should not approve the recommendations before you today to give the Civic administration complete authority to proceed with the proposed \$1 billion Southwest Rapid Transitway without any further meaningful oversight by City Council. However I am absolutely opposed to this proposal to hold a non-binding plebiscite or referendum on the project during the Civic election in October. This project is much too complicated and involves so many issues and options that it cannot be reduced to a simple yes or no answer. And who decides what the question is? If the vote were binding on the new Council, it would represent the complete abdication of Council's authority and responsibility for governing this City and if it were not binding, why would anyone take it seriously? This fall, the newly elected Council will become responsible for hiring and supervising professionally competent and ethical senior administrators for expressing and upholding the values of the citizens of Winnipeg, as you all, of course, were elected to do. The Mayor and Councillors will bring a wide variety of experience and skills to City Hall, but most importantly they will all be uniquely qualified to express and uphold our community values by virtue of their election. I believe they will have plenty of time to revisit the Southwest Transitway project proposals and to bring forward a much more sensible plan for approval in 2015. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Fleischer. You have 5 minutes and then we will entertain questions.

Zach Fleischer: So at first, I would like to take a moment to thank Mr. Mayor Katz for his decade of service to the City. As it has been mentioned, anyone entering public service should be recognized for their efforts that they make for the betterment of all citizens. It may be known that while I do not agree personally with everything that he has put forward during his time in office, I do applaud his recent efforts relating to transit advocacy, in particular his leadership on moving Rapid Transit forward and the post-secondary student bus pass. Council will be voting today on whether or not we plan to have a referendum on the future of Rapid Transit in this city. The long term plans released by both Winnipeg Transit and the Our Winnipeg Plan state that there are 5 Rapid Transit routes from all areas of the city meeting in the downtown. Beyond the obvious environmental benefits, the positive effects of transit oriented development and the reduction of travel times, the proposed system, when completed, also stands to revitalize our downtown as a major destination for business and entertainment. The engineers and visionaries behind this plan should be praised. Finally, Winnipeg has the potential for a transit system that would make us the envy of other cities, like Calgary or Edmonton, rather than the opposite being the case. However, at this time we have completed half of the leg of Rapid Transit, amounting to one tenth of the final system. Due to delays in construction and the completion of the first leg, which only serves one segment of the city, can you blame citizens for feeling frustrated with this consistently stalled process? Four years has been a long time and I have to stand with that frustration. Governments of all kinds and stripes are often entrusted to make difficult decisions on behalf of the citizens that they represent. In the 1960s, Progressive Conservative Premier Duff Roblin was faced with some difficult decisions. In the wake of the 1950 flood, it was becoming increasingly obvious that something had to be done to prevent future damage from occurring. Roblin moved two measures forward. First, he introduced a Provincial sales tax and secondly, he moved to create and build the Red River Floodway, which is now known affectionately as "Duff's Ditch". Neither of these measures were especially popular among the general citizenry or his caucus itself, but he moved forward and I'm sure all members of this Council as well as all citizens of the province are incredibly thankful for these moves. It is incredibly likely that these would have been voted down if they had been put to referendum because they would have cost money in the short-term. All members of this Council have been

elected by constituents to work in the best interests of the City of Winnipeg. With this in mind I have to register my respect for each and every one of you who are here to do this. I ask you to do what you have been elected to do and show leadership on this issue. Council is starting...are starting to sound like a broken record. Last time I was here we talked about how we have been discussing this since the 1970s so maybe it's appropriate to use that term, a broken record because we keep on spinning on repeat and coming back to this issue. A referendum only seeks to undermine the democratic power invested in City Councillors by the citizens of Winnipeg and the decisions that you have all been a part of in the past by bringing this up again, you are making it a...or you're showing disrespect to the process, the hard work, the debate that's gone through and the votes of your fellow Councillors. In the next 20 years Winnipeg will grow at rates not seen since the early 20th century. We are now a destination for new immigrants, business, arts and culture. And more specifically, the Human Rights Museum, the Stadium and hopefully, a good hockey team will stand to garner this city the international recognition it has earned and deserves. It is often said despairingly, that these improvements and strides forward are made in spite of City Hall, not because of it. My only hope is that this incarnation of shitty...of City Council...a Freudian slip there. My only hope is that this incarnation of City Council can show the leadership on transit issues to truly begin to make this a world class city that our citizens deserve. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Are there any questions for Mr. Sanders or Mr. Fleischer? Hearing none, you may return to the gallery and we now have Ms. Marianne Cerilli, if she can come forward, in support of item eight of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property & Development, dated June 14th regarding the Sherbrook Pool repair project. Welcome. You have ten minutes.

Marianne Cerilli: Thank you and thank you Councillors. I am here once again to talk about the Sherbrook Pool. I want to start off by saying thank you for the leadership and the support that you have shown for the Pool. We had a party a couple of Saturdays ago. Unfortunately Councillors weren't able to attend, but I did want to let you know that we have a plaque we would like to have installed in the Pool before it's opened, to recognize this sort of milestone that we have come through in terms of securing of funds and ensuring the Pool is going to be repaired and reopened, hopefully, by the end of 2015 or the beginning of 2016 at the latest; and our party got rained out anyway, so you didn't miss too much other than...we wanted to recognize also the Kinsmen Club of Winnipeg and the Provincial government for their contribution and willingness to work with the community. Besides coming to say thank you, I also wanted to talk about plans and work underway around the programming for the pool as well as further efforts on the building itself so the period of time that the building...the pool is closed, the Friends of Sherbrook Pool have a building committee and ironically when the pool was closed we had just struck the building committee to look at improving amenities at the pool and we're now back at that point because we know there are other things that need to be done at the pool. The pool really needs to have an elevator. The pool really needs some other upgrading. I think there is better ways to use the space around the pool. The pool is incredibly inefficient in terms of energy use. So these are some of the things we want to look at and we want to make sure that the City will...and we're confident in this actually, that we've got relationships with the administration and we'll ask the technical questions of them but what I wanted to put forward to Council is working together with the community to continue to look at improving amenities and we're prepared to run a capital campaign to develop the funds and the options and the support for what the community would like to see to augment the repairs being done now. So I wanted to just say that you know, you will be hearing more about Sherbrook Pool and we would appreciate the ongoing co-operation of staff with municipal accommodations and property and development in order to work with us and consult with the community. I'm pleased that additional improvements will be made in this round of repairs on the change rooms and that's one of the things that the community has as a priority. But, there are other things that we need to look at together. Similarly, on the programming side, I was pleased to get the report from Probe and to see that it really did reflect the concern about Sherbrook Pool that was expressed during their consultations on the recreational needs in the Daniel Mac Ward and I want to say though that...and maybe this is one of the questions I can bring today, is that we were really mystified as why the consultations at that time chose to focus on the Daniel Mac Ward and the recreational needs of the ward rather than on what the community wanted to see in terms of Sherbrook Pool because now I really feel like we are going to have to go back in order to look at the amenities that we can develop at the pool and have some further consultations. So the report has been helpful in making it evident that the pool is the priority for the community. However, it didn't go into the detail I think that we need to, in terms of looking at what the options are and what we can do with that asset in terms of what the community would like to see at the pool. And like I said earlier, I think there is a better use of the space that we want to explore. So the facility itself and the programming design go hand-in-hand because in order to develop the kind of amenities we want there, we have to know what the community would like to do in the pool. So, we are pleased to be working with the Aquatics Department on developing a new collaborative programming model for the pool and when the pool opens our goal is that there will be a program to fully use the pool, all the hours that it's open with a diverse group of users and people from the community that...and we think that this new collaborative programming model could be something that the City looks at for other facilities as well. Because what happened now at the Sherbrook Pool in the past is it was fully utilized from the end of school hours on to when it closed. But during the day it was under-utilized and I think that goes for a number of other City of Winnipeg recreation facilities. So what we're proposing is rather than have the City do its programming and figure out how its going to use that facility, the pool, that we work with community organizations to do the planning for

programming together. And I think this will help make sure the pool is used a hundred percent of the time and that's our goal, is that the pool is used one hundred percent of the time. And I think this model has probably been tried in other jurisdictions but it's a way of ensuring that A: the community's needs are reflected in the programming and B: that we increase the participation of Winnipeggers in active living and in programming and we make sure that we are maximizing the use of the facilities with the kind of groups that are working in the community, alongside the City to encourage Winnipeggers to be active. So those are the only things I wanted to bring to you and to just close by saying that we want to be able to work with City staff and I have more questions about, based on the report that's part of the agenda today about what's happening with the roof and the tank of the pool, but we will be able to get into that kind of technical thing with the administration. But, I would like to sort of get a sense from Council, if someone wanted to respond, about this idea of having a collaborative approach with community organizations to develop programming for recreational facilities. Because I really think it's the answer, as well, of increasing use of facilities and that will help revenue by increasing the number of people using the facilities, rather than just increasing the fees, and it will mean that more people are participating in programming. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Any questions? -- Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you for the presentation. Just very briefly, the...I think there is tremendous community city-wide support for expanding the programming as you say. The only thing my mother ever lobbied me on was Sherbrook Pool, saying it is an important community asset, keep that open. But the...one of the community players there is the U. of Winnipeg, which doesn't have its own pool and I'm wondering if there is any conversation going on with the U. of Winnipeg? I know it's not exactly the pool they would want. I'm sure it's not an eight lane competitive facility but is there any community consultation going on with the U of Winnipeg?

Marianne Cerilli: I'm glad you asked that Councillor Mayes, because the answer is yes. We have been in conversation with the University of Winnipeg Student Association and I think they would be considered a new Friend of the Pool. And they are interested in actually holding a referendum on an increase of student fees in order to allow students to have access to the pool. The other option is that they become part of this collaborative committee that would look at booking some time for University of Winnipeg student activities. But then they would also be able to use the pool as any other pool user, beyond that. So yes, we are in conversation with the Student Association in particular from the University of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Thank you. Next we'll call back Mr. David Sanders in support of the following items. Item eight of the report of the EPC dated June 11, 2014 regarding the open government initiative and improvements to the Freedom of Information Protection of Privacy Act processes. Mr. Sanders you are also speaking in opposition to four other items after that? Shall we maybe go through them now and you can get your paper work ready?

David Sanders: I can go to the first one.

Madam Speaker: Yes, just go one at a time that might be easier. Are you ready Mr. Sanders?

David Sanders: Could I have one back please?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk. Could you give Mr. Sanders one copy back?

David Sanders: Thank you. Thank you Madam Speaker. This is in regard to the motion or recommendation of EPC for the open government initiative improvements to the Freedom of Information Protection of Privacy Act process. Appearing again as a private citizen to speak in support of the recommendations on your agenda. I'm in favour of improving the City's FIPPA process. I do wonder with the timing of this proposal. The City commissioned Duboff Edwards, the law firm to prepare the attached report of the City of Winnipeg FIPPA working group regarding the audit report of the Manitoba Ombudsman which had been published in February of 2012. The commissioned report was received on February 19th of 2013 and I wonder why a City which is really committed to an open government would not release the commissioned report until now, more than a year later. The Edwards working group had expressed the hope that its report would have been considered by EPC within three months, by the end of May of last year. The term "open government initiative" appearing in the administrative report is a new one at this City Hall for a template for a local government, open government directive based on President Barack Obama's 2009 US open government directive and there is a reference on the internet to that information and yes the City has created an open data portal on its web site for neighbourhoods of Winnipeg now. But this is just a very small step towards the achievement of a truly open government. Following the recommendations of the Edwards working group, the administration is now recommending creation of a centralized FIPPA office, except for investigative inquiries of the Winnipeg Police Service, the posting of all requests on the web site, the addition of two new FIPPA staff members and an annualized cost of about \$200,000 instead of the four staff recommended by Edwards and centralized responsibility for FIPPA to be assigned to the Chief

Administrative Officer. I would add that given a large increase in FIPPA requests the City should follow Edward's recommendation and authorize the hiring of four dedicated FIPPA staff now, otherwise the more centralized procedure may become a bottle neck, further constraining the responsiveness of the City instead of improving it. I would suggest that answers to FIPPA requests should also be posted on the City's website and in addition it would be extremely helpful if the CAO and FIPPA staff would provide advice to City staff which would enable them to respond positively and directly to citizen requests for most information without having to go through the access to information request procedures. So you understand how this looks to the citizens outside of City Hall, I am attaching a number of documents...

Madam Speaker: Mr. Sanders the next page and a half is not relevant to this topic so we will move on now to item number five, report of the EPC dated June 11. You are in opposition to that item regarding Mayoral appointments and composition of EPC committee. Would you get your paper work out for that, please.

David Sanders: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I considered that the practice under FIPPA was relevant.

Madam Speaker: Item number five regarding Mayoral appointments and composition of EPC committee. If you give me a moment I would like to look through the document first. Thank you. Mr. Sanders do you have other documents for the items you are discussing afterwards.

David Sanders: Sorry?

Madam Speaker: Can you give me the rest of your paper work as well? Your submissions? It might move things along quicker. All right Mr. Sanders, the next item is item five. You are in opposition to the Mayoral appointments and composition of EPC committee.

David Sanders: Very quickly this is in regard to the motion proposed by the Mayor and Councillor Steen affecting the appointment of three members of the Executive Policy Committee by Council rather than by the Mayor. And my comments are as follows: The next Organizational Meeting of the newly elected City Council will be Tuesday, November 4. Probably before the Manitoba Legislature is even back in session. During the past five years the earliest re-opening of the legislation in the fall was October 20th so there are not going to be any amendments so the City of Winnipeg Charter Act before City Council establishes new committee memberships after the October 22nd election. Secondly, if the new Mayor wants three or even more members of the Executive Policy Committee to be selected by a majority of the new Council, there is nothing in the present Charter which would prevent the Mayor from simply asking Council to recommend the appointment of the desired number of EPC members. In fact the membership of EPC could be changed in that way today. However, if Council wants to suggest a significant change in the dynamics of political decision making at City Hall then I would suggest the Governance Committee should be given the time and resources to undertake a review of the evolution of our Civic government and to prepare options for major improvement. The municipal manual which is published by the City Clerk's Office does provide a good summary of where we've come from. Forty-two years ago, the local government included the Metropolitan Council of Greater Winnipeg plus 12 different cities and towns and over 100 elected Mayors, Reeves and Councillors. The Provincial Government established the unified City of Winnipeg in 1972 with a Mayor elected at large, a Council of 50 elected for three years terms. In 1977, Province reduced the size of Council to 29 and reduced the number of community committees from 12 to 6 and in '89 the power of the Mayor was strengthened with the right to appoint the Deputy Mayor, Acting Deputy Mayor and the chairs of Council committees and in '92 the Council was reduced to 15 plus the Mayor and the number of community committees was reduced to five and in '97 the electoral terms were increased to four years and the most important administrative change occurred then when the City's Board of Commissioners was replaced with a Chief Administrative Officer model and in 2002 the City of Winnipeg Act was replaced by the City of Winnipeg Charter Act. In my view the City political decision making model has been confusing from the beginning. The Province had intended to create a parliament form of Government in 1971 with the Mayor elected by and responsible to a majority of Council but in the end Mayor Steven Juba was able to persuade Premier Schreyer to allow the continued election of the Mayor by all citizens and thus we always have two competing electoral mandates at work: the popularly elected Mayor and a majority of the Councillors at any given moment. The business of Mayoral appointments and extra stipends/salaries can affect relationships on Council but in the end the majority of nine Councillors can and do make the major decisions of the City. And in this context, the Mayor of Winnipeg in the abstract really has no clothes but he or she is able to parade through the streets without any opposition as long as no little child points out the obvious. And this is a recipe in my view for political impotence, perpetual finger pointing and the frequent avoidance of responsibility and when you combine this political confusion and impotence with the delegation of almost unlimited power to a single person, a Chief Administrative Officer, no one should be surprised that matters have ended badly for all of us here. I therefore recommend that Council defeat the motion and refer it to the Governance Committee giving it the time and the resources to undertake the review of the evolution of our Civic government and prepare options for major improvement for consideration by the new Council. And it would be helpful if the Committee could review and approve the publication of its report at its next meeting on

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
June 25, 2014

September 11 so that candidates for election might express their views on the identified options before election date. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Sanders. Now moving on to item three, you're in opposition to the report of EPC dated June 18th, 2014, regarding consultant assignments for January 1 to December 31, 2013

David Sanders: Right. I wanted to speak briefly in opposition to certain aspects of the recommendation on your agenda, specifically EPC is recommending that the consultant assignment's report for January 1 to December 31, 2013, including appendices, just be received as information and no doubt that is what you will do. During 2013 the City spent about four and a half million dollars in operating funds on many different types of consultants and professional service providers and about 2 million in capital funds for new single source consultants retained without a public tendering process and more than 3 million of that total consulting expenses reported was committed to new single sources. As a one-time course designer and instructor for the Purchasing Management Association of Canada, I understand that there are often very good reasons for retaining qualified consultants and professionals without a public tendering process. However, it is essential that such assignments be transparent, especially in the public sector and that's why this annual report to City Council is mandatory. And last week I appeared before EPC and asked some questions about this 2013 consultant assignments report and since no one even attempted to answer my questions I find it necessary to repeat those questions here briefly at Council. First of all, the administrative standard states that this report is to be submitted to the Office of the Chief Financial Officers within 45 calendar days of the end of each year. If the departmental reports were submitted by February 14th, I wonder why the Chief Administrative Officer has taken another four months to forward this consolidated City report to EPC and Council? And I wonder whether KPMG, the City's current external auditor does audit this annual report to ensure that all of the consulting contracts which are appropriately reported here have in fact been properly authorized and reported pursuant to Council policies. Now in the appendices, Ernst & Young is reported to have been paid \$211,000 by December 31 of last year for the comprehensive five year real estate management audit ordered by Council in September of 2012 and awarded to Ernst & Young for 240,000 on December 20th of 2012, a year and a half ago. On April 17th, I requested that the City Clerk place that matter on the agenda for EPC and Council, but apparently the Mayor's Office decides what goes on the agenda and his Office has so far failed to respond to my request. When will that audit report be published? Ernst & Young had also been paid 246,000 by the end of last year for the fire paramedic station construction project audit...

Madam Speaker: Mr. Sanders, this is not relevant to the topic again. Thank you. We will move on to the next item.

David Sanders: ...You are suggesting that the report and contents of the report is not relevant?

Madam Speaker: Yes, I am.

David Sanders: Okay. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: We are now moving on to the notice of motion moved by Councillor Havixbeck and seconded by Councillor Smith regarding Committees of Council /disbandment of Committees.

David Sanders: Thank you Madam Speaker. I would like to speak in opposition to the motion which you have before you and basically involves a number of changes with regards to Council Committee structure and the roles of Chairs and EPC and salaries and so on. This motion does not require any legislative amendments. It suggests an overhaul of the Organization Bylaw 7100/97 and changing the composition and functions of the Standing Policy Committees, increasing the frequency of Council meetings and slowly eliminating the Community Committees now established pursuant to clause 15/2 of the by-law. It also suggests some changes to the Elected Officials Compensation By-law which presently provides some \$22,000 in additional stipend for the members of EPC and includes up to six months' severance pay for members of Council who are defeated or do not stand for re-election. Further to my earlier comments on the Mayor's proposed motion about EPC membership I would also recommend that Council defeat this motion or refer it to the Governance Committee, giving that Committee again the time and resources to review our Civic government and prepare options for major improvement for consideration by the new Council and again it would be helpful if they would report by September 11. I should add that the governance review should pay particular attention to the manner in which the Mayor and Councillors interact with, and provide direction to, the senior administrators of the City. It's been my observation during the past year and a half; many Councillors have little knowledge of what the administration is doing and even less control over what is being done. And from that perspective the proposed motion is rather like rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. On the one hand I suppose we should all be thankful that the City government works as well as it does and I do think that the vast majority of our employees are working very hard to provide an excellent quality of life for Winnipeggers. Much has been achieved day in and day out, but our capacity to do great things is matched by an equal capacity to make great mistakes such as in my opinion, the proposed \$1 billion Southwest Transitway boondoggle on today's agenda. We need to ask how this has been allowed to reach this stage. I would add

that I personally oppose the elimination of the Community Committees which really ought to be reemphasized as a means for outreach for informing and empowering citizens to participate in Civic affairs and the care and maintenance of local plants and services. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Last item. You are in opposition to item one of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management dated June 5th, regarding the establishment of the Live Downtown Rental Development Grant Program

David Sanders: Thank you Madam Speaker, with regard to the proposed Live Downtown Rental Development Grant Program again speaking in opposition to it, I do...did object to the placing of what is a complicated and hopefully significant program proposal on the agenda of the Downtown Policy Committee, with less than required 96 hours' notice. I would have preferred that the Committee hear a presentation from City staff and CentreVenture, discussed the merits of the program and then laid the matter over for further public input. At the very least there are flaws in the program which should be corrected and I do understand that Deputy Mayor Swandel and Councillor Browaty voted against the proposal as presented, but that the other four members of the committee that is EPC voted in favour of the recommendations without amendment and perhaps there will be some amendments here today. I still have a number of questions and comments and perhaps you all have them from before but they are before you in writing and...by the way of conclusion without taking more time because I appreciate the amount of time I have taken this morning I do think we should keep in mind that this proposed program for 900 units in 2014 and 2015 which is few as ten percent, or 90 units, would cost the City and the Winnipeg School Division about 1.4 million per year for 20 years or about \$28 million. I wonder if anyone can explain how this program will help implement the City's newly adopted housing policy? It would appear that the proposed 900 units downtown would exhaust all the City resources intended to increase the number of rental units throughout the city by the more than 750 units which was mentioned in the implementation plan recently adopted by Council, but very few will be affordable. This rather reminds me of the time when multiple unit residential building tax shelters and accelerated capital cost allowances produced more public subsidy per unit for market rental developments than was being provided for social public housing until an embarrassed Federal government eliminated that scheme in 1981. In the absence of any comprehensive financial analysis I would guess that the combination of the Province's 8 percent Rental Housing Construction Tax Credit, the City Rental Development Grant and the Provincial Community Revitalization Grant would produce a subsidy of more than 50 thousand dollars for each rental unit costing \$150,000 and up to 90 percent of those subsidized units will be unaffordable. And that's if the program works at all. I believe this proposed long term tax write off program needs much more work before Council should be asked to approve it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Sanders? Okay seeing none you may return to the gallery. Thank you. We'll now move on to Committee reports. First we have EPC; Mr. Mayor on the report of EPC dated June 11.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 11, 2014**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda items one to six.

Madam Speaker: Number one. Okay I'll call the question on items two to six. Five and six. Councillor Smith? Okay I'll call the question on items two, three and four. All those in favour? Contrary, carried.

Item 1 – Land Dedication Reserve - L'Arche Winnipeg Incorporated

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I understand this is for access ramps for homes, but I would love to hear what I believe is why Councillor Wyatt stood it down and I will respond, if necessary.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Madam Speaker. I stood it down because this is just to bring to highlight this organization. This is an organization which is known but also not known of in the City of Winnipeg. It's an international organization which is actually based in my ward for Winnipeg called L'Arche Canada, or L'Arche Winnipeg and is part of a larger organization of L'Arche Canada and their role and responsibility is to provide housing, homes to people with developmental disabilities. They have been doing it for decades and it was started by Jean Vanier, a former Governor General of Canada. And it is something which has spread literally around the world in the past; you know a hundred

years ago these folks were sometimes locked into attics and forgotten about, ignored and there was a need to integrate them into our society as much as possible and to give them meaningful work. The L'Arche Tova Cafe which recently opened in downtown Transcona, thanks to the generous support of Larry & Tova Vickar, is an example of giving meaningful employment to folks with developmental disabilities. And so the work they do in the community is tremendous. They are an organization that really has reached out to the entire community, entire city and every year they do a walk with L'Arche which is growing by hundreds every year and getting larger and larger to raise funds for their organization and they are...have a number of properties throughout the city. Most of them are in my ward but there are some in other parts of the city. This is to install wheelchair ramps; to assist those with more severe developmental disabilities to enter the home. They received a grant from the Federal government and I believe the Province as well. This is to cover the balance in terms of that one property. In my ward I know they are still looking for funding. I think it's in St. Vital and St. Boniface Wards so there may be something coming forward to those respective areas but it's a tremendous organization and I just stood it down to highlight it and one of the biggest fundraisers in terms of the walk this year was a former MLA of the Manitoba Legislature, Gerard Lecuyer, who has made this his passion to help them raise money and we have some outstanding members on the Board of Directors who have done many things in their lives and they do terrific work, so I'm happy to be supporting this here today. This is a small grant but it makes a difference. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to close if you wish.

Mayor Katz: I'll briefly thank Councillor Wyatt for those who weren't totally aware of what L'Arche did. I think Councillor Wyatt did an eloquent job in enlightening everybody, they do do wonderful work and are a great organization. I thank him for those comments

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of Item 1? Opposed? Carried. Item 5.

Item 5 - Mayoral Appointments and Composition of Executive Policy Committee

Mayor Katz: Thank you Madam Speaker, as you have heard, Madam Speaker, there are those who I believe think the way it is should stay that way and there are those who think it should be wiped out; there are those who find a balance between the two and that's what I think we have done here is make sure that the Mayor is able to basically select three members to EPC and then Council at large would select the other three. I think it certainly brings balance; there's no question about it. I think it's a positive step. These changes took place when Mayor Susan Thompson came into office and as you know, we've made other changes in the past along with in past we had an EPC Secretariat, Council voted I believe 15-1 to no longer have the EPC Secretariat and changes are always being made and there are reasons for it. I think this one has a great deal of merit.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck, I believe you stood this down?

Councillor Havixbeck: Councillor Smith stood it down, so I'm not sure who you want to go first.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Smith

Councillor Smith: Madam Chair. First of all, I think this is a sham. It looks good, but really, the Mayor has more than one vote on this Council. For example Thomas Steen has voted with him every single time and let me tell you, there are other members of Council that... so he has more than one vote... so really it doesn't make any difference. He will decide who gets elected. I'm telling you the way it is.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Smith, are you done?

Councillor Smith: I'm saying to you that the Mayor has more than one vote already at this Council and therefore he determines who the three will be.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I am not supportive of this. I think that this is just something...I'm not even sure what the impetus was for doing this. We did something similar to this in the process of the CAO recruitment in electing two people that were non-EPC members to represent us. This still creates two groups. It creates those Councillors who are in the know, who drive the policy changes and I have seen it having been on the inside and having been on the outside of it. And then it also creates the tier two Councillors who have no idea of what's coming ahead. You are on the outside, always looking in. Council seminars become irrelevant. They become a "tell" scenario. We'll "tell" you what we're bringing forward. There is minimal opportunity to shape the policy. Every member

around this Council Chamber was elected to represent their citizens equally not as a tier one or a tier two Councillor and not to be on the in or not to be on the out, but to represent their citizens fairly. Not to push the agenda for their wards as I have often seen happen. I think that this model or the notion of bringing some change to this model is important. I have a notice of motion coming up later that we will also debate. I think that it's necessary that we relook at this. I brought this initiative forward to EPC at the February 14, 2013 meeting where I had done an analysis of other jurisdictions and what they were doing. We are the last Canadian city to have such a structure. Calgary, for example, rotates its members. The Mayor doesn't select those members who are chairs of committee. Everyone selects them and it's a meaningful vote. Right now what you have is a Mayor who selects and we vote on it and we really have no say in that. Edmonton, for example, same system. Membership rotates among Councillors and each Councillor, except for the Mayor, serves for a total of one year on each committee. You know, I would argue that this and the notice of motion should go back to Governance and we should start with a fresh, clean slate after the election perhaps, with something that is more progressive and more representative of where our City should be. Thank you.

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

Councillor Fielding: I'm going to be supporting the Mayor's proposal and actually truth be had, I would actually be one that would keep the existing system and the reason why is I generally support the strong Mayor model. It makes a lot of sense in a whole bunch of ways and thinking back I know the Mayor announced his retirement and I will be leaving Council as well, and I think I probably have served on EPC second longest behind Councillor Swandel who has served the longest and I can tell...I wasn't going to speak but right off the bat I was on Executive Policy Committee for six years and what did I vote against, while Executive Policy supported? I voted against BRT, the 1st phase of it and I voted...you had two Councillors actually, Councillor Russ Wyatt and also Councillor Pagtakhan at one point who voted initially against the capital budget in 2010 at EPC and I voted against photo radar. I voted against what I called the cat tax. I had fun with that of course. That's a part of it and Councillor Browaty voted against the garbage plan originally when it was brought out. So my point is Councillor Russ Wyatt, goodness gracious, at the end of the day voted against a number of different initiatives that were there and Councillor Vandal, the same thing, voted on a number of different initiatives and Councillor Swandel and whether this is about the current Mayor or not, I think there is ample opportunity to vote against things. There are certain things you probably aren't going to vote against, the Capital Operating Budget because you are working as a group to do that overall and I see the merits of a group decision making part of that but for the most part, I think that this Council...there have been opportunities whether you are serving on Executive Policy Committee or not to support projects or not to support projects and I was never penalized, I was never kicked off Executive Policy Committee for these types of things and rightly or wrongly over the last ten years since Sam has been the Mayor, there has been a lot of opportunity. People disagree with him on an issue, then you can support it. So, the proposal, I think, is a fair one. I think it allows three members of Council to be picked and I think the Mayor... I think we should still give the Mayor, whether it's Sam Katz or whomever is the next Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, should have authority to be part of that I think that's a fair process and allows for some Council... whoever may be leading candidate in terms of the Mayor to be a part of it and I think that's a fair process going forward so I very much support it going forward and I think that the rest of Council should consider that as well. It's an important process in terms of the strong Mayor model. I think it gets things done at City Hall, that's what's important, so I will be supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Vandal and Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker, I was just going to make a point about the inter relation with the Police Board but after Councillor Fielding failed to mention my name anywhere in terms of people who have ever dissented from an EPC vote, I have to point out that Councillor Vandal and I both voted against the golf course contracting out proposal and Councillor Wyatt and I voted against the \$10,000 condo subsidy bribe as some termed it last year, but Councillor Fielding supported that, but maybe that's why he didn't mention it, but to speak well of Councillor Fielding who I think is doing a very fine job as Chair of the Police Board...my point on this...I'll support this motion, I think this will come down to Councillor Havixbeck has a different idea and she is putting that forward pretty vocally in her campaign and that's certainly her right to do so. We are going to have a new Mayor and I think this whole reorganization issue is one we should discuss as has been pointed out there is a Provincial role too here if there is legislative change. All sorts of different models can be looked at. I will say though that Councillor Fielding I think is doing an important job. He's Chair of the Police Board yet we have no vehicle here to ask questions about that. We have the odd situation where nobody on the Police Board is actually on...neither of the two Council appointees are actually members of EPC and I don't think we should allow that to happen in the future. This got reported as Mayes is concerned with how they appoint the chair of the Police Board and that's not quite right. My concern is not who is the chair of the Police Board but making sure there is a connection between EPC and one of the Councillors on the Police Board because I think frankly, that's become a very important committee here and we don't have that connection. So, whatever model gets decided on, I do think we should make sure we have a connection between the work that's being done and I hope no one takes that as any criticism. I think Councillor Fielding is doing a good job over there at the Police Board. We are having issues with

communication that we are working through but I think we have to recognize the importance of that committee which has emerged in the past couple of years.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Madam Chair, as a person who...a politician who ran for Mayor ten years ago, I liked Executive Committee and I think perhaps the current Mayor and myself were two of the only candidates who pledged to keep Executive Committee. The think the real issue is...I don't dislike this suggestion, this motion, but the real issue is that we don't have the authority as a City to actually do this ourselves. We have to go to the Province. We have to ask them to do it. And this likely will be filed with a whole bunch of other motions that we've brought forward. So, I like the Executive Committee. I think you need a strong Mayor model to move things forward like Rapid Transit. And I think...I'm not sure what the real problem is here. We know that two tiers of Councillors is a good talking point for people who like to criticize what goes on in government and at City Hall. I'm not convinced of that and I think Councillor Mayes and Councillor Fielding have offered many examples of where people have dissented and yet have not been kicked off and people have been removed for different reasons. So, I think if you are talking governance reform, rather than move a motion, bring it forward, try to get it done, I think the 1st thing the mover should do is call a meeting of Council. Go downstairs into the war room and talk about what the real issues are for governance reform. Governance reform is a very, very important initiative across all three levels and find out the real issues and actually come forward with a model that is comprehensive; that addresses the real issues and that makes some sense going forward into the future. I don't think this will really going to change the dynamic of the strong Mayor model when you really think about it. An EPC of seven, three appointed by the Mayor, three appointed by Council and of course the Mayor is on there...we still have a strong Mayor model and the Mayor will have a lot of influence and I'm not sure it's going to be a lot different from what we have now and in fact, it may even get the different factions on Council cemented in positions and may even be, should I say, the start of party politics at City Hall. I'm thinking out loud here, but I'm not sure what this is trying to solve. I like the strong Mayor model so as such, I am going to be voting to maintain what it is we have.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Steen and Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just start off by saying that it's really good I had the opportunity actually last night to talk to Alf Skowron, former City Councillor from Elmwood and he was telling me of me how people were elected as Chairpersons of various committees and actually elected onto committees, but at that time, of course, there was a lot more City Councillors. There was a lot stronger capability to actually lobby your position as to why you should be Chairperson and so on. So, you know, it's good to have a potential democracy to do things, but what I want to say is I think you know...and having been involved at the City level politics and not as elected but at different levels and seeing how Mayors choose to have their Executive Policy Committee members and how they do these things, I think that maybe...and I'm not sure but I know that this current Mayor has been criticized quite often for who he selected to be on his Executive Policy Committee, but ultimately, you know when you make these decisions, and for me, I was quite concerned that there was never really any City Councillor on Executive Policy Committee that really represented, for lack of a better term, the inner city. Although, I will point out that there...since I have been here there have been some people with some older neighbourhoods and areas that have certain issues that need to be dealt with. Councillor Fielding comes to mind in terms of having Brooklands and now Weston in his 2nd term as City Councillor. You know we have these areas and there is some representation there. So really, I think that what has been most critical and the reason I am actually not going to support this motion is that really, it's...you know, when you are the leader, you are the Mayor, you are making decisions, you decide if you want to have a number of women on the Executive Policy Committee or whatever reasons they are that you make decisions, you know, I knew that...actually, I'll give an example going back to Mayor Murray, when I thought he actually made a great decision. He chose Bill Clement to be on his Executive Policy Committee and I think that's very important because there was actually a City Councillor who had a vast experience in the financial areas with the City of Winnipeg and why wouldn't you invite him on? And I know our current Mayor reached out to people of different beliefs and had them on the Executive Policy Committee and not everybody always votes the same way and there are those issues but in terms of governance, I think really you can have a strong Mayor model so long as the Mayor, from my perspective, so long as the Mayor is also reaching out to the rest of City Council to try move forth their vision. The vision of where should Winnipeg be going. And deal with that. I know I appreciate...there has been quite a few more seminars, although seminars on specific issues I think are very important to have, it would be nice to have some sort of in advance of having to make a vote in a couple of weeks or a day or what have you, I think that would be very important to bring all of the City Councillors into the loop. We may or may not agree on what these issues are or how to proceed, but, and I have to say that I appreciate our current Mayor having...and I think it's through him that we do have more seminars and I learned more information. Think that's really important to be able to do that. The final comment I want to make is that what's happening right now through a budget consultation is a review not just of consulting with the public in general about what the budget should be, but consultation with how should the budget process work with City Councils and through committees and how does that work and I think that out of that consultation report are going to be some recommendations of how to proceed better with

budgets. For example, it could be that Protection and Community Services, everybody on that committee actually gets to work with the Administration that's directly related to that particular standing committee well in advance, just like the chairperson gets to, well not necessarily the chairperson but...to really get involved in that, and I think there is some really good changes that will be there in a report for any new Council and a new Mayor to decide to proceed with. And I think that that could also alleviate some of the big criticisms that have happened of our Mayor since I was involved in politics and that also involves Mayor Thompson who made decisions about who she was aligning herself with and trying to move forth the agenda that she believed needed to be done. Anyway, I will conclude and say that I won't be voting for this recommendation. I think there are a number of things that could be done that a new Council and a new Mayor can deal with. For us to really do this now I think is not necessarily needed. It does request the Province of Manitoba to change the Charter and change things and we all know, every...how many recommendations have been accepted from us since I was elected anyway, for me I don't see the urgency of passing this motion at this time. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Just really briefly because a lot of what I was going to say have been said, some of which by Ross. Really, this is coming forward at a less than ideal time to revamp the governance on a one-motion changing it. I don't think this particular change would be harmful. It probably would be a little bit positive in some ways and certainly. But to just ask the Province to amend the Charter for one aspect of the governance right now, right before the election, I mean it seems kind of unfair to the next Council, in a way. I really think the newly elected Council might want to do a serious governance review of a number of these factors, keeping in mind the budget process and other things as Ross mentioned that we are looking at; doing a better job with those things, so I mean, to me it's not the end of the world if this passes. I don't think it will go too far anyway or even if it does, it would be fine, but I think we should look at this in a broader way. So that's really all I wanted to say. I think we should have a comprehensive review of options from looking at different jurisdictions about what's happening there, what's happening in Winnipeg. I do not...I will speak briefly to Councillor Havixbeck's motion which I really oppose for many reasons for those types of suggestions to change things. This change would be relatively positive, but I still think it's the wrong way to go about it and that's my concern with the motion. It's in the 11th hour, so I think we should do this properly and have a proper governance review and do it in a more meaningful way. Thank you.

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

Councillor Steen: I just want to add there to Councillor Smith that I have yet to be on EPC and I'm also trying to figure out what the Councillors want here, like a Mayor with no voting right, is that what we are discussing? I thought this was a good way of making it a little more transparent but still the Mayor is the leader and that's what we are voting for in the election. That's all I want to add. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, you're the last speaker.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I guess I have heard many speeches in this chamber about the powers of EPC and how strong EPC is and you know need it for more inclusiveness, more team work. I think I was one of those people who made some of those speeches, when I look back on it now. And you know, first of all, party politics doesn't exist in City Hall? Yes it does. We know it's under the surface, under the current that's there, number one so let's be blunt and frank about that. Number two, this Mayor is full of surprises. I was actually quite surprised to see this motion moved a month ago and come forward as a recommendation. You know, I think it's a breath of fresh air. Can you imagine if the Provincial Cabinet, if the floor of the House of the Legislature was allowed to vote on who half a Cabinet would be? Can you imagine the change and the style change and how positive that would be probably in terms of public policy development and openness and ideas? Can you imagine on the floor of the House of Commons, if the Prime Minister said half of cabinet going to be selected by the floor of the House of Commons. No different than they select the Speaker today through a democratic vote. It would change everything. I think there is definitely in this country a strong...for whatever reason and more so in Canada than other western democracies, a strong adhesion to the executive branch. And I think that's causing challenges at every level of government in terms of public policy and issues that are arising. I think we have seen that here. I think no matter who the Mayor is, I think there is a greater need for checks and balances and I think this is a step in the right direction. Is it everything? No but I think it's a genuine effort. I think it's a legitimate effort and I think the reality is today we have a stronger model where the Mayor, all good things that the Mayor can do, the Mayor can do. Whoever the Mayor is and if they want to bring that forward, at the same time all the challenges, problems and all the real challenges that come forward, go to the Mayor's desk and I think that is part of the challenge as well because I think those challenges should be shared and the responsibility should be shared and the need to face those challenges together. So I think this is a welcome change in terms of our organization. One of the greatest challenges we have as a Council and I have spoken about this, I know other Councillors have spoken passionately about this; we tried to do it two or three years ago and it didn't come really come out and get on to the floor but we tried to make a strategic plan. We are one of the few Councils of a City in Canada not to have a strategic plan written

together as all of Council, and because really out of your budget, your budget priorities would really, and should flow from your strategic plan. What are your priorities in terms of what the public service should be working on a daily basis? They should be referring back to the strategic plan set by Council. We don't have one. We need a strategic...I'm hopeful the next Council will make it a top priority to do that and it's not easy writing a strategic plan is extremely... you know you got to basically get everybody in the room and you got to have, there has to be compromise, strong discussions, giving up evenings, giving up weekends to make it happen, but you need that strategic plan to be able to perform and actually have a proper budget in my view, because the budget flows from that in most organizations large and small. So that's crucial and maybe this reform I think could help that process along the way because I think it does send the message of being more inclusive. I'm kind of surprised at folks who railed and said we should have more inclusivity and we should be more open are saying "well this is not really perfect"; there's nothing that's perfect, but you know, giving up almost half the authority in terms of direct deployment, turning it over the floor of Council that's huge. As I said, the Mayor is full of surprises and so I have to give him credit for bringing this forward and I think putting all differences aside, and you know what, whoever the next Mayor is, is the next Mayor. This will be an asset to the next Mayor. It will assist the next Mayor. When Mayor Katz was first elected, one of the first meetings I had with him, I recommended, I said give up half your hammer, give up half your power, turn over half to Council. At one time we had that before actually and we had a mixed model before. One time only one Councillor was elected from the floor of Council to EPC actually. I think the Councillor that got elected was Al Golden, but he was elected to EPC and you know, so you know, but still you know what, he was the kind of person who spoke his mind and that's what members of Council who were not part of EPC wanted, right? So I think it would be positive in that sense and I think Councillors should welcome this. Let's keep in mind that when Cuff came back with his report, George Cuff in the late 90s, his big report, really what he concentrated on in a huge way was the removal of the Board of Commissioners. There was huge restructuring in terms of the public service. That is his, what his report really consisted of. A lot of the other changes in terms of power of appointment and in terms of the power of the Mayor's Office to appoint, happened slowly in a period of time leading up to that. It was already there and it was really...Susan Thompson as the Mayor made the time request to the Province with the final changes and it was really Mayor Murray who had the benefit of all of that work over a decade starting with Norrie, Thompson, then himself. So I think this is a step in the right direction. I know it's not perfect to everybody, but it's better than what we have now. I would encourage members of Council to support this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker let me start by saying that any well run organization has a strong executive committee. When you look at the City of Winnipeg and the strong Mayor model, that's probably the reason why we have some of the lowest taxes in the country and some of the best levels of service in the country. We deliver some of the best levels of service at the lowest cost in the country. And that can't be argued. That's been proven over and over again by a variety of different methods. So what we are talking about here is an amendment that keeps the strong Mayor model going. If you want to have an Executive Policy Committee, you want to have a Mayor that comes forward with ideas and a vision for the City and then puts a committee together that will help drive those ideas forward after the public has spoken. I think Councillor Wyatt made some good points here that we do need a better planning and policy development process. Those strategic plans, an informed policy development and a policy development informs budgets and budgets with the strat plan and policies hit the road. This motion, it doesn't take any of that away. It creates a little more transparency. The opportunity for different influences to help get different voices on Executive Policy Committee. The Executive Policy Committee and the strong Mayor model in Winnipeg have been very effective. As much as we sit around and beat ourselves up an awful lot here, this Council in particular has done more in this City than any Council in its history whether on infrastructure, Rapid Transit, policing. You look at the top issues, infrastructure safety, the environment, we've done more than any other group of Councillors in the history of the City of Winnipeg and it's because of the strong Mayor model. Where we have lacked is we have done it a little bit haphazardly because we haven't had that solid strategic plan driven by a vision and that policy development piece that we need. And that's, that's really where we need reform is getting a stronger policy development body in place so we have a lot more detail when we are making decisions, whether it's members of Executive Policy Committee or Council in general. So I'll support this because it's a move to change and to see if that change gets a better system of the strong Mayor model. I hope it does. I think it can. None of us can predict the future except for Councillor Wyatt with his crystal ball, but I think this will be a positive for the City of Winnipeg. The Province will take a look at it as well. They are not going to do this willy nilly. They're going to try and understand what it means, but any strong Mayor should be able to have an Executive Policy Committee that they can work with. If you can't, as a strong Mayor and someone able to get themselves elected in this city whether there are three members elected by Council and three members appointed or whether it's all six members appointed by the Mayor, if you can't get your team in place you probably shouldn't have been running for office in the first place because you are running with your vision, with your idea for the City of Winnipeg and the Executive Policy Committee will drive that home for you, with you and as long as you do your planning, your proper planning, in line with that you should get a lot done for the City. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Pagtakhan

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. There has been a lot of discussion regarding the strong Mayor model and I think also that the strong Mayor model is a good model here for the City of Winnipeg. I want to thank Mayor Katz for the motion that we are considering here today. It's a motion that I'm prepared to support Madam Speaker, I think that, like what others have said, this is moving us into the right direction and allows Council the opportunity to discuss amongst themselves, to have representation in all Community Committees. I have always been critical if...I always believed it's very important for Executive Policy Committee to be comprised of members of all community committees Madam Speaker, so I think what this motion does is it allows the next Council to actually have that debate and for consideration for Councillors and for the Mayor to have representation in all community committees so I will be supporting this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Madam Speaker. For almost ten years now I have seen that, whether you are a Mayor or a Councillor, the media tries to pigeon hole you. Are you Liberal? Are you Conservative? Are you NDP? I think I made it very difficult for them to do that when it comes to me because I try to do what's right at that point in time and if you look at the makeup of EPC, two Liberals, two Conservatives, one NDP. And someone that none of us know what he really is, and yes, I'm referring to Councillor Wyatt. That's true independent. The realities are, you can see there is a very good mix. I remember when I first asked Councillor Dan Vandal, a proud member of the NDP to be on EPC. No, I'm talking about when I first asked him, proud member of the NDP. A lot of people were extremely surprised Mayor Katz would ask someone and Councillor Dan Vandal served the City and EPC exquisitely. Once again, I can say the same about Councillor Mayes. People were shocked and surprised but you know what, you want to have a mix because everybody here talks about inclusive. You want to be inclusive. And just recently when we were doing our search committee, we had the balance of Council recommend two members from Council to join us and that was Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Eadie. I hope someone asked them, do they feel that they were listened to when they were at the table?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, yes.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much. That's how we work here, contrary to what some people might say. I think it's unfortunate that Councillor Smith felt that the Mayor has more than one vote. I've always said Council is supreme, everybody has one vote. But I will remind him when the administration first made their report on Sherbrook Pool, all right, it was over. It was dead, all right. Yes, I worked hard to get members of EPC to support this based on the way it was put together and they did and I like to think that Councillor Smith who is the Councillor for the ward is appreciative of that and I know that the Friends of the Sherbrook Pool are as well. The realities are, each and every one of us has one vote, but I've seen situations, on this very floor, where people have said, "well, the Mayor controls all the votes and that's why our current Speaker is there". I think that was unfortunate and inappropriate when Councillor Orlikow actually said that. Council voted unanimously and a few days later I heard Councillor Havixbeck say "The Mayor has no control over EPC." The realities are that every member of EPC can tell you and show you when they voted on their own each and every time. There isn't one member of EPC who did not vote on something that the majority of EPC voted on. That's fine. Had no problem with it. I accepted it. Whether the vote was 4-2, 5-2, 4-3. Whatever it was it was. They all speak their own minds and that's why they are elected to represent their wards and hopefully, the entire City of Winnipeg. The facts here are this brings inclusiveness and to also says that the Mayor has to build consensus. What a better way of building consensus than having three members at large from Council come to EPC. Madam Speaker, there are some issues that I have championed and brought to Council. I don't think that I recall where one of them has not gone through because we build consensus. That's the way you have to do it and any member of this Council could have brought a motion to the floor. I notice no one brought a motion until I brought mine which I wanted to debate a long time ago, but I believe it was Councillor Wyatt who moved notice on it, so it didn't happen that way thank you very much, not, but the realities are Madam Speaker, I brought the motion forward, no one else did. Now there's all sorts of other things, but let me share one thing with you. If there is anybody on this floor of Council believes this City can move forward without having an EPC, you are sadly mistaken. We must have an EPC, just like every Board has an executive committee. That does not mean that every member does not have input and should have input and I can tell you, that if anybody has attended our Council seminars in the last little while they have been extremely valuable; they've been informative and everybody is gathering information so they can make an informed vote. This to me makes a lot of sense. I very much hope that Council will support this and I can tell you that I believe the Province will move forward. We have gone through the proper protocol. I think the Province will see this is good, this is democratic and we shouldn't have any problem with this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Call for a recorded vote. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Havixbeck and Councillor Smith.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 14, nays 2

Madam Speaker: The item is carried. Mr. Clerk Item 6.

Item 6 – Open Government Initiative – Improvements to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act process

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker, very briefly. Madam Speaker, we have been inundated with FIPPA requests. Our staff is overwhelmed. It can't be done. They are always asking for extensions. The whole concept of basically adding staff to basically meet those requirements means having to add money. We now have a report that shows how to do this. This is very positive. I don't recall who stood this down but I love to hear whatever they have to say and then I certainly would respond.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Madam Speaker, I stood this down. You know, this came forward over a year ago and it was amended somewhat. I don't see an adequate plan in this report for getting us from 867 FIPPA requests a year down to 12 which is about what a city like Regina can do. Surely we can be somewhere in the 12 to 30 range. I don't see a plan for how we are going to reduce this. What I see here is mention that there is FIPPA requests...the FIPPA requests are handled throughout the organization in various people's positions and yet it's a call for an additional \$101,000, two additional FTEs. Now, Madam Speaker, when I was on Executive Policy Committee that would have been before I was removed for voting against something, it was about 2012 when this came forward from the administration. And Executive Policy Committee at the time said how is this exploding? Why are we not looking at getting this down to a more comparable index to somewhere like Regina? And so here we are simply adding resources to a problem that is going to only grow and we are only going to see more requests on from what I can tell. I want citizens to be able to access information. People call our office because they can't get through to 311, for example. They call; they want know why they have no water or why they have brown water. Well, if the Department can immediately put that up and out, it would save a whole lot of requests for information from other areas of the city. You know, reporters often tell us how they put in requests for information and it takes months, it takes analyses, it takes releasing and there is a cost. And I would like to see that that information be much more readily available. So this report does have some small steps towards providing more information, but I just don't see how throwing more money and more positions at something is going to solve the true essence of the problem, and that is, what are these complaints? What are the requests and how are we tackling getting them down? Getting the numbers down? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. I wasn't going to actually speak to this because I think that this is actually a good initiative that has to be done. In 1994 I was heavily involved in access to information bylaw drafting here, I was put on a committee by Council and Councillor Fraser, to deal with access to various kinds of records. It's Provincial legislation. Under FIPPA, the way things are working today, I have to say there is a process that needs to be followed. There are a number of records identified in legislation that should be protected and then there is a whole bunch of different kinds of records and information that you know, could be subject to many different interpretations as to whether or not it's protected and so on. And right now, really, in that Provincial legislation there really is no mechanism to say to a City,

here is a criteria structure. If it's this, you know, there is really no reason for you to hold back this record and so on. I think what's really happened and in order for this City to deal with this, since I became City Councillor, I can tell you that the real problem and the rising request for freedom of information has been related to all of these controversies that come up and there is constantly a number of...actually, I'm very supportive of citizens of this city who do actually spend time to challenge and discuss and try to find out why the City is making these decisions, because they play a very important role, such as people like Nick Ternette and Mr. Sanders. The...but you know, if you are creating a storm, if you create a storm around issues and it becomes...you get protective. Really, I think that part of the problem is that we have all these controversies and people are constantly trusting...like I don't know why we need to see all the bills and receipts for various projects or whatever. Anyway, the whole point is that I'm trying to get at is that I'm in support of this report. The circumstances that we are dealing with here in Winnipeg really, our administration, this is a good way to go and we really need to support it. But what can happen though is as things move along, there can be a move to make...to give considerations as to what is relevant and what can be released. As a matter of fact, I just asked a question earlier today and it was pointed out, I think quite accurately, cost benefit analysis, what is the value for money and why can't we release that because...that's a very good point. But ultimately, this structure is needed in place and frankly, if we can get it down over time, we can always change what's being presented here with the central system. But ultimately what I am hearing is that the administration is having great difficulty with dealing with it and things haven't changed all that quickly. So, wholly in support of this.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I am also going to rise in support of the report even though I'm not sure exactly...it will do what it can do, but really for me what has to be addressed is the culture at City Hall where we decide quite clearly that there may be something in this report that we don't want released, so we are not releasing any of the report. We need to be sitting on Council and our default position should always be we need it release the information and then if there is a reason why specifically for a line here, or piece of information there, we can redact that. Now there may be some different redacting for Councillors versus the public and I can understand that as well, but presently the culture right now and I have faced it as well, is I say I'd like to see that report and I am advised to go make a FIPPA request. As a City Councillor, I am advised that if I want the report, I have to go make a FIPPA request as well. Again, I respect the administration, I respect that we don't want to get into any problems regarding tenders and all of that, however, I need that information and I think the public needs that information, including with today we'll be looking at the VMM, value for money analysis and also the business case analysis. We didn't have to give us the whole report but I would have really been...I really would have been interested in the table that had the inputs and the value of each input. Again, I was denied that access because of...P3 Canada doesn't want to hand out the information. Great for you P3 Canada. I am a Councillor who has to figure out do I support something and it's not just for Rapid Transit but for anything and so again for me, this is say good first step, however it's a culture that we need to do. We need to be...and I may be leaning a little more farther over than some on the releasing of all information, however, I feel the balance right now is far too over to isolating ourselves from the public and from the information. So, this is a great first step but again until we change the culture at City Hall, I say that the submissions are just only going to increase.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close, oh no? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. It's interesting to hear people talk about this and the need to do more. The fact that you are going to put a couple of extra positions in place creates the capacity to do more. That piece alone helps. It helps you develop more policy going forward to try to reduce the number of requests. The other thing that would greatly help and I think it was Councillor Orlikow mentioned the controversies. Many of those controversies are what I would call faux controversies. We tend to embellish for the sake of our own self-promotion. We create this need for people to access information by exaggerating stances and really going over the top and we participate in this demonization of individuals whether they are within the organization or other politicians to try and create this appearance of impropriety which drives people to FIPPA's and the challenges around FIPPA's and then that challenge becomes the story and it just goes on and on and on. So, part of eliminating FIPPA's is perhaps all of us acting a little more responsibly in how we self-promote as politicians. Believe me, if you go and look and you will see many of the FIPPA's that have happened are the result of misinformation put out by members of this chamber, many of them. I don't know how many but a vast number of them. So this is certainly a step that gives us the capacity to make further change; to make better change; to reduce the impact on our administration to what would appear to be a ridiculous number of FIPPA requests. You need to look further, they need to look at, you know it's interesting, we had the conversation about Executive Policy Committee before; when you get into the policy around FIPPA, you need to look at what the Provincial Government rules are. You know, matters of cabinet are not FIPPA-able if there is such a word. Maybe that will end up in the dictionary going down the road. FIPPA-able. Policy discussions are not subject to FIPPA. There are pieces that we as a municipal government aren't entitled to and that the Provincial Government and the Federal Government are entitled to have and we need, perhaps, to be a little more challenging in those areas because Executive Committee is the same as a cabinet as far as I'm concerned. And I think discussions around policy, trying to put ideas forward shouldn't just be out there in the public realm. Until you

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
June 25, 2014

have done your depth, you have looked at some of the detail, you understand all the dynamics of the ideas you come up with and you can have a good discussion amongst yourselves to see whether or not it makes sense. But people are just choked by FIPPA. I don't think that's the intention of the Act, but to be choked by FIPPA because you can't get enough work done for fear that somebody is going to go out there and misrepresent what it is you are trying to do in policy development. There is a lot of work that can be done here, certainly creating the capacity to do that work is a good thing and that is what this report does.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Madam Speaker and that's really what this is all about. It's coordinating and creating the capacity because right now FIPPA's go in different directions for different departments and this way everything could be coordinated. It would be done quicker in my opinion and more importantly, it gives us the capacity to do a better job. I would hope everybody would support this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of item number six? Contrary? Carried. I would like to suggest at this time that we break for lunch and we'll reconvene at 1:30. Thank you (lunch break taken).

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
June 25, 2014 at 1:30 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Councillors, I'll call the meeting to order and we'll continue with the report of the EPC dated the June 18, 2014.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 18, 2014**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Madam Speaker, I would introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda items one to seven.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I would like to stand down number four on the June 18 agenda.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of one, two, four, five, six, seven. Four? You are moving one, two, three, five, six, seven?. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 4 – Field House Development Proposal – Jonathan Toews Community Centre

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor. Do you wish to open?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm guessing that the Councillor pulled it because he wants to fill us in. I know this is something near and dear to his heart so I would rather hear what the Councillor has to say and then I would be happy to comment.

Councillor Nordman: You want to talk about "pickle ball"?

Councillor Mayes: They do play pickle ball, as my colleague has reminded me, at the Jonathan Toews Community Centre, but I actually want to say some positive comments about two people who have helped make this happen and that is two people, sometimes they don't always get along. Councillor Swandel and Theresa Oswald have really been very instrumental in getting this thing to happen, the expansion of the Community Centre Field House. It's a great project and we often battle with the Province. This is one where we're co-operating very well with the Province, with the local Board, Jacques Levesque, Barry Catt and some of the other folks, Karen Irvine, who is great at the Jonathan Toews Community Centre. It's across the street from my ward, it's in Councillor Swandel's ward, so he has taken the lead on this. They have done some really good work with the Provincial Government and Theresa Oswald in particular to make this happen. And as the 91-year-old woman who was across the street, biggest senior's building in my ward, the Dakota House is across the street from this Community Centre...I was there for a coffee party about ten days ago and she said

"Get going. I'm 91, hurry up and get that thing built" It will have a lot of facilities for seniors. It's going to have a walking track; it's going to be a great project, so we're going to try and hurry up and get this thing built. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further Speakers? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

Mayor Katz: Just to reiterate, I thank the Councillor for those comments, but I think it's important to say there has been so much co-operation and so much work to make this become a reality; hopefully if approved by Council, but Councillor Swandel has shown phenomenal leadership and really got everybody to work together and make this happen. So on behalf of everyone, I do want to thank him for everything he has done on this particular project.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour of item four? Carried: Report of EPC dated June 25, it's a walk on report, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Yes I would move that the rule be suspended and that the report of Executive Policy Committee dated June 25, be considered item by item.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 25, 2014**

Item 1 – Building Canada Fund

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker I know many of the Councillors were not able to be at EPC but we have been talking about the Building Canada quite a while and we know that's an integral part of helping us rebuild our infrastructure as well as building new infrastructure. We have many projects that are listed here. The purpose is quite simple. There is approximately \$1.2 billion and when I say that, that's between all three levels of government that will be coming to the Province of Manitoba. And the way it's working, it's on a first come, first serve, so the idea is to get your projects in there as quickly as possible, as I hope everybody can see from the motion, we've listed several projects in there all throughout the city, that obviously would have a major impact and we want to get this on record so that we can hopefully move forward and get as much of that funding that's available for the City of Winnipeg, and that's the purpose of it and I would love to hear what other members of Council have to say.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie? Sorry, Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Madam Speaker, we have an amendment to motion that we brought forward to include the Assiniboine Park Conservancy; however, I understand that it wouldn't be under the list. It doesn't meet the criteria, so, I believe we have been informed by the CFO that it doesn't meet criteria, so I wish to pull it off at this time unfortunately.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of withdrawing? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Eadie you wanted to speak to the item in front of us.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. I haven't decided actually yet how to vote on this. I will listen to any information I can glean from it. So this list of projects, the six of them, I don't think it was amended in meeting. I only read the original report. Anyway, I have some concerns about...well, we can all talk about different projects and I think only one project, I could be corrected, but I think in the last Building Canada Fund there was a list of ten and or course, they all didn't get done and it's my understanding that with this list, as it exists, are projects that we would like to receive funding from, from the Building Canada's initiative there. I'm not sure...I'm sure all six would not be funded. What I'm also interested in is do these six then go to the Federal government for them to make a decision and which one they like in terms of building projects? I would have a great concern if that's what it actually is. If it's just simply we're as a city putting together a list of projects and in the future, as Councillor Wyatt did for Plessis Road, we have to push forward. There are some really good projects in here but there are some that I don't think I wouldn't want to see funded through Building Canada initiative when we have very important projects like the Kenaston widening, which actually helps to build what I call the inner rectangle trade route road as well which also includes the Chief Peguis Trail extension. It's those kind of projects that I think not only will serve the residents of all of Winnipeg but will also serve our economic

capability in going...in moving forward with our city that is expanding and becoming more and more a great place to live. So, I am waiting to hear the Mayor close just to clarify some information and I'll make my decision then on how to vote. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck followed by Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. I just wanted to also have clarification on how this process would work. In past years, a list has been generated, adopted by this Council, but not necessarily all of those priorities are selected by the various levels of government and supported. So I just wanted to be clear that we are putting forward our list and that somebody else will scrutinize it yet in terms of the funding, but perhaps the Mayor can clarify on that. I'm very pleased to see that as a result of I believe two years back, Councillor Sharma...Madam Speaker, you and I did a motion together to elevate the Chief Peguis extension, as well as the William Clement Parkway extension and we see both on this list and we did that when we approved the Transportation Master Plan and got support, so I'm very pleased to see them on the list. I also think this is a great day for the southwest quadrant of the city and in particular, the Waverley underpass. I hear from residents in Charleswood, Tuxedo, River Heights and throughout the areas, Whyte Ridge, trying to get through trains and we have all sat at that intersection and seen the issues around wait times. I have also asked the question, because I don't believe it has been asked in some time, what is the average wait allowable for emergency vehicles? And I'm concerned where there are emergency vehicles crossing that railway crossing. If one train takes eight minutes to go and then another train in the other direction takes another eight minutes, what does that do to our emergency response? I think that's an important one. The Kenaston widening, I do believe we still have some challenges ahead of us and that being, in working with negotiations that are before the courts still, between the First Nations and Canada Lands Agency so I'm not convinced that that one may go anywhere too quickly, however, I think it's important particularly for much of the increase in traffic that we've seen. So, I think these are all good priorities and absolutely integral to continuing to move goods and people around our city more effectively. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I have a couple of questions about this too. The process of how this list comes forward, I realize many of these things are in the Transportation Master Plan, but it seems to me... I'm not sure of the time frame of this request, because the program is ten years, so are we saying that these are what we want to do in the next ten years? We're about to have a new Council which might have different priorities, too. I realize most of these are committed projects, but there is no prioritization either and I know last time we put out a list of ten projects, so you really don't know...you are not really telling the government directly which ones are more important, you are saying ten things and you know you won't get them all done. I just wish that we did some form of prioritization, number one and also in terms of process, this just appeared as a walk on. It seems to me we could have known this was coming for quite some time and we could have had a Council discussion about it and we could have aired some of those issues rather than on the floor of Council sort of saying I want this one and that one. Eventually it will come to that, but we could have had some of that discussion in a better process, so I think we can do better. I also am disappointed to see the Osborne underpass project is gone from here as it was also delayed in the Capital Budget. That's a really important project dealing with existing infrastructure and links for our Active Transportation network. As you know, I did not support the amendment of the Transportation Master Plan to include the William Clement Parkway. I just think that development hasn't happened yet. There's a lot of other things, the Arlington Bridge also isn't here and there are other things that are existing infrastructure that are not here. So I just think if we had had a more robust kind of discussion with all members of Council we might have come up with a list that's maybe better, more reflective. I realize there are some differences of opinion on what the priorities should be and maybe that would have been difficult to resolve, but we didn't even try. We just put out this list and I'm a little disappointed with that. Having said that, we do have to move ahead and give them some information and I'm sure this is going to proceed today. I don't know if the Mayor can make any comments that might make us feel a little better about this list, but those are my concerns. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you very much. Again, my comments are going to be fairly brief on this, but I do think it's important to put it on the record.

Councillor Gerbasi: I didn't tell him what to say.

Councillor Fielding: I have Jenny's notes, in case she lost them. We're usually on the same page anyway, Gerbasi and myself on big capital projects and she said I can use her notes. But no, I was fairly happy to see in this list. I think that the Executive Policy Committee came with a list, but when I read the news release that came out, I thought all these projects make a lot of sense. Quickly, the Waverley underpass, I know that Councillor Orlikow's worked hard on that for a number of years as well as Mayor Katz and I can tell you there is very much a need to do it. I just answered your

question I think, Councillor Havixbeck; I believe the emergency vehicles if they are on one side or the other come from either station because I actually have asked that question. I also do like the Chief Peguis extension. It's the start of a ring road which I think is inner city ring road that I think has been missing in the City of Winnipeg. It was a lost opportunity probably in the 60s and early 70s when they made those decisions to do it which makes a lot of sense and I can tell you with everything that's going on: the developments down on Kenaston, very important in terms of the Kenaston expansion and that would, of course, be from I believe the St. James Bridge all the way to Taylor Avenue, is a big part of that, which is really important. And the other priorities, of course, the William Clement Parkway is important and that's of course, a part of that ring road depending which way you see it. The real ring road I guess if you will, inner city ring road would tie into, in through Route 90; through the Chief Peguis trail and tie into Centreport and go down the William Clement Parkway you could argue in the interim if you were able to do some stuff down at Kenaston and tie in through Councillor Wyatt's ward through Lagimodiere, where they use Lagimodiere or use, I guess it's the Schreyer Parkway, would tie into that intermodal piece, but I think these projects are very good and makes a lot of sense from it. I am not as familiar with all the needs, I know Councillor Vandal's area, but I understand it's a priority for our citizens and that sorts, so it does make sense. Very happy with the list. I think it makes a lot of sense and whether we are able to do everything as a part of this it puts our priorities for the most part and we've got some consensus that these are the projects worth going ahead with it. Thanks very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Madam Speaker, First of all...

Madam Speaker: Excuse me, did you have your hand up Councillor Wyatt? I missed you then, I'm sorry. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Mayor. I thought there were other speakers. Anyway, I just want to say, when we look at the list here, we know this is the list we submit to other levels of government. We know they are going to have potentially their list. It's a negotiated matter that involves the Mayor and the other levels of government. It's important to note that it's estimated this could be as high as 1.2 billion, this is over ten years and a 3rd, a 3rd, a 3rd that's 400 million a year and we know from Building Canada in the past, that would work out to 400 million for over ten years sorry or 40 million a year for us. And we know from experience with Building Canada in the past, that any kind with cost overruns or not even cost overruns, any kind of costs that are ineligible under the rules of Building Canada fall back to the municipalities. So that number is probably not 40 million a year, probably more like 50 million a year or maybe more. So just to give you in perspective that's probably the equivalent of an 11% property tax increase. One time. One time to fund it over the next decade. I don't think anybody has the appetite to do that. So the question is we still have to find the funding for our share of this proposal and I think that's where the rubber is going to hit the road for the future Council and that's where it's going to be, I mean it's easy for the Federal government and the Provincial government to be coming forward with these great initiatives, but the challenge we're facing, and municipalities right across the country are facing in terms of finding that one-third share and how to make it happen. But the reality is municipalities will make it happen. They are not going to pass up this funding, they are going to make sure the funding occurs. It's going to be an issue of how to do that. No different that the debate we're going to have on the BRT. Where are we going to find nearly 20 million a year starting in 2019 to start to finance the cost of that project? Okay so, that's on top of this. So you know, I guess, I just want to put this in context. This is a huge challenge that is facing us. These are new strategic projects that we have identified in our Transportation Master Plan. The list is here and indeed it would be nice. You know there are always different issues, but I think we try to balance it by a list of projects in terms of geographic across the city, in terms of the challenges faced by growth in other parts of the city. We can't seem to do everything, but I think we're addressing a lot of historic issues and I know the Waverley underpass, I've heard from Councillor Orlikow, has been a long standing issue also in his area. I know Councillor Vandal has spoken passionately about Marion and the need to do something there in terms of Marion realignment and the underpass regarding the growing use of the CPR Emerson line at Marion near Archibald and of course we've heard...Councillor Eadie talks in the past about the Chief Peguis Trail, from Main to Route 90, the need of that tying into the future...or the Centreport developments. The Louise Bridge is very interesting, that's an amazing piece of architecture or engineering in our city. It's really the oldest bridge of its kind and it's lasted, I mean I wish all our bridges lasted that long. I mean, it's really remarkable, it's remarkable but we have to replace it but it has lasted over a hundred years and we have to replace it and we'll actually...Councillor you are saying four lanes, but the reality is with the traffic there, there is actually an opportunity here for those who are supporters of Rapid Transit, there's an opportunity here in terms of economies of scale because we know that the eastern leg of Rapid Transit is going to need to get across the river and here is the opportunity potentially to build that into that project and to address it at the same time, so actually we are taking into consideration Rapid Transit with this on the list. So the William R Clement Parkway, well you know what? I guess we did change that. We did move it up. It was quite a debate at the time I recall, but at the same time, we want development in our city. We want development in Charleswood, the lands that have been frozen by Councillor Havixbeck's predecessor...I'll say by the City to be diplomatic, for many years are now being developed and there will be demand, there's going to be traffic issues in that neighbourhood, otherwise the

through streets on Charleswood...we need to address that. So I would hope that Councillor Havixbeck of Charleswood, supports this as well. And of course, Kenaston and Route 90, we all know what the issue is there. It's a huge challenge for that area of the city in terms of upgrading that. I know we all know that we have that issue outstanding with regards to Kapyong Barracks and hopefully that issue will get resolved soon between the Federal government and the First Nations. It's in the best interests of the City to have that resolved and so that we can move on and so we can acquire land to do the road widening and improvements there because we are going to need a right-of-way there to be able to do what we need to do. Hopefully this will be a stimulus to be able to do that and get that resolved once and for all, rather than tying it up in the courts and making lawyers a bunch of money, and move these projects forward. Our city is growing and we need to be able to address that growth and if we can't reinvest in new strategic infrastructure, Madam Speaker, we are bound to see the economic growth that we've taken for granted all these years slow down dramatically. Those are my comments. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further Speakers? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker, I won't speak at length here, but I just want to say that I think the list that we have in front of us actually does represent the desires and needs of our city going forward. I hate to say it, but should we do a referendum, I think this basket of goods will be very popular amongst the people that we represent each and every day. The reality again is that there is only one taxpayer. We have no way of funding these projects yet. I've got a suggestion on how to do it, but I'll save that for later. Thank you

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. I wasn't going to speak until I heard that nonsense. The reality is that we put, I think we are up to about 72 million a year cash to capital, and maybe a little bit more than that now, we added an extra \$2 million a year every year, it's our policy, cash to capital. That \$2 million a year in ten years would be \$20 million in order to service \$400 million in debt you need about \$28 million a year. So the cash is there when you add on to that some of the other revenue streams that we have and you add on to that the fact that these projects and many of them are already in our long term planning processes so we do have the capacity to do this. Our end of this is about \$400 million. Is it reasonable to say that we can do them all in ten years? I don't know that this town has the capacity, the engineering capacity, the construction capacity, all those things and we're going to be competing on a national level with all of those pieces. We certainly don't carry that type of capacity internally, so it's more a matter of the other capacities as opposed to the financial capacity. One of the other financial pieces that we have is in the last couple of years we added a point...or one point property tax increase to go towards infrastructure which is something that we will carry forward for a long time. So you can see that there are many ways that we can pay for this and you could have the same conversation about Rapid Transit or anything else. There is a number of ways to pay for required infrastructure. Let's not forget, too, that the reason the infrastructure debt was created was for the old conservative ways of dealing, sort of the Reagan-omic days and Margaret Thatcher days where you want your money in your pocket today as opposed to planning for the future. People chose to keep their money in their pocket today and now it's like the old Fram Filter commercial, "Pay me now or pay me later", it's now later. So it's time to pay, we have to figure out how to do this. Nobody likes this. You know. But, you know, there is 1 percent Provincial sales tax increase. It's good someone pointed out this morning that the Provincial sales tax was created to build the first version of the Floodway. It takes some foresight and some courage in order to have strong cities and so let's keep this stuff moving along as there's going to be wrinkles and there's going to be people accused, "Oh it's way over budget. It's more than \$1.2 million". We know these are not tight numbers. We can get this done. We have the capacity and if we don't, we have got to find ways to get it, but let's keep building the infrastructure. We're doing it probably faster and better than any other city right now, so let's not find ways to shoot ourselves in the foot, let's keep building it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Madam Speaker and I do appreciate all the comments that were made. I think the first thing I would like to do is point out that this is not listed. There is no priority here. We didn't do this one, two, three, four, five, six. We just listed some of the key projects and I think everybody here on the floor of Council will agree that these are projects that have been discussed for a long, long time. There is nothing new on this. This is things we've been discussing that need to be done. I also want to make it very clear and Councillor Eadie asked the question and through you, this is done by consensus. All three levels of government sit down and have a role to play and I can tell you that there have been discussions with both levels of government on many of these projects. As may have been stated but not quite clear, all of these are in our Transportation Master Plan and keep in mind, anything that is in here, the way this is done, by the Federal government, has to go under or through the P3 lens and that's still a process. In addition to that, I have made this comment many times but I'm going to make it again. And I think Councillor Wyatt was basically going there. You know, this one-third, one-third, one-third which hardly ever is one-third. We're always closer to 38, 40 percent whatever the case may be, but even if it's at one-third, it is always difficult to come to the table with one-third of the funds

when you only get 8 cents out of every dollar. Regardless of what anybody says, that's a challenge. And I can tell you I sat at the Big Mayor's Caucus for many years and everybody agrees with that statement. By the same token, no one's going to walk away from two-thirds funding from the other levels of government; they're going to find a way to do it and I think Councillor Swandel very eloquently said here is the way you can do it. With today's interest rates, here is what we have in our cash to capital and keep in mind, we keep on raising it. We've agreed to raise it by \$2 million. We can raise it by more if we so desire, because there are other projects. It's not just these projects; there are other projects that we will always continue to do. We will always continue to do here in our city when it comes to infrastructure. So, like I say, I think this is a good representation of the city, but most importantly, as the Mayor of Winnipeg, my job is to get as much money for infrastructure for Winnipeg. I love our neighbours, but my job is to get as much money for the City of Winnipeg as possible and the sooner we do this, the more money we will be able to get. It simply works that way. That's why I hope this will be unanimous.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour of item one? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk. Item two.

Item 2 – Assiniboine Park Conservancy (APC) - \$4.5 Million First Charge on 2015 Capital Budget

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, there has been a little bit of confusion because a lot of people, when they think of Journey to Churchill, think this was funded by the Provincial government. That's not accurate. The City of Winnipeg is at the table for almost an equal amount and it's just been misinterpreted that way. We have something very special that's going on in Assiniboine Park and this project came in over budget. The reason it came in over budget, heating and hoarding came in extremely higher than they budgeted for. We know what kind of winter it was as well as the exchange rate changed drastically. I can share with you that the Province of Manitoba made a commitment to this project; they've also increased it by \$3 million. Here we are looking for another \$4.5 million to go towards this project and as was stated earlier at our EPC, but I know everybody wasn't there, we the City of Winnipeg did commit to \$50 million towards that goal of 200 million. The Federal government, the Provincial government, the City of Winnipeg and the private sector, over a ten year period of time so we certainly are well within that. We want to make sure that the ratios are the same and we do have in our agreement that they have three years within to catch up so we're all balanced. I know many members of this Council have had the opportunity to go to Assiniboine Park and do a tour. I know we were invited to the Journey to Churchill and if you have seen the transformation of Assiniboine Park and the Zoo, it's spectacular. I remember years ago we used to talk about this wonderful jewel that has basically been left to rot because we didn't have the money and how the Zoo was falling apart and Assiniboine Park, etc...but no one was coming up with any ideas on how to get things done and how to get money in there. I would happen to be with the CFO and the CAO many years ago and I believe the Chair of Finance on a trip to New York and I made it a point to talk to the people who basically run Central Park there and see how they did it. It made so much sense, came back and brought to Council this idea and then Hartley Richardson, took some convincing, but he decided to be the Chair of the Assiniboine Park Conservancy. We have some wonderful people sitting on that Board and they have raised so many millions of dollars from the private sector that never would have happened, if it hadn't been put to bed this way. This is a true partnership at this stage of the game and I certainly hope that people will see...no one likes to come in over budget, we all know that, but sometimes it happens, it's the reality. It happens that way. There is no need to get angry or upset, the facts are all there and hopefully Council will support this. As you know, we did have a Council seminar and I was happy to see that almost half of Council did show up at that seminar and we had the opportunity to discuss it. We had a presentation from Margaret Redmond and some of her people so I look forward to the dialogue and I'll sum up later on. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: I will add a few comments. I am going to be supporting the motion forward and I can tell you that as Mayor Katz indicated there, their dollars had grown in terms of this. But we talk a lot about a lot of projects here in the City of Winnipeg and I can tell you there are always groups that come and want money for this project and that project, but rarely do you see a project, in my opinion anyways, where you see such great progress that's there and it's not just the City and the Province and the Feds haven't kicked in their money per se but where you see private sector money that is flown in and at the Park you can see a transformation of the Park just by going in there. You see the duck pond; you see the Zoo. You see a whole bunch of other things and there are a number of projects that all governments always fund or have to fund and there is debate whether we should fund it or not, but this is something that I think could drive not just tourism, but it just drives an amenity and I can tell you there is immense public support for this project that's out there. I was on...I know Councillor Havixbeck was there and Councillor Nordman were on the Conservancy and I was for the first four years and I can tell you the type of people that have committed time and money and energy to this this is unbelievable. We're at the grand opening of the gates yesterday and I can tell you there is a lot of excitement about the Journey to Churchill opening up on I believe the third of next week. It is a fantastic project; quite honestly I think it's a

legacy of this Council over the last, I would say four to eight years so I am very supportive of this. You don't like to see things come over budget, but I think the end product that you will see is just fantastic and really going to make a difference in terms of our community and something we should whole heartedly support especially when you have the type of corporate dollars that have been raised for this project. It's phenomenal, so I'm very much supportive of that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm glad Councillor Fielding raised yesterday's opening at the gates. The Mayor was present. Councillor Browaty, Councillor Fielding, Councillor Nordman and the gates. It's very significant because just about a year ago we were in this same situation. We were debating advancing the Park the money to do the gates and here we see the results, one year later. It's a beautiful, beautiful facility. In fact, there was talk of holding events right in the opening area because it is so beautiful. This proved to be workable and to be successful and you know, this is the perfect way to greet our visitors both from our city and those who are visiting our city who plan to go to the Journey to the Churchill opening, which is July 3rd. We were faced with this same decision, but yesterday, for me, proof was of us having done the right thing about a year ago. And as the area Councillor where the Park is located, as a member of the Board for all four years of my tenure on Council so far, I'm proud of the accomplishments. This is a group that can get things done and moves quickly and does things wherever possible, on budget if not under budget. I know Councillor...I replaced Councillor Nordman but he is back on the Board and I have worked with Councillor Mayes, Councillor Wyatt, Councillor Fielding and they have all contributed to this in these past four years and I think it's significant. This is not just an area of the city's park, this is our city park. It's unique to our city. It's unique like our downtown. The downtown belongs to everyone. This is our city park. And this model has worked tremendously. It's been able to have a group of professionals leverage at least two levels of government money to engage the private sector like no other project. This model works and can work in many other places. We're debating this here today because it was a fierce winter and we know it was a fierce winter, we're faced with all kinds of dilemmas. There was a contingency, the contingency was exhausted, my understanding is the Province came to the table to help with this a bit and this is this is over and above all of that. So to charge against the 2015, given what we have learned from the charge against the 2014 Budget was, is palatable to me. I would also like to add though that when the transformation of the Park began and it was long before my time on Council, the underlying principle was that it was going to be a third, a third, a third among all three levels of government...quarter, quarter, quarter, ya, shared among all three levels of government though and that being able to leverage the private sector. It's disappointing that the Federal government has not stepped up on this and that is why I had drafted a motion to try and include this. The funding criteria has shifted around. I do think this is an important criteria for our Federal government to pay attention to and the Mayor told me earlier today that I was creative and I should put that creativity to work in finding another way to appeal this to the Federal government and I will continue to do that. I hope everybody will support this with that logic. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise today and add some comments to the idea of the Assiniboine Park Conservancy and in this particular instance, the over-expenditure at the Zoo of \$4.5 million. This \$4.5 million is really an investment in what is arguably going to be our...one of our marquis destinations within the city of Winnipeg and we're about to open in September the Canadian Museum for Human Rights and these two items, I think, on an international basis, the Assiniboine Park Conservancy and the Assiniboine Park Zoo, are going to be what we will be known for far and wide around this globe as a collection of northern hemispheric animals that are going to be on display there and in particular the polar bears, will give us worldwide notoriety. Further to what both Councillor Havixbeck and Councillor Fielding mentioned about the opening of the fantastic new front doors to the Assiniboine Park Zoo on Corydon Avenue you will no longer enter from the inner park parking lot, you will now have to enter through this new, close to half a million dollar, entrance, which like our airport is a fantastic front door and the first impression is important and it's going to be an extraordinary message that we send to visitors not only from Winnipeg and the Capital Region but also from around the world. I can remember about eight or ten years ago there was some suggestion by some folks that we should put some condominiums on that old parking lot. As I look at His Worship. Whoops! Anyway, I couldn't resist. In any event, what you will see when you drive by there in the next five to ten days, two weeks, will be a beautiful new parking lot that is not just the front door but the whole presentation of what's there, opposite Tuxedo Golf Course on Corydon, will be something I think we can all be proud of and we will long forget the \$4.5 million that the heating and hoarding and exchange rates have caused us to be forced to appropriate this money so they could pay their bills and get the project up and running. Looking forward to seeing everybody. 10:00 o'clock July 3rd, grand opening of the Assiniboine Park Zoo and the Journey to Churchill.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, I just wanted to stand up and say I'm just so pleased to see that this Council finally understands the term "unforeseen" and doesn't have to go running off demanding audits and extra scrutiny when the

"unforeseens" rise up and we have a huge cost overrun on a project. These are things that occur when you are dealing with projects of this scale and scope and complexity especially one as innovative as this. There are several you can compare it to in recent history that we have done and we have all fallen over backwards to take our moment, centre stage complaining about how evil it was that these things happened and how terrible they were, but when some of the premiere citizens of our city are behind a project as grand as this, we all seem to change our tone. It's a good thing. We finally learned that projects will go over budget. There will be "unforeseens". We don't need to go into these ridiculous diatribes of nonsense and demands for audits and the excessive scrutiny. Read the reports. Understand the reasons and we can keep these great projects and this great value being built in this Winnipeg. I keep saying, "Look at this Winnipeg" The Conservancy, the stuff that is at Assiniboine Park is only one of those things. The Human Rights Museum, the four fire stations, the two police halls, our brand new police headquarters, our brand new football stadium, our brand new Disraeli Bridge and its Active Transportation Bridge beside it, our airport. They all had "unforeseens" except for the Chief Peguis Trail which actually came in under budget and ahead of schedule. Rapid Transit Phase One was on time. It wasn't on budget. What we're all saying is this an amazing amenity to our city and it's our reinvestment that this city needs and we can all stand up and celebrate that we all participated in all of those projects and their grandeur, not just this one. This is a great place to live right now and it's a great place because of all the work we have all done. Some of it got done a little ugly, but we got it done and we got great value for money. The great value and quality of life for all our citizens. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt followed by Councillor Mayes, followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Wyatt: I just wanted to echo some of the comments of some of my colleagues. The work being done at this significant Park is amazing. I think the Journey to Churchill which opens up on July 3 will be an amazing amenity for the citizens and for visitors coming to our city. We have in the past done this as a first charge against previous Capital Budgets so there is actually a pattern here. They do need to make this up. There is a shortfall in funding and it's correct we do need some support in terms of the Federal government. I know the Federal government has been looking at the significant anniversary that we have coming up in the country. They were very much, I think, when it comes to the Building Canada that's been rolled out, wanting to ensure that so-called hard infrastructure, the roads, bridges and pipes had the first attention and they did some creative stuff with the Building Canada Program that they have brought forward. One of the creative things they included for example that was never included before was brown fields and that's an amazing thing to actually have a part of. So in terms of recreation, yes, there were many recreation needs and cultural needs that we know of, we know we have asks coming forward from significant...the Winnipeg Art Gallery being one of them, the Aviation Museum being another. We have these challenges, but the reality is, you know, the priorities I think, what we have heard from our constituents and I think the Federal government has recognized that, is the fact that hard infrastructure is a priority and that's really something which a lot of the folks see out there right across the country, not just here in Winnipeg, but the other thing I was mentioning is the 150th anniversary of Canada is coming up, 2017, and it may be an opportunity for the Federal government to look at that in light of the fact that a lot of our recreational institutions or facilities were built on the centennial anniversary and are now 50 years old and either the centennial anniversary of Canada or the centennial anniversary of Manitoba or the centennial anniversary of Winnipeg. There were a number of years there, basically within a five year span where you had these centennials and a lot of facilities opened and now they are really getting tired, needing replacement, needing repair and major upgrades. We are trying to do that with a lot of the facilities that we have so maybe there is an opportunity here for the Federal government to address that and hopefully, look for solution here is in terms of something like this because I think this is a great project and there is no doubt that they have done a tremendous job with regards to the private fundraising and the Province has been supportive of us. I just want to make a pitch for our northeast area of the town just for a moment. This is a regional park as we know. We have a number of regional parks throughout the city working with Councillor Steen and Councillor Browaty and our public service, the City of Winnipeg Council funded an engagement process with the citizens of Winnipeg, specifically our area, to look at a new master plan for the purpose of Kilcona Park, which is kind of the poor lost cousin of our regional park system and really in need of some major repairs and upgrades and there is a report coming forward for Council's consideration spearheaded by the public service with recommendations in terms, and funding recommendations, funding implications and terms of Kilcona Park going forward. It's not as grand or as big as this, in terms of Assiniboine Park, but it's still significant and the last time we made any real significant investment was really the building of Kilcona Park which happened in 1982, and it tired and it's old and it needs...and it's one of our regional parks that has been forgotten. Yet the area in northeast Winnipeg is growing. So very strong supporter of Assiniboine Park and the users of Assiniboine Park, enjoy it with your family, but we have other regional parks and we need to ensure that our entire regional park system...as we know any great city, Madam Speaker, folks look for when they move to a community they look for predominantly three things, they look first of all for a community that's safe, that they feel safe in; they look for places where they can meet friends and family and gather and they look for green, open spaces and places where they can enjoy and recreate and play sports and green spaces just for the sake of beauty itself. So, I think our parks system is a key to our quality of life as a city and so I think this decision should be unanimous. Thank you very much.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
June 25, 2014

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

Councillor Mayes: Yes Madam Speaker. First I think we need a cap on metaphors for parks after you and I referred to Little Mountain as the orphan park and we've had the poor little cousin of Kilcona and the jewel of Assiniboine, in the interest of time, I think have a moratorium on park references. I'll try to be brief. This is roughly 5 percent over the budget. It's \$90 million project that's gone roughly 5 million over. Not our project. It was run by APC, so people said "Ah, it's another City project that's gone over budget". But no this was done by the Conservancy. Why is it over budget? Largely because they are trying to get to a July opening and we have been through the hardest winter in 116 years. They had overtime costs, they had heating and hoarding costs because they're trying to get ready, to get it in shape to start bringing in revenue in July of this year. So I'm certainly supportive of this project and supportive of advancing the funds. It's important to note this isn't over and above previous pledge. The previous pledge was up to 50 million, not necessarily 50 million if as Councillor Havixbeck has said, the Federal government never does come to the table, then our commitment is 25 percent of a much lower amount than 200 million so we may end up contributing 37, 40 million or something along those lines, but in any event we are well below that now so it's certainly not exceeding the City's already made commitment to advance these funds to try to get this project paid for, get it open, it's a great part of the Park. I was on the Board for a year with Councillor Havixbeck. I had some issues with some much the other projects that are planned for the future, but that's a debate for another day and will be conditioned by how much money there is there, especially if there is a Federal contribution, but what we have on the table before us today, we are simply advancing some of the funds that we have already committed to try to get this...which is the key really I think to the whole redevelopment of the Park, the Journey to Churchill open, so as the Councillor Nordman has said, I think we all look forward to seeing everyone at the opening.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. I couldn't resist after hearing the speaker. I wanted to talk about the unforeseen accident when Ross Eadie drives into the big gate trying to get to the nice looking parking lot. You have to support this. I just heard about all our regional parks and I have to say something though. Kildonan Park exists in my ward. I know that my family and I know many families all around the city utilize all these regional parks. I have been to Kilcona/Harbourview and all these places to participate in various activities that we as a City provide to all the citizens and so this one is no different at Assiniboine Park. Everybody talked about the cost overruns and yes, who owns what or, you know, that doesn't really matter. Technically it sounds like from their first planned budget it's gone over 7.5 with 3 million extra from the Province and our end is 4.5, related to some of the issues but...so I mean I'm in support of this. All Winnipeggers will take pride in Assiniboine Park and take pride in all of our regional parks and want to see all good things happen in all these places, so I'll leave it at that. I couldn't resist the unforeseen accident.

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

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, it appears to me that when you talk about the duck pond or the play area or the Qualico Centre or the Journey to Churchill or the magnificent window to the Zoo which some people referred to as the gates, everybody here sees the value of what's going on there and how the jewel of the city, its luster has most definitely been restored, which is very, very positive. I might just add that I do recall many years ago when we were looking for money for Assiniboine Park, there was no money and that's when that idea about building on that lot which hadn't been used and putting the taxes towards restoring the Zoo, and then when I came up with the idea of the Assiniboine Park Conservancy, there were many members of Council who were very, very opposed to that idea. I think you can see the proof is most definitely in the pudding. They have done a wonderful job and from what I heard, this looks like it will be unanimous, then good on Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Next we have the notice of motion regarding Committees of Council. Councillor Havixbeck, that's your motion.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes Madam Speaker. I would like to move this into the...move to Governance to have a more comprehensive review. I am not sure if I can move that with instructions...

Madam Speaker: You would like to refer it to Governance? That's in order. All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Next is a notice of motion regarding the plebiscite rail line location. Councillor Browaty, you have the floor.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Council in decades;

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Clerk be ordered to add the following nonbinding plebiscite question to the October 22, 2014 civic election ballot:

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

Executive Policy Committee – Notice of Motions (continued):

Kenaston Widening, Ness to Taylor – \$129 million

Marion Widening and Grade Separations, Archibald to Lagimodiere - \$70 million

Louise Bridge Replacement - \$100 million

Arlington Bridge Replacement TBD

William R. Clement Parkway, Grant to Wilkes - \$60 million

St. Mary's widening, St. Anne's to Marion - \$60 million

Waverley Underpass - \$150 million

Chief Peguis Trail Extension, Main to McPhillips - \$100 million;

AND THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that future City Councils strongly consider the outcome of the plebiscite in making future capital budget decisions;

AND THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that future City Councils works with the Provincial and Federal governments and the major railways to look at opportunities to relocate rail lines to Centreport Canada.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. We all know the City of Winnipeg has significant infrastructure shortfalls right now. We hear from our constituents every day. We drive down our streets and the conditions of our roads, our arterial roadways are in deplorable conditions in many ways. We have growth in our city. It's a wonderful thing. We have many new communities that need to be connected with arterial roadways, but the funding to build those doesn't exist today. We have the Provincial and Federal governments spending large amounts of money right now, investing in a new trade area and perhaps with a tax free trade zone. A very exciting opportunity potentially for the future commercial, industrial growth of our city. That could also open up an opportunity here in Winnipeg to get rail traffic moving away from the core of our city. Right now, we have rail cars filled with bakken oil going through the core of our city, barely slowing down and we have an opportunity perhaps to open up those right-of-ways for Rapid Transit going into the future. I don't know why we need to drop everything and regardless of the cost invest in this model of Rapid Transit right now. I agree, Rapid Transit is a highly desirable thing to have in a larger, major growing city, but what we are proposing is an awful lot of money, in my mind, for very minimal benefit. The advantages of a bunch of Capital projects that I listed off, I think would provide better value to our taxpayers in a shorter term. These...we require these projects regardless and we don't have the money to fund them right now. \$590 million dollars, these are major investments that our children and perhaps grandchildren will have to pay for at some point. I don't think we're getting the value we could for some other projects that we need to do. I mean, of course, we are the poor cousins to our other levels of governments. Eight cents of every tax dollar comes to Municipal governments in this country, it's not enough. You see the Provincial government going and getting a huge wind fall, probably \$170, \$190 million a year annually, from the taxpayers of Winnipeg on PST. They brag that it's all going into infrastructure, but where is it going? It's not going to the City of Winnipeg. How much of that are we seeing? A very, very small amount and in my mind not acceptable. The motion I have before us today is to go and consult with Winnipeggers, the people in our city, the people who elect us. Let's have an open and frank discussion. If we do this and if we want to do this and maintain our roads and all these other things, it's going to cost a lot of money. Taxes are going to have to go up substantially unless we get a better break from other levels of government. I'm not convinced that's coming any time soon, so we need to actually have that frank discussion. We can build phase two of Rapid Transit, we can build an eastern leg of Rapid Transit, we can build a line out to the airport. All wonderful, very worthy projects in my mind, but, if we also want to deal with arterial roads and raise the standard on those roads, if we also want to build these other expansions that we're talking about and even our portion of the Building Canada projects, you're going to have to pay a lot more taxes. There is only one tax there. It's going to be nice to have all these nice amenities going out to fancy zoos and everything else but how will you get there? Some people don't want to pay more for transit, they don't want to pay more than their \$2.55 today. They don't want to

pay more than that. I'm sorry, I do take a bus from time to time. They don't want to pay more than that. If they are going to be priced out of the market, how are they get to go see the new polar bears at the Zoo, how are they going to get to go to movie? We have to remember, even transit users, because the cost for some people is going to get prohibitively high. We can't price ourselves out of this. I don't think it's fair to the taxpayers of Winnipeg to not consult them. If they say overwhelmingly that we want to go down the road or the rail or whatever of higher taxes for doing things like Rapid Transit phase two, fine, I will support them. I will support that and I think it's very exciting, but at the moment, we don't have a means to pay for this. I don't think it's responsible to go ahead with this without having Winnipeggers completely and fully understand what this means in a plebiscite. What would a plebiscite look like? I think there will be all sorts of people out there, barking up a tree, saying we need it and that's wonderful. Let's explain the advantages and the benefits of it to Winnipeggers, that's fantastic, but there is also an opportunity for people who are opposed to it. People who don't want to be paying massive taxes for something that is of a questionable value. So again, I look forward to the debate here today and I would encourage all of you to support letting the people of Winnipeg have their say on this matter. Again, I'm ready to support whatever the decision of the public is and if I should happen to be elected again this Fall, and again, I would support...50 percent plus one in my mind it's a go ahead and I would support Rapid Transit if that's the will of the people of Winnipeg is.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The motion in front of us today asking for a referendum is asking for a referendum on whether or not to finish our half-completed very first Rapid Transit line in Winnipeg. Winnipeg is poised to make a decision today that could either move us forward as a city that would have a comprehensive mass transit system in the relatively near future or create a situation where we have no Rapid Transit system to speak of. Our decision today is monumental and we must make that decision recognizing that it will have a great impact on the future generations of Winnipeggers. Dan Lett's column today did a great job of explaining the need for elected officials to make tough decisions and have long term vision. If a referendum had been called for major projects such as the Floodway, the Floodway Expansion, the building of the Legislative Building, The Esplanade Riel, the MTS Centre, likely none of these iconic symbols of our City would exist today. While under the pretense of trying to give people a say, the truth is that this referendum proposal is a tactic designed to derail Rapid Transit late in the game. A project that the proponent of this referendum has never really believed should proceed. For one thing, even to pause and ask the question in October we would have to put a stop to the \$140 million application to the Federal government for at least a year. This funding application is due and we would miss the deadline. I have been told that each year of delay results in a cost escalation ranging from \$25 to \$65 million. And such a delay would also jeopardize the 225 million of committed funding from the Province. If the Provincial government were to change in the next year's election, that funding could actually be lost and a new agreement would have to be reached to cover the higher cost escalation that were caused by the delay. The proposed wording for the referendum question is biased and intellectually dishonest. I say that because the wording gives the public the impression that this \$590 million is just sitting there and that we can spend it however we want. The reality is, we know that the Province's funding is for this project. The Provincial funding could easily be lost and again, as I mentioned we could have a very different Provincial government a year from now that would get rid of the PST and they would have even less money for infrastructure. This motion pits public transportation against a long list of road projects but it provides no context to emphasize the benefit that Rapid Transit brings to all Winnipeggers, even those who don't take transit, such as reduced congestion, reduced wear and tear on the roads, reduced greenhouse gas emissions and economic development to name a few. Imagine if there was a referendum on all other major projects in the city. Would the majority of people in the rest of the city agree we should spend hundreds of millions of dollars building extensions to the Chief Peguis Trail? Why would the majority of people in the other three quarters support a road that they don't see themselves as benefiting from? The point is if we took a public opinion poll about major Capital projects like this, nothing would ever get built. The Southwest Corridor is the first Rapid Transit line in Winnipeg and the next one is likely to serve the eastern quadrant of the city. So short-term thinking is the enemy here. The motion also tosses in the issue of rail relocation, which I didn't even notice the speaker mentioning, the mover of the motion mentioning, but railway relocation is a worthy goal and one that many of us have been pushing to be considered over the years, but the reality is it takes an incredibly long time. There is no clear sense it will happen in the near future. I'm glad to see an interest in it, but this is not a justification for halting all Rapid Transit development indefinitely to wait around for this to happen. That's just absurd. It's also intellectually dishonest to portray this referendum idea as being about democracy and giving people a say. It's really more of a tactic to put a stop to investing in Rapid Transit. I understand the place that the motion comes from. Councillor Browaty has been pretty clear, at least some of the time, that he does not support investing in Rapid Transit in Winnipeg. It changes, but...well it's not your motion, Councillor Fielding, but you know I am thinking of you. At the very least there is a perception that Rapid Transit can wait, perhaps for decades. Perhaps until the magical time when all our other problems are solved, our roads are wide, shiny, and perfect and extend into the sunset and money is growing on trees and I guess climate change and traffic congestion will also have disappeared into the sunset. What I'm finding a bit hard to take is that in the year 2014, Winnipeg City Council is still debating whether Rapid Transit is something that a mid-sized and growing city like ours should even have. I could make quite a lengthy speech about the benefits of Rapid Transit, but hopefully by now members of Council already

understand. Read my speech from 2004, it's not that different than the one I'm making right now. The benefits that come with Rapid Transit, such as economic development, sustainable transportation, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, reduced congestion, less wear and tear on the roads and better quality of life are pretty well understood everywhere in North America and in most of the planet. Other benefits of this project that are being overlooked and weren't made clear in referendum questions or public opinion polls in the paper were that this project also addresses important existing infrastructure needs like widening the Pembina underpass, drainage work and creating a proper active transportation route to the U of M and stadium, back through downtown and to the U of W. We all know that the growth in the south part of the city, we all know of the growth in the south part of the city is it growing by 50 percent. The problem of congestion on Pembina Highway is dramatically going to worsen and we ignore that at our peril. Yes, the city is growing which is why building new suburban roads without building Rapid Transit will only cause further congestion and frustration for the very suburban dwellers who want to travel downtown and across their city for their employment and other activities. The connection to the U of M from the downtown makes perfect sense, especially with a new stadium. 40,000 students, 30,000 stadium goers from every part of Winnipeg benefit from that and from a separate and complete cycling route to the University. Studies show that young people want viable transportation choices when they decide which city to live in and I'm sure you are also very tired of hearing me describe what other cities in Canada are doing, but it does really put things into perspective to realize that Calgary has a plan for 7 BRT lines and an LRT line by 2021. Not to mention protected bike lanes throughout the entire downtown and here in Winnipeg this is the second meeting in a row we have had to fend off an attempt to derail the completion of our first and only Rapid Transit Corridor in the eleventh hour of a project. In conclusion, keep in mind what we are debating here today. We are talking about a project that has been talked about for more than 30 years. We are talking about a project that is already half built and requires completion to connect our two major universities and a new stadium through our downtown. A project that has been recommended over and over, by study after study and task force after task force. A project that has 230...or \$25 million in hand from the Province, a project with a Federal government application under way which needs to move forward this month or another year is lost. A project, if it is stopped now will likely be delayed for years with massive associated cost escalations. A project that has undergone repeated public consultation with stakeholders and public as we move through the decisions about the route and feasibility studies. A project that is but the first of other future Rapid Transit, investments the City should be making This is a time for leadership and vision from this Council because Winnipeg City Council has moved so slowly and voted against investing in Rapid Transit since the 80s we have fallen behind other major Canadian cities in significantly meeting our potential as a healthy vibrant and sustainable city. Councillors over the years have chosen to invest in expanding our regional street system to support single use automobile trips and the suburban growth and have under-invested in fixing our existing streets as well as not investing in public transit. Building an accessible and convenient mass transit system is a basic tenet and core responsibility of the leaders of every city our size. The mood in Winnipeg towards this particular City Council right now has grown ugly and trust is at an all-time low. It is a perfect storm for motions to come forward to...and words to be said to exploit that feeling. Right before an election, it's the best time to weaken the resolve of Council, but this is a time for leadership and vision from this Council. Please don't let a biased and poorly worded motion or public opinion poll sway your resolve for building a better Winnipeg. Thank you.

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

Councillor Swandel: Madam Speaker, Wow. A lot of that wasn't factual, but it was certainly nice to hear again. Let me start by saying I think referendums, plebiscites in general, are clearly a sign of weak leadership and a lack of vision; a lack of strategic planning; a lack of policy development and you know, it's just weakness. To try and pit one thing against another for the sake of, I don't know what, these misnomers that there isn't enough money to fund this stuff, if you actually look at it long term, you know you dig right into the nuts and bolts, down to the depths that we should be digging to, to actually understand where we can go and what we can do and maybe even get to the point where you have three year or five year Capital Budgets, rather than just estimates. We might be able to have a more informed debate or conversation. This speaks to real rationalization and we already have a motion in front of Council that will come back to us and I'm looking at real rationalization and bringing all the stakeholders together and trying to see how we can create value and bring that piece to the forefront whether on this leg of Rapid Transit or some other leg of Rapid Transit and even a lot of the rail lines don't fit well with where the planned Rapid Transit corridors are indicated in our Transportation Master Plan, so they also raise other opportunities for infield development, active transportation corridors, parkways and other nice amenities for our city. I support Bus Rapid Transit. I hate hearing the conversations about Light Rail. Build for Light Rail in the future, fine, but Bus Rapid Transit really is what Winnipeg is all about. It's a prairie city, I've said this before. We're spread out. We are flat ground. There are a number of reasons why prairie cities are different than some of the places where you will see Light Rail and some of the density you have driven into those other locations, but for Winnipeg and the way Winnipeg lays out, Bus Rapid Transit is the right thing. What I don't support is, I don't support stupid Bus Rapid Transit, Rapid Transit where you are destroying value, where you are creating extra miles of lines where you don't have to. Where you are avoiding the opportunity of dealing with things like Light Rail rationalization That's not what this particular motion goes to. There was a comment made that Winnipeggers need to understand that we have to give them more information. The need to understand and they need to be moving forward. What do they

need to understand? Do they need to understand Councillor Browaty's position? Do they need to understand Councillor Gerbasi's position? Do they need to understand my position? If you leave things up to plebiscites you will find there is a lot of lack of understanding out there and perhaps what Councillor Gerbasi had alluded to that people will making parochial votes as opposed to big picture thinking votes. That's what we get elected to do. We get elected to make big picture votes and decisions and that brings us back to vision, strategic planning, policy development that informs good budgets. That's where we have a void here. We don't have a void in asking the people what they want. We have a void in putting good information in front of the people and stronger policy development. Referendums shouldn't be thrown around the way they are being thrown around here today and I think some of that ties into Provincial politics around referendums on taxation. As far as I'm concerned any elected government has the right to change policy. They get elected by the people. Go and do your work and if people don't like what you are doing you will get unelected. You shouldn't worry about getting unelected for doing the right thing if you truly believe it to be the right thing. That's the way we should walk into this building every day. Sometimes we just can't communicate enough information to the public to get the public to understand the difficult decisions that we have to make and that sometimes we have to risk our own forward lives in politics because the decisions have to be made for the betterment of the city. You can't possibly expect every citizen that comes out to vote to have the level of knowledge that we have. I think we lack quite a bit of knowledge right now because we lack that policy development piece and we're not following a plan. Even our Transportation Master Plan that was developed by experts when it came to the politicians, we just went willy-nilly and we said "Oh, ok, we're going to change that, we're going to take things out of this category and we're going to put it into that category, no thinking, no depth of understanding, pure political parochialization or political rationalization. So, at the end of the day I am not going to support the motion obviously, but I do support us moving forward and getting Rapid Transit Stage Two done. I do prefer it get done in a better way that we're doing it. You won't see me support the stuff that is in front of us today, but I also support getting all the projects that are in our priorities list done as well as that corridor of Rapid Transit and hopefully another piece of Rapid Transit in the next ten years because when you look at Rapid Transit, the off road pieces of Rapid Transit, there is some really low hanging fruit there where we could really speed up Rapid Transit. I think of Councillor Wyatt's ward and the intersection of Lagimodiere and Regent, just to go around that; if you could get the buses to go around that intersection, it would add so much. Even if they got to come back on the road, just a short little section there where they somehow get around that intersection would mean so much in transit efficiency. So we need to keep moving forward on all of these fronts. It's not one against the other or somehow tied to rail rationalization and plebiscites and referendums. Keep moving. Keep this stuff happening. Do a better job of planning on the front end, do a better job of the strategic planning and the policy development and aligning budgets, longer term budgets, to the stuff that comes out of our policy development. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I do want to rise. I will definitely be supporting Councillor Browaty's motion. I talked about this for about six months. I think this makes eminent sense. First of all I'll have most of my comments here where about the whole system where we're voting on the second phase later on in this meeting, but what I'd like to say and have repeatedly said is this project is one of the biggest projects in our City's history whether it's \$590 million, whether it ends up at that, I'm not sure, but I would guess it probably will weigh in at a little bit more, but my concern with this and I've always supported referendum, I've been a big supporter of term limits as well. I think with this, this is a monster mega project that the City is engaged in and I think that it just makes common sense that when you have a major project like this going forth that I think our citizens should have a say and that's what I said when we had the new stadium built as well. It makes a lot of sense when you are spending this amount of money and you put in the context of the situation we are in. You know from the report that we are going to be debating later on down the line that you have to adjust your debt strategy. We know for a fact that I chaired Finance for six budgets and Councilor Wyatt took over after me. There isn't all the money in the world, but if there is an ability to have a printing press or go down to the bowels of City Hall and pick some money off the money tree and do every project around, that would be fine, but the reality is you don't and you have to set priorities as a City and I don't know if anyone has driven around our streets over the last year or two, but they are in horrible shape and let's face facts. There is a lot more work that is happening in my ward, I appreciate that, I think it makes a lot of sense, but the streets are in absolute horrible shape and I think if you talked to our citizens about this, I started a petition, an on-line petition and in about a week and a half I got 2200 people that signed the petition that said exactly that. If you could support, you had \$600 million in play to spend, what would you rather spend it on? Would you rather spend it on fixing our existing streets or would you like to spend it on Bus Rapid Transit? Clearly the opinion has come back. There are some opinion polls that came out earlier on this week with Winnipeg Free Press partnered with Probe Research where they're saying it's 70 percent of people want this as a referendum. So I think it makes a lot of sense. The second part of the question is interesting. The question was basically should we spend it on the Bus Rapid Transit system? If you actually asked the question would you rather spend it on Bus Rapid Transit or fixing our road system I bet the numbers would be even higher than it was with 49 or 42 percent or whatever the respective numbers were because I think people are just fed up. They see what's going on and I don't think this is this Council's fault. I think infrastructure...there just hasn't been enough money over the last 20, 30, 40 years and there are editorials in the late 70s that talk with infrastructure deficit here. So, it's a major problem that is here. Another

topic I like to talk about when you talk about this project is in terms of the attitudes. I have always been one where if I have a difference of opinion, I disagree with Councillor Gerbasi, but we're friends. We disagree on a lot of different projects, but for the most part I respect her opinion on things. She pushes hard for them. I respect it. It's a lot different than mine on a lot of occasions. Sometimes I feel with this debate, somehow it boils down to if you have a difference of opinion or don't agree with our vision of Bus Rapid Transit, somehow you don't have a vision or your vision isn't as good as ours and I just flat out think that's wrong. You know. I'm sorry. At the end of the day, people are passionate, passionate about the subject, I get that, but I just don't see the respect back for someone like myself, or Councillor Browaty, or someone that says we need to fix our priority streets first. I just personally don't think that's wrong. You could have a debate on what projects we're going to do, whether it's new or existing infrastructure and get into that whole argument, but the fact of the matter is, I don't see a lot of respect coming back to people like ourselves who actually do, I think, have a vision. I have a vision of what I think the City should be spending this money on and I don't sometimes see that back in newspaper columns or people on the floor and somehow our opinion is not as good as everyone else's and the cool kids in town, or maybe the cool cocktail parties where they have these opinions on certain things. Somehow my opinion isn't as good as them and I flat out don't get it. So I think it is a vision, it is a vision in terms of whether you do a ring road for the City of Winnipeg or what you want to do, it's making sure you can get from point A to point B and prioritize your spending and I personally think that is a vision. Funding, we talked about the funding. The arguments are "well this money is going to go away". Our money is the 225. We know the Federal government money is the 140, that's the P3 fund. I've talked to and I know a lot of MPs. I have talked to them and they say it's whatever is your priority is our priority. The money would be there no matter what so I would say, our money, the 225 and \$140 million is not something that is there. You could argue the Province will hold out in terms of their money, the \$225 million that's there. We're hopeful there will be a change in government next time. It's Provincial and I'm kind of biased in that occasion of course, but the fact of the matter is if you are talking about this massive amounts of money, the majority of this is money that will be there for infrastructure projects. Phase One Rapid Transit, well, we spent 138 million, yes it did come in on time and it did come in on budget, which is a good thing, but it's been pointed out quite clearly that it actually did not save you any time and the premise of using Rapid Transit was twofold. Number 1, the quality of ride I think is a little better and by the way, I took a bus for six weeks in September and I was on part of that first phase of Rapid Transit, but essentially you are not getting anywhere quicker. I have never seen the numbers in terms of the excess user piece that is a part of it, the greenhouse gas emission argument is always interesting. You know, I'm not sure how much that is going to make a difference in terms of Rapid Transit and I personally think, I actually do like the Light Rail, I personally think that people would get out of their cars and possibly do it. Not everyone is going to do it. We have a business, we've got two kids going to different schools and everything else, so there is not a way we are able to use the bus system. We're going to use cars and that's a lot of people in Winnipeg. Not everyone is going to be able to use it. So my point for Phase One, I don't think that we've seen,, when you look at the cost benefit analysis and you look at years later if you can't get there quicker, why are we still calling it Rapid Transit to a certain extent? It's an enhancement of the service, it costs us \$138 million, but I don't think it's fair to say that. The P3 is something that is also there and I alluded to this in the past. I think it's a little bit ironic that you have a number of these Councillors, God bless them for their opinions whether you like or dislike P3s to a certain extent, but to make this project whole you're erasing the P3 concept. So at one point you don't like P3s, but to get your project done you are embracing the P3s that the Federal government has put forward, so I think you are kind of talking out of both sides of your mouth with this equation and I personally think that there is an opportunity with the elections coming up over the next few months, makes sense put it on the ballot and let's have our citizens have a final say. I just personally don't think we should discount what they are going to have to say. These are the people that are shelling out the money. They're the ones that are paying for this. Why not let them have a say? So, with that, I will be supporting Councillor Browaty's motion and most of my comments will be here. I won't make too many more comments when the project comes forward. I won't be supporting the project when it does come forward, but one thing I would say is if a referendum was held and our citizens did support the referendum I would support it because I want to support what our citizens are having to say with it. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I hope you support Councillor Browaty's motion.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. I am going to try to stay to the idea of the referendum on this particular motion. I think the problem with the referendum in regard to Rapid Transit, or any other project for that matter was eloquently spoken by the previous Councillor who just spoke, who talked about "I can't see my family with two kids and driving around how this is going to benefit my family in any way" so that is what the problem is with a referendum. When you have big picture ideas that you are trying to move forward in the whole city, you can't get at this whole referendum on major projects. Yes, it may be the biggest project that this City at this point has embarked on at 590 million, some might say it's more and I'm sure we'll hear it, but ultimately we didn't have a referendum on the first extension of the Chief Peguis Trail, which is a P3 and you can't, and it's important but what do the people in south Winnipeg care about the extension of the Chief Peguis Trail out to Route 90? They don't. I can tell you right now, if you ran a referendum on Rapid Transit in my ward, most people don't care. Actually, they would vote against it because they don't see how it's going to benefit them. So, when you look at referendums, I will have more to say in this regard a bit later, but I just...

The referendum idea is not there and I have to say though, there was somewhat of referendum in 2010 when I ran. I talked about commitments to my residents and commitment to Winnipeggers and I think Councillor Swandel eloquently said it, although I don't think our whole job is the whole city, but as a Councillor I said I want to be part of a bigger vision of this city and right in there I said I support Rapid Transit. I was very clear about that. And so that in a sense was a referendum and I ended up winning the election. I think that while we will be voting on this project to either go ahead or not and I think it will be moving ahead, there is nothing stopping Councillor Browaty from going forward in his next election and putting down the Rapid Transit if he wants, I mean, there's no reason and if that gets him elected I think that's a referendum in itself, but it might prove out the fact that, you know, does that benefit? Should we have a referendum across the city on doing a project that Councillor Wyatt talked about with the Kilcona Park? There is no need to do a referendum on that. We know it benefits the whole city. There is no need. It benefits the whole city. So for me the referendums don't work and I also wanted to just mention while we are talking about this and we're debating whether you should have a referendum and where people would rather spend their money, I want to remind this Council, we all voted together on the Capital Budget when we decided to create a Local Street Renewal Fund and then we had a Capital Budget that had a Regional Street Renewal Plan in it, these plans were put together by our administration and for you to lead people down the path to say that if we spend 590 here there won't be any money to fix our roads and we also need to talk about this. This year, in 2014, the announcement said, I think it was \$57.8 million being invested in local street renewal and regional road construction, or it just might have been the local one and then add in the regional, but I distinctly remember 57.8, the Province is in on part of that. That's almost 10 percent of the 590 million. Right? So next year that 57 million is going to be more and by the time the Bus Rapid Transit is built, if we follow the Plan, we had our Administration build for us, we will see huge investments as we progress along and as the construction industry progresses along to be able to have the capability to do all this work. I heard that mentioned, do we have enough engineers, do we have this? Anyway, I leave it at this. There is no need for a referendum on the Bus Rapid Transit. The Mayor, who is not continuing on, bought into the vision, it took a little while, bought into the vision of Rapid Transit. This is part of his moving it along. And it's going to get done. So, I don't know why we are even talking about referendum at this point. I'll be voting against it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker, you know they say we should just delay...they say we should just delay it some more, we're rushing into it. We got to have a referendum. If you don't support the referendum you are antidemocratic. I want to speak largely about the referendum here and not the merits of the exact proposal we have for BRT that's on the table. We didn't have a referendum on where we would build the stadium and how much that would cost and people complained about that, but we didn't have a referendum on that decision made before I got here. We didn't have a referendum on Phase One of Rapid Transit. We didn't have a referendum, interestingly, on \$293 million worth of priorities, road projects that are identified in this document, the Transportation Master Plan. We didn't have a referendum on any of that, interestingly, this list, not arrived at by referendum, suddenly enters the referendum in this question and somehow that becomes the democratic process. So I think the idea we're being antidemocratic if we don't put this to a referendum, is on a base level, very dubious. We would make history in one respect, we would make history if we vote for this in the following respect: this is probably the most confusingly worded referendum question that would ever have been presented to the Canadian public in my view. You can vote no for about four or five different reasons. Ya, I voted no because I wanted LRT, not this BRT thing, so when do we start on the LRT? You can vote no because you didn't like the particular alignment that was proposed; you could vote no because you wanted to see some of the rail lines moved, but you still favoured BR; you could vote no because the Pembina underpass isn't identified down here below in this list of other projects, and by God, you wanted the Pembina underpass. There it is right there, in the list of priorities along with these other things. The irony is that the Pembina underpass is part of the BRT proposal and not all of the 590 million is going towards the BRT proposal. Worth saying it yet again, some of it's going towards infrastructure related to roads, namely the underpass. Some of it's going to drainage work necessary for other core infrastructure work and namely the Calrossie combined sewer. You know, we get criticized for only caring about the new suburbs. That's an older area that needs work on the combined sewer and this is the way to do it in combination with other projects. If we delay on this project, the cost for doing the Calrossie combined sewer goes up. We're still going to need to do that Jubilee underpass and if we do that separately, we are moving bridges around to do that, the cost for that goes up. So there is an economy of scale for doing these three things together. You could vote no because you say 590 million, there's 590 million here, that's great. There is no guarantee that the Province would contribute to something other than BRT and there is certainly no guarantee that the Federal government would. To suggest that they would because we think they would is pure speculation. We know the Province is on side at this stage of history for this project and that's what we have to look at right now. So the question is, I think, spectacularly misleading and I think it's important in referendum questions, to be clear. I've lived through a couple of referendum campaigns and if people think they are always considered solely on their merits, when I lived in Brandon, a city which I hold in great regard, because of having been a School Trustee there, there was a referendum on a casino proposal that got voted down and you talk to people who say, "Well, that's really just a Trojan horse for an aboriginal reserve, urban reserve and I know what you are up to there I know it doesn't say that anywhere in the question or anywhere in background material but I know what's really

being asked here", so the thing gets voted down on something that isn't part of the proposal at all, whereas I think that maybe most of us remember what was not the intellectual high water mark of Canadian politics, the 1992 referendum on the Constitution. An issue that got completely garbled with simplistic ads, simplistic discussions. I remember Bob Rae saying once, "If only we'd only been able to put Mulroney out on a barge about 30 miles out in the ocean and campaigned without him, it might have succeeded, but people hated Mulroney so much, they voted no on the Constitutional question. So you get these different countervailing things coming in in a referendum question even if it's clearly worded and this is, I have to say, incredibly unclear, plus, if you want an answer you don't go while current street renewal budgets remain significantly underfunded and the following major projects remain unfunded. It's not exactly neutral wording seeking the public's neutral input. Lastly, it's a non-binding referendum, we would be right back here, or whoever is elected would be right back here considering the issue again and I'm sure we'd have speakers come forward and say, terrific we killed off that now on to the LRT. I didn't favour that billion dollar boondoggle, but I want to go with the \$2.5 billion gamble, because I think people will get on the LRT, not on the bus. No studies to support that necessarily, in fact our studies say the reverse, but let's gamble 2.5 billion, not a billion. So, I think I'll speak more to the merits of the proposal later, but in terms of a referendum question, I don't think it's being antidemocratic to say on this matter I don't favour a referendum, and lastly, to build on Councillor Eadie's point, I'm the most recently elected Councillor here, here's what one of my leaflets said, it's not unclear, it's not vague, it's not talking about remaining significantly underfunded. Here is what I said, to update our transit system, I will support the extension of the new Rapid Transit Corridor so that it will run from downtown to the University of Manitoba. Let me repeat that, to update our transit system, I will support the extension of the new Rapid Transit Corridor so it will run from downtown to the University of Manitoba. That's right after I talked about my favourite subject: gravel back lanes and I'll come back to that in due course I'm sure, and about streets. You can address all these problems. We have to address all of these problems. We've been talking about Rapid Transit for the better part of 40 years in this city and I think in terms of referendum, you know we got hassled sometimes, you are not keeping your promises, you're not showing leadership and you are just following polls. Show some leadership. Well Madam Speaker, I feel I ran on this issue that I would support the extension and I'm happy that the voters understood that was my clearly worded position. Maybe not all of them favoured it, they voted for other reasons, but certainly I feel I have gone to the people, I've made clear that is my position, I don't feel we need a referendum on this and I look forward to moving forward with the debate on the merits of the proposal later today and if voted down by the duly elected Council, so be it, but I think at this point to say well now that we put the stadium there and we've put Phase One there, now is the time for referendum, I think is unfair. I think it's misleading and as I said, if you want to load a question, this is the textbook example of how you load a question for an answer you are already looking for. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Havixbeck:

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Madam Speaker, I will just be very brief. Much of what I would have said has already been said. I cannot support this question. I think that this being here today is part of a symptom of a bigger problem and that being the lack of public engagement on this and I'm not talking about public consultation about the route and so forth, but the actual public consultation and the clarity around this for the last decade and whether people in the city want this. I think that's what we need to be asking. The other issue is this is the largest dollar value project that this Council would be approving and the next largest was the Police headquarters which was 55 percent over budget and we're still asking questions about that. I think there is just a real lack of certainty; almost an inability; a paralysis to make a decision and move something forward in a reasonable way. Another reason is that this is here because the BRT costs have escalated, I mean, Councillor Fielding, as the seconder, saw the Police headquarters going so, spiraling so far upwards, upwards and upwards, that, you know, in fact this was a critical juncture for him in his role on EPC and he made a decision based on that. I think this is here because we have all of this other stuff going on right now. I think there is just a lack of confidence of making a decision. I'm not going to speak to the report. I'll wait for that but I see a number of problems that I have spoken out on that about. We are elected to make decisions and I think it's important that we make decisions. This came to Council, the BRT issue came to Council in 04, 06 and 09 and so I have to ask where was this plebiscite question for the 2010 election and I'll leave it at. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Madam Speaker. First of all, let me make it very clear is I very much respect the opinion of both Councillor Browaty and Councillor Fielding and anybody else who supports this. Although I vehemently disagree and I certainly will not be supporting it, that's number 1. I have made it clear on many occasions that I do not believe or support in referendums. I've said it's up to us to make those difficult decisions. That's why we're elected. Every four years we have a referendum. It's called an election and that's when the people will judge you. I found it extremely interesting that it took a young man who was here earlier as a delegation, Zach Fleischer, to make the comment about it's up to Councillors, members of Council, to make the difficult decisions and he referred to the PST and referred to Duff Roblin with the Red River Floodway, but if this was really genuine and you truly believe there should be a referendum, then there should have been one on Investors Group Field; there should have been one on the Canadian Museum for

Human Rights; there should have been one on Chief Peguis and there should have been one on Disraeli Bridge. The realities are there shouldn't have been referendums on any of those. It's up to the elected officials to make those decisions and that's exactly what we are doing and I guess a lot of people don't understand it, but Mr. Fleischer who said he doesn't agree with me all the time, but in certain scenarios does, that is what Winnipeg is all about. That is our future. Young people that'll make the city much greater than it is today, they want to see Rapid Transit. They want it very much. And when you do what was done unfortunately, in my humble opinion, why this was even done in a poll is beyond me. You can't get an objective answer. The realities are, Madam Speaker, I represent the entire city, not any one of the 15 areas represented by individual Councillors, I represent all 15. The facts are, that if you have something going on in one part of the city, they, most likely, will support it, which they did whereas other parts of the city won't. That's common sense. You don't have to spend money on a poll to determine that; anybody can tell you that. I've heard so much today about what's going on, what we're going to lose and what we are not going to lose etc., so let me make it very clear. The \$140 million from P3 Canada is at risk. Not because they may not support another P3 project in Canada, there is a lineup, there's a lineup at the P3 funding right now. Every single city is going there with mega projects. This is a small project compared to some of the big ones. That's number 1. Let me make it very clear, we discussed long and hard with the Provincial government to come to the table to fund it 50/50 no matter what the contribution was from the Federal P3 program and they did and that's what this money is for. Nothing less, nothing more, that is what this money is for. When you say you want a referendum so citizens have a say, as I said earlier, citizens have a say, Madam Speaker. It's called the election. They vote. If they don't like what you do they'll vote you out so it's not a referendum that gives the citizens a say, it's the election where they have their say. We have always had that and will continue to do that. Madam Speaker, we have identified our infrastructure problems. In case everybody forgot here, how hard have we lobbied with the Association of Manitoba Municipalities to get 1 percent of the existing PST? We have tried and tried and tried and we will continue to try. And that will take care of all of the funding we need for these kind of projects. The Association of Manitoba Municipalities that represents every single municipality in the province believes that we should be getting 1 percent of the existing PST. You have heard the numbers. That would basically address so many of our problems. So, Madam Speaker, this has been discussed over and over again. I remember saying at the last meeting of EPC. If anybody says we're rushing into this, come on. Get serious. We're not rushing into this. This has been talked about for probably four decades, maybe five decades now. The reality is there is the opportunity right now. There is a partnership that can make this happen and on top of that with our other problems, we came up with the greatest solution. There are some who basically you know, dissed it, but now it seems like it's working out very well. We dedicated 1 percent. We had a property tax increase of 1 percent that went directly to local streets. Another 1 percent went to regional roads and that keeps on building so we can reinvest in our infrastructure because we could not sit around and do nothing. Okay? These are all facts that people have to look at. You know, I think it is unfortunate that we're having this discussion. It takes away. I must comment that I am not...I really don't understand what Councillor Havixbeck was referring to. We're talking about a referendum. I'm not sure she was addressing the referendum, maybe it will come forward. This is a positive step for the City of Winnipeg. This is long overdue and you know what, we're not just talking about the southwest. We want to go east. We want to go west. We want to go north. We want people to basically have that opportunity no matter where you live in the city. You can't do it all at once so here is where we're starting. And it's a great beginning and let's hope it gets finished so it covers every part of the city. I say absolutely no to the referendum.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. It's been good having the debate here today. I would love to have an opportunity to have this debate with all 700 plus thousand people in the City of Winnipeg. Have the debate and have the discussion. What is the harm? There is a whole notion that the funds will disappear if we don't support this particular project. We knew from the last...the previous incarnation of Rapid Transit. The money ended up getting repurposed to go towards recreational amenities that have helped community clubs and recreation facilities city wide. The Provincial government and the Federal government, they want to see, they want to support Winnipeg in many ways and I think this is an opportunity for them to do so by supporting multiple opportunities that we have in the city as outlined as debated, as discussed, as planned through our Transportation Master Planning exercise. The notion is that young people like Zach Fleisher are the number one people who want to see Rapid Transit Phase Two and again it's a small sample size, but you believe the Probe polling that came out on it, the demographic that was least interested in spending \$590 million on Rapid Transit Phase Two was the young people, the people who have to pay for it over the course of their lives. Thirty seven percent support versus 49 for 35 to 54 and 39 percent in support for 55 plus and there is this whole notion about that us as elected officials we need to have the vision, we got to be the visionaries. There was an editorial in the Free Press today. You know what; it was visionaries who tore down all of north Portage and build Portage Place. It was visionaries to tore down our really cool Gingerbread City Hall and built this rather bunkerish building. It was vision. Councillor Mayes talked about the Investors Group Field location. It's a nice venue, but it's in the wrong spot. Heck, it was even visionaries that decided let's go with diesel buses instead of street cars and rail vehicles we have had in the city in the past. Those were supposed visionaries. What's wrong to go out and have a discussion, a broader discussion to decide if you know what, maybe this is the right vision, maybe it's not the right vision. Again, this is so big; this is so important we need to have a broader perspective on it. Technology is changing, too. If we delay this in

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
June 25, 2014

the next five or ten years, Google is already testing self-driven vehicles. Maybe we don't need to build new cloverleafs because vehicles can move independently through artificial intelligence through intersections without having to have signals for example. They will know the best way to move through, they are talking to each other. We are probably not that far off from those technologies existing today. The whole notion it's going to cost more? Again, if the railways move out of our downtown core, we may have a very good opportunity to actually produce Rapid Transit routes throughout the city at a lower cost, so I encourage all of you today, to support the motion before you today and Madam Speaker, I would request a recorded vote. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: We shall do that. Let's start with the recorded vote. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Fielding and Wyatt.

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 3, Nays 13.

Madam Speaker: Motion is lost. Moving on to other motions in front of us, we have motion number one which is revised.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE – MOTIONS

Motion 1

Moved by Councillor Vandal

Seconded by Councillor Browaty

WHEREAS on December 12, 2012, Council approved that \$100,000 from the proceeds of the sale of 227 Provencher Boulevard (former St. Boniface Police station), be committed to improvements to Boulevard Provencher with the condition that the Winnipeg Public Service work with the area Councillor, area residents and Business Improvement Zone to implement the improvements;

AND WHEREAS the Provencher Boulevard Business Improvement Zone (BIZ) has led the consultation and planning through their streetscape revitalization strategy process with the area residents, Councillor, as well as the Public Service;

AND WHEREAS the BIZ shall be responsible for the implementation and completion of the works including maintenance;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council directs the \$100,000 contribution to Boulevard Provencher improvements approved by Council on December 12, 2012 to be disbursed to the Provencher BIZ as a grant;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the provision of a one-time grant of \$100,000 to the Provencher BIZ be subject to:

- 1) the City entering into a grant agreement with the Provencher Boulevard BIZ which sets out the terms and conditions pursuant to which the City's grant is to be provided and;*
- 2) approval of final plans, specifications, maintenance responsibilities and installation, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Property and Development and the Director of Public Works.*

Councillor Vandal: I'd like to ask Council's indulgence to suspend the rules and deal with this now. I can introduce it for a few minutes?

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Vandal: Yes, this really is housekeeping. Last December...well December of 2012 actually, we sold the Police station on Provencher Boulevard for 600,000, 100,000 of that went to street improvements on the Boulevard with the Provencher BIZ and essentially the administration informed me this week that we would have to formalize an agreement with the Provencher BIZ in order to give the BIZ a one-time grant of \$100,000 to fund the street improvements on the street, the banners, the flower beds and assorted other improvements. It is something which was approved about 18 months ago and it simply formalizing the legal agreement necessary to let the money flow.

Madam Speaker: Any other further speakers, no. Call the question. All those in favour, opposed, carried. Motion 2, Councillor Havixbeck, it's regarding the patios. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Havixbeck.

Motion 2

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

WHEREAS the Provincial government has already taken initiatives to reduce public exposure to second-hand cigarette smoke by enacting The Non-Smokers Health Protection Act;

AND WHEREAS the inhalation of second-hand smoke has been linked to a myriad of health implications;

AND WHEREAS individuals who are enjoying a restaurant experience deserve the same opportunity to enjoy a smoke-free atmosphere on an outdoor patio as they do inside the restaurant;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT The City of Winnipeg will call on the Province of Manitoba to examine the possibility of extending the locations outlined in The Non-Smokers Health Protection Act to include publically accessible patios.

Councillor Havixbeck: Well, I'm quite surprised we're actually discussing this item and am quite pleased we are. I guess...I had a constituent, someone who works and is very involved in the smoking cessation programs in the city along with Murray Gibson, contact me and ask me to drive this forward and upon speaking with our Director of Community Services, Mr. Clive Wightman, he informed me that with the health transferring to the Province, that this was now a Provincial responsibility and the best we could do as a Council was to push for no smoking and that the bylaw be expanded and extended to encompass patios and I know there are Councillors with their own experiences on this and I hope that everybody would unanimously support this around the table in moving to forward to put the call on the Province to begin this process so it may or may not be eligible for something to happen this year, but it is a step in a very positive direction that shows leadership. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding, then Councillor Eadie. Councillor Fielding, did you have your hand up? Okay, Councillor Eadie, pardon me.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks, Madam Speaker, I thought I was going to debate this at PCS next month, but anyway. I stand here as a smoker who stopped for ten years, who started again. I remember the debate about banning smoking in all the public indoor public places and the debate went on and there was actually a study done, because at the time it came through I was a smoker, over that time, but anyway I ended up stopped smoking because almost every smoker knows that it's not good to smoke. And they would like to quit. So, you know, if we're going to put in efforts, we should try to help people to deal with that but I remember the study. Actually, it was Councillor Browaty's predecessor, Mark Lubosch had a study done about, talked about...because I said why don't we have a clear air policy because you know what, when I did quit smoking and I was walking down Main Street sucking in the exhaust fumes I thought to myself, well why did I quit smoking because this stuff isn't good for you either when you are outdoors, right. So there was a study done and they said that because the exhaust fumes supposedly disperse, it somehow doesn't have a bad effect on your lungs, supposedly. This is what they said. So that study was done. Now I have been listening to the debate in other cities on this matter and to me, I find it very interesting that now they are saying that "x number of feet" or this distance away and now all of a sudden cigarette smoke can have an effect on people's lungs. Well, which studies are they? You hear these studies and I think there is a right for people to buy...well there seems to be a right still for companies to sell cigarettes in this country. It's a legal thing to do and I do recall how busy the Salisbury House was at Matheson and Main for many, many years and when the no smoking policy came in, slowly and very slowly, but it happened actually all of a

sudden really quick, that's a very slow restaurant now. There is not that many people there anymore, they don't have a patio or anywhere for people go and have a cigarette and still socialize because that's what happens at the Salisbury House, the north end Sals. Or used to happen, it still does happen for some people but for the vast majorities that ever did that, it's not there, so now we are asking people to ban smoking on patios. I know there are a lot of people who attend certain restaurants. Santa Lucia Restaurant, right on Main Street in my ward. They built a little deck off there because for people wanted a place to smoke because many, as a matter of fact, probably the majority of people who go into the restaurant, at least to their lounge part, are smokers and so when I start hearing that we are trying to push banning outdoor consumption of cigarettes because other people have the right and yeah they do have the right not to suck in smoke, but hopefully one can sit in a different seat, but all I can say is I get really concerned here when we start limiting, because in Victoria as I understand it, now they are talking about banning smoking on public sidewalks because of that very issue I spoke about, this thing about somehow now we know this is pollution in the air that people are going to take in and it's going to cause them to get cancer. For me, I don't think that this is a fair issue to do. It's a politically good one to do because there are many, many nonsmokers in this city and this province and so for me I won't be actually supporting this because I think that at some way, we have to carry a balance. We and I did vote to ban smoking on sports fields around kids. I think that's one of the ideas there is... simply you are at an event where you are supporting athletic, good healthy thing to do, unless you're playing football and you are not that good and you get crunched, but anyway, the point I am just trying to make though is that there are places where outdoors it makes sense to ban. But this is just going crazy, it's too much. If we want to, let's make tobacco illegal then, like really, you might as well do that because I think it's crazy, it just makes no sense so I won't be supporting it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Ya, I'm going to move that this be referred to the Protection and Community Services Committee.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk we will vote on the referral now then? Okay, all those in favour of referring? Recorded vote. All those in favour please rise.

Clerk: Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Smith, Steen, Swandel, Vandal.

Madam Speaker: All those in opposition, please rise.

Clerk: His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Mayes, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 6, Nays 10

Madam Speaker: Motion is lost. Referral is lost so we continue now? Councillor Vandal would you like to continue.

Councillor Vandal: Actually, I'm going to stand down and see who else wants to talk.

Madam Speaker: We need to close on it, so if you would like to, Councillor Havixbeck. Are there any further speakers?

Councillor Havixbeck: Call the question, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motion 7, the infrastructure question. Motion 7 the infrastructure question. All those in favour to suspend? Contrary? Carried. Okay. Motion 7. Councillor Wyatt, can you open please.

Motion 7

Moved by Councillor Wyatt,

Seconded by Councillor Havixbeck,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following wording and one question be placed on the 2014 Civic Election Ballot:

The Provincial Government increased the Provincial Sales Tax (PST) by one percent, from 7% to 8%, without a required referendum. The one percent sales tax increase collects approximately \$170 million every year from sales inside Winnipeg. Yet the Provincial Government is dedicating only approximately \$50 million a year from Winnipeg's roads and bridges, taking \$120 million out of Winnipeg.

Do you believe that all the revenues collected by the Provincial Government's one percent increase in the PST from inside the City of Winnipeg should be used towards fixing Winnipeg's existing roads and bridges?

Yes _____

No _____

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, thank you for suspending the rules, Madam Speaker and Councillor Fielding for approving that. This is pertinent to the Fall election. The matter before us today, Madam Speaker is straightforward. The Mayor actually spoke to it quite well.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, yes?

Councillor Eadie: I didn't hear the vote to suspend the rules.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Fielding asked for suspension.

Councillor Eadie: There was no vote.

Madam Speaker: I asked the question. This is the 3rd time. We have done this the other two. Okay, sorry, it will be on Hansard I'm sure

Councillor Vandal: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The wording says notice of motion. Which nobody heard.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Vandal, they heard when it was your turn, I'm sure.

Councillor Vandal: I heard that, because there were actual questions

Madam Speaker: I'm sorry; you have the floor Councillor Wyatt

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, it's pretty straightforward. The Mayor actually spoke to this earlier. Well in terms of the history of our Council attempting to secure funding from growth revenues, the Mayor has led the charge in the past and this Council has been part of it to speak to the whole issue of growth revenue with regards to funding our infrastructure. It was somewhat of a shock to us when the government decided to raise the sales tax. And it's still a concern that, in terms of the funding of that sales tax, Madam Speaker, the funding coming back to the City. We know from our own administration, from work done by Corporate Finance, that based on the amount of funds they are collecting, that in terms of the retail sales tax ratio of what Winnipeg would notionally be collecting, which is 61 percent of the entire economy, it works out to 170 million which would be Winnipeg's share based on that. We are right now receiving roughly \$50 million a year for roads and bridges, which isn't reflective of the entire amount being collected inside the city of Winnipeg from this new one percent sales tax. I don't begrudge my colleagues outside of the City of Winnipeg, the Rural Municipalities, I wish them all the best and good luck with all their projects, but at the same time I believe what's collected inside Winnipeg, paid by the citizens of Winnipeg, should stay inside Winnipeg. We have a huge infrastructure deficit Madam Speaker and we're struggling right now to fund it as we know as was rightly pointed out we're setting aside one percent for residential streets and one percent for regional streets. That does not include our bridges. That does not include our new regional infrastructure that we were talking about earlier today, strategic infrastructure. That does not include costs of Rapid Transit. We have huge challenges that affect us and right now, less than half of what the Province is collecting from the sales tax inside the City of Winnipeg is coming back. This question is very simple, very objective question. It does not use words this are inflammatory, it uses words that are frank, it uses words that are fair. This is what's being collected by the Province. This is what's being turned over to the City of Winnipeg. And really what we are saying here, it's almost a common sense question, do you believe revenues being collected based on this one percent should be staying inside the city of Winnipeg for the good of fixing infrastructure, our existing infrastructure, our existing roads and our existing bridges? You know I think it's a common sense question and I think though it's a plebiscite, we know it's nonbinding, but it's an opportunity without really any extra cost because we are having an election anyway and the ballots have to be printed, to send a message, a message by the way Madam Speaker, that this Council to it's credit has been consistent on. Not just this Council, but previous Council to this and previous Council to that in terms of calling on it. We can go back to the days of the New Deal with Glen Murray and the efforts he made with calling on the Province for growth revenues. So it was a huge shock to see the sales tax go up Madam Speaker, it was a huge challenge to see that and I really think we need to send the message out there. When we go back out there this Fall we're going to hear that, or this Summer, we're going to hear that from the constituents. I heard it four years ago. Fix the roads, get them resolved, fix the infrastructure. I tell you what, it's frustrating to be able to say where are the dollars coming from? Fifty percent or more of our revenues come from property tax, we know that.

Our tools are limited which is why we have been calling for this and we've been saying that we are prepared to stand front and centre with the Province on the idea of growth revenues to do these things we believe in. This is a very simple question. It deserves to go on the ballot and I hope it has the support of everyone here today. Thanks very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Swandel then Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Eadie: Actually, I've decided not to speak Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: You know again, referendums and plebiscites are signs of weak leadership in my opinion. When we talk about this one percent tax increase, for ten years is what was actually put forward, I believe. Ask yourselves the contribution to BRT, would we include that as part of our share? Do we include Winnipeg's share of highway construction outside the city? I don't know about you, but I use the highway to get to Brandon or to get to Grand Beach or for that matter, what about Provincial parks? Should we all be contributing to infrastructure at Provincial parks? What about combined sewer overflow contributions, what about water treatment plant contributions and what about, what about, what about? The citizens of Winnipeg are also citizens of the Province of Manitoba. There is a great deal of infrastructure in the Province of Manitoba that all citizens benefit from. Sixty one percent of the population being in the city of Winnipeg. I'll take Councillor Wyatt's number. What should our contribution be to the rest of the infrastructure throughout the province? I don't know how you measure that, I've driven to places as far away as Thompson and Flin Flon and I have used those roads. I used to go on a regular basis up to Waterhen, Manitoba. I have been all over this province using roads, highways and bridges and some of the community infrastructure that's in place in those other municipalities as well. The balancing act you do here, I don't know how you do it and you make sense so that we all understand as one taxpayer we are getting our share. I can tell you if you were to land \$150 million in to the laps of the City of Winnipeg starting this year, we don't have the capacity to spend \$150 million. We wouldn't have the capacity for three to five years to ramp up to the full \$150 million a year plus growth. Let me remind you, it was a little while ago we added \$9 million into our budget and that \$9 million came from the growth in that one percent between last year and this year that was distributed on a per capita basis so in Winnipeg it was \$9 million. That money won't hit the road...over half of it won't hit the road until next year because we don't have the capacity to do that work. We are already at capacity, we need to do better planning. We need to plan and budget, three to five year plans before we go and start making these demands like we're the poor, beaten child of the Province. We're not. We're well funded for the projects that we can do. Now, we need to spend money as one taxpayer, wisely. We need to do it in concert with the Province and with the Federal government, not throwing stones at them or lobbing grenades at Broadway. There is enough money right now on our plate to do what we can physically do. You know, if you want to start moving faster, let's go back. Let's go back to the stimulus funding where we moved very fast. Let's go back to the fire stations where we moved very fast. Let's go back to our Police headquarters where the other Police building has to be decommissioned by the end of this year because of the structure it's in that we are moving very fast. If you want to move that fast, be prepared because you don't have a plan. You don't have a plan, you don't have the supports, you know, you don't have the design capacity, the engineering capacity to put that money to work. So you know, what are we talking about here? A PST increase, I don't think the Mayor said it, that PST increase when it was done by Duff Roblin and that government of the day it was to protect the city against the 1950 flood. I don't know if you all know this, but since the 1950 flood there have been two floods of greater magnitude than the 1950 flood Madam Speaker. The 1997 flood and the 2009 flood which should be still fresh in our memories were greater floods than the 1950 flood. That benefited greatly the citizens of the city of Winnipeg, but if you put it into a per capita basis, the cost of doing that at that time we were probably spending a far greater proportion of what that money was. There has to be some sense to all of this, there has to be some planning. Just throwing the concept out there, I appreciate the concept Councillor, it's good, but you have to put it into the context of the Province. You can't put it into the context of Winnipeg. We need to be responsible leaders, keepers of the taxpayer's purse, not the Winnipeg taxpayer's purse, but all of the citizens of Manitoba taxpayers purse, Canadians taxpayer's purse. We have to be responsible. We have to look at it in context, Provincial, Federal, municipal. We know that we have impacts in this province far greater than the boundaries of the city of Winnipeg and we have to respect that and we have to work within the capacity that we have. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: To your earlier comments re. referendums, clearly worded questions, I don't think, with all due respect, this is all that clearly worded. It's worth pointing out we have \$113 million. Our second biggest source of revenue in the City of Winnipeg after property taxes, our second biggest source of revenue is government grants, some of that is Federal, but the lion's share is Provincial. It comes in all different forms, like ambulance. We have a great ambulance service. People tend to forget about it, but it's a thing we have to do co-operatively. I don't know what specifically we should be saying in terms of roads and bridges here when we get Provincial funding on a number of

other things. Earlier today we voted on going in together with the Province on Assiniboine Park. We don't seem to have any trouble taking the money there. We voted to going with the Province on Jonathan Toews Community Centre; don't have any trouble taking the money there. So I think as Councillor Swandel says, there is a lot of overlap here in terms of what it is we do with the Province. A good example is at the very south end of my ward, Hallama Road, you can only get to that part of the city of Winnipeg by driving into the RM of Ritchot and then back into the city of Winnipeg. One guy's property, his farmhouse is in the city of Winnipeg, but his farm is in the RM of Ritchot, so it's a little hard to figure out what exactly should be spent where and Ritchot, merci conseiller, et puis, just in conclusion, I appreciate Councillor Wyatt trying to raise the issue and we do deserve a fair share of the Provincial sales tax, but I don't think it's an appropriate issue for the ballot. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Excellent speeches by my friends on the Riel Community Committee. Just simply to add to that what we're asking for is the Provincial government, on a retroactive basis or on a proactive basis next year, to carve out money that's already been allocated for infrastructure projects for Lake Winnipeg improvements, we're asking them to cancel those projects and rather reallocate all of this money to the City of Winnipeg on a motion which landed in front of us about 45 minutes ago. So we know there wasn't a heck of a lot of forethought presented to this. I'm, unlike many of my colleagues, I think the opportunity for a plebiscite presents an incredible strategic opportunity to do something significant, but you have got to put some thought into it. You can't just drop a motion in front of people that says notice of motion, have a phantom vote because I know several of us didn't hear the vote and now we'll put them on the ballot questions. Madam Speaker, elections are sacrosanct and I would advise this Council before we decide to put a half thought out motion on an election ballot, for all of the city of Winnipeg to vote on, to give it more little more thought at the very least, have it referred to the appropriate committee so that you can have the time to discuss the pros and the cons. Councillor Swandel makes a very strong argument about the capacity of our engineering firms and the capacity of our construction firms in the city of Winnipeg. This is very significant. We should take the time to do it properly and at this point I am not comfortable moving forward with this ask, asking the Province to undo future budgets, future commitments they have made to all Manitobans, including Winnipeggers and to just give us all the money.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thanks Madam Speaker. Again we have tried all sorts of tactics to try and get the Province to step up and take notice of our needs we have in the city. We have very limited means to raise revenues to do the types of services that people notice and interact with most closely. If you wake up tomorrow morning and you flush your toilet and the water is not there, you call the City. Your street lights or stop signs get changed, people notice it right away, it's the City of Winnipeg, the municipal level of government that people notice the most. Yet again, we get 8 cents on the dollar of all tax revenues raised. This might be a way to actually get some attention from the Provincial government, therefore I am in support. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on the Item? Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I have to applaud Councillor Wyatt for what he is trying to do here and to make an issue of this. It's important that the City of Winnipeg have a larger share of the Provincial sales tax that is coming from the Provincial government. The PST was raised one percent and I believe Winnipeg does deserve a fair share of that, those are growth revenues that we need to tap into. As I was listening to some of the debate and comments here, the fact is the PST is raised throughout the entire province of Manitoba from other towns and other municipalities and in this motion, the way it's worded in its present form, I have a bit of trouble supporting it saying that all revenues raised from this increase go to the City of Winnipeg, so it's hard for me to support this today, but I just wanted to applaud Councillor Wyatt for what he is trying to do and to send the message loud and clear to the Province of Manitoba that we need to have a larger share than what we're getting right now, with respect to the PST.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Just really briefly, I think a lot of good things have already been said and this meeting is getting very long but I don't think this is a good negotiating approach with our greatest funding partner. I think it's somewhat disrespectful, it's really kind of a political tactic and I also share Councillor Vandal's concerns that you are putting something on the ballot. It's clearly...it's got a bias in it that I think is disrespectful to the voting public as well as our major funding partner. I don't see any real results coming from it and so I don't think it's worth putting that out there in that way. We just had a 13-3 vote against... and many people voted against the concept of a referendum itself and here we are with another one that just...I also agree it said notice of motion and no one had time to think about this, us discussing this. We haven't had time to put thought into this and so to put a question on the ballot, this just being handed to us and we didn't even have time to think about it, I think is inappropriate. I'm sure the intention is obviously to get

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
June 25, 2014

revenue for the City and we want that, but I think the approach and what's happened here today is very concerning and I don't think we should support it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I want to get the Clerk's attention because I've been called...

Councillor Wyatt: Based on Councillor Pagtakhan, if the seconder is favourable to it and Council Chamber is fine, I'll move a friendly amendment to the motion which is change the wording "do you believe that all, if not most". That would be a friendly amendment to address Councillor Pagtakhan's concern. Would Councillor Havixbeck accept that?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck?

Councillor Havixbeck: Madam Speaker, I didn't get a chance to say that...I wanted to rise to speak on this item because we were in a discussion about how to do this, but I would like move a motion to refer this to EPC without instruction.

Madam Speaker: We'll vote on the motion to refer to EPC. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We are moving on to By-laws now, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you Madam Speaker, I'm just waiting for quiet. Madam Speaker I move the following by-laws be read a 1st time. By-Law 68/2014, 69/2014, 70/2014, 71/2014, 78/2014, and 79/2014.

Madam Speaker: All in favour ? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 68/2014, 69/2014, 70/2014, 71/2014, 78/2014 and 79/2014.

Mayor Katz: I move that By-laws numbered 68/2014 to 71/2014 both inclusive and By-laws 78/2014 and 79/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Madam Speaker: I see you have the volume up on, thank you.

Clerk: By-law No. 68/2014 and 71/2014 both inclusive and By-laws numbered 78/2014 and 79/2014.

Mayor Katz: I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 68/2014 to 71/2014 both inclusive and By-laws 78/2014 and 79/2014 be read a 3rd time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: We'll now move onto...I guess yeah, question period for the Mayor at 4 o'clock. Any questions for the Mayor? Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Madam Speaker. Can the Mayor please tell everyone what the process will be now for the release of the Real Estate audit?

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, the process is very similar to the previous. There will be a Council seminar, then there will be a meeting of the Audit Committee and then they will probably call a special meeting of Council.

Madam Speaker: Pardon me? Yes, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Very briefly, Madam Speaker, I had a question. Some of us received a letter from Brent Letain, who's one of my constituents. He's the President of IATSE Local 63. That's a union that basically represents stage

hands. He had concerns about the Investors Group Field and the union he is part of being shut out of the work there. Concern seems to be with Triple B, the entity that runs the stadium, I just wonder if the Mayor has any...anything he can address on this issue in terms of whether or not Investors Group is using a different promoter or in some way, the best route for this to be addressed for Mr. Letain, in terms of...he seems to feel it should be addressed to the City of Winnipeg Councillors and Mayor whereas it may well rest with Triple B.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, this isn't the 1st time. We had something similar to that with True North. As many people may know, when there's concerts taking place there, it's a joint venture between the Winnipeg Football Club and True North. They are the ones making that decision. I don't know if there is really anything that we can do and I think the discussion should take place with the parties that are directly involved.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Mayor? Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. Through you, Madam Chair...Speaker. Mr. Mayor you have two Committees, the Environment Committee and the Age Friendly Winnipeg Committee. They are committees that you have in your office where the press does not come because it's in your office and I'm wondering if you can tell us one idea that was put in...that came forward from the Age Friendly Committee that has been instituted or a movement to see something happen. One idea.

Mayor Katz: It's extremely unfortunate that the Councillor has not been properly informed. Those meetings do not take place in my Office, they take place in a committee room. They are chaired by Councillor Nordman and Councillor Mayes and their recommendations come here on this floor of Council and if the Councillor isn't aware of some of these recommendations that have been approved and come forward, I'm very sorry to hear that but I'd be happy to give him a whole list of recommends that have come forward and will continue to come forward and maybe he might want to speak to either of the Chairs of those committees and they could enlighten him as well.

Councillor Smith: The fact is they're not...the media are not there and I want one idea they came up from the Age Friendly. Tell me one idea they've came up with that they are trying to institute with department.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, before the day is done I will get the Councillor a list, not just one; a list of all the items.

Councillor Smith: You know I have this report for this year and all it lists is things that are happening. Nothing that the Committee came up with but things that are happening in the various departments throughout the City. I want to know what the Committee came up with that is new and has been instituted.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, as I said before, the Councillor hasn't looked at maybe the reports on the website but I'm happy to supply that with him. And I think it's really unfortunate because both these committees are doing phenomenal work and I will remind the good Councillor because he chaired a committee on safety and they came up with nothing. We actually talked about disbanding it but he said we're going to start to get things done. These committees have done yeoman's work.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the mayor? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Several months ago this Council authorized the expenditure of...I think it was half a million dollars on additional audits of the Police Headquarters as well as a quantity survey of the Police Headquarters project. My understanding was those are supposed to be returned to this Council perhaps June? Does the Mayor have any information on when those will be coming forward?

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, I can tell you that the Mayor's Office was informed...actually I believe we were supposed to have them here for this Council meeting, obviously we don't have them. We have been informed by the City Auditor that they are late. They will not be coming forward as far as the Police Audit until mid-July. That is the information that I have and I believe we gave them 150 days. So they are late, end of story and I hope that addresses the question. And the Councillor is right, we basically...half a million dollars and 150 days and they are...they have advised us just a few days ago that it won't be until the middle of July.

Councillor Browaty: Audit them.

Mayor Katz: Audit them?

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Mayor? Okay seeing none, we'll move on to Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and River Bank Management. Councillor Pagtakhan.

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much Madam Speaker it's my pleasure to introduce the report of June the 5th and move adoption of consent agenda item one.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Item 1 Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 - Establishment of the "Live Downtown - Residential Development Grant Program"

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'll stand down and let Councillor Wyatt say some comments and respond.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Just reading the report, Madam Speaker. I would like to know exactly, in terms of future funding for the Program... and maybe Councillor Pagtakhan can speak to this, but in terms of the funding going forward, for these grants if you look at the actual costs directly in terms of 2017 represents grants equivalent to the incremental property taxes for the first Call for Proposals while those in 2018 represent estimated incremental property taxes from both the first and second Calls for Proposals. These costs are offset by estimated incremental municipal property taxes accrued the City as a result, assuming these rental developments are there. So the question would be is whether or not... we know when we booked this into our financials, Madam Speaker, these are real dollars, that we have to account for on an annual basis and as you can see, it's growing and starting at basically 317,000 in 2017 and going up in 2021 to \$10.4 million in terms of incremental costs associated with this. It's quite substantial in terms of actual dollars that we as a City and as we know, property taxes are a main form of revenue that we are actually going to be giving up for this program. It's substantial, it's significant and I'm concerned that from our finance point of view, whether or not we can afford this type of thing. It seems to be rather aggressive and so I have some serious concerns about that, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: I was going to be recorded in opposition, but seeing it's been stand down I'll make a couple of quick comments. I think this driving purely towards rental property is the wrong way to go. I think a lot of our rental in downtown right now is investor condos that are currently being built and as people are looking at it as an investment opportunity. So they don't show up on the regular inventory of rentals. Some of these lower-cost condo complexes, a lot of those are actually rented out. Actually if you do a search on Google or Kijiji or places like that, you can search apartments in downtown and you can also search condo rentals in downtown and they'll come up with two separate numbers. Some people have claimed that they are being counted, but if you do a little bit of a detailed analysis, you'll clearly see that they are not being counted. The one good thing in here is that, instead of it being 100% affordable, which our last multi-family grant program was driven at, this actually creates a category for I think it's 10% if not a bit more, that hit the affordability category which is inclusionary zoning which is a good way to do this, rather than just putting affordability categories on everything, which really kills the incremental taxes and you don't get the type of growth and development and a good mix of incomes in the downtown community. Just purely on it's the way it's structured, I believe these programs should be broader, that they should include all multifamily and that's how you'll will get more done in the downtown. I think when you driving just at rental like this is, that it's a big mistake, so I won't be supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Just quickly, I rise in support of this program. It's very much part of the new Housing Policy that Council just unanimously passed. It was mentioned earlier by a delegation earlier in the day and it's actually 15% was required to be affordable in partnership with the Provincial government program. It's tax increment financing so it's the new incremental taxes that are going towards something and it's not only the goal of increasing residential rental in the downtown, but also dealing with reducing the amount of surface parking lots we have plaguing our downtown; for having on-site parking and reducing surface parking lots. Affordability, density, downtown, all these things are goals that are in Our Winnipeg; they're goals that are in the new Housing Policy we just passed. It's something done in partnership with the Provincial government; we are not bearing this all alone and the idea of taxing increment financing is that these are taxes we wouldn't be receiving without the incentive because these projects would not be going forward without an incentive. That's why we have acres of surface parking lots and some of these cases, it's just not economically feasible

to provide affordable rental accommodation without an incentive program. That's why we're doing this Program. It's been studied by our excellent staff, I'd like to thank Winston Yee in the housing division, who's been very diligent and knows his stuff and the team there that brought this forward. I also know that one issue came up it's over 20 years, that's because of the nature of rental investments for developers doing rental investment, it's a longer term investment than a condo is, so there is no financing or borrowing against future taxes. It's covered off in the report, I think it's a really positive initiative and we need to take action to revitalize downtown; reduce surface parking lots; increase downtown density and have more on-site parking in the downtown. It meets all the goals of our plans. I don't know why we wouldn't do it and those are my comments Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further Speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Pagtakhan to close.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. As Councillors and as the Mayor, do we want to see more surface parking lots Madam Speaker, within our downtown? Is more surface parking lots... is a surface parking in our downtown the best and highest use of that land? No and no. We should thank Mayor Sam Katz for this this Madam Speaker, this is one of his visions and one of his commitments to the city, as Mayor, to look for a better way, a better alternative to find the best and highest use for surface parking lots in our downtown. This report clearly articulates with a graph here, it delineates graphically the boundaries of the highest points of incentive and it's a great program. Madam Speaker, that's only two years. It will be two years long in duration and with respect to the condominiums and home ownership; we need more rental property in our downtown Madam Speaker. There is a lot of condo development projects in the pipe right now and they are going to be realized in the very near future. This is for a two year program, a pilot program and after two years and I should note we are in partnership with the Province of Manitoba, we can modify and we can massage the program a bit to include some home ownership as well, so I want to say it's a great program. I appreciate the comments from Councillor Gerbasi and others on this and I'll call for the question.

Madam Speaker: Call for recorded vote those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors' Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Mayes, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Vandal and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Swandel and Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 3.

Madam Speaker: Item is carried. And we'll now move on to motions. We have none. By-laws, Councillor Pagtakhan.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 1ST READING ONLY**

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, I'll move By-law No. 67/2014 be read a 1st time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 67/2014.

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

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
June 25, 2014

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll move that by-law No. 67/2014 be read a 2nd time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 67/2014.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Madam Speaker I'll move the rule be suspended and that By-law No. 67/2014 be read a 3rd time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period. Any questions for the Chair? Seeing none we will move on to our Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Browaty on the report of June 10th.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JUNE 10, 2014**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker, I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 to 12.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Councillor Smith? All in favour of 1 through 7, 9 through 12? Contrary? Carried.

Item 8 – Sherbrook Pool Repair Project Status Report

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker, it's a pleasure to be finally bringing this report forward. I think Councillor Smith will be happy to see this in front of us today and I know the numbers now add up. We have done some work and there are contingencies in there and I will certainly be willing to respond to questions or concerns that Councillor Smith has.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: First of all I'm very pleased this has come forward and I'm very...and I like to say this: I have to congratulate the Mayor because this would not be occurring without the help of the Mayor. When I went to EPC, the Budget meeting and brought my concerns about Sherbrook Pool, the Mayor immediately budgeted 200,000 from his Office for Sherbrook Pool and he instituted...I worked with him over a period of time and he has to be congratulated for what he has done. Now, the report entitled "Recreational Needs Assessment for the Daniel McIntyre Ward", indicates the Sherbrook Pool in regard, as a unique and historic facility that provides much needed recreation services to the surrounding community, but also, other, but other caters to individuals from an area of Winnipeg to use it for medical and cultural needs. So the pool is used by people outside the Daniel McIntyre area. The only thing that concerns me about this report is on page seven, additional repairs, building code compliance requirements, the Sherbrook Pool would likely, likely and that's the word I don't like because it means that if time comes and it's not finished, they would say well it's likely promised for that period of time, but the fact is Sherbrook Pool is going to be rebuilt; it's going to be reopened, it is going to be better than it has been for years and years and so as I say, I congratulate the Mayor because without his help this wouldn't be occurring and I recognize that even though I disagree with the Mayor on many, many things. I really liked all the help he gave me over the Sherbrook Pool.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Browaty to close.

Councillor Browaty: I want to take a brief moment to congratulate Councillor Smith for his tireless effort on this particular file, he saw it through, he pushed it forward and he was certainly the lead on this file. There might be other people in the community, but again he worked his power in the Mayor's Office and saw this through, so I would like to personally congratulate Councillor Smith on the success of this file.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll call the question on item eight. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay we have Motion No. 3.

Motion No. 3

Moved by Councillor Eadie

Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz

WHEREAS the time has come to honour Harry Lazarenko, a stellar citizen of the North End;

AND WHEREAS Harry Lazarenko passionately served as the City Councillor for the Mynarski Ward and its preceding ward names for thirty years;

AND WHEREAS he and his wife have been strong supporters in the North End for over sixty years;

AND WHEREAS Harry Lazarenko's employment from 1956 to 1992 as an equipment operator with the Canadian National Railway endeared him to many North End railway workers;

AND WHEREAS Harry Lazarenko loved serving on the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, dealing with many issues important to the City's employees and residents;

AND WHEREAS Harry Lazarenko's leadership on City Council as the Deputy Speaker and Speaker from 2004 to 2010 earned him the respect of his colleagues;

AND WHEREAS Harry Lazarenko was the Riverbank Management Committee Chairperson for many years, advocating heavily for the City of Winnipeg and Province of Manitoba to reduce the erosion of Winnipeg's riverbanks;

AND WHEREAS Councillor Lazarenko was instrumental in getting the Elmwood Cemetery's riverbank restored to prevent the loss of grave sites near the river;

AND WHEREAS the Redwood Bridge connects riverbanks over the Red River near the Elmwood Cemetery, leading into the middle of the part of the North End he represented as a City Councillor;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Redwood Bridge be renamed the Harry Lazarenko Bridge;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an \$8,000 contribution from the Mynarski Ward Land Dedication Account be earmarked for the establishment of a permanent cairn / plaque memorial and new bridge signage.

Councillor Eadie: May I suspend the rules to debate this motion today?

Madam Speaker: Okay, all those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Eadie to introduce the motion.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. If I could have the motion read because most of the detail I would read off is there.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, excuse me, we'll start with the Clerk, my apologies.

(Clerk reads above motion)

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie

Councillor Eadie: I think many of it is said there and this is a positive thing about Harry. I got to know the man actually through the 90s interacting with him on various committees and I actually ended up on the draft bylaw committee that I mentioned. The draft of the access to information bylaw and ended up on that committee which he was basically chairing and anyway, I think that 30 years of service is something that should be honoured. There are some who say that that may be self-serving, but it's not self-serving to me. I think that Harry was re-elected many times to represent us for 30 years and he really did dedicate his life. You may or may not have agreed with many of his decision, but the point is that he was out there every day and actually, yes, we as Councillors, we are paid money, but the thing is it's not a 9-5 job. It's one that you are passionate about and you give and I think Harry was quite instrumental and I believe

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
June 25, 2014

everybody, including the media, does ...every year Harry would do a tour of the river and I think that was very important that he did that. He always pointed out where the problems were, and I actually had a discussion with Alf Skowron, the former City Councillor for the Elmwood Ward and he was talking about, I only remembering Harry being the River Bank Management person for a certain period of time, but it was all the way back to 1974, he was involved in the committee that dealt with that. So yes, while it's not a park, it is a bridge and I think that a bridge is appropriate in this manner. So I encourage you all to vote in unanimous support to recognize Harry Lazarenko, a man of the north end, a citizen that is stellar and we need to appreciate him for that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour of this motion? Contrary? Carried. Move on to by-laws for 2nd and 3rd reading. Councillor Browaty.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker, I move By-law No. 39/2014 be read a 2nd time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 39/2014.

Councillor Browaty: I move By-law No. 39/2014 be read a 3rd time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

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

Councillor Browaty: I move that the following by-laws be read a 1st time. By-law 72/2014, 73/2014, 74/2014

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried

Clerk: By-law No. 72/2014, 73/2014 and 74/2014

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-laws numbered 72/2014 to 74/2014 both inclusive be read a 2nd time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 72/2014 to 74/2014 both inclusive

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-laws, okay, I move the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 72/2014 to 74/2014 both inclusive be read a 3rd time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Move on to Question Period now and any questions for the Chair? Seeing none move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, Councillor Mayes, on the Report dated June 13, 2014.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED JUNE 13, 2014

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker, I'll move adoption of numbers 1 through 7 inclusive and number 9.

Madam Speaker: All in favour?—1 through 7, so we pulled number 8? yes.

Item 8 – 2017 Canada Summer Games Capital Legacy Project and In-kind Contribution

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Councillor Pagtakhan has been a great champion of this particular item and look forward to hearing his comments.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, I just want to say this is a great project for the downtown and as well, congratulations to Councillor Mayes and thank the Mayor's office for their involvement and all of Council for supporting this. Once this is built, it will be a real gem for the downtown and especially for all the youth right here in our city and through Manitoba and our capital city of Winnipeg to utilize the Field House and Sport Manitoba, so congratulations again to Sport Manitoba for this and to Councillor Mayes for championing this cause.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, do you wish to close?

Councillor Mayes: Yes, thank. This is a fine project for downtown. Councillor Pagtakhan, representing downtown on EPC has been a champion of this and I know Councillor Gerbasi's also been in favour of this sport expansion of the Sport for Life Centre. It's for elite athletes, but as well, it will be a great asset for youth in the Point Douglas neighbourhood. I also want to commend a couple of other people, the Mayor's support of the Canada Games bid and particularly on this project, Bonnie Staples-Lyon from our staff has really done fine work to get this together along with Jeff Hnatiuk from Sport Manitoba to make this thing happen and people may wonder about the Canada Games, but total cost all in, three levels of government, \$9 million, we're getting thousands visiting. Edmonton is looking to host the Commonwealth Games in 2022 and the cost of the bid is \$5-7 million, that's the cost of the bid and the Games themselves may cost a billion dollars, so we're upgrading to the Sport for Life Centre downtown, we're upgrading the Pan Am Pool, we're upgrading U of M track facility, we're upgrading things across the city, hopefully some in St. Vital, but we'll come back to that later, but we are doing a lot of good work here and we are going to get a lot of visitors. This is a good initiative, the Canada Games, and pleased to support that the legacy part of this is going to be right here, right down Main Street from here in the Support for Life Centre.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of Item 8? Contrary? Carried. We have Motion 4, Councillor Mayes and myself on Little Mountain Park, that will be an automatic referral to Protection and Community Services. Now onto by-laws, Councillor Mayes.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Councillor Mayes: I move, Clerk up first or am I up first? I am? I move that By-law No. 77/2014, By-law of the City of Winnipeg to amend responsible pet ownership be read a 1st time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 77/2014

Councillor Mayes: I move By-law No. 77/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 77/2014.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 77/2014 be read a 3rd time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Move on to Question Period. Any questions for the Chair? Seeing none. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Swandel

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JUNE 3, 2014**

Councillor Swandel: I will introduce the report and introduce items 1 to 8.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? 1 and 8 have been pulled, 5. Okay, so I'll call the question on 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Item 1 -Capital Integration Project - Southwest Transitway (Stage 2) and
Pembina Highway Underpass**

Madam Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Swandel: Just for the record, Councillor Vandal gave me his proxy before he left. Councillor Vandal had to leave to do an important opening of a park in his ward, so he had to leave on City business. I think a lot of this has already been spoken to earlier on in some of the other matters spoke to. I think that at the end of the day, I'm pretty sure the the vote on this will be about 12-4, maybe worst case scenario, 11-5. There will be a couple of people for political reasons, there will be a couple of people for practical reasons, I don't know why else anybody else might not support it, but I think this is going to go ahead. I'll listen. My two issues that I have with this are one; the relocation of the railroad closer to residents' homes and two; that we are not considering the relocation or the rationalization of the railroad in the overall context of this Corridor at the same time because I think there is a great deal of value for money to be achieved there and if you were to do a comparative cost benefit, the cost might be greater. I don't know that it would be, my sense is that it would be close to break even and maybe a little bit better than what we are planning to do, but the benefit would far outweigh the benefits of what we are going ahead and doing. I don't think we've done enough work on that. I'll close with some other comments, but for now I'll listen to what everyone else has to say.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Who pulled this item? Councillor Wyatt, would you like speak. Okay. Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, actually, I'm going to be pretty short on this. Some questions were called, but one of the things that we need to understand here is that Rapid Transit is actually part of a bigger whole transit system. The City of Winnipeg is in the mass transportation business and part of that needs to be Rapid Transit. Bus Rapid Transit, I think is actually a very good way to go and while people will say that diesel buses are running on it now, we know that the future is not that far away from us where battery powered buses will run and those are electrical as well. So if that's the reason people were focusing in on Light Rail transport that it was using electricity, but the most important essential thing to consider about this and I know in my ward people don't see there is necessarily a benefit from it, but again it's the whole system and there will be a benefit for certain individuals who travel from the north part of Winnipeg who have to go all the way to the south part of Winnipeg and many times those of us who have no alternative but to take a bus, will really appreciate this Bus Rapid Transit corridor in the south and we have to start the whole Rapid Transit somewhere, and this is a great place. In Edmonton they started in a weird place because of the Commonwealth Games, that's where they started their Rapid Transit. So, in terms of the money, this is a really big project and I need to say something. I am actually opposed to P3s. I'm sick and tired of arguing about whether or not a P3 or whatever. I have come to a conclusion that if that's the only way, like really, the Federal government is telling us this is basically the only way you are getting money for this, so we do need the money so I'm going to leave it at this. It's simply this: I have had to put it in my mind, yes it's one taxpayer but what I say is the Conservative Government of Canada has decided that they would like to put their money in the project and I like to think of it this way, they are the ones deciding to spend the extra money that's more than likely involved with paying off this project to go ahead and I'll leave it at that. Because, when I look at the Chief Peguis Trail on the P3, all of a sudden the Government of Canada is trying to say, "oh we paid for this part or we paid for that"...they didn't want to own the idea that they are actually paying for the P3 extra cost. So that's how I rationalize it because people are asking about people who are in principle...at what point do you continue to try to argue when it keeps getting forced on you. Some will say that it is not being forced on us, but you know the reality is we need to move on a project, and there probably is some risk transfer here. Will there be higher construction inflation? We know that construction inflation is rising faster than inflation, we know then the basket of goods we all purchased. The City of Winnipeg and anybody who is doing construction was quite clear at Assiniboine Park as a matter of fact too, certain kinds of construction costs, they can go up. A P3 will take on that risk, but I don't necessarily believe they are taking on a huge amount of risk, other than maybe what is happening under the underpass whenever you go under the ground as Councillor Wyatt could tell you, you start running into some real issues and problems that may be unforeseen. Anyway, what I do know though is that private corporations are risk adverse and they are not going to bid on a project that they think is overly risky either because they don't want to suck up the extra

millions of dollars. So, just I'll leave you with that, but we do need the Rapid Transit. Finish Phase One, Phase Two. We really do need the rest of this project. There are many bus routes that will utilize this particular Rapid Transit route. It's not just the 100 and whatever buses that will run down this Rapid Transit corridor. There are other buses that will be able to utilize this speedier way to get into the neighbourhoods that serve down in the southwest of our city, so it will help and be beneficial to other bus riders who travel into downtown and go back and forth to work and I think that actually it will provide a real, better convenience and remember it's the whole transit system. This is part of a whole transit system and as long as those routes are convenient, the ones that aren't really the rapid, rapid ones but that will be able to use pieces as long as it gets out and people can get to those buses and use them. So I think that's really important. I support it. I know that I have received many people who say I should vote it down, but again, I want to make this my final comment on this because we have a plan to fix our local roads and regional roads. The local renewal is a 25 year plan. We are being, in regard to other things, we are planning, we are making proper decisions and as I said eventually that Local Street Renewal Program will be in the hundreds of millions of dollars to catch up and fix our real bad problems. So, I think that's the last thing I wanted to mention. It is a big complex project. I'll leave it at that. I have to vote for this Rapid Transit and I thank all those who did all the work, Oh and that's what I wanted to mention as well. You know, it has been a very difficult couple of few years. A very difficult couple of few years on Capital Projects, but you know I think that there is a bunch of studying going into this. At some point we have to rely on our City senior administration and I think this is good. I know that the big project, I can't remember the exact dollars of Phase One but I know we have administrators involved in this that we can rely on and ask them questions and confirm they are okay. I don't know if there is a motion to amend the particular report, if it's come up yet or not, but if it does I wanted to say I would support that amendment. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Smith.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We debate a lot of banality and a lot of things here and I'm probably the cause of some of that as are my colleagues, but then you get an issue like this, a big issue, an important issue and I think even a historic issue and there is a biblical quotation, John 4:23 "but the hour cometh and now is" and I think the hour has cometh for this proposal. People have been talking about it for 40 years. I said it here before that I left to go university in 1981 and people were talking about Steve Juba and the monorail idea and nothing came of that. We've had 30 plus years go by, now we have the hour at hand to make a decision on this item. Do we know it's perfect? No, we don't know that it's perfect, but we could continue to debate for another 30 years in search of the perfect proposal. People raised a number of objections. Well, there is a dog leg here and it's shorter if you go straight down Letellier line. Well, we heard a lot of presentations from a lot of experts over the last 3 years saying that if you go down the Letellier line you also run into a lot of level crossings, it will slow it down; it'll make it less cost efficient; it'll make it slower and so the recommendation was not to do that, but do a dog leg and there was another reason to go in the dog leg and we get a lot of criticism here, "you should be building up not out, you should be building up, not out". So here's a possibility where you develop a line to try and encourage people to build up, to do infill housing. Does this line make sense in that way? Well I have in front of me, a report that was adopted by Council before I was elected, the Transportation Master Plan and in that there is a chart of six different Rapid Transit corridors. This one, the one we are talking about with five major redevelopment sites within one kilometre, all the rest combined have four, that's all the rest, the other potential lines have four. So this is the point, this is the area with the most opportunity for major redevelopment sites: Parker lands, sugar beet lands, Southwood Golf Course lands. Where is that number coming from? That number, the five potential sites, is coming from another document adopted by Council, by Our Winnipeg. So Council has adopted that this was the priority. This plan made sense. This is the plan to try and encourage infill housing. Well, you don't care about the environment; you're driving it through the wetlands. Well, if we really didn't care about the environment, we would be driving through Route 1A, which is the more northerly option that was first explored, which would go through more of the forested area, instead, we're going with Route 1B and I have had a number of discussions with Dave Wardrop and the ever patient Bjorn Radstrom who is up there all day waiting from this item, from our Transit staff about why that alignment. Why are we really going through wetlands? The answer is no and we are certainly not going through lands that the City controls that are designated as wetlands. A lot of this land is privately held already. Whether that was a good decision or bad decision, it's hydro land, it's railway land, it's private developer land. We are not talking about driving this for the sake of some developer, through the midst of a pristine wetland here. We're talking about trying to do it with little impact and if you think about it, why are we doing a Rapid Transit? Part of it is our concern about the environment. We are trying to get people out of their cars into Rapid Transit. That will help with greenhouse gases, frankly it will also help with the shape of our roads, fewer vehicles on the roads is the hope here, less wear and tear on the roads. So there are a couple of reasons to do this in terms of infill housing, and in terms environment, in terms of convenience and in terms of frankly, having a vision. This idea has been talked with for 30 or 40 years without bringing it to a conclusion at the U of M and cometh the hour, I think this is the time to do that. We have heard from a couple of people...I know John Callahan was here from Amalgamated Transit Union Local 1505, the union that represents our transit workers, very much in favour of this. I asked him at noon hour, "You guys are in favour of this, right?" and the answer was "absolutely". I think that's public input that's valuable to take that the people who operate our system are very much in favour of this and lastly, Zach Fleischer, who was here before said something about..."Well, Councillor

Mayes you've always got the most profound comments or wittiest comments" or something, so I will end by quoting from Zach Fleischer himself by saying he was up here a month or so ago and he said the best time to build a Rapid Transit system was 40 years ago, but the second best time is now. We can't go back 40 years, but we can do it and so I will conclude with what I started with. The hour cometh and now is, this is the time to do this project. Is it perfect? I don't think we can know that, but it's an important step forward for the City. It's a major financial commitment yes, but it's a commitment I think we need to make if we really want to seriously do what all the other major Canadian cities have done which is make a commitment to Rapid Transit. There is a sense of doing it as Bus Rapid Transit, rather than Light Rail, which nobody has disputed the estimates that Light Rail would be two and a half times more expensive than this, so if you are concerned about the cost you can't come in here and then say we should do it rail which is two and a half times more expensive. It's a reasonable compromise, it's a reasonable extension of the existing Phase One that will benefit the University and Councillor Eadie was diplomatic enough not to say this, but the deployment of the universities in this city frankly, favours the south end a great deal and the kids from the south end, so anything we can do to help Transit get from the north down to U of Manitoba I think is part of what we should do as a city wide effort. So, I'm in favour of the item Madam Speaker and I think there is some times when we debate important things, this is one of them and I think now is the time to move forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Madam Speaker. I hope everyone reads on page nine the following in the report. "Rapid Transit is necessary for Winnipeg's ongoing growth. It is needed to ensure that residents are provided with a viable alternative to the automobile. It reduces existing and future road congestion and to build a transportation system that is capable of serving future generations. Rapid Transit is also essential for shaping land use in a manner that achieves the objectives of Our Winnipeg and corporate communities". It's important for this to go through. I listened to David Sanders and David Sanders has a lot of very valid points while trying to get information and being stonewalled and I recognize that. So I reluctantly am supporting this, but I think much of David Sanders' comments are true. Now, when I look at the polls been taken and reported in the Free Press, one of the things I mentioned to Councillor Gerbasi at all times, I mentioned a few times to her, is that you know, we have to make everybody in Winnipeg know the benefits of Rapid Transit and when they will get Rapid Transit to help them. We know right now that the Transcona is the next route and that's important, but the people of Winnipeg want to know where other routes are going to be in the future. They want to know that they are going to be able to use Rapid Transit. So I think it's important for the Committee and for the Council to communicate to the city of Winnipeg as a whole where Rapid Transit will go after Transcona. We need to publicize so they see they will get some benefit out of it and so I think we will all be supporting this. Even reluctantly, I'm supporting it. It's important for us to go forward. We started something, let's finish it.

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

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Madam Speaker. You know, there is a big white elephant in this room right now.

Madam Speaker: Excuse me are you closing?

Councillor Havixbeck: Sorry?

Madam Speaker: Sorry, the Clerk was just trying to get my attention. Go ahead and Councillor Orlikow, you're next.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. There is a big white elephant as far as I'm concerned, in the room right now. We have an audit that we are going to receive next week and I know during my interview, I was asked about two of the developers that are on this route. I question the route, I question the direction. That's the first thing I'm concerned about. Very concerned about because I don't understand what the legal ramifications would be of passing a route and receiving an audit next week. Number two; the issue of the railroads. We have heard this repeatedly. We see it in this report and it hasn't been addressed. Again and this is the third time I'm saying this on the record, nowhere is it written that this is convertible to LRT at some point down the road. It's not in writing and I know some will argue and say we heard, we heard it, we heard it, but we may be in a position in five, ten, twenty years where we want to switch this route and then some Council at that point will say how could this be approved in this format? I'm concerned about the levels of delegated authority. This was identified in one of our audits at least, and the results and so. If you have an audit what's the point of having an audit if you don't do anything with the recommendations? Additional FTEs, I don't understand why we need additional FTEs and the nomenclature on this report, this is a Rapid Transit extension. It has become some convoluted title, I don't understand that and I have heard every member around this Council pretty much say unless you identify a source of funding, what are you approving?. I have seen it on projects of \$50,000 and we are approving close to 600 million here. I can't believe that nobody is saying where the City's portion of this source of funding is coming from. We have it as a small, tiny sub note as a heading to an appendix. You know, on such a significant project, I see this vote landing at about a 9-6 and I would have hoped it would end up being closer to being

unanimous. I raised these concerns, I came to the Public Works meeting, nothing was done at that meeting it was just passed, Councillor Orlikow came to EPC and expressed some of the similar concerns and nothing was done, so here we are, I absolutely, I support the notion of Rapid Transit, I support it whole heartedly but not at all costs. I have been down this road before. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Rapid Transit is a critical investment that's needed for our city and I do support BRT. This is why my decision today to support, or not, a P3 funding model for the completion of a Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. The delegation of authority and the commitment of \$600 million in City funds and over a billion dollars in public funds, has been weighing very heavily on me for quite some time. I have appeared at numerous meetings and studied the information provided, met with administration, met with others and offered recommendations that would have helped to ensure this project can move forward, including, a limited functional design for the Pembina route and an open debate on the type of funding models and increased Council oversight, access supporting documents and provides supporting data for the project. Clearly identify the benefits of the project for the public and let the public know how Council intends to pay for it before committing the money. The taxpayers are the ones that must pay for our decisions and I know that we all take this responsibility very seriously. So after my attempts to amend and address issues I am left in the position to vote against this motion because I do not support the route chosen, I do not support the lack of Council oversight, I do not support the lack of access to key supporting documents and data, I do not support financing a project through a P3, the additional financing costs related to the transfer of risk, I'm not convinced of. I do not agree with the environmental assessment, timing, lack of scope and lack of analysis on the impact of the adjoining area and I've submitted such to the Province. I do not support the business case provided including the application that the TOD value of the developments, for I fundamentally know through the sugar beets land and the Parker lands that there may be a few...a little bit, a 5% increase in density, however, I have been assured by both of them that they are going to be building there regardless of BRT or not, that doesn't matter to them. I do not support the value for money assessment, I do not support the recommended delegation of authority from Council, I do not support the management structure that is being presented to manage this project, I do not support privatizing the maintenance of the corridor for 30 years, I do not support how Council has managed this project so far and I also don't support committing over \$20 million in 30 years without identifying how we're going to pay for it. While I realize that no one project will be perfect, there are far too many issues that I do not support preventing me from voting in favour of something I truly believe in. Regardless of how much I like the idea, so at the end of the day I have to look back, not at the concept itself, not what I personally believe in, but what is the value that I believe is being given to the taxpayer. How are we protecting that investment, not just for my own self, but for the grand scheme? So again, when I look back at all the information I have, what I could get, looking at the funding model that we're provided today, provided the management structure that we have been asked to follow, how can anybody, in my opinion, possibly agree with this? It's a huge leap of faith from Councillors who say "okay". Again, I am not sure other Councillors have been able to get the data that proves the value for money in the business case, I know some people have tried and it hasn't been made available. I am hearing that it could have been made available if I did this and this, however, it's a little late in the game for that after numerous recommendations. So again, I just do not believe that this project provides a value to the taxpayer. While I believe it's a great concept idea; while I agree that Rapid Transit does need to be in our future, the question is not that today and I'm sorry that people have been waiting so long for this discussion to happen, but this discussion hasn't happened. The discussion today before us is the P3 agreement, the delegation of authority, the management structure. It's not about LRT or BRT, it's not about plebiscites, it's not about referendums, it's about do you believe as a Councillor, do you believe that the assertions are made in all this reports for the business case, the value for money, the P3 agreement. Does this project itself, regardless of RT or not, warrant this type of investment. Again, if you do believe that, I'm very...I'm very happy for you. However I hope you respect that I don't and therefore I can't, I cannot support this, the recommendation before us today. I hope that Council immediately, regardless if this motion is supported or not, set up a specific working group to focus Council's oversight on completing the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor in a way that all Winnipeggers can support. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next...Mr. Mayor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Madam Speaker, I was just admiring the ability of some members of Council to suck and blow at the same time, Madam Speaker, I don't know how you can possibly say you support BRT, but then give a list of reasons why you are not. You either do or you don't, so let me address some of them first of all. It's interesting and it's almost offensive when someone says there is a white elephant in the room, talking about the route of this. That route was not selected by any member of Council. There was a committee, a committee appointed by rep from City of Winnipeg, Province of Manitoba, and the University of Manitoba. They selected that route. In addition to that Madam Speaker, I've heard the comment so many times, "No one has assured me that this can be transformed at a later date into BRT". Well, If you attended the last meeting of Executive Policy Committee, it's on the public record when Dave Wardrop was asked that question, he gave a definitive "yes." End of story. Yes, it can. So I think it's time to get on with

this, Madam Speaker. We know that every major city in the country has Rapid Transit. We know that Winnipeg is behind. We know this is something that Council said we're going to do. We did it in two phases. It's time to get it done, end of story. If you have no faith whatsoever in the Public Service, then say you have no faith in them. There are many members of this Council who have faith in the Public Service, who believes they have the expertise, the knowledge, the dedication to get the job done. I believe it was Councillor, I'm sure it was Councillor Gerbasi who basically reminded everybody, first phase, on time, on budget. Okay. Let's believe this will be done as well and keep in mind...and I believe the contingency they built into it is between 10 and 12 percent, a significant amount. On top of that, P3 Canada has gone up and down this with a fine toothed comb. They don't put any money in to label even the project and don't think the Provincial government just recklessly throws out 225 million. They also have done their due diligence and they believe in this project. How long do you want to wait? It's amazing, but once again that young man Zach Fleischer probably said it best and I will not repeat what Councillor Mayes said. Okay, forty years ago, now. Okay, this is the time, now and I very much respect those members of Council who have always voiced an issue and had a concern with Rapid Transit. I believe Councillor Fielding was the one I remember, right from the beginning, consistently right from the beginning, the others I don't know what you're talking about. This is something that has to be done to move our city forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel to close.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Madam Speaker. Some good comments made as were made before and I remind everyone and I believe Councillor Orlikow said it best, this is most about the method of payment, the discussion on alignment, I lost my argument then, that discussion was had some time ago when it was decided by Council where the alignment was going to go, that's been done, so we are here to talk about the delegation of authority and the P3 piece. It doesn't mean we can't talk about some of the other pieces, but those are what are key in this report, the financing through P3 and delegation of authority. Also, the spending of \$4.5 million immediately to relocate the hydro lines, sole source negotiation through Manitoba Hydro to relocate hydro lines which will happen this year. I talked to Councillor Orlikow about that because him and I both agree that we need to continue this conversation about location and the relocation of the hydro lines, you can rationalize by saying that with the movement it does actually create some opportunity for development along the Corridor. Just from the P3 perspective, I think one of the failures of P3s is the cost benefit analysis always does the cost benefit of what you are doing compared to the status quo. So the base level is what you are comparing to. So when you are doing an improvement like this, there's always going to be a positive cost benefit. What it doesn't do is it doesn't do a comparative analysis. If you were to do this and these things were to be included what would the costs and the benefits be there? If you do this and these things were included, what would cost and benefits be there. It's doing it all compared to just having regular transit, that's what the cost benefit analysis does, it doesn't give us that big picture that we...and I keep going back to this, but it's that bigger picture of planning. You talk about the opportunities for density. There's there opportunities for density along Pembina Highway and it's almost like Portage Avenue, where it's just one story and two story buildings for miles. There is opportunity there for density and somebody mentioned a little while ago the different lands development or redevelopment lands that exist. If the railroad wasn't there, the Parker lands and the sugar beet lands would be connected to the Pembina Corridor. If the railroad wasn't there, those pieces are already connected, the Parker lands are right there, on one side of the railroad and Pembina Highway is on the other. The sugar beets lands are right there on one side of the railroad and Pembina Highway is on the other. Those are included even with the Letellier alignment. Let's look at that in the cost benefit context and why we would do this. The Southwood lands are included in the Corridor no matter where you go, they are there. It's already there. That's the up and out argument. To me, to build up, I think the greatest redevelopment opportunity we have is taking Pembina Highway and driving it up from this length of one and two story buildings and these functionally obsolete little roads that people keep saying we'd have to bring them over. You take the railroad out of place, those roads you can close because you can get better access on to McGillivray and at the single points where you would actually fly over. You have had the opportunity without the railroad to do something closer to Jubilee. Your whole thinking has to change when you look at it in the bigger picture and you actually go after real value for money for the City. Not this cost benefit that just looks at the base level compared to this alignment. Funny, you know, Councillor Mayes made the comment about the time has come, or you know, the time is, well the rest of that there goes somewhere to speak about the time is now, if you are going to worship, worship in spirit and in truth. That is what the complete 423 is about, so you know, if you want to get completely into truth, praise Allah, there is a truth here that is lacking. The truth is that we're leaving a lot on the table and we still have time to take a deep breath, I don't, I hate this gun to the head, if you don't do it now you are going to lose \$150 million of Federal P3 money. That money isn't going to burn, it's not going to be destroyed, you know. By the way, all of our projects now in Building Canada, I believe the Federal government has said will go through a P3 lens, no matter what we do, they are all going to go through a P3 lens. There's more P3 money available with Building Canada. So, we're not stuck if we take a sober second look at this and bring some of the other pieces into play, like the railroad and even if we don't do that, a human piece, there are human beings out there who believe that when you move the railroad closer to their homes that it's going to have an adverse effect on their lives. We won't even go and try and find a way to help those people, to say that if you truly believe that and you truly feel damaged, or that you are going to be hurt by that, then we'll agree to buy you out at

whatever your market value is or assessed value plus so much. We don't do that, you know, I've talked about that with a number of people and nobody wants to go down that road. That's not the end of the world, we would still own that property and if you truly believe that it's not going to have a negative impact on you, then you should be able to agree to that, you should be able to take that property and then re-market it along your great transit corridor. If you are not going to destroy the value of the property. One of the things I would like to see as we go forward is not in this Report, but you'll see one of our greatest successes as a P3 was the Chief Peguis Trail extension that we just did, it was the size of project that fit well for Winnipeg construction companies and local players were able to play. I think we have to be cognizant as we go forward with this as well, that, I don't know how this P3 will ultimately shape out, but to maybe break it into some different components, you've got the tunnels, it's a huge piece of work. You've got the roadway, you've got a number of bridges, fly over is an actual bridges and then you've got the drainage component, but to combine a couple of those together, some of them, just to break it up into small enough pieces so that some of that work we might actually gain from having our local players engaged in, rather than the huge national or multinational guys. There is some value that can be created there, additional value for Winnipeg and for all Winnipeggers. Certainly those who work in those industries. I am pretty sure there are enough votes here to get this through. I do want make a comment about the Mayor's comment of sucking and blowing with regard to Rapid Transit. I don't think it's a fair comment Madam Speaker. I wholeheartedly support Bus Rapid Transit, I think it is the solution for Winnipeg, I just don't think this particular approach to Bus Rapid Transit is the right solution for Winnipeg, I think there is a great deal more value here that can be delivered to the citizens of the city Winnipeg. For the Mayor to make that comment, I think was a bit unfair. I believe that we can do better, I think we can strive to do better and all that it really takes is for us to make a commitment to do better and the opportunity is there, certainly for us to do better in this case. I'd also like to say that I certainly have proven over the years of my time here that I have a great deal of faith in the Public Service. I just don't believe that they have done enough in this case and I don't think we've pushed them to do enough. So, when it comes to the Public Service, I think that we can direct them to do more, we haven't given that direction and we need to give that direction, we need to get this done properly and in a better way. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. There is a call for a recorded vote. All those in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Swandel and Councillor Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 9.Nays 6

Madam Speaker: Item is carried. Moving on to item number 5 Mr. Clerk.

Item 5 – Implementation Plan for the Operational Review of the Public Works Department

Madam Speaker: Item 5, if you could open please.

Councillor Swandel: I'll just listen to what Councillor Wyatt and everyone else who wishes to speak has to say. I think I know where Councillor Wyatt is going. I did do a bit of work on this and I didn't get it ready to come forward. I was actually going to do it Public Works next week, but I'll listen to Councillor Wyatt's words and we'll take it from there.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes actually stood it down. Shall we start with Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: Just very briefly, the report on its face makes it look as if we are ignoring the problems with the zone system, the snow clearing. The zone system was problematic, at least in St. Vital this year, but we are getting work done on that by the administration. We are going to have a new zone system proposed to us in the Fall. I know Councillor Gerbasi raised this at Committee, I know Councillor Swandel had followed up, so I didn't want to go forward with the appearance that there was nothing being done on the zone system. I appreciate the work that was done at the Committee and look forward to getting a report on revisions to the existing zone snow clearing system.

Madam Speaker: Okay, any further speakers on Item 5? Councillor Swandel do you wish to close?

Councillor Swandel: No, I'm good.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 8

Item 8 – Reduced Speed Limit in School Zones By-law

Madam Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Madam Speaker, I'll introduce, you know that there has been some discussion about some of the school, not the schools, but some areas in some schools because they have multiple frontages that we haven't been able to, we are not able to include in the By-law right now because some of the technical pieces put in the regulation brought forward by the Province. We have been working that through very positively, a very positive response and great working relationship...we have in trying to remedy some of these things with Minister Ashton and others at the Provincial government. I'll listen to what the Councillors have to say and perhaps I can shed a little more light as I close.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt

Councillor Wyatt: Ya, thank you. I too have made a point of talking to the Minister. The concern I have here is if you look at the report, it identifies 171 schools that would establish a reduced speed school zone adjacent to those schools. However, the report, because of the Provincial government regulations that have been passed, there's 103 school zones, 103 schools that have been identified that are not eligible for the reduced speed. The key thing when you are going to do something like this, especially in school zones, is to have it as clear as possible and as transparent as possible, especially if we are going to be doing enforcement in those school zones. I think we have to...I know the Public Works Department does want to get out there and sign the ones that are under the legislation eligible, but clearly the Provincial Government got carried away with the regulations because what we heard in the Standing Committee at EPC was the fact that, instead of using some common sense...if the street is shorter and not as long, you don't need to have the warning signs that you would if the street is longer, yet still the reduced speed. So, because of that, I've done the count now, if you look at your Appendix B in the report, school zones that do not meet Provincial regulation requirements, there is a total of 103 schools that have been identified in terms of their streets that are, right across the city, everything from Ecole Romeo-Dallaire to Red River Valley Junior Academy to Immanuel Christian School in my end of town to the Manitoba Youth Centre to Marymount School, Niakwa Place, Victor Wyatt School, Hosanna Christian School, Beaumont School. I mean the list goes on and on. My concern is if we proceed with this today, that there is going to say "Why isn't my school being signed and why is this school being signed and why is this not being done? A child is a child is a child". We'll be hearing from people, it's going to be done in the Fall and I think it will be a lot of confusion and my concern is that...the reason why our Public Works Department did it like this, and it's no fault of their own, is because of the Provincial regulations which basically limited their ability to do this. Now, most of these are regional streets, we don't have it applying to regional streets, but if you look at the list here of the schools that do not meet Provincial regulations, most aren't regional streets, they are collector streets or residential streets, so I think we have to take a step back here, get this cleaned up before we go forward. I would welcome it being referred back, but I mean, this is something for the members of the Standing Committee who dealt with it, I'd like to hear what your thoughts are. This is something that really concerns me because we are going to have a real show on our hands come the Fall if this is not clear. When 103 schools out of...171 are being applied, but 103 aren't.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Madam Speaker, I actually spoke to this as well prior and the two concerns I did have was how do we explain to various schools which will come in the Fall, when they say "Hey, why don't we have, or the parents, why don't we have one around our neighbourhood, or around our school?" I wasn't sure how that process would work. I guarantee it will work by, probably individual Councillors getting a phone call by a number of parents at once. What I was hoping for would happen when I asked for an amendment, would we structure something similar to the Edmonton model, the Office of Traffic Safety, where those requests come in, we can explain it to them properly and then help lobby which I'm very happy to hear from Councillor Swandel that it is already working. How do we change or amend some of these policy points to allow more schools to be engaged? So, hearing that from Councillor Swandel today is very helpful, but again we have to get prepared for those calls that are going to come in the Fall time. There are too many schools that are not on the list. The second question I do want to raise, because we did bring this up, I think at the Committee level as well, is I'm still not sure how we are going to be enforcing, enforcement is going to be happening at these sites. My preference is always that when there is an actual need that Police or someone comes by and actually does specific enforcement, because then it is really a safety issue at that point. I'm not sure if cameras are the way to

go, I don't think so. However, at this point, I'm still not sure how that enforcement is going to be going through. That said, it may not be perfect, but again, there are a lot of schools are going to be included. This will, in my opinion, provide an extra level of safety for those kids in those schools. So even though it is not perfect, I will be supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Madam Speaker, this is an initiative that we started quite a long time ago and if you recall, we wanted it in place for the school year that we just missed. As a result of the by-laws needing any information from the Provincial government, we couldn't really move forward and we do have a challenge here, which we are working on. As it has been said before, Councillor Swandel has spoken to the Minister, Councillor Wyatt has, I have and I believe he is working on a solution, but I don't think you want to wait. You want to get those schools in place that you can for this September and bring the others on line as quickly as you can. So, waiting to me would not be the right thing to do. We have already, it's already been delayed by a year...you don't want it delayed anymore, we want to get as many schools on as possible and I believe when Minister Ashton says he is working and has a solution, I truly do believe that is the case, so we can add more on later on.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Swandel to close.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. The long and the short of this is it all comes around the term defensible. The Justice Department, when they got ahold of the regulations, they did everything they could to make sure that they were defensible in court. This is where infrastructure meets justice. Simple common sense of making school zones safer kind of got left on the sidelines. I, this comes, the Provincial, this is a regulation, not an Act. To change it just requires an order in Council. What we are working on is, if that regulation change happens, we have our Infrastructure meeting coming up this Friday, we've got a Council meeting coming in July, we have been working on a draft motion that would create the authority for Public Works to sign those locations and to use existing funds, the unspecified account, funds that we can identify, bring that motion forward for the July meeting, we would still have to have a Special Meeting of Council - if we can't get it done by the July Council meeting, we would still need a Special Meeting of Council prior to school going back in September to add those locations to the signable location to the schools that can be on there, because they've got to be in our By-law. So, there are technicalities here at work that are creating the challenges. We are working together to get something done. Our people have been very cooperative, very helpful in explaining the technical piece. The Provincial end is working on their technical piece as well, but I believe they can do something, we don't have to do it with Public Works, we can do it with EPC just prior to the July Council meeting if we get something in that time, but they still have to vet it through Justice and get regulation right. I think we're driving in the direction of doing something more, as an omnibus, a loosening of the distances which is where the challenge comes in, the distance that you got to be away from the school, well, if the distance is across a T-intersection, or across any intersection for that matter, the signs don't make any sense. The traffic that would be turning on to the street the school's on doesn't get the sign. There is a minimum distance under the regulation. Suffice it to say we are working on it. What we need to do is keep this moving along right now and get everything done that we can and hopefully, by September we'll be able to get everything else done that we can. Some of them are just going to be purely impossible to sign. There are going to be certain locations that are absolutely impossible. I truly believe that, but we'll get as much done as we can and deliver on what we have worked a long time to do.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on Item 8. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have motion 5 in front of us from Councillor Pagtakhan and Councillor Browaty regarding a front end agreement be an automatic referral to – pardon me? On this motion? So it will come back to next Council. This is Item 5

Councillor Wyatt: Calling Notice on the Motion.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. So it will appear on Council next month. By-law's Councillor Swandel?

Councillor Pagtakhan: I said I wanted to vote on referral, not sure what happened there. We should be dealing with this at the Committee level. Moving it to be referred to the Committee for next....

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan, after it goes to Committee, would it not move on through...but you wanted it to go to Committee, it would have went through the EPC and back to Council anyways, is that correct Mr. Clerk? So you'll skip the Committee process?

Councillor Pagtakhan: I want it to go to Committee.

Madam Speaker: The vote has already been had Councillor.

Councillor Pagtakhan: No. I asked for referral.

Madam Speaker: I had said it was an automatic referral and then the Councillor called Notice for Motion.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Madam Speaker, we wanted some information. I was talking to the Chair of Public Works and we are looking for some information from the Department, so I agreed that we would have an automatic referral to allow the Committee to have the information it was looking for so we could deal with the matter.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, Councillor Pagtakhan does not have a point of order. You called for a question, you called for the vote and the decision has been made.

Madam Speaker: I am going to look for some direction from the Clerk on this. I just want to again, reiterate what was said, on Hansard, which is I mentioned it was automatic referral and that's when Councillor Wyatt called Notice of Motion. Would you like to challenge the Chair? I'm telling you what I remember happened and you can see it on Hansard this evening or electronically if you like.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Point of order. I'd like to respectfully challenge the Chair because I think I was saying I wanted automatic referral to the Committee and that is what I want to be considered.

Madam Speaker: Right. It was, but then he called notice on it.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Oh no, I wasn't sure, I thought you were calling...

Madam Speaker: I'd be happy to go back, but I'm looking for direction from the Clerk and he's telling me the same thing that I am reiterating what I said.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Madam Speaker, if the will is to get it done and that it's going to come back to Council, I don't see a problem with this going to Committee for the information, going through the process then coming back to Council.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, can we vote on the referral?

Councillor Swandel: Perhaps, just by way of background Madam Speaker, Councillor Pagtakhan and I had a conversation about this this morning. I had said I wasn't willing to deal with it today because I needed to get a better understanding of why we are doing this and that the timing would still be fine if it came to Committee, Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. I want that information. I'm not sure that serving notice and having it come back here does that. I'd like to have a conversation, in public, at Public Works, which is what I had set out to do. I think we've ended up in the wrong place here. Somebody has asked to challenge the Chair on the ruling that was made. I think you have to call a vote on that. I would hope that we get support challenging the Chair, no?

Madam Speaker: The question, Councillor Swandel, Councillor Wyatt had raised and said Notice of Motion. We voted on that. Then Councillor Pagtakhan has now raised himself and said that he'd like it referred back. Can we have a vote on that? I'm asking the Clerk.

City Clerk:because he's challenged the ruling. There is also another way you can deal with this. You can move to suspend the rule and reconsider the item.

Councillor Swandel: I move we suspend the rule and reconsider the item.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Pagtakhan, so the motion is now to refer to Committee, right?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes

Madam Speaker: Okay, all those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Thank you. By-laws. Councillor Swandel.

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

Councillor Swandel: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a 1st time. By-law No. 75/2014 and 76/2014

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried

Clerk: By-law No. 75/2014 and By-law No. 76/2014

Councillor Swandel: I'll move that By-laws No. 75/2014 and 76/2014 be read a 2nd time

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried

Clerk: By-law No. 75/2014 and 76/2014

Councillor Swandel: I will move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 75/2014 and 76/2014 be read a 3rd time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried. We'll move onto question period. Any questions for Councillor Swandel? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Just to follow up on the school zone question, is it possible that we could ensure that there is a communication plan coming out of the Public Service in terms of the schools that are being signed for the lower school zones and the schools that are not and why they are not, and when they...I think there could be a lot of confusion out there if we don't have a proper communication plan by the Public Service and I guess that's the gist of my questions.

Councillor Swandel: I think absolutely. I think we have got to do it jointly with the Province because the regulation affects more than just the municipality of the City of Winnipeg, but we have some specific communication that we need to do around areas that aren't zoned and that is going to have to be a significant communication strategy given the enforcement issues that John has raised already.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Chair? Okay, we'll move onto the Committee on Finance. We have no reports, no motions, no by-laws for Finance. We do have 30 minutes for question period. Any questions for the Chair? Any questions for the Chair? I'll ask a third time, any questions for the Chair? Okay. Moving on to Committee on Governance, we have a walk on Report from June 19, 2014. Councillor Steen.

**REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED JUNE 19, 2014**

Councillor Steen: I move suspension of the rules to consider the Report of the Governance Committee of Council dated June 19, 2014.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of suspending the rules? Opposed? Carried

Councillor Steen: I move the consent agenda Item 1

Madam Speaker: Councillor Steen, we'll just give the Clerk an opportunity to read it out

Item 1 – Councillor's Representation Allowance (CRA) Review

Councillor Steen: I'm moving the consent agenda Item 1

Madam Speaker: All in favour? So noted. Contrary? Carried. Moved by Councillor Nordman that we will now adjourn. Roll call Mr. Clerk and I would like to see Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Pagtakhan in my chambers after.

ROLL CALL

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
June 25, 2014

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

Council adjourned at 5:26 p.m.