

# **COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG**

## **Wednesday, February 26, 2014**

**The Council met at 9:32 a.m.**

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

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Pagtakhan.

### **ROLL CALL**

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

### **INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Madam Speaker:** I'd like to introduce our Page for today's meeting, Midori Matthew, from St. Mary's Academy, who resides in the Charleswood -Tuxedo Ward. Thank you for being here today. I'd like to recognize in the gallery, Assistant Professor, Shauna MacKinnon and her class of Urban and Inner City Studies students from the University of Winnipeg. Welcome to our chamber. Mr. Mayor, I understand you have some announcements you wish to make.

**Mayor Katz:** I do Madam Speaker and thank you very much. I'm rising to express how troubled we all are regarding the ongoing unrest in Ukraine. Both for the people and for the future of Ukraine's political, economic, and social development. Winnipeg is proud to be home to a vibrant community of over 110,000 people of Ukrainian decent. Many maintain close ties to Ukraine through family and friends. I think we all share their concern over the current situation. To date, the violence has resulted in the deaths of more than 100 citizens and hundreds more have been injured. Last week, we flew the Ukrainian flag at half-mast here at City Hall in honour of those killed and injured and as a symbol of our hope that things will soon come to a peaceful resolution. Madam Speaker, I'd also like to take a moment to mention another country which is currently being affected by political unrest. For the past two weeks, the people of Venezuela have been involved in several protests in Caracas and throughout the country. Some of these demonstrations have been peaceful while others have taken a tragic, violent turn. As a result, over a dozen Venezuelans have been killed; another 150 have been injured and nearly 600 have been detained. We have many citizens of Winnipeg who are afraid for the safety and well-being of friends and family in Venezuela. And I join them in prayers for a quick and peaceful end to the situation. On a good note this morning, I have the distinct honour of recognizing Winnipeg's tremendous winter Olympic athletes. On Monday night, hundreds of Winnipeggers gathered at the airport to welcome home team Jennifer Jones. Team Jones captured the hearts of the nation and made Olympic history by remaining undefeated throughout the Games. The Canadian men's curling team also took the gold in Sochi with Winnipegger Ryan Fry playing third. Ryan currently lives in Sault Ste. Marie. We are looking forward to celebrating his win when he returns to Winnipeg for a visit. Another Winnipegger adding a gold medal to his collection is our own Jonathan Toews. Millions of Canadians woke up early to see the Canadian men's hockey team earn the victory and it was especially exciting to see Jonathan Toews score the winning goal and of course I would like to recognize speed skater, Brittany Schussler for her participation in the games. This was Brittany's second Olympic Games and we're proud of the hard work and determination that she has shown throughout her career. We are in discussions with the Province to recognize the achievements of our Olympic and Paralympic athletes sometimes in the future. At this time, speaking on behalf of all Winnipeggers, I'd like to offer congratulations to all our athletes and coaches. They did us proud. And lastly, Madam Speaker, as you know, today is Anti-Bullying Day, known throughout Canada and around the world as Pink Shirt Day. Students across Winnipeg are joining thousands across the country who are taking a stand against bullying by wearing pink shirts and taking part in anti-bullying activities. Today, I'm sure you will see many people here in the gallery and on Council wearing pink to support the movement and to offer support to all kids who've been victims of bullying. By coming together as a city and taking a stand against bullying, we are making Winnipeg a better place to live, work and play for all of our citizens. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck, I understand you have an announcement.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** It's not an announcement per se but just to contribute further to what the Mayor has said. I am one of the members of the Ukrainian community who is on Council and I'm wanting to make note that a (Ukrainian spoken here) service or service for the deceased was held on Sunday and that I was in attendance, albeit briefly, but I was there and I think it's important to note that the City had representation. I would also add for the record, (Ukrainian

**COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG**  
**February 26, 2014**

---

spoken here), which means eternal rest to those who were victims and condolences to their families in the Ukraine. Having represented our city in Ukraine through the FCM on being municipal local economic development initiative, I've met with many of the political leaders in both Lviv and Kiev and I have had exchanges of e-mails and there is a sense of pride. Despite the loss, there is a sense of pride in the community and so I wanted to reinforce the Mayor's message of peace and harmony of moving forward in the challenges that they face in the country. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. We have a leave of absence motion for Councillor Wyatt. Mr. Clerk, will you read the motion?

**MOTIONS**

**Moved by Councillor Browaty,**  
**Seconded by Councillor Steen,**

*THAT Councillor Wyatt be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to a personal family matter.*

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

**MINUTES**

Councillor Steen moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on January 29, 2014 be taken as read and confirmed.

All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Madam Speaker:** Before we move on to our meeting today, I would like to remind all members of Council that part of the role of Speaker is to ensure decorum and respect is maintained in the Chamber at all times. Our Procedure By-law and past practice in this matter has always recognized that Council shall not discuss HR matters on the floor of Council including discussion about individual members of our administration. I am reminding everyone of this and the fact that I shall be ensuring that this practice is followed. I thank you for your co-operation. We have four delegations with us today; the first two are in regard to the establishment of a U-Pass program. First up is Mr. Zach Fleischer followed by Mr. Rorie McLeod-Arnould both of whom are in support. Mr. Fleischer. Good morning. Mr. Fleischer, you have ten minutes.

**DELEGATIONS**

**Zach Fleischer:** Ten minutes? I first want to thank Council members for hearing me speak. I've been...I've been proud to have been involved with lobbying for the U-Pass and for sustainable transportation for about a year and a half and I understand that the process has been going on for a very, very long time, and I do want to just quickly acknowledge everyone who has made an effort to help bring us forward, be they Councillors; be they advocates through the student associations or anything of that nature. I do want to recognize and I don't often agree with the state of the City's planning, but I think it's important to recognize that the current state of rapid transit development in Winnipeg is such that it connects both universities and it's important to recognize that, in that both the U of W and the U of M, which are the participating post-secondary institutions in this city, are connected to rapid transit and what we have here is we're creating a program that has the potential to revitalize that route, to make it viable and then using that ridership, we are able to, using the ridership from the increased numbers from students which we see as happened in other cities as well, we are able to work for the betterment of all citizens because all citizens benefit from major investments within transit as well. I do want to just provide you with some factual information. What we see in Winnipeg is that we have a higher percentage of regular commuters using transit than both Calgary and Edmonton as it currently stands. And that's because, you know, we have a fairly dense city within our core neighbourhoods and there are certain demographics of Winnipeg that encourage our transit ridership and currently, I think the number right now is at 14.6 percent of Winnipeggers who are regularly commuting are using transit and in Calgary and Edmonton, which are both cities with rapid transit development, that supersedes what we have. The numbers are a bit lower so what we really need to look at is with the implementation of a U-Pass and with the continued investment into rapid transit development, I think, and I think it's an admirable goal, puts us in the realm of Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa for us to try to reach 20 percent ridership by commuters within the next couple of years. And I would invite this Council and future incarnations of Winnipeg City Council to stick with this goal. I think it's an admirable goal. Winnipeg, we see, is a city that's known for a

lot of things. We're known for our cold winters. We'll soon be known for the Human Rights Museum and we're known for our passion of hockey as our Mayor mentioned before. But I want us to envision a city where we become a centre and a model of excellence for sustainability. And I think that there is the potential here. We've invested a lot into renewable energy through Manitoba Hydro. We are at the centre of two rivers. There is a really, really a lot to be said for the fact that we could become a model city within North America and I think that by moving forward with this motion, that Council...this is the first step in making sure that it's a more sustainable city for Winnipeg and that we are also capitalizing on our rapid transit plan outlined through the Our Winnipeg plan. So I'm not going to get into the numbers here. I know my, the person coming after me, Rorie is going to probably go and delve into the numbers more so than myself, but I do want to thank all members of Council for working through this process; working through evidence-based city planning policy and to look at the numbers, look at Calgary, look at Edmonton, look at Halifax, look at Saskatoon, Montreal as well, they don't have a full U-Pass program, but they subsidize transit use for people under 25, I think is the realm. And I just want to thank all members of City Council for coming together on this and hopefully we'll see unanimous support for this wonderful program and I invite you all, when you're considering your vote on this matter, to think big, think of the big picture, think of a long run. I understand that there's a civic election coming up and that a lot of folks are more focused on that than other policy matters, but don't think about the next four years, don't even think about the next eight years. Think of the next 25 years, the next 30 years and how much of a dynamic change that you, by voting on this measure are bringing to our city. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Please remain on the floor in case there are any questions. Next is Mr. Rorie McLeod-Arnould, also in support of the item. You have five minutes, sir. Thank you.

**Rorie McLeod-Arnould:** Thanks, Zach and I, too, would like to just take a moment to thank all the people that have gone into bringing this before you, today. Employees of Winnipeg Transit have been very helpful and have been over the past year in bringing this forward and helping us collect numbers and do all the leg work that gets into getting a proposal like this before you. Councillor Gerbasi has been indispensable and a real champion. Thank you very much for that. Mayor Katz as well, thank you very much for putting this motion forward. And to some of the student leaders who aren't here today...who have invested a lot of time and effort into this, they can't be here for some technicality reasons with their student elections that are going on, but I'm happy to represent them today and thank them very much for the work that they put in. This is going to be, I think the fourth time I have spoken before Council and some of you have heard this speech a lot, so I'll actually not give it. I think everyone can understand the environmental benefits. I'm looking around and seeing smiles so I'm sensing I'm right about that. But if I can get down to brass tacks for one quick moment, because there was a bit of confusion in the media recently about what this program would cost. If we go back to April 30th, 2013, there was a report issued to the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee that explicitly stipulated a cost for the program. That cost included a \$15 contingency fee and that cost also included the purchasing of new buses to support the additional ridership going to the University of Manitoba. Needless to say, students are not the only people using those buses so I find it somewhat interesting that's included in there, but nonetheless, we can't win everything and so we'll take that, but that was already included in the cost. So as the program was originally proposed, we looked at a \$3.6 million figure. As it proposed before you today at \$260, that's a subsidy of \$46 per student, at 30,000 students, that's \$1.38 million. That still includes the cost of the buses and it still includes the \$15 contingency fee per student. So that's the real cost before you today and I suggest that if any Councillors or any members of the gallery, have questions about that or concerns about the cost of the program that they looked that up, that report is available on line. Relative to other universities and municipalities in Canada this would put us at the top level. To run through other schools in western Canada because Mr. Mayor, I know you brought this up last time, the Alberta College of Art and Design \$216, Bow Valley College \$160, Mount Royal College \$190, University of Calgary \$150. And so you see there are lower costs out there in western Canada if we go to Alberta, sorry if we go to Saskatchewan and if we move into British Columbia, we see the same pattern; so we are on the upper level here of what these programs typically cost students in municipalities of our size or smaller. I would point to our neighbours in Brandon who have this program at \$15 per year, 7.50 per term, so to suggest that this is somehow an inordinate cost or an unnecessary subsidization of post second education, I would suggest we look around the country and recognize the precedent and value that's been set there. And I trust that in our meetings with Councillors, we've been receiving very positive responses. I look forward to the results of the vote. As far as process goes, on our end, the way that this will work is that we are committed to running student referendums in November. The reason why we have to run another referendum is that we cannot impose fees above the cost of what the previous referendums proposed which is for \$200 at the University of Winnipeg and \$170 at the University of Manitoba. So we will run that second referendum in November of this year at the \$260 figure should if this motion pass. I'd also like to reiterate our commitment to finding real and tangible solutions for the lowest income students or students who are pursuing active transportation methods as well as students who are living outside of the city limits or for accessibility reasons cannot use Winnipeg transit and those last two, students who live outside of Winnipeg or can't use Winnipeg transit, those are already not included in the figures that you would be looking at for the program, so rest assured on that. The reason why we haven't done that to this point, I'm sure some of you can imagine who've tried to find money in the not for profit sector, it is very difficult before commitment by a public body, before the baseline of a program that's been established to get funding organizations to commit preemptively to

something without a guarantee of the program existing. So with that constraint, we don't have any of those things in place at this point in time, but we do have experience securing those funding sources and we will aggressively pursue those as soon as this gets approved, should this get approved. So I welcome any questions. I imagine there might be some and if not, I thank you for your time.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Are there any questions? Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you very much and I want to thank both of you for all of your work on this. It's been wonderful you've done a great job and I just wanted to...one of the points that wasn't mentioned when you were going through the accuracy of the numbers just for clarification for everyone was that we have and I guess it's an "are you aware" question that we...are you aware we have a 50/50 funding agreement with the Province so that the eligible cost which don't include the cost of the buses, but there are eligible costs that would be covered by the Province so it's actually, even a lower number because of the Provincial contribution that is already agreed to come.

**Rorie McLeod-Arnould:** Yeah, that's absolutely correct. I didn't mention, and thank you for bringing it up. That was true at the \$3.6 million figure and it continues to be true today. It's not exactly half as Councillors are aware because the buses aren't included, but...but that is certainly very accurate. Thanks.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you and like Councillor Gerbasi, I want to thank the two of you. I found my notes from the first meeting I had with Zach about a year and half ago and the number that was in there was I think 260 a year as the break even figure, so the vote is coming on that. In a way, I was going to say you are reaching the finish line now, but in a way you are reaching the halfway point because what you said, so maybe you can flesh out a bit for the public. There is...there are, we're sort of at the finish line on this with our vote, but you still have to pass a referendum. That will include part-timers can vote, students in residence can vote, so I wonder if you can just detail that. We've had a couple...I stopped Rorie on the street in the freezing cold and we had a long debate about the part-timers and I came to see your position which was basically everyone's going to pay the same, but everyone's going to get the same benefit. You don't get a fifth of the bus pass if you're a part-timer. So maybe you're going to explain there's yet another democratic step in this in which all students are going to be able to vote in the referendum.

**Rorie McLeod-Arnould:** Yeah. We are currently holding student elections currently which...which also include things like referendum questions of which any new fee must pass. So there will be an opportunity for all students to vote on this matter. We advertise our elections very well. There's a notice period of three weeks before the election where there will be notification posted on line and throughout the school of a referendum question coming up. There's a period of campaigning and then a period of voting of one week each. So there is ample time for students to weigh in and we will ensure to Council's satisfaction in whatever means you'd like to determine, that due consultation and availability is made for students who are looking to weigh in on this issue and who may have points to make. I think that if I can read between the lines of your question a little bit, I think you're asserting that some students may have an issue with the mandatory nature of the program and I would like to comment on that briefly. Being a part-time student doesn't mean you don't have to get places. What we are, in effect, is a 30,000 strong group of individuals who are putting forward this as something we all voted on and voted resoundingly in favour of. Being a full time student necessitates you getting to school more often, but you still have got to take your kids to the gym and you still have got to drop them off at school and all that kind of stuff, so the benefits of the U-Pass as you stated are universal ironically. And I feel like there will be...certainly there will be some people who don't agree, but I imagine it will be the small minority and certainly as we look at some municipalities and the schools who've implemented this program, that's a very consistent feature that some people don't like it but over the years, let's go talk to students in Brandon. Let's go talk to students in Calgary, let's go talk to students in Victoria and see what they think and we know, because none of these programs have been rescinded across the country that they're predominantly very, very popular amongst people who use the program, because...precisely because it is a behavioural change exercise. If you're using the bus, 50 percent off the student rate, that's 260 bucks, it's the cheapest way to get stuff around. Try to insure your car for three months, you can't do it, so never mind gassing this thing up and fixing it once it rusts through because of all the salt. So I would say that since it's a legitimate concern and I hope that the process will be to everybody's satisfaction.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Smith.

**Councillor Smith:** My question is directed to Zach. How does an individual citizen of Winnipeg gain by us passing this, if you are not a student?

**Zach Fleischer:** That's a good question, Harvey and I appreciate the question. The viewpoint I would take on this issue is that I would say that by boosting the number of students and the total ridership of Winnipeg Transit that future

incarnations of Council here can justify increasing the level of service for Winnipeg Transit to handle those students especially on the current southwest transit way. And I understand that you've raised concerns in the past about that, about that route not really affecting residents of your ward and constituents in that area, but what we see in the long term Our Winnipeg plan is I think it's five rapid transit routes connecting to the inner city, through the downtown, and by raising the ridership through students and ridership in general, we are able to offer more amenities and better service for all Winnipeggers based on the ridership needs there and therefore, because we're able to offer better transit service, therefore we are able to attract more riders. So I think in that way, everyone benefits. And then the other ways that everyone kind of benefits as well, is based on the fact that you have...you simply have less drivers on the road, you have less people commuting to and from campus. And in the long term, that means that there's less road damage, there's less road repair that needs to occur because there's physically less cars and the final thing as well is that it changes the culture. So what we know is that students are a very transient population. They are in school for two, three, four, five, six years maybe, but in the long term it changes the culture around bus ridership. So 30 years down the line, what we see is that more students are acclimated and ready to take transit both in their degrees and they're happy to take it after their degree as well. What we saw in Vancouver actually is that so many students...is that a lot of former students actually just ended up taking transit services there because they were so impressed and they found that because it was easy to access during their university days that they were ready to use the system and knew how to use it in a proper manner.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Smith. Any further questions? Okay, you may return to the gallery. Thank you. Next is Mr. Colin Craig, in support of the item, Request for release of Stantec Traffic Study relating to the fire hall located at 1705 Portage Avenue, Station 11. Mr. Craig, you have ten minutes. Thank you.

**Colin Craig:** Well, good morning and thank you for the chance to speak here this morning. As many of you know, we've been pushing now for almost a year and a half to try to get the traffic study released for the new fire hall on Portage Avenue. This of course is the one that's located in the middle of the cloverleaf there and our actions on this were provoked by a whistleblower who indicated to us that there were staff concerns about building a fire hall in the middle of a traffic cloverleaf and there seemed to be some merit and especially given the other problems with the fire hall program, we decided to investigate so we filed a freedom of information request with the City of Winnipeg asking for all copies of reports on the matter as well as other documentation, and we were stonewalled. We were told that all the information was confidential, that a third party had rejected release of the information. I was quite surprised actually, I mean, traffic studies for fire halls, one would think, would be a fairly benign matter, but like I said, it...we were refused information. So what I then did was file an information request with the Ombudsman's office to see if they could take look at the matter and determine what could and should be released and what they concluded of course was that there was an ability for a third party to block the release of the information and that third party was Stantec and that Stantec had actually agreed to the release of the information. They had no problem with it being released. The third party that had objected did not have the right to do so according to the Ombudsman's office. So they did sort of dismiss that reason for refusing to release the information. They did conclude that the City does have the legal authority to release the information if it so chooses and of course that is our request to the City that you do release the information. And so on that note, I would thank Councillor Havixbeck for drafting the original motion to release all this information to the public for we think that that would be a good thing especially given the recent polling figures that CJOB had showing that there's a very, very low level of trust with Council among the people of Winnipeg. So this is one way that you can work towards rebuilding trust. When asked to speak today of course, you are asked if you are in favour or opposed and I said in support, I guess...except that I was in support of the original intent that was in the motion that was tabled by Councillor Havixbeck and that was to release all the information. The motion that you have before you, I do believe it requires some change. The motion of course says that the Winnipeg public service provide to all members of Council information relating to the Stantec traffic study in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. So technically, the administration could still block the release of a traffic study to yourselves and to me, that's very troubling because as members of Council, you should have all access to this information. You should know exactly what was in the initial report, what the recommendations were to alleviate any concerns about public safety and you should be able to then evaluate if you think that the administration actually implemented any recommendations that were in that report. And if you think about it, if there is a problem with this fire hall that's located there, heaven forbid if there is a tragic accident, we all know that someone would probably sue and they could sue the City and try to get a copy of the report and then release anything that is in fact in it. And so if that happens and if there is a problem, we know that it's yourselves that are going to have to wear this problem because everyone is going to be coming to Council and say what did you know? Why didn't you take a look at the study et cetera? So we know that the blame is going to be laid at your feet if there is something so I think that that's another reason why it's important for yourselves to know exactly what is in the report. The next thing that I'll touch upon is something that was in the Bartley Kives Winnipeg Free Press column on February 13th. He noted and I'll quote, "the City wound up enlisting Stantec, a consulting firm to conduct an access management study for the four new fire paramedic stations. A revised version of its resulting report completed in May 2011 came up with ways to mitigate safety and operational issues inherent with locating the proposed fire hall within the Portage Avenue, Route 90 interchange". So I guess, the question is if there's a...if that was a revised report that came

forward, what did the original report have to say in terms of recommendations? So I think that that's very important for yourselves to have the opportunity to take a look at that as well. And then also, ask staff what their concerns were so that you have the full picture. So again, we're acting on concerns that we've heard. Of course we have no way to know exactly what's in the report because it hasn't been released. I think everyone hopes that any concerns that were raised in the report were actually acted on. Of course there is that special traffic light there that's at that particular intersection. Was that the only recommendation? I don't know, but certainly we would hope that there are no further concerns but just given the other concerns with that whole fire hall program, I think it's very important for Councillors to have the ability to take a look at all the information and confirm that all the recommendations were followed on. So thank you very much.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. We have a question. Councillor Fielding.

**Councillor Fielding:** Thank you Colin for your presentation. And I just get you to clarify you're suggesting we amend a portion of it just to make sure it's more transparent so I'll get you to after my question, my first question on it. Just this might be a you know, are you aware type of question, but you know, after you did raise these issues and thank you for bringing them forward, I did have a chance to go through an audio file, we of course have these meetings on audio file, came to Assiniboia Community Committee me with Councillor Nordman and Councillor Havixbeck. And we did ask the question, actually, three times in those...in those committee meetings about the traffic safety and was there support from administration in traffic basis in terms of going forward. So it was conveyed three times, at questions asked by Councillors at that meeting and it was conveyed that there was support, that they did support this so that's part of the public hearing that was there. I believe there's some transcripts that will be there as well, so you know, interested to see the final reports of it and, so I guess, I'm not sure if you are aware of that and second of all, if you could just clarify once again how you'd like to see the actual report amended in terms of regulations.

**Colin Craig:** Sorry I missed about...you're wondering how we would recommend amending the proposal?

**Councillor Fielding:** Yes.

**Colin Craig:** Sure, I think the way it needs to be amended is to simply release all documents, all traffic studies related to that fire hall and all information. And that staff should be fully available to any member of Council who would like to ask questions about it because you know as referred to that, Bartley Kives column noted that staff did have concerns so I think there's a question there, too, of why it is that you know they would feel comfortable talking to someone with the media and saying that they did have concerns, but yet, at a public meeting, they would tell members of Council that there were no concerns. So I think that that's that...I think I've answered your question.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor, do you have a question?

**Mayor Katz:** Yes. Colin, I need qualification. It's my understanding after this was brought up, I asked the administration and they have told me after your FIPPA, you have received information or material or a copy of that. Is that accurate, yes or no?

**Colin Craig:** I have a copy of the study that was released by the administration. And as you would probably be aware, Mr. Mayor, there's fair amount of information that's both blacked out and entire chapters were severed from the release. So basically anything you would actually want to see, the observations, recommendations, conclusions, that was all stripped from the report. So all the meat has taken from the bone, so to speak.

**Mayor Katz:** So you have what we would call a redacted version?

**Colin Craig:** Quite redacted, yes.

**Mayor Katz:** Okay, and is it accurate that the Ombudsman agreed with what the City has done and told you if you want to appeal, that was an option and you chose not to?

**Colin Craig:** I think we foolishly believed that given all the other concerns associated with the fire hall program that someone would have taken a look at this report much sooner and made the entire report public.

**Mayor Katz:** Unfortunately, you missed the question. Did the ombudsman not agree with the City of Winnipeg with the redactions and said they should do that and if you disagreed, you could appeal and you had a certain time period in which to do that and you chose not to. Is that accurate is what I'd like to know.

**Colin Craig:** We did have an opportunity to appeal and we assumed that at somehow, some point, someone would've decided to take a closer look into this and ensure that the information was released. I mean it's quite puzzling if we really

stand back and think about this and to provide some perspective, you know, I talked to people from other provinces, people out of the City of Winnipeg and I explained it. We can't even get a traffic study and they're just aghast. Well, why is a traffic study for a fire hall being kept hidden from the public? You know, you might assume that we're asking for details on nuclear weapons and warheads or something truly confidential or you know confidential police strategies for raiding drug houses, something like that, but no it's traffic study for fire halls. I mean that should be available to the public. You know, it shouldn't take someone going to the Ombudsman's office to have to try to get this information. So, it should be public. The City has, as far as I understand it, it's trying to move forward with the open data project and make this information more available in the first place. I think that's the answer where in terms of what needs to be done.

**Mayor Katz:** I appreciate that. The only reason I ask the question, because on many occasions you've been here and said how the Ombudsman has sided with certain people. Here is a scenario where the exact opposite is the case, the Ombudsman agreed with the City, yet you didn't bother sharing that and I wanted that to make sure that everybody knew that was on the record, so I thank you for that.

**Colin Craig:** The Ombudsman's office indicated that the City has full discretion to release this report and again, it should be a pretty straightforward, it's a traffic study.

**Madam Speaker:** I'd like to move on to our next question now.

**Colin Craig:** Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Havixbeck.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to go back to two items. The original wording of the original motion that Councillor Orlikow and I brought forward, November 20th, now some four months later, here we are still debating this. It was, therefore be it resolved that the administration release immediately the Stantec's traffic study related to the new fire hall on Portage and any other administrative analysis on the same subject in their entirety. Is that wording satisfactory to you?

**Colin Craig:** Yes, absolutely. And my apologies, I forgot to acknowledge Councillor Orlikow for supporting that motion.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Do you think Councillors, every single Councillor around this table and well, every elected official, so including the Mayor, should have all the information? I think that's more of the heart of the issue, but I want to hear from you. Do you think that you necessarily need to have this report or you are satisfied to know that everybody around this table has this report whether it be in camera or in some other venue?

**Colin Craig:** I think that at the very least, it should be available to members of Council. Like I said, I mean, if something goes wrong here, we all know who's going to get blamed for this, it's yourselves. Why on earth would the administration refuse to disclose this report to you? Does anyone have a good answer for that? Of course you should have access to this. The public elects people to serve as watch dogs and provide guidance to the administration. How can you do that as Council members if they are not giving you basic reports? They're preventing you from doing your job if the full information doesn't flow to you. But yet, you're going to take the blame if something goes wrong. And that's not right. You know, this is something pretty straightforward here.

**Madam Speaker:** Any other questions? Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Yeah. I mean, there's a concept of...in the legal system of things being moot and just by way of information, you said we're going to get sued, the City's going to get sued. Well, my predecessor wanted to abolish the MPI system, which is a no fault system. I actually don't take that position, so if there is an accident, nobody wants that, no one is getting sued here. I mean I think that's a complete red herring. It's an MPI system, you don't have the right to sue for automobile accidents at least you haven't for the last 40 years. My question is always, just in terms of, do you actually have any evidence that this fire hall and the signalization system is unsafe? Because as I sit here, I'm sitting and thinking people want the information so they can say, "I would not have voted for what's turned out to be a safe firehall, had I had the information, I wouldn't have voted for something that's turned out to be safe". Well, that seems to me kind of a moot point. We built the fire hall. We have no evidence that it's operating in an unsafe manner. We do have a motion that says we're going to have an evaluation and update on the new traffic signalization system, so we're going to get a report. The report's going to say if there's been any problems or not. I'm not aware of any problems. You said there seems to be some merit if something goes wrong. Do you have any evidence as you stand here today that this is in some way an unsafe system? Please share it with us now. I think that would be helpful if we knew what the unsafe aspects of the system. Because what you're saying is let's go back and look at the report that was prepared several

years ago before the thing was actually built. Is there any evidence that we can look at that this is an unsafe system? We've got a report coming.

**Colin Craig:** Sure and let me just clarify again my comments about the possibility of a lawsuit. It may not even be a...due to a traffic-related reason. Who knows what other concerns there might be? I mean at one point someone wanted to have a museum in the fire hall in the middle of a clover leaf where there's no parking like...do you want children running around outside while a fire hall or fire truck in, you know, an emergency has to pop out quickly? It just boggles the mind. I raise that as a concern. I mean who knows what types of concerns might be there. More than anything, there are alarm bells going off here. I mean this is not just some fire hall that was built, it's part of a program that was wrought with problems for which an auditor came forward with scathing criticism, scathing kind of criticism. So when we heard that there were concerns from someone, I thought well, let's investigate and to get...have a brick wall go up in front of us when we're trying to get something as simple as a traffic study for a fire hall, I mean that...like I said, it's sending off alarm bells. So in terms, and I'll just get to the point quite quickly here. In terms of evidence that there is anything unsafe about it...

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Craig, we've had lots of conversation on the topic and a few questions, so we're going to move on to the next speaker now. Thank you. Next is Mr. David Sanders. He is in opposition to four items before us. Number one is expropriation...are you here, Mr. Sanders, yes, Expropriation of Land Portion of 1780 Taylor Avenue for the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Station No. 12. Second item is the Establishment of the U-Pass Program. Third item is Discoloured Water Investigation Findings and Mitigation Plan. The last item is Request for Release of Stantec Traffic Study relating to the Fire hall located at 1705 Portage Avenue.

**David Sanders:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Mayor and members of Council, with regard to the first item, the expropriation of the land at 1780 Taylor, my specific objection to the recommendations relates to the transfer of the \$1 million proceeds of disposition of 409 Mulvey Avenue East from the land operating reserve fund to the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service 2013 facilities replacement and relocation capital program. The 409 Mulvey property has nothing to do with the fire paramedic service. The two former fire halls at 1710 Grosvenor and 200 Berry are now being sold for total of 677,000, which is certainly enough money to have available in the capital account for now, to settle the acquisition of the site for 1780 Taylor Avenue. I presume that the long delayed report of Ernst & Young on the real estate management audit which was ordered by Council on September 27th of 2012, that's a very long time ago, and which better appear soon, I presume that report will fully expose what appears to be the continuing gross incompetence of the City's officials in dealing with the land at 1780 Taylor. As soon as the City found is itself committed to the site and this is a long time ago now, it should've been initiated expropriation proceedings to secure the property and to freeze the acquisition value. There is no excuse. None at all for waiting until February of 2014 to suggest now that the Council initiate expropriation proceedings in this case and I really don't know what the present 1 to \$2 million in compensation figures where they are coming from, but I do know that the subject property at 1780 Taylor was assessed by the City Assessor with a market value of as of April 1st, 2012, which is a relevant time period, at only 526,000. And furthermore, I don't know how the present owner can now argue that at disposition, he willingly agreed to, can be causing a loss in value of the remaining lands at 1780, a few square feet now in the amount of \$844,220. And even if he does mean the adjacent property at Roll No. 120977504000, its total assessed market value as of April 1, 2012 was only 539,000 in total. The other adjacent property at 1770 Taylor is fully developed already and that's obviously not affected. And under the circumstances, I am very pleased to learn that on February 7th of this month, the City retained procurement law office professional corporation of Toronto to quote, "provide a legal opinion in relation to whether the conduct of the civic administration to the public tendering and procurement process is in breach of Provincial or Federal legislation including the criminal code or contrary to common law requirements for procurement practices. I would be happier if Ernst & Young had by now reported publically on its follow-up interviews with the Mayor and Councillors as regarding their roles and responsibilities in the subject matter of the new Fire Paramedic stations construction project and if that report was also referred to the external legal counsel for the same reasons. With regard to the other matters, in the case of...well, I've attached a copy of my presentation to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works on February 4th with regard to those items. But by way of additional comments with respect to the proposed U-Pass, well, I'm appearing in opposition here, my opposition is to the possible delay of this program until 2016. I've been a supporter of improvements in transit service to the University and for university students in particular for some 45 years, since I was president of the University of Manitoba Students Union. I certainly support both U-Pass now and I support this introduction by September 2015 if possible. And again, I would urge that Council prove it is serious by dealing with the budgetary and implementation report this summer, not a year from now as the resolution before you what implied. As the author of the original provincial 50 percent transit operating subject grants some 40 years ago, I wish to stress that the Province is now legally bound to match the City dollar for dollar for the net cost of any improvements in transit service or any reductions in fares. I might add that the cost of this incentive to get university students out of cars and to reduce future congestion on Pembina Highway is a far, far more cost effective program than the ridiculous \$600 million that they now plan on spending on development oriented transit, not transit oriented development, the development oriented transit in Phase 2 of the Southwest Rapid Transit Bus Corridor. The civic administration is continuing as we



speaking to press for further approvals of the what I would call the developer land value enhancement scheme known as the Parker Lands Manitoba Hydro Alignment so as to qualify for \$150 million in yet undetermined federal P3 funds. Again, the Ernst & Young real estate management audit report should have a lot to say about the land transactions associated with this project. With respect to this discoloured water report, I specifically object to the recommendation to authorize the Interim Acting Chief Administrative Officer to negotiate a single source engineering consultant, the cost of up to \$500,000 to review the report and the process design of the \$300 million water treatment plant. Given the gravity of the problems and the unknown costs of reducing the discoloured water in the future, which may be huge, I think both the City Auditor and legal services should be involved and I think a recommended contract should be submitted to EPC for public review and approval. Speaking of audits, I'm pleased to...

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Sanders, let's stick to the point because I am reading ahead of you and that's irrelevant to the topic at hand. So let's get back on the U-Pass or let's move to the discoloured water matter.

**David Sanders:** Well, to those who have my documents can read my references to the...and concerns about the...

**Madam Speaker:** Would you like to move on to the discoloured water, perhaps?

**David Sanders:** The audits of the Police headquarters. And finally with respect to the Stantec traffic study related to the fire hall located at 1705 Portage Avenue, I find it ridiculous that it is being suggested that some parts of that study report can be withheld from Council. I would suggest that Council now order that copies of the full unedited report be provided today and if someone feels aggrieved by the release of that report, then let them pursue whatever their rights may be under FIPPA. I don't expect there will be any problems with it, but respect to the Ombudsman's report, the Ombudsman indicated that the City has the discretion to withhold parts of reports provided by advice and I take it the City is choosing to exercise that discretion in which case I want to know why. Why is it that the City wants to withhold this information? There's no good reason. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Sanders? Okay, seeing none, you may return to the gallery. Thank you. We will now move on to committee reports. First, we have EPC. Mr. Mayor on the EPC report dated February 5th.

**REPORT OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE  
DATED FEBRUARY 5, 2014**

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will...bear with me one second. I will introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 to 4.

**Councillor Eadie:** Stand down 2.

**Madam Speaker:** All those in favour of 1, 3 and 4? All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Item 2 - Burying of Manitoba Hydro Transmission Lines in Sage Creek**

**Mayor Katz:** Madam Speaker, I'd love to hear from Councillor Eadie and I would certainly try to address any concerns.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will...I'm rising to speak...I have a number of concerns with this particular motion now. I know it doesn't...I'll support it, but because it doesn't indicate that the City of Winnipeg is going to cover off the 50 percent to bury the Hydro cables in Sage Creek, a relatively new development in the City of Winnipeg. As I understand it, there is the...Hydro is installing some new towers in their right-of-way through this particular part of the city and that you know, for safety and esthetic purposes, there's a discussion to bury the cable and I know that when we have developments along the Red River and the Assiniboine River, wherever there's a need to stabilize the riverbank, the developer is the one who has to pay to stabilize that riverbank. So for the life of me when this development of Sage Creek which also when it was first passed and...when I wasn't on City Council and Sage Creek was basically created and by-laws were done and plans were put in place, what should've happened was you were building a community here, there should've been a discussion so that the developer paid the other 50 percent to bury these cables if that is what the need is. So, while this resolution endorsed by EPC, saying that...recommending to go to Hydro to look to bury the cable and to try to find a partner for 50 percent. In no way, do I think that our city tax dollars should pay for this when it should've been all factored into the Sage Creek development when it was originally created. So I'm going to leave it at that, but I will vote for it.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Vandal.

**Councillor Vandal:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is in my ward and it originates from the Riel Community Committee, so I'll give it a bit of context. Manitoba Hydro have been holding public open houses on their plans to construct two new transmission towers through the right-of-way which runs through Sage Creek. It's already...it originates from what is actually called the St. Vital station and it's going to run all the way to Letellier. They are holding public consultations and some residents, the residents of Sage Creek are very, very concerned for potential safety reasons to their constituents, to themselves as well as esthetics. What Hydro is not telling the constituents is that there is a current policy in place that says Hydro will bury all transmission towers and will pay for 50 percent of the cost of burying those transmission towers subject to that another 50 percent coming from another source. It may be the City of Winnipeg; it may be the Federal government; it may be a district local improvement that involves the entire Sage Creek region, half the constituents cost share. That's yet to be known, but I think the first step is for Hydro to come clean, tell the constituents, my constituents in Sage Creek that there is...they have an existing policy and number one says let's determine what it actually costs to bury the transmission lines. We know there is precedent for this in North St. Boniface. We buried the lines through Aubert Street. In fact, they originate at the James Street Pumping Station. The transmission lines were pumped under the Red River all the way to Des Meurons at a cost of \$3.6 million I believe which was shared equally by the City of Winnipeg and Manitoba Hydro. And in fact I think there was probably \$300,000 of leftovers that the City ended up picking up to complete that. But the point is, the people of Sage Creek need to know that there is an existing policy in place that Hydro adopted about ten years ago and...but the first step to all of this is that we need to determine how much this is going to cost and this is a simple motion to get information from Manitoba Hydro to share with the constituents and with the area Councillor that this is what it costs to bury those transmission lines and that they're bound by their policy to cover 50 percent of it and then the community and whoever is the Councillor after next year will try to find the other 50 percent. So that's all this is, it's information gathering and it's trying to solve a concern for the residents of Sage Creek.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Yeah, I'll be brief as Councillor Vandal has nailed it pretty well there in terms of this is...this is not something that could've been foreseen at the time of the development. This is a new Manitoba Hydro proposal as Councillor Vandal is saying where they put out two potential lines or discussions. It's called the St. Vital line coming from the St. Vital Station though largely it pertains to the St. Boniface ward. The public hearings were at Niakwa Community Centre. It has come up in my ward though, I have...I actually had, I represent the area below the Perimeter directly south of Sage Creek. That happens to be in my ward and people there have talked to me about well there will be a 12 storey tower. It's going to be on the other side of the floodway but these are folks who basically, their backyard is the floodway down on streets like Courage Place in my ward, south of the Perimeter. So it is a live issue. It's not something that could've been foreseen. Councillor Vandal certainly highlighted the numbers well there and this is more of an issue in Sage Creek given the density of the population there that might be further south. All sorts of issues here but where the line will go, will it be. At some points, it's not going to be in the City of Winnipeg but it will be visible from the City of Winnipeg so it's a...it's worth looking at...see if the line can get buried at least so far as the Sage Creek portion, is effective.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close on the item.

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I can tell you that I agree with both Councillor Vandal and Councillor Eadie. Both have valid points, but I think, but you have to...if you read the specific motion and as Councillor Vandal has pointed out, there's already 50 percent available. This motion basically says to go out there, have administration explore the possible avenues for funding for this, whatever that source may be. If that source were to be suggested to be the City of Winnipeg, have to come back to Council regardless so this is just to get the administration to start doing the work and I will say this, at this stage of the game and I remember vividly what Councillor Vandal was talking about because I did a little trip through that area of St. Boniface and when I saw these huge towers and actually in people's back yards, it was insane and it's a good thing that we buried that working with Hydro. At this stage of the game, Councillor Eadie is right. We're doing the development...everything should be buried. That should be our motto, it should all be buried. So let's just find out what the information is. Are there other funding partners out there? We know what Manitoba Hydro is prepared to commit to and then if the City has to play a role then we can discuss it at that point in time. So I will be supportive of the motion.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All those in favour of the item? Opposed? Carried. Next is Mr. Mayor, on the report of EPC dated February 12.

---

**REPORT OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE  
DATED FEBRUARY 12, 2014**

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1.

**Madam Speaker:** One pulled. Mr. Mayor or Mr. Clerk.

**Item 1 - Memorandum of Agreement – United Fire Fighters of Winnipeg, Union Local 867 of the International Association of Fire Fighters**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Havixbeck has pulled the item, Mr. Mayor.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** I'm not opposing the item, I wanted to have a couple of points noted on the record. I would like to point out something because there are Councillors who have said during budget debates that I and other Councillors have supported wage increases such as these in the negotiated settlement here and that this is what drives the budget to such a significant amount that it warrants a tax increase and then these Councillors would argue and say that I along with perhaps others don't support budgets that see tax increases. But in increase in wages correspondingly with the CPI does not equate to an entire department's budget going up by the same proportion. And I wanted to make that clear and on the record. I would also say that this collective agreement, specifically as the wage increases, these are on par with the cost of living increases and the cost of living increases in the report. And I checked it for a more current number and from January, 2013 to 14, it is 2.6 percent and the most significant driver is now energy cost. So I would argue that this is one driver of the department's increase in budget. I think we should also look to other regions. The City of West Kelowna imposes no more than 1.5 percent increase over the prior year's budget and should a department need more than 1.5 percent, they need to come to Council and they need to state a business case for that and show explicitly what the service enhancements are to a community. And so I want to reiterate that yes, wages go up and they need go up and we need to keep pace with other jurisdictions, but they are not the sole drivers in the department's budget. I also think it's important to note that the CFO will be providing as part of the quarterly reporting beginning at the end of the first quarter, the actual compared to budgeted FTEs. And this is something I have asked for for well over a year and this is the only way we know that...we truly know the City's true staffing costs. So I think it's important to have those actual break downs. So again, I just want to reiterate those points for the record. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor to close on the item.

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I want to commend the administration. These negotiations as you can appreciate are not always easy. They're very challenging. I think both sides have seen the light and came to something that I think is realistic in light of everything that's going on in communities right throughout the country, trying to basically make sure that the increases are in line. In the past, we've seen increases significantly higher sometimes when negotiating. I think we did that very well. I also would like to share that when it comes to operating expenses, the majority of operating expenses are basically the cost of labour. I mean that's a large part of our operating expenses and like I say I would like to thank our administration as well as the United Firefighters who basically sat down and worked something out that was very reasonable and something that made sense and something that can serve us for the next several years. I will be supporting this.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Mr. Mayor, on the report of EPC dated February 19th, 2014.

**REPORT OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE  
DATED FEBRUARY 19, 2014**

**Mayor Katz:** I'll introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 4.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have a notice of motion from our January Council meeting. Councillor Vandal, will you please introduce the motion?

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE  
NOTICE OF MOTIONS**

**Moved by Councillor Vandal,  
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,**

*WHEREAS the major railways own and operate hundreds of kilometers of rail track throughout the City of Winnipeg;*

*AND WHEREAS recent trends in goods rail transport have seen an increase in transport activity, as well as change in the quality of dangerous goods being transported;*

*AND WHEREAS recent high profile rail accidents have prompted public concern regarding the safety of Canada's rail network, especially on routes where large volumes of dangerous goods are being transported;*

*AND WHEREAS the Federation of Canadian Municipalities' National Municipal Rail Safety Working Group has called for swift and concrete action to improve rail safety;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg call upon Transport Canada and the Federal Government to ensure that all rail safety rules, including those affecting large rail yards such as Symington, are reviewed and modernized to reflect the new realities in rail transport;*

*AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the review include information sharing to municipalities and cities by railroad companies on the nature and volumes of dangerous goods being transported;*

*AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT crude oil and all other flammable liquids be included on the list of substances deemed high-risk for transportation, and that detailed emergency response assistance plans (ERAP's) be in place in the event of an accident.*

**Councillor Vandal:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a pleasure to introduce the notice of motion. This motion is all about railway safety. As everyone knows Winnipeg is a rail city with literally hundreds of kilometres of railway running throughout east, west, north, south, some area very close to existing neighbourhoods. What people may not be aware is that over the last six, seven years, there's been a dramatic increase of commodity transportation through railroads and in fact, some people are saying that railroads have become the new pipelines of North America and it's linked to that whole do we move the goods by rail or do we move them by pipeline argument. And in fact, I read a report last month that said in 2006 across North America, there were 4,000 car loads of crude oil transported by rail car. Seven years later, in 2013, that number had increased to 400,000 of car loads. That's a hundred fold increase, which is very, very dramatic. Much of that crude oil comes from the Bakken region in North Dakota. It's heading out east to the refineries on the east coast and we also know that it trends that the oil that's being transported for reasons...the Bakken oil is more explosive than traditional crude. So given those facts, Madam Speaker, essentially this motion calls upon the Federal government to do all things necessary to ensure rail safety, perhaps I'll go out over the, "therefore be it resolved, therefore be it resolved that the City of Winnipeg call upon Transport Canada and the federal government to ensure that all rail safety rules including those affected, affecting large rail yards such as Symington are reviewed and modernized to reflect the new realities", which I've just spoke of, of rail transport. "Be it further resolved that the review include information sharing to municipalities and cities by railroad companies on the nature and volumes of dangerous goods being implemented, transported, excuse me. And be it further resolved that crude oil and other flammable liquids be included on the list of substances deemed high risk for transportation which would thereby trigger a detailed emergency response assistance plan in place in the event of an accident". Madam Speaker, it seems to me and we've all heard it. It seems like every month we're hearing about a derailment, a major accident involving railroads, crude oil. We all know about the horrible, horrible incident in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec, but not many people know that before Christmas there was a rail fire in Royalwood, in my ward, literally 10 or 20 yards away from where people were sleeping that night. The Fire Department did an excellent job in containing that fire, but there's a heightened public concern about what's going through our cities and I know in my constituency in Royalwood, right next to Symington Yard, I get calls every week for...people want information of what's going through their neighbourhoods. I know the Federation of Canadian Municipalities have done tremendous work along with the federal government in making improvements and in fact, some of...some of what I have in therefore be it resolved may already be achieved. In fact, Councillor Orlikow sent me an e-mail where there's a protocol in place for information sharing. I believe the City, the municipalities, the cities have to make application to the Federal government by actually the end of the week, so I hope we are going to do that. But the third therefore be it resolved is something that has not been achieved yet and I see this as our city's way to lend our

voice to a movement that's pushing for rail safety, something that everybody across Canada wants. So I'm going to stand down. I'll try to answer any questions and we will take it from there, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think this is a good motion, very timely. I'm glad that Councillor Vandal waited awhile after the terrible incident in Lac-Mégantic. It would've been easy to be politicizing something like this while that tragedy had just happened so, but we do need as a Council and as cities across this country to begin to address this issue. And you know, I made a couple of quick notes here just to talk about. First and foremost is the cost of what it takes to change regulations in the railroad industry. If you start talking about adding personnel on trains to ensure that they're safer, you know, for example, a conductor and extra brakeman and a caboose on every train, you think about how many trains pass through our city on any given day, what the cost of that is. When you start talking about perhaps identifying crude oil as a dangerous commodity and what the rules for dangerous commodities are in train, how many cars you can have before you have to have a significant separation of cars. Are the cost of switching those trains to build them and to drop other cars off and to maintain that separation, it's a very significant cost, runs into the billions of dollars annually, I would believe in this, in the country of Canada. Those costs I believe create opportunity that we should be...even going further than what Councillor Vandal's motion does, and I'm not going to go there today to try and tinker with this motion, but we do have an opportunity for relocation right in front of us right now. And you can also add to that. You can add to that the cost of servicing railroad crossings, the cost of servicing underpasses. The cost on the environmental side of delays in moving traffic because a train has stopped that you know what's...I think Councillor Orlikow's ward is a good example, Waverley, closed to...between Wilkes and Sterling or between the Wilkes and Taylor Avenue. Every day, there's thousands of cars that are delayed there emitting their greenhouse gases into the environment. The social cost of delays and people not being able to get home. The anger that it causes and the frustration that it costs rushing to get your children to a soccer game or just to get home and have a cocktail at the end of a hard day, a terrible social cost out there as well. We have things right in front of us right now that we should be considering. I know, you know, we're looking at the BRT line extending out south to the University of Manitoba from Jubilee. Well, along that corridor is the Letellier subdivision which has a great deal of this product coming as it straight out of North Dakota and you will look at what we are doing, we're going to go and we're going to build a bus rapid transit corridors through some at the lands and down Hydro corridors through an industrial park. Well, we've got a railroads sitting, going right through residential and commercial in nature where our citizens need to go on a regular basis and in extremely close proximity to the corridor along Pembina Highway. Should we not be talking in the costing of that project about relocating the railroad? You know, especially from Bishop Grandin, through to the main...to the CN main line whether it's, you know, where it comes down at Pembina right now. Should we not be talking about relocating that railroad over through, the down the Hydro corridor or it can connect with the CN main line closer to Waverley where the car wash is. And you know there is also talk in the city about relocating the CPR line that runs the north through our city to Winnipeg Beach and relocating that out to centre point that opens up a whole bunch of land for both infill development and perhaps some recreational purposes whether it's active transportation or additional green space for community centres, for soccer pitches or baseball diamonds. And those come with their challenges and they come with their cost, but when you look at what the alternatives are, you know, the alternative is that we continue to allow this dangerous situation to exist and I truly believe that if we task some folks to start measuring the financial impacts on both sides we're probably pretty close to the cost of relocating major rail roads out of our city, and to having a plan as to where rail roads should be allowed to go because we do need them to serve some of our industrial players. And you know we've got a problem in this city where industries and residential have kind of grown too close together, and it's not just rail, we have dangerous commodities hauled by trucks and other pieces. But there's ways to properly adjust that, when I think, when you're talking about significant changes in regulations and you're talking about the costs that might be associated with that, that we have a responsibility to look at it and then to take a much deeper look, to see if we can't come up with a Winnipeg solution that makes financial sense to both rail roads and to all three levels of government in this country because they have to be involved. You know, we know we have little power when it comes to the railroad act that they're...it's a federally controlled act. We know our frustration, we've through and trying to deal with antenna siding, which is a federally controlled as well. And so we need to be partnering with the Federal government and the Provincial government because there's great opportunities for the Provincial government in this as well. So those are my comments. I appreciate Councillor Vandal bringing this forward and I think it has some real good pieces in it, but it's seriously, really is only the beginning of a conversation. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thanks to Councillor Vandal for bringing this forward. I was happy to second it. As you know, as a representative on FCM, I've been following closely that...and it's been mentioned, that immediately following the Lac-Mégantic tragedy, a task force was set up and that work has been ongoing and to find out more about it, there is lots of information on the FCM website about the things they have been working on to date and I think it's already showing results in terms of that initial change, which allows the reporting of dangerous goods

going through that the new system that was referred to earlier by Councillor Vandal. I think there's always been...I wanted to point out there's always been a challenge in municipal level of government trying to deal with these issues as we all know. It's very difficult to deal with, from very local issues like an underpass in your ward and getting maintenance and things like that and just working out anything with railway companies, it's very difficult to have that action and have response and get things done. And at the Federal level as it was mentioned, it's controlled by another level of government mostly in terms of the rules, so it's a really effective way to work through some of those bigger issues of rail safety and policy, through the FCM, which is sitting down at the table with representatives, municipal representatives across the country on this task force. And I just want to report that the current Minister, Minister Raitt has actually really been responsive more than on many other files we've had it, been working on with the Federal government in other areas. It has been going very well for this very challenging file. So I would like to mention that. And I think it's a mechanism to have the municipal government at the table to talk about railways. It's very challenging with the jurisdictional issues so it's very good process. I'm sympathetic to the notion of relocating railways. In fact, Councillor Vandal and I moved a motion looking at that several years ago. It's been talked about over and over. The reality is we simply can't defer everything we're doing until those problems are planned and resolved or we're not going to see rapid transit till the year 3,000. I mean we really have to move on this project so I hope that's certainly not really realistic to sort of call a halt at this point because we might be able to relocate the rail lines. Obviously those types of...there's many other issues. Rail transportation is a reality. It's not going to go away in Canada. In fact, it's increasing massively, and I think it's really important that we find ways to deal with it. I do like the idea of looking at some planning on where we can do railways location. When it can be done, you know to reuse that land and have good plans for that in terms of enhancing our city, but those things will take a lot of time and when we looked at it before, do cost incredibly large sums of money. So, you know, just to put that in a little bit of perspective, I do appreciate the thought of doing that and it's something we should work towards in the future, but really in dealing with railways, the relationship with the railways is key and with the Federal government and having that dialogue between the municipal level of government. So I totally support the motion and this will be brought to FCM's attention and I know that other municipalities are bringing forward the same kinds of concerns across the country. In fact, at the sustainable communities conference that FCM just held in Charlottetown, the Mayor of Lac-Mégantic was one of the speakers and it was incredibly moving, but there are stories and problems across the country as we all know. So thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor. Yes.

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I will definitely be supporting the motion, number one. Number two, I just want to share that as a result of some of the tragic events from the past, there already are changes that are taking place. As was mentioned before, for example, now they're basically changing how they basically identify the tanker cars and what they're carrying which is an important change, about what time they can pass through a community. What speed they can travel at. As well as, you know, when it comes to the relocation, which is an issue right across the country, I can tell you through the big city Mayors that the Mayor of Saskatoon has actually gone forward to represent us all to start these discussions about the opportunity of relocating. I don't think there's any community that wants any rail line going through their community. We all know the potential problems, what they can cause, but the facts are, this is something that has to be dealt with, the Federal government, what...so this is why this is a good motion, but on top of that, don't think it's just Winnipeg. It's going to be right across the country, they have to look at this. And I hope this starts something going and people listen. It's going to be costly, but the realities are, is it an expense or is it an investment? So this is something I would definitely support. And I thank the Councillor for moving it.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Orlikow followed by Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Actually, I am as well as Councillor Vandal and many of us, I still deal with this issue pretty all weekly in the ward. There is no question about the increasing flow of traffic from the BNSF line and the CP line that runs right through the heart of River Heights. There's a lot more trains there, not only just coming through, but they are also being parked there. The only way that presently we are able to get some answers over what's in there is by the grades of people who work for the CP or the BNSF who are out there and as I trot along and try to find someone, sometimes there's somebody out there will tell me and they do give you some good ideas and the best of their knowledge. I just want to state, the best of our knowledge that those railcars that are sitting there on the Lindsay block are empty and they're empty accordingly so they can sit there. They're not flammable. They are empty railcars at that point. So again, there are some standing there, but there's...they don't need any oil, full tanker trucks of oil. So for again, the people of the River Heights ward, they need to know that. It's unfortunate though right now what happens with the FCM report that I will be asking the Mayor about it if we register for it shortly. Is that...they only tell us what's going through the city at the end of the year. So the trains have already gone through. Again, that's not helping the residents who know that it's only...and again, and this is a classification issues of what type of oil needs to be registered. So again, as we talked about...it is very complicated on the transportation side. But the present situation really is...cities need to know. I can't believe with this days of technology that cities can't have some access to a data base where we know what's coming through the city and when. It's just even to alleviate the concerns of the residents because right

now when we see, if I see any rail car that looks like a petroleum rail car coming through the city. I'm assuming because my default position is, is it's full of flammable liquid. Again, it may be full of water, it may not. Again, but we as a city don't have the opportunity to know this. We also don't have an opportunity to know a lot of things about the rail lines. So there needs to be a better partnership with municipalities and the rail line and Transport Canada. So the public knows what's happening in the city. We do need to remove lines, I've got to say that I'm very impressed with our City administration and CentrePort and a number of other groups, BNSF and CP who are working diligently to remove the rail lines out of River Heights. It is actually moving forward in a very positive light, but that's very unique situation where all parties don't want to be there. So it really helps to motivate all groups to try to find alternative routing so that is working very positively, but that's very small spur line. We're not talking the big lines that are happening in the city. So again, in our planning, we need to be...taking this into account. I don't believe rail line is going to be, rail use is going down, I believe it will be going up. So again, I fully support Councillor Vandal's motion and we need to be working at many fronts because it really is an incredibly serious issue for the residents, not only on transportation, but on public safety and just the enjoyment of your neighbourhood. If you look out your window, every morning and you see this rail car that you're not sure what's in it, automatically, that's going to devalue your love of your neighbourhood because you want to make sure that you live in a safe and comfortable environment and it could be as easy as just telling people, you know what, they're full of water and we know that, but at this present time, we don't even know that. So again, I support that idea, I can't...I know it's complicated, but with, when there's a will, there's a way.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, this is an issue for the whole city. Rail has been built within the City of Winnipeg. That's how it's grew out and we have that problem. It's interesting today that we ratified the negotiated agreement with our Winnipeg firefighters, our emergency, part of our emergency response and I don't know if you could pay me enough to deal with a disaster like the ones that happened across the country. And so for me, you know, at the very least, they should be reporting what's coming through on a daily basis to our emergency response people so that we have an idea of how to react at a minimum and our residents are very concerned, yes. Speaking of railway development, I'm on my soap box here because you know technically, you know if they're going to keep moving more and more dangerous things across our rails which they weren't really doing as much of in the past, in the future it looks like there's a lot of that. So you know if we are going to develop and move, I would suggest that in order to find all the money to be able to remove railways and do development that maybe we should put a suspension on any further development like the Transcona North Precinct I, slow down these things so that we can actually look at working with the private sector, not just other levels of government to move our railways away and I like Councillor Swandel's idea. I've trying to say we need an active transportation trail along the Winnipeg Beach line for a long time. I think it's a great opportunity. It would be great to move it, but again, I don't see how we're going to be able to do this. We need private sector money as well as public sector money. And so it's good to talk about that, so in the meantime, we need to deal with what's being moved on the railways. Yes, they'll put in new rules to slow down railcars and so on, but we really need to know what's being transported on a daily basis so that our emergency response group can deal with it. So I'll leave it at that and be wholeheartedly voting for this motion that Councillor Vandal has brought to the Council.

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

**Councillor Vandal:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's been a good discussion. I think we're all on the same page. I'm happy to note that there has been some progress made at the Federal level. FCM have done an incredible job of working with the Federal government, representing cities and municipalities and we're going to need continued consistent, strong leadership from FCM, obviously from the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg and from this Council. There's incredible opportunity in terms of transportation for rail roads in the City of Winnipeg. We were...rail roads played an incredible important part in our past and they will in our future, but this motion is about safety and there's lots of opportunity in the months to come, I think to look at how we move forward in a progressive way to create opportunity from some of the changes that are going to happen. I didn't mention in my opening comments how old the infrastructure is, rail infrastructure, but I think the Mayor did allude to that. So it's been a good conversation and I think we need to move forward. This is an incredibly important issue going forward for the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All those in favour of the motion? Opposed? Carried? Okay, on to other motions.

#### **EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS**

**Madam Speaker:** We have Motion No. 1 from Mayor Katz and Councillor Browaty regarding an FCM appointment. This is an automatic referral to the next...

**Mayor Katz:** Madam Speaker, I'd like to move to suspend the rules and deal with this with Council's blessings.

**Madam Speaker:** All those in favour of suspending the rules? Opposed? Carried. Mr. Mayor to introduce.

**Motion No. 1**

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

*WHEREAS Councillor Jenny Gerbasi has represented the City of Winnipeg, serving as a Board Member of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) since 2007;*

*AND WHEREAS Councillor Jenny Gerbasi advocates passionately for issues of concern to local governments, serves as the Chair of the Prairies and Territories Regional Caucus since 2011, is a member of the FCM Executive Committee as well as numerous other Standing Committees of FCM;*

*AND WHEREAS Councillor Jenny Gerbasi has expressed an interest running for the position of 3rd Vice President for FCM;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Winnipeg City Council strongly supports Councillor Jenny Gerbasi with her intention to run for the position of 3rd Vice President of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities.*

**Mayor Katz:** I believe everybody has had an opportunity to look at the...at the motion, it's basically quite simple as that Councillor Gerbasi has represented the City of Winnipeg, serving as a board member of the FCM since 2007 and whereas Councillor Gerbasi advocates passionately for issues of concern to local governments, serves as the Chair of the Prairies and Territories Regional Caucus since 2011, is a member of the FCM Executive and whereas Councillor Gerbasi has a trust and interest for running for the position of 3rd Vice President for FCM. Therefore be it resolved that Winnipeg City Council strongly supports Councillor Jenny Gerbasi with her intention to run for the position of 3rd Vice President of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. I have very little doubt in my mind this would be totally unanimous.

**Madam Speaker:** Any other speakers? Okay, Mayor Katz to close. Okay, do you close?

**Mayor Katz:** No close necessary.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, all those in favour of the motion? Wonderful. Unanimous support. Carried. I'd like to take a moment to recognize students from St. John's Ravenscourt in the gallery under the care of Mr. Matt Henderson. Welcome to our chamber. Motion No. 2 is from Councillor Eadie and Councillor Havixbeck dealing with the Canada Post delivery boxes.

**Motion No. 2**

**Moved by Councillor Eadie,  
Seconded by Councillor Havixbeck,**

*WHEREAS local governments have a direct interest in the security and stability of Canada's postal system, both in terms of municipal corporate operations and services available to citizens;*

*AND WHEREAS the service delivery changes would directly impact local governments, including in relation to land-use policy, requirements for municipal land and rights-of-ways, infrastructure for paving, lighting, and waste management, snow removal and storage, street maintenance, and public safety considerations;*

*AND WHEREAS residents will blame the City and contact City Councillors and the Mayor about problems with community mail boxes because many of the problems are associated with city services;*

*AND WHEREAS community mail box locations have financial effects on a city's budgets;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg call on the Federal Government and Canada Post, through the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and other avenues as appropriate, to suspend the Canada Post delivery*



*changes until a sustained, substantive consultation process with local governments and the public is completed and identified issues are addressed;*

*AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Winnipeg City Council, through the Mayor, write to Canada Post and the Minister responsible for Canada Post to call for a delay in implementing community mail boxes in the R2P and R2V sections of the city until Canada Post has consulted and worked out details of installation of these mail boxes in older neighbourhoods never considered for community mail boxes.*

**Councillor Eadie:** Madam Speaker, I'd like to move suspension of the rules to deal with this resolution as it's time sensitive.

**Madam Speaker:** All those in favour of suspending the rules? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes. First, I'd like to stand and thank my seconder, Councillor Havixbeck for helping us move this motion across. I believe that we've all heard recently in the news that they've decided to start implementing the removal of door-to-door mail service in our older neighbourhoods or mature neighbourhoods as you want to call them and I'll leave it up to others to speak to the problems that are even experiencing community mailboxes in other areas to other Councillors, but our older neighbourhoods, our mature neighbourhoods were never designed for community mailboxes. So that's first off. The whereases within this motion are pretty clear that cities have a great stake in door-to-door mail service and mail service as a whole no matter how it's delivered but, you know, the City of Winnipeg deals with snow clearing. This year is a great example. I know it's a little more snow than many years, but you know, our mature neighbourhoods, we store snow on the boulevards. That's where we store them. You constantly have issues with trying to deal with plowing the sidewalks in a timely fashion. It takes us like three to four weeks to get our neighbourhood sidewalks plowed. And you know, Canada Post's perspective on this is oh, this is a great time to socialize at community mailboxes and greet your neighbours and so on. But you can't get there in the winter and my issue with this is that Canada Post hasn't the foggiest idea how they're going to deal with mature neighbourhoods and also deal with seniors who are to the point where they really can't get out themselves, especially in winter. And I know that my office spent some time actually removing windrows on the front street so that these people can get to their Handi Transit trip if they're not on the parking side of the street. So, you know, we do these things and there's all these issues. They haven't even devised a way for people who are totally blind who don't have somebody to help them deal with these things, people using wheelchairs...you know, this winter, I had a wheelchair user very angry, staring across the street at me as my assistant told me. She was cruising down Euclid Avenue because she couldn't actually ride on the sidewalk because of these issues. And so this is what we deal with in mature neighbourhoods. We have a lot of people experiencing those problems and actually, it costs the City money, I believe, dealing with the existing community mailboxes, we have in new neighbourhoods. So for me, that first be it resolved is that FCM is a great organization that advocates the City's concerns and I think that be it resolved on the FCM is a very important one. But number two, they are talking about having community mailboxes in mine and Councillor Sharma's ward in by fall. And I know that she understands in some of the neighbourhoods, that we have an issue of where do you put them? Vandalism. There is crime although R2V and R2P are not exactly the most notorious, but you know, the issue is, they're moving towards this plan and they haven't the foggiest idea how to deal with the crimes that are involved around these things. Heaven forbid when we get to the point where we are in William Whyte and somebody's got to go to a mailbox where they're going to have a chance to get robbed. I'm already dealing with issues where seniors are going to ATMs and they're getting jacked for their money in the middle of the afternoon. So for Canada Post to say that you know it's more important that we go to community mailboxes and not care about those people who are going to be injured and not to mention that our city, we have a whole bunch of issues to deal with. And so, how much damage are we going to do to community mailboxes on Scotia? There's nowhere to store snow and that's where they're talking about putting these things. They're talking about putting them at the end of residential blocks in different places like that. It's just a big shmozzle and I think we need to ask them to delay this immediately and try to figure out in detail. They haven't done enough consultation. The City of Burnaby has done a great study on it. Quite a long report and they've demonstrated that there hasn't been enough detailed consultation with the cities in this country to determine how they're going to implement that. So I urge you all to vote in favour of this motion and I guess I get to close on it. Thanks.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I'd like to thank Councillor Eadie and Havixbeck for bringing this forward. Yes, Councillor Eadie's outlined well that there's a number of concerns raised by this rather sudden and arbitrary announcement that home mail delivery is to be phased out from Canada's postal system. Most glaringly, there's been little if any consultation, collaboration or apparent thought onto the impact of this change on Canadian citizens and on the costs downloaded to municipal governments. As your FCM rep, I want you to know that FCM is very aware of this issue and it's really helpful to have a motion coming forward from a number of Councils on this. The President of FCM,

Claude Dauphin released a statement following the announcement blast about the Canada Post changes, and advised that FCM met with Canada Post to discuss the impacts these changes may have on municipalities and to share your concerns with them. FCM stressed the importance of consultations with our members and stated that Canada Post must communicate directly with municipal leaders. I'd also like to bring to your attention that Vancouver City Council voted unanimously in January to ask the postal service to suspend these service cuts pending full consultation with communities across the country. In Vancouver, City staff will also research how the changes may affect residents specifically seniors and people with disabilities. A few days ago, Toronto City Council voted 40-2 for a similar motion. I'm not sure who the two were, but...one of the key points here is that we don't know the cost to municipalities, but there definitely will be an impact and an expanded need for City services such as snow clearing and litter removal around these mailboxes. And furthermore, there are real issues of how this can possibly be implemented in older neighbourhoods with small lots and minimal space on the boulevards. I really hope we're not going to see our elm canopy affected for example. I can tell you looking out my door in the Fort Rouge area, there is no room for these mailboxes. It wasn't part of the way our cities were planned. And again as Councillor Eadie has alluded to, the impact on people with disabilities, seniors and those with health issues, people struggling over windrows to reach their mail will create more demand for services from the City. So I support the motion this needs to be reconsidered. This will be a national discussion for municipalities across the country as it should be. I mean I don't know if this is ideologically driven you know you're...a lot of jobs are disappearing as a result of this kind of move as well. So you know, I could not, you know, that's part of an ideology, but you know, some oppose it simply for that reason that it's driven by that. And you know, you take the budget line from one budget line and then you create unemployment, you're not really helping the economy. So I just thought I'll point that. Other political view out from what may be driving this, but I think the key thing for us is municipal government is what is this going to cost us, how is it going to be implemented in our communities if it can be and what kind of...how will it affect our citizens, who are going to have to struggle to get to their mail and be more and more isolated, you know, we're trying to be an age friendly city. So there is a number of concerns that I think whatever your political ideology, whether you support this government or not. It's not really about that. I think this is a city issue that affects our citizens and all of us should support the motion to get further dialogue with the Federal government. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** That Councillor Gerbasi is the FCM rep is highlighted. I think they're major concerns but it is a valid budget issue we are going to have to look at. Right now my ward does have a lot of community mailboxes, placed at Gosford, Ashford. I had a call from somebody the other day or e-mail that I'm sitting here trying to find, but I can't find it and the question was I've talked to Canada Post and they say it's the City's job to take care of the area around the community mailbox and snow clear and 311 says it's Canada Post's job so I talked to 311 and our position is as the City is that it's Canada Post's job. So it's not getting done and this is just going to get magnified and reinforced and expanded if we don't have some agreement with Canada Post or the Feds on. If they are coming, who is taking care of them since we can't seem to sort out, who's taking care of them now, this problem's only going to get worse. So I think it's a valid concern and something we need to raise that this could be a real long term cost for the City.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm going to be at least one Councillor from this Council that's going to be opposed to this particular motion. I have to start by saying that the Federal government, the way they handled the timing of it was awful to begin with, making these announcements and these changes before Christmas I think was a low blow, poorly timed and frankly, inappropriate even if all the changes are going to be happening over a longer period of time and through attrition, just the fact that they did it right before Christmas sent a lot of families a lot of stress at a tough time of year where people should be celebrating. So start with that comment to start off. That said, mail delivery in Canada is changing. The volume of paper letters is going down. The number of bills people receive by standard mail is changing. Canada Post like postal...bureaucracies across the world are going to be changing. I have a community mail box. It's not the end of the world. It's actually rather convenient. Private contractors do come out and shovel out the area around the mailboxes and it happens quite quickly after a snowfall. I actually find it also convenient on a summer Friday, happen to, my wife takes the day off. We want to head out to the lake. We don't have to worry about having somebody going to get your mail because it's securely in the mailbox over the weekend. You don't have to worry about stopping it for a day. You can't just call Canada Post to say, hey, can you stop...hold my mail on Friday, like you can for your newspaper. So this is actually in my mind an improvement in service in some ways. Also, today's modern suburban neighbourhood especially, and even older neighbourhoods. People don't talk to their neighbours. You've got big front garages, you don't have people out on the streets. You don't have sidewalks in many cases. Where do I see my neighbours? When I'm outside going to the mailbox. I probably wouldn't see a lot of my neighbours if it wasn't for having this mailbox. So it actually helps build community in many ways. So again, are they going to get everything right with the first neighbourhoods they convert? Possibly not. Is it the end of the world? No. But there is room for improvement and again I'll be here fighting Canada Post if they get something wrong to be responsible in being

the ones that actually had to come back and fix any of the problems that they get if they don't get right. So again, timing bad, the concept and the idea good. And I look forward to having a continued debate on this topic.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Vandal.

**Councillor Vandal:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Browaty forgot to mention the exercise benefit for seniors who have to go over snow banks, which I believe the CEO, Mr. Deepak Chopra said, as far as I'm concerned in addition to the timing, the communications of this has been a mess. The communications of this has been a mess. So I've been hearing from my constituents from Windsor Park, from Norwood, from East Norwood, from central St. Boniface who are very concerned about having to trudge over their snow banks in a harsh, harsh winter. Many, those are...those are some of those neighbourhoods are...have a lot of seniors who live in those homes and they are very concerned. There's been zero consultation on this and I always to take a balanced view because I do have some community mailboxes in the more southern, newer parts of the ward and they appear to work for the most part well. Not always. There is protracted discussions about whose responsibility it is to clear the snow. People call 311; people call my office. I talked to the directors, Canada Post are involved and after all of that, the snow is not getting cleared to the satisfaction of what, of our constituents and often times Canada Post don't deliver the mail because they say it's the City of Winnipeg's job to clear the snow and our foremans are saying, it's already done. It's their job to do the snow. There's got to be some consultation first and foremost. That's off the table. I can tell you the constituents in my ward are very concerned about this so I want to thank Councillor Eadie, Councillor Havixbeck for moving this motion and it's a pleasure to support it.

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

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. This motion is to do two things and I think the most important thing is to have more dialogue at a community level and as many speakers have said, to have consultation because that's what's truly lacking. And the second part is for the Mayor to take a lead role in delaying so that that consultation can be facilitated. I've heard from many constituents on this matter and many people are concerned about the loss of property due to expropriation, property values decreasing, litter and traffic congestion because I think everybody has pretty much said that they expect people to walk to these mailboxes, yet I expect people to drive to them as well and so traffic congestion is probably number one for many of the residents that I speak with. And I can tell you that I've seen first-hand how this has gone on McCreary Road because prior to his passing, Bill Clement pushed to have McCreary Road resurfaced, drainage improved. And as a result of it being somewhat widened, the mailbox was moved arbitrarily, with no consultation and lands from the property at the corner of McCreary Road and Sterling Lyon were expropriated from the owner to fit three cars so they can move through. And I can tell you that that has resulted in at least eight phone calls from that land owner to my office and that's just one. I can also tell you that residents in the community find traffic congestion so hectic that the cars actually line up and wrap around Sterling Lyon. That's a busy intersection. And as well, litter and requests for a recycling box go unheard. Now, there are areas I represent and area, Charleswood-Tuxedo has homes as old as 1900 to as new as growing now. And Whyte Ridge has seen some success, however, I have also heard from residents in that community and it's mostly around snow and ice removal. And this is problematic because as two Councillors have now said, these complaints go back and forth between 311, the City of Winnipeg and Canada Post. So I have concerns about that and now with an expansion of this, I believe that that will only escalate and we will be the ones hearing these complaints. We can't send our snow clearing crews in because Canada Post is supposedly maintaining these centres and I don't think citizens really realize that. They call our offices or they call 311 expecting that the snow can be cleared and something that can be done. Some Councillors argue that there are already community mailboxes in communities. Well these communities were designed with that in mind with appropriate land uses to take into consideration land to be allocated towards that. Imposing this into existing neighbourhoods now says that we are going to move in and we are going to take land. And I, too, am concerned about older tree loss and in particular, our elms because we are losing them to disease. Are we going to lose them to mailboxes so that we can have a handy mailbox? So I hope that this would see more support in our community. I hope that every Councillor would take into consideration that this is simply an ask to postpone and to increase consultation and dialogue. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

**Councillor Fielding:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I won't be supporting the motion coming forward before us today. I generally agree a lot with what Councillor Browaty had to say on the issue. What I can say is that I've recently moved to a place where they actually have these community mailboxes. You know, and we walk down, I mean, people go there and they get their mail themselves. If you ask my opinion and Canada Post obviously didn't ask my opinion, I would suggest that just reduce the mail cycle to every second as opposed to kind of an everyday cycle might be another option that's there. You know, I don't think these things are the worst in the world. I think that dynamics that postal industries in terms of the amount of people that are sending mail has changed substantially. If...I would give one piece of advice. Once again, I don't think they all the...asked for my advice on these types of things, but if you look at the example of when we introduced the rolling bins and the reason why I bring that up is because it's something that touches everyone

on everyday basis whether you're rolling your bins out for garbage or where you're going to get your mail, everyone has an opinion on that because everyone has an opinion on that because everyone has to do it on a day to day basis. And what the City did is they made some exceptions, right? So if there's a senior, for instance, that has a hard time rolling the bins out. We have a...had a program where you could, you know, you can have an ability to have the City basically come pick it up for you. I forget the name of the program in itself. They had to have a doctor's note that's there. I think items like this could be incorporated because what Councillor Vandal raised is a concern with what some of the seniors had an inability to walk and if there's an impairment or there's hard ability to do it, I think introducing stuff like this. I'm not sure what that would do to cost, but I think it's something that actually could address that issue in itself. For the most part, I think most people receive a lot of their information nowadays through, bills or anything else electronically, I would imagine, maybe seniors might be a little bit different if they're not computer friendly in itself. So I think that dynamics are changing and I think to survive as an organization, you need to make some changes. And I think it's one of these things if you do look at the experience once again with the rolling bins, you know, back to that experience, we are the first in St. James to experience the new...and when they initially introduced that we were kind of the guinea pigs for this. I had about 150 calls and this is just before they introduced that people had dramatic concerns, and what is it going to look like? How is it going to react? And you know, you get 150 calls to the office, you start to...you start wondering. You know, how is it going to impact things? Six months later they introduced the policy. We had a general election and I was able to knock on some or...thousands of doors. And for the vast majority people liked the new system that's there. So I think there is a matter of getting used to it. I think if there is something that they can introduce into this system where seniors could have an ability, you know, possibly to apply and they would still be able to deliver mail to that one house, you know, where there is an issue. You know the details could be faired it out in terms of how you do that. Is it through doctor's note or what have you. There are some standards of practice in place just looking for the City of Winnipeg did. I think it's a system that could work. But I would also encourage them to take a look at every other day delivery. I think it's something that could work well. So I won't be supporting the motion here today, with that all, I will stand down. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Pagtakhan.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I represent a lot of older and mature areas in the Point Douglas ward, the City of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker, and I want to thank Councillor Eadie and Havixbeck for this motion. I have had a lot of calls on this and heard from my constituents with a number of concerns specifically regarding accessibility and safety, Madam Speaker. So this motion is really coming from a very courteous and very respectable premise and that's to ask Canada Post to include us in a consultation process and I think that's a very positive thing, Madam Speaker. So I really want to say that there are a lot of concerns that need to be addressed. I think it's important that the citizens of Winnipeg are heard and put their voice forward to Canada Post. I think it's also important that this Council support this motion and send the message to Canada Post that we want to be heard. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Seeing no further speakers, I'll call the question. All those in favour? Pardon me? Oh yes, Councillor Eadie, yes, of course.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you. I thank everybody for speaking to this motion. Not to be nasty or anything, but I notice the two that aren't voting against it are young healthy males who are... And then I think that's great. I think that's great. I think that's great that healthy people have the ability to...and I have no problem going over windrows myself. I have no problem...you know, I walk down the middle of the street sometimes and you know, cars almost hit me, but you know, I'm kind of a different person though. What people need to understand is that we're talking about mature neighbourhoods. Yeah, there are problems with the neighbourhoods that are even developed because you know what, what Canada Post doesn't get with every residential person does get is that when a windrow is created by plowing a sidewalk it is the property owner's responsibility to remove the windrow. So, Canada Post remove the windrow! It's your property! Okay. Like, but we're talking again about in R2V and R2P, we're talking about mature neighbourhoods where we're going to have all kinds of problems. Are they going to appropriate some of the Volunteer Park on Scotia? A park named after all the volunteers that sandbagged in 97? Who's cleaning all the litter? Because this city other than parks, we don't clean up litter. Who's cleaning up the litter? Who's dealing with that? Because we don't do that service. Who's going to do that? I want to know because there will be litter, trust me, going down the pipe here, there will be a financial cost to this city. There will be demand. I will still point out that while the majority of my residents appreciate and love using the garbage carts. We still...my office and 311 continue to receive a thousand calls a month about problems with garbage carts and bulk waste. Lots of it's about garbage cart pick up and collection. So you know, if that's a minimal number, you know, okay but anyway, I'll leave it at that. I think that there's a support for this motion. I am really concerned. This does cause a problem for the city. I'm not just talking about people with disabilities here. Councillor Fielding did mention some different ideas. I threw those ideas at the two Canada Post representatives I met last Thursday at 3:30. And they're not willing to go to two days a week delivery because they're delivering parcels every day. They have to still deliver to those mailboxes and I will point out that yes, well actual snail mail has slowed down, What has not and what is picking up and I know lots of seniors do this, I do that. I order packages on the internet and it's going

to go to these community mailboxes. So you know what, there is still a need for mail delivery. It's not like the internet. I heard comments from Federal MPs about this. You know what, the reality is, is there's a continued need for mail delivery and whether that's parcels or whatever it is, there is a need and they'll always be a need for it. So if we're going to move ahead, I say let's get them to really figure this out because in my meeting with those two people, they hadn't a foggiest idea, but somehow, they are going to implement it in the fall of this year, 2014. They're going to implement it, they said. It's going to happen. They don't even know what they're doing yet. They're doing a consultation, but all they're asking is would you like to go to a further away, to where there's like more mailboxes, more community boxes or would you like to go closer to home where there's fewer community mailboxes. But it's...there's community mailboxes. There's no consultation. How do you think you can...how do you think we can make this accessible for a wheelchair user, that's not in there. They have no standards like automatic teller machines now. They have standards that they have to meet when they install them so that people with disabilities can use them. Canada Post does not have that for these particular things and I'll tell you, people who are blind, just as one example, you buy homes and you live in neighbourhoods that are more accessible, I would never buy a house where there's a community mailbox. Why would I buy a house in a place that's not accessible to me? Remember that. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All those in favour please, rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

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

**Nays**

Councillors Browaty and Fielding

**City Clerk:** The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 2.

**Madam Speaker:** Motion carried. Okay. Motion No. 3, from Councillors Nordman and Gerbasi dealing with the rescheduling of the May Council meeting. This is an automatic referral to the next meeting of the Governance Committee.

**Motion No. 3**

**Moved by Councillor Nordman,**  
**Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,**

*THAT the Council Meeting of May 28, 2014 be rescheduled to May 27, 2014.*

**Councillor Nordman:** Well, let's...first of all, I'd like to suspend the rules and deal with this issue, given that it's in the next couple of months. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Nordman, would you like to introduce the motion?

**Councillor Nordman:** Thank you. Yeah, just call the question. I don't think there's anything...it's pretty self-explanatory.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** It's my birthday, it's my birthday.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Eadie. I see you. You may...you've got the floor.

**Councillor Eadie:** I'd like to rise and say that I could think of a better thing to do on my birthday than have a Council meeting. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** We'll...we'll have cake for you. Councillor Nordman to close.

**COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG**  
**February 26, 2014**

---

**Councillor Nordman:** Let's call the question.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move onto by-laws, Mr. Mayor under EPC, by-laws for second and third reading.

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

**Mayor Katz:** Oh, back to work.

**Madam Speaker:** Yes.

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move the By-laws numbered 121/2013 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law 121/2013.

**Mayor Katz:** And I'd like to move the By-law No. 121/2013 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

**Madam Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Next set of By-laws, Mr. Mayor.

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

**Mayor Katz:** I'll move the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 23/2014, 24/2014, 25/2014, 26/2014, 27/2014, 28/2014, and 29/2014.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws numbered 23/2014, 24/2014, 25/2014, 26/2014, 27/2014, 28/2014 and 29/2014.

**Mayor Katz:** And I'll move that By-laws numbered 23/2014 to 29/2014, both inclusive be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws numbered 23/2014 to 29/2014, both inclusive.

**Mayor Katz:** I'll move that the rule be suspended and that By-laws numbered 23/2014 to 29/2014, both inclusive, be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

**Madam Speaker:** We'll now move on to question period for the Mayor. Councillor Havixbeck.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**QUESTION PERIOD**

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Thank you Madam Speaker. All of Council has been copied on two letters from CUPE Local 500 wanting Council's position clarified by the Interim Acting CAO. Can the Mayor please tell us, does he intend to do anything about the issue raised by CUPE, that being the 3.5 mandatory furlough for staff between Christmas and New Year's 2014?

**Mayor Katz:** Madam Speaker, that is something that our staff is working on right now, both Human Resources as well as Legal and they will get a response as soon as they have all the information gathered and have finished and completed their due diligence so that is in process. It's been discussed many times with them and they are diligently working on it.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question?

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Yes thank you. Can the Mayor tell us when is the real estate management audit going to be coming to Council?

**Mayor Katz:** Madam Speaker, that's a question for our auditor, that's number one. I think the Councillor knows that. Number two, it's rather disappointing that we've all expected it. There have been delays. There's also...these audits have gone over-budget as well and unfortunately the auditor has the final say. Only the auditor will know that. I would have hoped they would have already come a couple months ago. They're still doing their work. I would be happy to, at the request of council, to ask the auditor when they believe it will now be ready.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Anything further Councillor Havixbeck?

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Sure.

**Madam Speaker:** Third question?

**Councillor Havixbeck:** With regards to the Police headquarters audit, is it true that the emails will be culled from that audit and not included as part of the audit scope?

**Mayor Katz:** Madam Speaker once again I think that's something the Councillor should be talking to our City Auditor who is putting together all of the material. It's not my decision whatsoever. We have handed this off to a third party which will get instructions from our auditor, so that's where the question should be asked, and I know the councillor speaks to our auditor on a regular basis.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Swandel.

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you Madam Speaker. Mr. Mayor, can you tell me if there will be an audit on the cost overrun of the audits?

**Mayor Katz:** As Councillor Swandel may recall, at our last Council meeting, I said at some point in time a Councillor will probably ask for an audit of the audits because they have all gone over-budget.

**Madam Speaker:** Second question.

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you. Mr. Speaker, now onto a serious matter. Some time ago I'd asked a question regarding whether or not you would support the rail...the rapid transit alignment if it meant moving railroads closer to residential properties. The answer to that question at the time was "no". Given that we now know that the current alignment means moving, in one case, the rail twenty feet closer to the residential properties in the Waverley Heights community, what can you do to assist this in ensuring that that does not happen?

**Mayor Katz:** We have seen that report. The numbers are accurate. Obviously we don't want rail lines closer. We also want rapid transit to move forward as quickly as possible. I know that we have actually recommended having discussions with all the rail lines in the City as well as having discussions with the Federal Government because the realities are, if you are looking at any relocation, you're not going to be successful without the assistance of the Federal Government. I can also allude to the comment that was made earlier by Councillor Gerbasi. This is something we want to get moving as quickly as possible and I think, you know, I don't know, I think she was being a little facetious. We don't want to wait a hundred years for this to happen. We want to move quickly. So I think it's a matter of taking the "two-pronged" approach, talking to the railways, talking to the Feds and still moving everything forward and seeing if something is possible in this isolated situation.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor, I kind of alluded to it before regarding the rail lines. FCM still has a statement recently reminding municipalities that the CAOs must register with Transport Canada to receive annual

**COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG**  
**February 26, 2014**

---

reports for the dangerous goods transported by Canadian railways. So it's due on February 28, we're supposed to register by. So I'm wondering if you are aware if the CAO has already registered Winnipeg to be a part of that.

**Mayor Katz:** I believe that may have been done by the prudent thing would be during lunch break to confirm that one hundred percent and make sure it is done. I'd be happy to do that.

**Madam Speaker:** Anything further? Any further questions? Okay. Councillor Havixbeck.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Thank you Madam Speaker. Can the Mayor please tell us, what is the status of the Open Data Initiative that was to have been implemented sometime soon?

**Mayor Katz:** Madam Speaker, I'd be happy to get that information and get something in writing to Councillor Havixbeck.

**Madam Speaker:** Second question?

**Councillor Havixbeck:** It would seem, just with the number of motions, the number of people coming in delegation, that information is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain from our administration, and I believe that as a result of that, transparency suffers. In efforts to restore trust and confidence at City Hall, can the Mayor tell us what types of inquiries does he think that Councillors should not have access to the information of, about. What categories or what types of information should Councillors not have information on?

**Mayor Katz:** Madam Speaker, I would believe that the only information that yours truly or members of Council should not have would be the information that our Legal Department basically says may put us at risk. As we know, sometimes there is very sensitive information. As soon as it goes out to Council, it becomes a public matter, so I would basically leave it in the hands of our legal people.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you Madam Speaker. I appreciate your comments this morning Madam Speaker in regards to reminding this council not to discuss specific human resource matters on the floor of this Council. My question for the Mayor is, could you update this Council and the public on where we're at in terms of hiring a new chief administrative officer.

**Mayor Katz:** Through you to the Councillor, I can tell you that the...first of all the committee, which is a committee of nine members of council...we have met with the professionals who will be doing this. They've actually commenced advertising it. I believe it was advertised, probably I think it started about ten days ago approximately, and we hope to bring this to conclusion as soon as possible. We know it will take a few months and we've had one meeting. I'm sure once the applications come in it will be up to them to basically trim it and then the committee of nine once again will have a meeting, but right now applications are ongoing and I know they've all received applications as well.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to follow up on a question that Councillor Havixbeck brought up and just with...just interesting concern...not trying to attack anybody. But my question is related to fines to Emterra regarding the service. Now it is my understanding that it's the City that fines them, and I, for the life of me, can't figure out why a fine would somehow jeopardize a company's competitive ability when they have a five-year contract and simple information...so does the Mayor believe that that kind of information should actually be shared to a city councillor?

**Mayor Katz:** Madam Speaker, I think the issue is real simple. When something is performance-based, our departments put in certain criteria and if they're not delivering, there are fines. I happen to know that and I think all council knows that there have been fines. We do have people following up...our City staff. We obviously get complaints and we follow up on those. There definitely have been fines and that's basically what I know. I'm not sure what the real issue is. The fact is you're supposed to deliver a service. If you don't deliver that service you get fined.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question Councillor Eadie?

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. A concern from the City Councillor in terms of the long-term viability of providing garbage and having to deal with the constant phone calls and there have been lots of misses, like we had a huge thing, you know, in late December, January, but it's a continuing missing of this and I can't understand for the life of me how our contractor is going to be sustainable if they continue receiving fines and if they're that, and so I just want



to, as a councillor, I'd like to get an idea of what kind of fines they are facing because I think that, you know, our City should be concerned that they're sustainable and viable if they're providing our garbage services, so you know, I think that this is just information that we should have and doesn't the Mayor think that, you know, that we as Councillors and as the Mayor, should be concerned about the viability and sustainability of our major contractor of the City?

**Mayor Katz:** Madam Speaker, I get emails, I get phone calls, I get stopped at Safeway and Sobeys and every public place I go to when people have issues okay. I'm no different than any Councillor except I get it everywhere I go. The realities are, this was a contract that was put out to tender. This is the company that won it. It's up to the department to do the due diligence and when you're awarding a contract, make sure that they are a stable entity. They do have the financial wherewithal to provide the service. They do have the financial wherewithal to pay their employees, etc. etc. That's something that's all part of this. We were told that this company can do the job. It's unfortunate but it's a reality of life. If you don't perform in certain situations you do get fined. That's standard, that's been going on for many, many decades. It's not going to change. I have yet to hear from anybody and if the Councillor has some information that, you know, this company is having a problem as far as their financial position, I'd love to hear it.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Third question?

**Councillor Eadie:** Madam Speaker, if they continue to miss it at the rates they are, especially in certain areas, I would question that, but anyway...actually I don't need to ask another question. He's answered it. Never mind.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Gerbasi?

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you Madam Speaker. My question has to do with the snow clearing and way that we currently have a high ratio of that contracted out and we have a certain percentage...I don't know if it's twenty percent that's still done in-house, whatever it is exactly, but one of the issues that came up at Public Works Committee was that we don't actually measure or have a mechanism the way we keep track of costs and such, to compare the cost effectiveness of contracting out verses in-house, and I see that as a serious problem because other cities, as we know, have taken some of their services back in-house and, you know, how do we know we're not being gouged or that we're getting the best value for our citizens' money in our snow clearing efforts. It might make sense to have a higher percentage to go back in-house and we aren't even able to really examine that because we don't have the...I was disturbed to learn this...that we don't have the mechanism...this is what we were told...to really do a comparison. Does that seem like something...is that something that you'd be prepared to look at and would be supportive of having...finding a way that we could in fact look at that issue?

**Mayor Katz:** Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, first of all it is my understanding that we have about an 80-20 split. Eighty percent is done by outside contractors, twenty percent is done by City employees through CUPE, that's number one. Number two, I think it would be incumbent upon the Mayor and every member of council to always explore opportunities for savings, and that could go either way Madam Speaker. That could go from getting more done by CUPE, our Civic workers, or that could be doing more through the private sector. They should always be explored. I would totally concur with that on both sides of the equation.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question? No? Any further questions? Seeing none, we'll move on to Committee on Finance. We have no report, no motions and no by-laws, and no chair. Okay, we'll move on to...sure, we'll e-mail them to him. We'll get him on Skype. We'll move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and River Bank Management. Councillor Pagtakhan, on the report dated February 3, 2014.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON  
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT  
DATED FEBRUARY 3, 2014**

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to move and introduce adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 4.

**Madam Speaker:** All those in favour of 1, 2 and 3? Opposed? Carried.

**Item 4 – Exchange Waterfront Neighbourhood Development Plan - Reallocation of Funds**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Pagtakhan.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll stand down and let Councillor Eadie put his comments on the record.

**Councillor Eadie:** Madam Speaker, I must say that this report is actually one that I will wholeheartedly support. This report of course is the one where I'll say it, although some media got it right and explained it right but much of the media kept calling the incentive of \$10,000 to purchase a condo in the Exchange District, they called that a subsidy. It's tax incremental financing. That's not explained. Sometimes it's a difficult concept to understand but really what it was is if that individual was to receive the \$10,000, the property tax that they would be paying over the next whatever it is, five, ten years would be going to pay that off. It's actually giving them incentive to come in and pay property taxes in an area where we already have regional infrastructure; where we already have bus service. Where we...you know, there's always...there's all these things. So, well, what there isn't is enough grocery stores and, but I wanted to stand and speak about it because I got a lot of calls from my residents who are very angry at me that I was voting to spend their property tax dollars in the downtown. And I had to explain it to them because the media picked this thing up like somehow we were taking money from others to give to them but really what we were doing is taking, getting money in advance and they, the people who are receiving the 10,000, they're the ones who are paying for it. So I don't see the problem with that. That's incremental financing. That's how we're building downtown. That's how the SHED district is improving. That's how Exchange District is going to improve. That's what this report has in it, Councillor Pagtakhan. It definitely has a plan to move forward, to make the Exchange District a better place to live, to invite and bring people to live in that neighbourhood. I think that's excellent. It's great and I really hope that there's an ability to utilize that incremental financing from the municipal tax share to utilize that to attract some major grocer into the Exchange District so that it will be a place that people will want to live, work and play. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. No further speakers. Councillor Pagtakhan to close.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and I thank Councillor Eadie for his support and on this and his comments. I'll keep it really short and sweet. The report is before you. It's pretty self-explanatory. We've reallocated the funds with sole purpose of building complete communities in the downtown, specifically within the Waterfront and East Exchange area of the city. The downtown, we only have one downtown, Madam Speaker. And this initiative is going to increase the retail density and residential density in years out so looking for full Council support on this.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have no motions for this committee. We'll now move on to by-laws under Downtown Development, Bylaws for second and third reading. Councillor Pagtakhan.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON  
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT  
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND AND 3RD READINGS**

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Madam Speaker, I move that By-law No. 145/2013 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 145/2013.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** I'll move that By-law No. 145/2013 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

**Madam Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Next set of by-laws, Councillor Pagtakhan.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Yes, Madam Speaker. I'll move that By-law No. 32/2014 be read a first time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 32/2014.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** I'll move that By-law No. 32/2014 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 32/2014.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** And I'll move that...sorry, I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 32/2014 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

**Madam Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Any questions for the Chair? Seeing none, we'll move on to Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Browaty on the report dated January 14, 2014.

**REPORT OF THE  
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT  
DATED JANUARY 14, 2014**

**Councillor Browaty:** Than you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce it and I'd like to move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 2, 3 and 4.

**Madam Speaker:** All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, we have no motions.

**Councillor Browaty:** Oh no, another report.

**Madam Speaker:** We have one more report, the report dated February 18th, 2014.

**REPORT OF THE  
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT  
DATED FEBRUARY 18, 2014**

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of February 18th and Items 1 through 18.

**Madam Speaker:** Four, five and six and eighteen. Okay, so I'll call the question on 1, 2, 3, 7 through 17. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item No. 4.

**Item 4 - Closing – Van Roon Drive, west of Charleswood Road for incorporation onto DASZ 50/2013**

**Councillor Browaty:** All three of these items are related. Would it be able for Council to deal with all three together.

**Madam Speaker:** Items No. 4, 5 and 6.

**Item 5 - Subdivision and Rezoning – Charleswood Road at Harte Trail – Ridgewood South Area 1 – DASZ 50/2013**

**Item 6 - Subdivision and Rezoning – Southeast Corner of Community Row and Rannock Avenue – Ridgewood South Area 10 – DASZ 53/2013**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Browaty to introduce.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll respond after hearing any comments from the person standing it down.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Havixbeck.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Yeah, we were just saying how we made it feel just like at home with water spilling everywhere, so my apologies for the disruption here. These three items are indeed related and these three I'll call them all subdivisions even though Item 4 is the closing of a road. I'm very pleased to bring this forward with cautious optimism. These are the first two subdivisions out of the first precinct plan approved under Our Winnipeg and Our Winnipeg as you know, many of you Councillors were here before my time and worked through that initiative, which cost millions of dollars for our city. It identified this area as an important area for development in our city. There are fewer and fewer areas of lands for development within our city. These two subdivisions are very different, but within them, there is

something for everyone. And that's something I'm very pleased about. There's multi-family, there's lower density, there's a moderate level of density and what's most important is I believe that both applicants have worked with the community, heard the community's needs and have tried to navigate and change plans. In fact, moved roads when priorities were identified. And Councillor Nordman was at the hearing for both of these items and also at that meeting we approved a high density project, just west of Cabela's that would see three multi-family units. So that whole night of meetings was ...no, it wasn't quite that late, but it's really important to appreciate how much has gone into this. From my first day on Council, I've been working with the community and working with the developers and the land owners. This was a very challenging project. Some 69 land owners, people who bought property in 1973, told me they thought they would never see the day that they could actually have it as an investment. They thought they would've had to sit on it because of drainage issues, because of the inability for the community to help move forward. And I would like to commend the five planners from the planning department who have helped along this journey and I would like to commend on the record the Charleswood Habitat Preservation Organization who was diligent and relentless at forcing the developers into preserving both the blue stem and the old oak trees that are in this property, particularly in subdivision area 1. These were important aspects to the community. So I would like to also emphasize some of the other enhancements that will go into these communities. They will have connectivity to trails. One of the major trails in Charleswood, for those who don't know, is the Harte Trail. This is a trail that runs along and was in fact an old rail line. And we have taken into account the sight lines from that trail so that people aren't looking into someone's backyard, so that someone's backyard isn't on a trail with strangers are walking by. We have taken those small things into consideration in moving this forward and it hasn't been easy and it has been through extensive public consultation that we have done that. There will be trail systems, natural areas, the developer Qualico in area 1 invited the members of the committee to Sage Creek to look at how areas are naturalized, to look at ways so that our City crews once they take over the maintenance of these properties are really dealing with minimal work. There is no grass cutting along the river ways or along the waterways. The waterways that are presented in the appendices are to improve drainage. They actually correct some of the wrongs from the past in the drainage issues that we have here. So again, an enhanced trail system that will connect into U of M and will take bike riders, cyclists all the way to U of M, improve drainage. The mix of density I think is critical for our city. This is about choices and not everybody chooses to want to live in the downtown. Although many do, some people want to have the choice. Some people want to come back to Charleswood. Some people want to make a start as a family in Charleswood and I think this creates many options. I will continue to push for rapid transit into the southwest quadrant of the city because I think it is an important priority. Getting people out of their vehicles and into public transportation is incredibly important and will result in less wear and tear on our roads. So these two areas offer something unique. In area 10, I would like to state on the record that I think we will have an area for dedication and one of the people from the Charleswood community that I would like to see have some dedication and acknowledgment is Mr. Jim Ernst who was a former City Councillor and former MLA and who has contributed to the city immensely and we made mention of that at community committee as well. So I would like that, that be part of this and we will look at that further down the road as the development gets going. So, I truly hope that all members of Council will be supportive of this and will appreciate all the hard work and the work with the community that has gone on and how we saw an incredible turn and level of support from the community. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I just before I get into my concerns with this motion, I do want to acknowledge that the planning department has done a huge amount of work, the Councillors involved, the residents and I know a lot of work goes into these area plans, but I guess I'm taking a look at this as a member of Council. I believe we have a responsibility to look at the big picture of our city and how it's developing and these are the decisions that we are making and we have to live with ourselves when we make them. So with all due respect to all the work that's gone into this, there's some serious concerns I'd like to put on the record about this. I recognize that Our Winnipeg at the time, some of us expressed some concerns that it identified all of these new areas for growth and identified areas of infill but there was no staging or prioritizing or mechanisms or tools to encourage or infill development over the other kind of development. And in fact, we are seeing unprecedented levels of greenfield development on the edge of the city that is going to encourage a massive increase in cars, congestion on the roads and all those issues. That is in fact what's happening. We can say whatever we like about our intentions and I agree that Our Winnipeg has wonderful guidelines for infill and all sorts of things, but the reality of the market and the reality of the political environment and what's being approved by all constantly is massive greenfield development first, before we have the regional road infrastructure, before we have money for that and my big concern is that the cost of regional roads is not included in our cost benefit look at these projects. It really isn't. We just had a huge discussion about growth, the fact that it does not pay for growth. It's not paid for itself. I think most people agree that growth should pay for growth and in fact it doesn't. So we...and I realize we've made an effort to get new changes to our City charter so that we can charge the appropriate costs. But in the meantime, we're barreling ahead before we have that approval to approve massive growth at the edge of the city at a rate that I think is inadvisable. You know, it's much more profitable; it's much more easier for developers to proceed with the greenfield development first. It's not saying this will never be developed. Winnipeg is growing. But it's about our planning and our vision as a Council and I feel that that was the flaw in Our Winnipeg was that it didn't provide an

incentive to build infill development first. It just opens up everything all at once and we're seeing it happen all at once. We're seeing every Council meeting another precinct plan. And I also would point out, I do appreciate having precinct plans. It's definitely better to have planned development coming forward. I support that. It's...our planners are doing what they're instructed to do and they're spending most of their time on greenfield developments; they're spending some time on maybe a couple of inner city plans but most of their work is spent on all of this greenfield development which is happening at a very quick rate. Of course the Corydon plan is finally happening after 15 years and I do appreciate that. So don't...I'm not, I acknowledge that. But that's one neighbourhood, but I'm...what my point is, is that you know we don't have a mechanism to deal with the fact that growth does not pay for growth and it is out of control. It is happening very, very quickly. We don't...there was a push to move regional roads up higher in our transportation priorities, for example, the William Clement Parkway. I mean, where is that money going to come from? We're almost maxed out on our gas tax money to pay for 30 years of P3 payments for things like the Chief Peguis Trail extension, and everybody's wanting the next extension of that hurried along. Where is the money going to come for rapid transit? These are the big picture issues that we as a Council, we're making these decisions right now and that's why although I respect the work of the local Councillor, the work of the planners that were instructed to do all this planning and it's all been done and I'm sure it's all going to happen, but I have to look in the mirror in the morning and I think the public needs to know that this Council is moving forward in an unsustainable manner. We're...growth is not paying for growth. The development charges may cover the internal cost of the development but they don't cover the impact on the need for regional road expansion which the same Councillors are all going to be calling for those projects to be speeded up and money spent on that. So those are my comments and with all the respect to the work everyone's doing, this is about a bigger picture for our city. We need to have proper mechanism. You need to really work on the province and it may take...that may have to happen after an election, but if we're going to go ahead and approve all these precinct plans now before we have the mechanisms to charge the growth charges, we need...we're really going to be up a certain creek without a certain paddle here because we won't have that revenue and we won't have a mechanism to pay for the cost of this development. It's really going to cost the...and as much as we can, and I appreciate that Councillor Havixbeck is now supporting public transit, that's great, but the reality is...the reality is that it's...it took us this long to build, you know it's going to take us till 2019 to build the first phase of rapid transit and that's been a struggle. We're just doing the detailed design for the eastern corridor or not the detailed, the feasibility, that's years down the road, where are we going to get the funding we need to invest in sustainable infrastructure that our city plan actually calls for, because what always happens is something gets developed that needs a road right away and all the election comes and all the different levels of government wants to have the road in their area they're running in so that gets approved. You know, we have projects like the Plessis underpass, \$75 million, I still don't know why. And you know, I'm just saying...we, we are not making good choices and it's my duty as an elected official to say so. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

**Councillor Fielding:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't going to speak on this, but I will speak my three minutes on this. Number one, I can tell you, I was at the public meetings and it went over in two phases. Qualico is one of the developers, they kind of led the precinct plan. I believe there is over \$800,000 of money expended on this so, and tons of public consultation that was there. We're talking of course about the developments that are part of the precinct plan here and I can tell you that the developer listened to some of the...most of the residents. In fact, the majority people that came to the public hearing were, actually came in, were supportive of it and when they were able to move their roads and was able to save some of the natural life that's there. My comments are more guided towards some of the developments that's here. I know there's always the talk and it's always becomes a big political issue and it's always easy to attack some of the greenfield development that's out there. But I'll tell you what, people want choice and there's not everyone in the world that's going to decide to live downtown. There's people with families that love choice that want to live and have the City services. They don't want to move outside to Oakbank. They don't want to move to La Salle. They want to stay right here in the City of Winnipeg. ...in developments that's there. So I think if you have some choice, it makes sense. I agree with the some incentives trying to get the city to grow up as opposed to out, but I think there's a good balance here and looking at development just shutting your eyes towards suburban development for an ideological reason, you know, I just don't support. And I think you've got to look at every development that comes forward. There obviously is a long term plan for Plan Winnipeg that supports something like this. I can tell it's very well done and for that, you know, I was very supportive of it. And when developments come forward, I think we need to take a look at them. There's one item that was brought up that Councillor Gerbasi was dead wrong on. It was about the cost benefit analysis. I can guarantee you because I was at those meetings and Councillor Nordman and Havixbeck were there as well, that there was an extensive cost benefit analysis that was done on that that did support the growth and development that's going forward. So my concern is if you all of a sudden just for ideological purposes just say we're not going to develop anything more in the City of Winnipeg people are going to start going to La Salle. They're going to start going to Oakbank. They're going to start going to these other bedroom communities that are around the City of Winnipeg, Niverville another one, because they're able to take advantage of lower taxes, they're able to take advantage of a whole bunch of things and they're able to come into the City of Winnipeg when they want their services and when they want to go to a movie, when they want everything else. So what you're going to create, if you just blindly close your

eyes and just take an ideological position like Councillor Gerbasi has, in terms of this, you're going to create a big doughnut effect around the City of Winnipeg, where you're going to have developments that come outside. So I believe in choice, I believe it makes sense, I believe this development was done on a very appropriate basis and the fact that the majority people in Charleswood for those zoning and when it came forward, came eventually supported, it showed that they were listening and I think it makes sense so I'm very much supportive of it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Swandel followed by Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you, thank you, thank you, followed by wrong, wrong, wrong. Councillor Gerbasi was wrong on so many fronts. Plan Winnipeg, Our Winnipeg, we talk about looking at it through three lenses as sustainability, financial, social and environmental. Making a statement that growth does not pay for itself is 100 percent wrong. Repeatedly we go through this exercise of doing the cost benefit analysis; not only does new development pay for itself but it's also paying for the sins of the past. You look at neighbourhoods where we have twin sewer systems. All of those rate payers and our utilities are...some of their rates are going to pay to eliminate the terrible pollution that's caused to our rivers and to Lake Winnipeg that happens as a result of sanitary sewers overflowing into the land drainage system, and this combined sewer system that exists in our older neighbourhoods. So the cost benefit analysis clearly show, not only in this, but in Waverley West and every other growth development that's come forward, they clearly show that this is a positive number and so to make that representation is just wrong. I think Councillor Fielding did a good job of mentioning some of the environmental pieces that were considered in here. I've mentioned the obvious one of, these benefits of...the positive side on financial piece being able to go to dealing with the combined sewer issues. Also, Councillor Gerbasi was very wrong on our vision and our planning and following Plan Winnipeg or Our Winnipeg. We are growing up...we are growing up and growing out. We've seen a huge trend towards this. All you've got to do is go and it's very simple, in our permits department we see the increased number of permits for multi-families infill and one of the biggest challenges in that area is Councillors sort of looking at these applications for rezoning as being, it's about me as opposed to about following what Our Winnipeg is telling us we should do. We need to have the courage to say, yes, this is infill, this is growing up. That's what we are doing. We need to grow up at the same time as we're growing out because Councillor Fielding is also very correct that we don't just represent people who want to live downtown or 700,000 people want to live in Osborne Village...We have people who are looking for new schools, new community centres and places to raise their children with some of those amenities, and usually young new families that are going into these places like all of our or many of our parents or ourselves did before, looking for those new amenities and new opportunities. Growth is paying for the growth and the sins of the past. I already made that statement. And one of the things that we talked about...I heard Councillor Gerbasi talk about growth charges and I think we're going to see that when you get into the growth charges reviews that we're...we've undertaken, you're going to see that...we might actually be backing away a bit on this because when you actually compare apples to apples, you know, for some reason, people just keep showing this out there like it's gospel that they don't pay for themselves. Every indication, every piece of paper that we have here says that they do. And so people just make a blanket statement, "Oh, it doesn't pay for rapid transit or doesn't pay for this", but it does. There is a plus side to this. You'll notice they don't make a quantifying statement when they do that. They just make this open ended. It doesn't pay for this, but if you get into the detail, if you look for empirical data, if you do the analysis, if you build the spread sheets, you can see the opportunities that are created by new development. Winnipeg happens to be a very dense city in case you didn't know that. You compare, you know, the couple hundreds square miles or whatever it is Winnipeg is into places like Ottawa and others where...they're spread out over huge tracks of land. So we're not that bad off here. I think we also need to talk about the social lens for sustainability. We know and you don't have to look any further than crime stat to see that new communities are safer. New communities are safer. You know, the social dynamics of new communities tend to be safer, better, whatever term you want to use, but it's proven. We've got the data sitting right in front of us. Our own systems show this. Don't get sucked in by these statements that get printed and they are not backed up by any fact. Our facts clearly show that from the social, the environmental and the financial perspective, new development is sustainable. There was also a comment made about Our Winnipeg not creating incentives for infill and for growth, in other parts, in the aging parts of the city. How bad are our memories here? Twenty minutes ago, we just approved that the downtown residential grant program. Our Winnipeg clearly directs us to do things that help in us building up as well as building out. So, let's, you know, all of this...and hopefully, the media will take the chance, the time, the opportunity to talk about what Winnipeg is doing so much better than almost every other city in this country. We are growing up and we are growing out. We're creating options for all of our citizens whether they be communists or bleeding heart capitalists, whether they want to live in a 600 square foot apartment beside a railroad track in downtown or whether they want to live in a sprawling ranch on the edges of Charleswood. You know, we're creating those opportunities and we're doing it with respect for the three lenses of sustainability that Our Winnipeg has given us through this financial, the social and the environmental lens. Winnipeg is sustainable and it's a great place to live. Let's not bitch about it.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Point of order. I don't think that word that was just used was really appropriate for describing the political debate that we just had. I think you just heard what Councillor Swandel referred to my comment, obviously it was referring to my comment. Could that be removed from the record, please?

**Madam Speaker:** Which specifically, I'm speaking to the Clerk.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Bitch, Madam Speaker, that was the word. I think that's inappropriate and I'd like to have that removed from the record, please.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, I was conferring with the Clerk on something. If that was in fact said, I would ask that it be taken back. Councillor Swandel.

**Councillor Swandel:** (Inaudible)...word in the dictionary, that's fine for Council, but if it makes the speaker happy, I will withdraw.

**Madam Speaker:** Excuse me. It's extremely disrespectful and he has retracted it. Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** I was going to steal Councillor Swandel's earlier speech about combined sewer overflow, but he preempted me by if you're talking about the combined sewer overflow, which is, the best example we have probably have a big picture item that's going to largely be something that bedevils older neighbourhoods that the new neighbourhoods and the old neighbourhoods are all going to have to pay for it together. We...I don't think do a whole a lot of service by contrasting the suburbs with other parts of the city. I've got a hundred year old neighbourhoods around Glenwood School. I've got neighbourhoods that are being built today as we speak down at the south end of Dakota. Every groups pay-in...land dedication money often goes to refurbish older facilities like the Glenwood Arena. Everybody pays in, not just people from the older neighbourhoods. If people call me from the older neighbourhoods to talk about combined sewer overflow work, it's going to be billions of that. All of us are going to have to pay together, we are all in this together on the combined sewer effort. If you look at the new sign that went up on Fort Garry, I know Councillor Swandel put some land dedication money in there for that sign. It wasn't just from the old part of his ward. It was from the new part as well so land dedication money that came from a bunch of different wards...exactly. So the point here is...there is a good debate to be had here about different developments, the need for public transit is very important to recognize as we move out, but to simply say all of suburban development bad I think overstates things here if not misstating things. We're going to have a huge combined sewer overflow bill. It's going to be in my ward, it's going to be in the older parts. I'm going to tell the people in the newer parts. Yeah, you're going to help pay for that because people have to pay for some of the amenities you've got it in the newer parts.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, seeing no further speakers. We have...Councillor Eadie, okay I see you now. Councillor Eadie, thank you.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you. Thank you, Speaker Sharma. I get....Pardon me. You know there's a lot of good debate here. You know, people do need to have choice and actually just because we're building suburbs within the city, doesn't mean that people are creating a doughnut on the outside because they are. People will make that choice to still move to West St. Paul, to East St. Paul. Those choices are being made today and we have a lot of growth. Amber Trails has grown massively. It just continues to move and move and move and move and move. Transcona, you know, is just building up severe momentum here. We've got precinct I on the list, right? This is just the first step, but we're debating right now for five and six. This is just the first step over in Charleswood that's going to expand, expand, expand, expand and expand. We just changed Complete Communities for the land between Saskatchewan and the Centerport Highway, whatever it's called, I can't remember and from Sturgeon Creek to the Perimeter I think that's that whole track of land in there that's for development. I do believe all the regional roads are built for that. That's a good thing. If those regional roads are already built, then that's good because the developer won't pay for all the other roads within those communities, but you know what, what really needs to happen here and this is what we are all missing. We are all missing...well, there's two components I want to talk about, but one is this. This city, we've got huge things happening in Transcona, huge things happening in Charleswood, huge things happening up in Old Kildonan. We're going to have a...I don't know how big the new one is out in the St. Charles ward out in the Assiniboia area, 1800. So that's how small it is, this one, okay, but anyway, nevertheless, although I think the regional roads are already there. The...what we're missing here in the plan is, we can't be building out these extensions. We've got Chief Peguis, William Clement, Plessis Road, we're putting in the underpass right now and then precinct I, I believe, is just a continuation of more property going out that way. We're going to have to finish off twining and creating our...Plessis regional road, which will eventually connect to the other further extension of Chief Peguis Trail that will go up to Plessis I imagine, like the thing is here, is we need to have a plan that says let's do this incrementally. So we're doing downtown. We're doing all these things all over. How are we...because this is going to come to head all at the same time. We've got to build Chief Peguis, we've got to build William Whyte, we've got to build the rest of Plessis. You know, it's all there. It's all going to have to be built at the same

time and I want to hear from the Councillors who are okay with, you know, I'm okay with suburban development too when it's needed and if it's planned properly, but it's not, so when those Councillors start arguing about where the money is going to come from to build Clement or to build Chief Peguis or to build Plessis, are we going to get into a situation where at the underpass at Plessis, which you know, like, you know, we still have Waverley that's never been done. This was argued when, what is it, Lindenwoods, Whyte Ridge, all these communities right, we still never did the underpass for Waverley, like really people. The planning is not good. It...you know, the developers do good planning. I heard some really good things about multiple family units in Charleswood. I think that's great and that's what should happen eventually, but you know what, we need to deal with this and the second thing that one Councillor here doesn't seem to get as well is that we have reassessments every two years and I can tell you right now actually, apartment blocks, get this, their share if we took 2009 property taxes, supported revenue which was about 400 and what was it...18 million somewhere around there, 483 million, I can't remember the exact number, but the portion of that property tax if you look at it over the five years that ends in 2014, apartment blocks have increased their share of that by 88 percent. Apartment blocks, 88 percent, residential, our older neighbourhoods, the inner city neighbourhood, market region, 33 percent increase in reassessments and you know what that means? That assessed value because when we talk about building these new developments, Councillor Swandel, we are talking about assessment value that brings revenue in to help us pay for that yeah, sewer overflow. I agree. There's no doubt about it. We need to be bringing money in to pay for that. Hopefully, we get some money from the Province to deal with it as well, but that is the point. But what's happening is through reassessment, because the more affordable houses are in the inner city and there are people who can't afford to buy a Mercedes. So when you talk about choice, I'd love to drive one, I'd love to drive a Mercedes, okay? But I can't afford a Mercedes, so I've got to buy in the inner city. I have no choice to buy out in that new suburb because and those property assessments stay relatively stable for the immediate future after they are built. They don't change a lot in terms of their value, okay? So we have this and you need to balance it so let's balance everything. That's what I'm saying. I'm hearing Councillors telling people they don't know what they're talking about and I'm telling you I know what I'm talking about. And I'm telling you that there's all these things going on and so if we're going to be developing, we need to say, okay, let's let North Winnipeg finish developing out. Let's move that forward so we can afford to...you know, and then we can afford to pay for the Chief Peguis Trail, which also has this Centerport aspect to it, the trade aspect to it. Let's do that, but that's...that's what I'm saying is the overall planning. There has been great planning put into this neighbourhood as Councillor Havixbeck has said. And actually, I know personally some of the people who work on those from the private sector and they're very good people, very good. They're very knowledgeable, but I don't think in the cost benefit that they factor in. This is what Councillor Gerbasi said for people is she said that in the cost analysis of this value and so on, the regional road called William Clement Parkway Extension, I don't think was factored in, and I could be corrected. I'd like to see that pointed out in the report, but the point is always this is all coming to a head and the next City Council is the one who's going to have to decide which regional road gets built first. Will it be William Clement? Will it be Chief Peguis? Which one will it be? Because we can't be doing it all. And I'll leave it at that. I'm going to only vote against these three items for that only purposes that the overall planning for this city that we need to curb development in certain areas, like maybe we should stop Transcona then. Let's stop that. At this point, let's say, you know what, there's enough growth there. We've got Charleswood going. We've got Waterford Green, we've got what the North Point Village is coming up next, up further north. We've got to...we've got to slow down, people. We...it's, the growth is growing faster than we are planning. That's what I'm saying and so I'll be voting against these three items. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Browaty to close.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's been great to have this debate. Again, this Council approved and went through the whole exercise of Our Winnipeg. It identified Conference Board of Canada numbers, a couple of different sources for numbers for population growth. The growth continues beyond our expectations, beyond the lofty, what I think, I thought was lofty, in terms of the predictions for population growth. The number of people per individual housing unit, it's going down, people want to have choice. Yes, we are providing options in our downtown. We're also wanting to provide options to let people stay in the City of Winnipeg. Areas like La Salle, Headingley, Rosser, Stonewall. These areas are growing. Never mind East St. Paul, West St. Paul up in our direction for Councillor Eadie and myself, so there is demand throughout the capital region. Let's make sure that we have options available within the City of Winnipeg. I do want to commend our staff and Councillor Havixbeck for the work that went on there. This isn't as easy as a lot of the greenfield development that's come up in the past. This is some more challenging work both in terms of servicing as well as getting multiple property owners involved. So I do compliment them on their work there. I understand that there has been due diligence dealt with when it comes to the Charleswood transportation levy to cover some of these regional streets. And again, we are still going through another exercise looking at development cost charges and growth paying for growth, and we'll see those reports as they come forward and have that discussion in the future. In my mind, I think the biggest challenge in this portion of the city is Kenaston Boulevard; making sure and I think we're taking some positive steps to make sure that we do get access to the former Kapyong land so that we can do that extension through. We do need to make sure that we plan for and budget for any widening that we need to do between Grant and Portage and the river and Portage Avenue there because again, this is a big route. We've got Waverley West



still growing out. We've got Ridgewood now on the books. We have traffic coming from beyond the city limits. La Salle continues to grow. We need to make sure that we have that infrastructure upgraded sooner than later. So again, I would certainly will be supporting four, five and six here.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. I'll call the question on Items 4, 5 and 6. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. What is the will of Council? Shall we adjourn till...and have a short lunch break for 1:30 or keep going. There isn't very much left.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** There is a lot left, yea.

**Madam Speaker:** There's a few reports left.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** So we should break for lunch.

**Madam Speaker:** For one hour. Okay, we'll reconvene at 1:30. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of  
Winnipeg City Council of  
February 26, 2014, at 1:30 p.m.**

**Madam Speaker:** We'll call the meeting to order. We're on No...Item No. 18, Property and Development dated February 18th, 2014.

**Item 18 - Expropriation of Land – Portion of 1780 Taylor Avenue for the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Station No. 12  
- Fire Paramedic Facilities Replacement and Relocation Program**

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. As we said at the Property Committee and in the media locally. Of course, it's very unfortunate that we've come to the spot now where we need to go forward with an expropriation motion from this Council in regards to the Taylor fire hall. Again, the reality is today we have a fire hall on land the City does not own. We've been through a thorough audit. It was very clear that mistakes were made in this whole process and this whole notion of a land swap, this Council was kept in the dark. There've been various options considered, the whole notion of perhaps leasing this land for a period of time. I don't think that's palatable by the public. This...I mean, going through an expropriation process, there still is an opportunity to negotiate. I'm hopeful that in this case, Shindico and our property department folks will continue discussions. Both sides have appraisals, ours being just over a million dollars, Shindico's in the neighbourhood of 1.2, something between those two values I would be open with, the whole notion of the \$844,000 in injurious affection that our department says it's not reasonable. There's certainly an item of contention that I don't personally support either. I expect our legal folks to vigorously defend taxpayers' interests going forward as best possible, but we do need to be cognizant of the reality that the City is responsible for the reasonable and what some people may consider unreasonable, cost of lawyers, but again, they can't go and do things that are spurious in terms of trying to pad their legal bills or there have to be...people do need to realize that there's an expropriation taken the municipality or jurisdiction, province, federal government, whomever is responsible for the...those costs. So I believe it was Councillor Swandel that stood this down. I'll certainly respond to anything else in the closing.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. Councillor Swandel.

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to get a few items on the record. I won't be supporting the idea of going to expropriation on this property. I was actually in the middle of negotiating what I think would have been a fair deal and colleagues are...that brought this forward are aware of that and yet, still chose to do this because they believe this could be more transparent and an easier way of dealing with it, trying to negotiate a deal. I think that for the first time, as we've evolved through this, this will be the first time that we actually destroy value. It...when I look at the four fire stations, I believe that we got value for money. Actually, the price, I believe the prices, the cost to construct those buildings is real. I think that can be verified by a quality surveyor. I have held that position all the way through. Was it done ugly? Absolutely it was done ugly. Are we in an awkward position here? Yes, we are in an awkward position. I was pretty close to getting a deal done based on a value of around \$1.5 million. I believe that this expropriation is probably going to exceed a cost of \$3 million by the time we're done. So I do not believe this is the best way to do this. So I want to respond to Councillor Browaty's comments about the loss of value of the adjacent land. I believe the way it's being represented is not as an appraised value but a diminution of value which is a legal term for loss of value due to a contract. And I don't know what that means legally and you know my negotiations I said, I'm not

going to go anywhere near that term because it is a very correct legal term and I do not understand the nuances of how that works. I think basically that's all there is to say, but the biggest point is that this is the first time that I believe we will be destroying value for the citizens of the City of Winnipeg and we're not doing it because of a mistake that was made by a property person or a fire person or a developer, we are doing it because of what I perceive to be a mistake at this Council might make and that's by going down the road of expropriation when it's probably not necessary. Those are my comments. I'll leave you with that.

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

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's interesting some of the points that Councillor Swandel raised and I do have an appreciation for what he says and I'm standing in support, though, of the move towards expropriation, however, with some thoughts around caution. I'm optimistic and I heard because I came and listened to the P and D meeting on this item. I heard the Director of the Planning Department say that the public service will continue to negotiate alongside, and I'm very hopeful that it results in a win/win situation and sooner than any expropriation could realize. This is a very unfortunate situation that we as Councillors are now here left to clean up. Who would've ever sanction building a fire paramedic station, a beautiful building, on land that the City didn't own or have a solid provision for ownership afterwards. We are left with cleaning up this mess after mismanagement, for something that was agreed to by the administration. We heard at the P and D meeting for those who were there and the committee heard from the director that there are some expropriations as old as nearly 40 years old in our city. Well, that's astonishing and I don't want to see this land owner held up that long. I would love for this to be resolved within the next six months to a year, and furthermore, I think we need to be mindful of something else. The property owner has continued to pay the property taxes even though the City of Winnipeg owned the building that is on that land. They have done so, I believe in good faith, to avoid any seizure activity, and I think it's important to note that we have not offered payment, not offered those taxes back as far as I know, but perhaps the chair in closing could comment on that. I think that's an important thing to be mindful of and to be fair on. So, I am supporting it, but with many reservations, only because I am hearing from our administration that this is the only...we are at an impasse and this is the only way to move this forward.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't really going to speak to this issue but I just heard something that I am astonished by. I am going to be supporting that we move along expropriation and I believe in the audit report we've seen, there was some other land on Taylor that may have been available at the time that fire halls were being considered. But, it is also my understanding that this particular piece of property was...there was a try for a development agreement of some sort to build something that was disallowed. And that probably took value away from the owner of that particular property, then lo and behold, you know, we had this land swap issue and you know what's the value of that? And there's all these issues. So I really don't understand their position that somehow they're losing \$800,000 value of the other land, when the land, really, didn't have as much value for them in the first place. So we ended up doing this and so now we are where we're at. And I can understand that a City Councillor with this city...because you do have to balance your ward interests and your...and the overall city's balance, but I just heard a concerning issue about somebody negotiating a deal on behalf of the city, who I don't think was appointed through the Executive Policy Committee. I don't know if that person was engaged with the administration along at the same time to negotiate, but I find that very disconcerting here at this chamber. And I think some evaluation of how a City Councillor is in the middle of negotiations on something that has been a hot topic throughout the City for the last what, two years now? Very concerned. So I'm just going to leave it at that. I will be voting for this and yes, Councillor Havixbeck brings up a interesting point that they are paying property taxes on it. I don't think they are paying property taxes on it with the value of the fire hall on it. They're paying probably property taxes based on the value of empty land which they would've had to do if we never built the thing in the first place. So I'll leave it at that. Thanks.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you. I'll be supporting this as well. I think we're in a situation where, as we know, we have a property on land we don't own and we have to deal with it and I think the administration is taking the appropriate steps. Councillor Eadie actually captured the reason why I was going to stand up as well as I don't understand why a member of Council is off doing a separate negotiation and what process that is. And I'd like to have that clarified in some form or another by whose ever is responsible for this process that one member of Council can go off and be negotiating with someone that we're making this kind of...our staff should be negotiating. And I just don't understand what's going on here and I'd like...I think we all deserve to know. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I am going to very reluctantly support the expropriation. I said a long time ago, it was...it would be the worst case situation for us, we should not be doing that. We should be negotiating. I was hoping and there was an intent to bring forward two or three different options to Council including the expropriation so that Council can make a decision on that. That was not the case. I would just like to remind everybody here just to look at the numbers and remember when that land exchange which never happened, we now know that we do have three pieces of property that we are selling. We all know that if everything works out to perfection we will get \$1.6 million and that's if the largest piece of property on Mulvey meets all those conditions and there's a lot of conditions on that, but that's the max of 1.6. I don't believe there's anybody on the floor of Council who believes that we'll be paying less than 1.6 through an expropriation which God willing will never take the amount of time we have some others going on. But, the other scenario and Councillor Havixbeck is right, not only have they been paying the taxes, we have not paid a penny. The City has not paid one cent to the land owner for our building that's been sitting there whether it's been for lease of a land or whatever. We are not out a nickel right now at this stage of the game, and I want to make it very clear that our legal department advised for that not to be signed, but regardless of good advice, it was signed. So I want to make sure everyone here knows that. The advice was, don't sign it that way, because I don't think any of us believe that a caveat was protection for the City of Winnipeg. And the other scenario which people should know, the other piece of land that Councillor Eadie talked about, that's the tennis courts, the outdoor tennis courts that are next to the Taylor Tennis Club. I think Councillor Orlikow would know them very well. It's recreation, number one, it also puts you between two sets of train tracks. So I don't think that was truly a viable option, but nonetheless, the comment was made there and I very much too want to address something. I think every member of this Council, every day in their job, is out there negotiating, having discussions on whatever a project might be. There's always dialogue, whether it's development, what you want to see to protect your, to protect your residents et cetera. It's happening all the time. I know just recently, Councillor Orlikow was fighting hard and it was successful to make sure that a piece of land included in this deal went to an organization that had a great deal of merit and that was a success. So let's all realize that happens and when I mention to you, I can tell you right now I believe the administration had basically come to the point where they came to the conclusion that they can't get anywhere through negotiation. And it was...it was basically the Councillor who said let's have a discussion. You can always have discussion and see if we can have something. You know, I think we decided to wait a week and if something came forward, then great and unfortunately, nothing that was satisfactory came forward. Now, I'm going to support this for only one reason and it's the same reason that was stated because the opportunity to negotiate is still there. But, I can assure you, once Council approves expropriation, that opportunity decreases to less than five percent in my humble opinion because expropriation is expropriation. The land owners right now are happy to have expropriation and have an independent third party make that decision and it's going to cost the citizens of Winnipeg significantly more money, end of story.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. No further speakers. Councillor Browaty to close.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Just a couple of comments. Yes, I do believe at the end of the day, the final cost to taxpayers is going to be in excess of the \$1.6 million that the three properties that we are selling in this process are worth. That's after all the negotiated costs are out there. I believe in the fair transparent process of expropriation. The number that we're actually going to be paying Shindico I think will be actually less than \$1.6 million. That's why again I think the audit and you know I had an opportunity back in September of 2012 after everything started to become public, to go look at some internal values on the properties involved. There wasn't argument even back at that time to make that...to make the swap back in 2012. Within hours of reviewing those files I was down at Brian Whiteside, our auditor's office, raising alarm flags because I had troubles with some of what I saw in those documents at that time. And I do agree with the Mayor that various members of this Council will be meeting with different people in the public at all sorts of times. Shindico, I think has extended an olive branch to all members of this Council to meet with them, to get their side of the story on the entire fire hall swap. As far as I know, Councillor Havixbeck and myself are the only people who actually took them up on that to have that discussion. I don't necessarily agree with everything Shindico presented, but again, we had the time to listen and it was a worthwhile venture doing it. There's very few groups that I won't take 10, 15, 20 minutes out of my day to meet with, discuss almost any issue. So again, very unfortunate that this is the avenue that we have to take. I wasn't going to talk about, you know, Councillor Swandel did informally mention that he had spoken to Shindico, but the approach was being taken was a scenario that would be a 30 year lease. For a private sector business or something that...that's a good argument going down my route. You know, the residual value of a parcel of land thirty years from now is almost minuscule or is virtually nothing. And yet, the value that, you know, they were considering would've been a lease value within the neighbourhood of \$1.5 million, but again we won't own the land in 30 years. When it comes to a public organization like the City of Winnipeg, fire halls typically will be around for a lot longer than 30 years, so didn't make any sense to me whatsoever. Again, why I didn't consider the option that Councillor Swandel was proposing as being acceptable so again unfortunate that is the avenue we're taking, but this is what I'm recommending and our committee recommended.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All those in favour of Item No. 18? Opposed? Carried.

**COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG**  
**February 26, 2014**

---

**Councillor Swandel:** Madam Speaker, please record me in opposition.

**Madam Speaker:** So noted. We're now moving on...we have no motions for P and D, by-laws for first reading, Councillor Browaty.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT**  
**CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 1ST READING ONLY**

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law Nos. 1/2014, 2/2014.

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

**Councillor Swandel:** Nay.

**Clerk:** By-law No. 1/2014, By-law No. 2/2014.

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

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move that By-law No. 94/2013 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 94/2013.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move that By-law No. 94/2013 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Opposed? Carried. The next set of by-laws, Councillor Browaty.

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

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you. I'd like to move that the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law nos. 21/2014, 30/2014, 31/2014.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 21/2014, 30/2014, 31/2014.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move that the By-laws numbered 21/2014, 30/2014 and 31/2014 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 21/2014, 30/2014, 31/2014.

**Councillor Browaty:** I'd like to move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 21/2014, 30/2014 and 31/2014 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Any questions for the Chair of Property and Development? Okay, seeing none. We'll move on to the committee on protection and community services. Councillor Mayes on the report dated February 10, 2014.

---

**REPORT OF THE  
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES  
DATED FEBRUARY 10, 2014**

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 7 inclusive.

**Madam Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have no motions. We'll move on to by-laws. Councillor Mayes.

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

**Councillor Mayes:** I'll move that By-law No. 33/2014 be read a first time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 33/2014.

**Councillor Mayes:** And I'll move that By-law 33/2014 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 33/2014.

**Councillor Mayes:** Almost through my first by-law, Madam Speaker. So I move that the rule be suspended and By-law 33/2014 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

**Madam Speaker:** Any questions for the chair? Okay, seeing none, we will move on to the Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Swandel and a report dated February 4, 2014.

**REPORT OF THE  
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS  
DATED FEBRUARY 4, 2014**

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 to 7.

**Madam Speaker:** I will move Item 2 to 5 and 7. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 1.

**Item 1 - Establishment of a U-Pass Program**

**Councillor Swandel:** I'll just introduce it as the U-Pass Program. I know there's a number of people, I don't think anybody is here in opposition to this, maybe one or two, but generally a positive report. I'll listen to the comments and respond.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to put a couple of comments on the record on this. It's been a long road, so to speak, to get to this day where Council is poised to approve Winnipeg's first U-Pass Program. It took a number of factors coming together to make this possible. And first, I would like to thank the awesome leadership of the students. They spent over the last few years...they had spent time meeting with Councillors, organizing and raising awareness of the benefits of the U-Pass Program. It is heartening to think that when many of us in this chamber are long gone, these young leaders will be here in the future to keep our city moving forward, so thank you,

those of you that are still here. I would like to thank the Mayor and the EPC as well as most of the rest of Council who have been open to bringing forward a new policy that is progressive and is "best practices" in most major Canadian cities. We are at this point today because of the open-mindedness and flexibility of the Mayor, Councillors, students and Winnipeg Transit to work together to come up with a plan that makes sense. A plan that is affordable, doable and sensible. The motion before you has full support of the student executives at both universities and they're prepared to take this back to their student bodies for a fair and democratic election process. The U-Pass Program is an excellent public policy move for a number of reasons. The obvious benefit is that we will be seeing a very significant increase in transit ridership. That increase is going to occur in the short-term for the students who are initially given the opportunity to have a very large reduction in their transportation costs, but what is really exciting is that the U-Pass provides a benefit across the generations. It has been shown that U-Pass Programs result in a change in the culture of public transit use for young people, a change that continues across their lifespan. Even once they no longer receive the subsidized fare, a large number of students will continue to choose public transit throughout their lives. In the long term that means not only more revenue for the City, but a cleaner environment, less wear and tear on our roads and less traffic congestion. I want to clarify a few details of the program to alleviate any confusion caused by inaccurate numbers that were put out in the media earlier this week. The motion in front of you today, which depends on support from the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg, is expected to result in a total cost to the City of up to \$1 million per year at most. It is very unfortunate that the fictitious number of 15 million over five years was put out in a press release by one member of Council. Based on media reports, it is clear that these inaccurate numbers came from a number of misleading calculations. It appears that these exaggerated numbers come from double counting the cost of buses, ignoring the fact that we have a funding agreement with the Province and by adding in fictitious numbers for potential programs expansions that are not part of what we are voting on today and have not been costed out. The facts are that the cost of acquiring and staffing eight new buses is already included in the costing and it has been accounted for and should not be counted twice. We do have a cost-sharing agreement for transit operations and a significant share of the costs will be paid for by the Province. There...and there has been talk of other educational institutions joining in the U-Pass program at a future time and it is true that discussions are beginning with Red River College. This may well make a lot of sense to do in the future, however because of the unique situation of each institution, we cannot assume what a potential future expansion might cost. For the U of M to be involved, we know that eight additional buses are needed. For other institutions, we may not need as many or even any new buses depending on the number of students and the terms covered. The costs could be less or more or even cost neutral. We don't have that information. Again, I point out that we are not making a decision today about those other institutions as this motion is only a commitment to the two major universities. It is also misleading to give the impression that we can take this imaginary inflated dollar figure and fix roads with it. The Provincial portion is only there as a part of Transit agreement and the money isn't there from Transit's budget for roads unless some other source of tax increase would be brought in. So just to be clear to everyone, with the students' share of 260 as agreed to by all parties, the actual cost to the City is expected to be under \$1 million per year. Investing in public transit is a great benefit to people who take transit. However, I would remind you that increased transit ridership benefits all of us. Traffic congestion is getting worse in the city all the time. Investments in public transit that make choosing transit more affordable and convenient, will result in a significant improvement in our traffic congestion problems. And the costs are minimal compared to the endless call to expand widening and extend our road system. You can't build your way out of congestion although some of Council doesn't agree with me on that. Many other experts in the world do. But you can provide a better transportation system that provides convenience, safe, affordable options and when you do that, more and more people will choose these alternatives. This benefits automobile drivers as well with shorter commute times and less wear and tear on the roads. I have barely touched on the environmental benefits of higher transit ridership, but in case anyone has forgotten climate change is real and we do need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Each bus of passengers is equivalent to removing 50 cars off the road. That's very significant. In my work as Winnipeg's representative at the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, and Winnipeg's transit rep on the Canadian Urban Transit Association. I have spent a lot of time in Ottawa and talked with political representatives across the country at all levels of government. It is the year 2014 and the importance of investing in public transit is very well understood across all political parties and all of the leaders across, maybe not every leader, but most of the leaders across this country. The leaders of all political parties are realizing the importance of public transit investment. So in closing, there is huge room for growth in transit ridership among university students. U-Pass programs are known to massively increase ridership in the short term and there are significant long term benefits for the environment, public health, congestion, the fiscal bottom line, decreased wear and tear on the roads and enhancing the culture of public transit use across the life span. The cost of this program have been well considered. The details have been very well worked out in terms of the time frame it will take. It is a very reasonable investment for the return we get especially when you look at the whole picture and consider the future. I would again like to thank Mayor Katz for his crucial support. The students for their hard work and persistence, Winnipeg Transit for their assistance and all City Council for your support today. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. The numbers do matter on this and it's worth spending a little bit of time on the numbers and I actually did find the notes of when I first met with Mr. Fleischer, with Zach up there in July 14 of 2012 and the numbers that were being talked about then was that I think Transit had put forward a proposal for 280 dollar a year, eight months, a year pass. We're now at 260 so there is obviously been some negotiations, some give and take by both, by both parties, both the students who passed a referendum at a lower rate and by Transit trying to make this work. So I think the numbers are at this level are worthy of our support. If this was a proposal to have a U-Pass at a much lower number I think I would take some pause and say, "Well, is it really worth subsidizing that much?" But at this level, I think it's a fair deal. I think the students have made a move. I think the City Council and the Transit Department made a move to try to make this work. My notes indicate that when we met in 2012, they were talking about a 15 year campaign for a universal bus pass. So it's been a long campaign by the student groups and Zach who's here and Rorie who was here earlier, I think of, I've had to do a lot of work, answer a lot of questions from people like me about what about the part-timers? What about people who live outside of the Perimeter who don't have access to the bus system? those sorts of questions and it does sound like everyone's trying to work in good faith to try to make this work and it's going to be a very democratic process. There's going to be another vote, so I asked Rorie I think one time, what do I say to somebody who comes up to me who lives say south of Nova Vista in my ward and says, I drive my kid to U of M every day and you idiots are making them pay for a bus pass that they're never going to use and the answer is, there was a vote. Did they vote? The democratic process. This was Rorie's answer which I actually thought was a pretty good one. Tell them there was a vote. It was democratic and if the majority of students and that includes the part-timers that includes the residence students, if the majority carries then, we'll implement a U-Pass system and if the majority doesn't carry among the student population then, they'll veto it themselves and that's okay. But from our end, we can pass it at a reasonable amount, which is the 260 a year. It's indexed to inflation or at least to the inflation in our prices so our transit prices so this isn't locked in forever. And I hope...and Councillor Gerbasi touched on something. There may be additional costs. Well, that wouldn't be a bad thing if USB students and CMU students call us up and say what's in this for me, why can't I get on this then we can say, have a referendum, here is the framework and we'll try to move forward. I know when I was at the grad for College Secondaire Léo-Rémillard, the French high school in my ward, most of their students were heading off to University of St. Boniface, probably taking transit would be a huge benefit for them I think, so hopefully, we'll actually get some more uptake on this and be able to expand it, so I'm...I will be voting in support.

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

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to start off by thanking the students from the U of M and U of W for their passion and involvement in this issue. Frankly, the final cost to the taxpayers is not all that substantial, but I do have some questions and issues of fairness and equity and the cost of what a post-secondary education and how this is going to prohibit some families from participating in a post-secondary education. Unfortunately, I think I'm going to have to vote against the U-Pass motion before us here today. We already subsidize transit heavily whether it's through capital programs like we've seen just this past week when we opened our new garage. The capital cost of buses, those are borne entirely by the City of Winnipeg. Taxpayers overall also subsidizes the operating of transit to a very substantial level. But again, it's fair, it's equitable, across the board. You know, doesn't matter if you're a multimillionaire and you want to take the bus or if you're a Joe Q. public. What's been proposed here gives one particular group of citizens an added advantage. This is on top of the advantage that they get as students going to post-secondary education. But again, it's at least consistently applied across the board, but bigger issue is from different parts of the city, if you're coming up from Garden City, from Amber Trails, from North Kildonan, from Windsor Park, from Sage Creek, you name these various neighbourhoods throughout our city, there isn't convenient transit service available that's going to get you to the University of Manitoba in particular. U of W is a little more centrally located. It's a less of an issue there. If you're representing Osborne Village, this is a great program because again you've got transit buses every two and a half seconds going down from your neighbourhood to get to the University of Manitoba. Every university student is going to have to pay hundreds of dollars, you are trying to take one class. What does one class cost nowadays? One six hour class, I'm sure it's \$2,000 for a single class. You're paying another 250, 260 dollars on top of that to pay for a transit pass you might not want, you might not need. You can go opt out of this. How can I look at my constituents who are in the City of Winnipeg living on Gleenlea Avenue? Immediately across the street from them are similar houses in the RM of East St. Paul, guess what? They aren't part of this program. They don't have to pay. Tell me how, that's fair or equitable? It simply isn't. So again, I think this is actually a detriment to a lot of working class families that want to be able to access post-secondary education. It's a penalty for people who don't really have much of a viable option other than to drive to campus, people who need to hold part-time jobs, people who are doing education, you know, in different ways. So again, I appreciate the initiative of the students and that involved in trying to promote this program. Again, the amount of dollars isn't substantial from the City of Winnipeg perspective, but again, I think we already provide ample and fair subsidies toward public transportation. And you know, I'll look down some of my constituents and say that's not fair. I'm okay supporting it, I have supported it in the past. So again, I will be voting against this today.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you. You know, in talking to residents who live in my ward, you know, it's kind of balanced on different sides. Some people believe that you know we're giving too much to these youth and they don't want to support. And that somehow it puts a burden on other...actually, some people actually believe that it puts a burden on other transit users. So the first thing I want to say here is that the City of Winnipeg's, Winnipeg transit system is a mass transportation system. The more people we get using it, the more efficiency we find in it. Yes, there is some subsidization early on in terms of, it will require some property tax support. Did a calculation, at some higher numbers, you know, and with our 50 percent of the share, I know that the bus thing is all factored in, but again, I think the young people who were representing and trying to move forward with the U-Pass clarified that very clearly that all transit users will be using it. Many of the students who will now be using transit will actually make, create more efficiencies hopefully on our feeder buses, get more people on the feeder lines who are carrying less because of the mass transportation system. Actually I'll point out that you know in the suburbs, they removed the 18 Leila service to supply more service to the suburbs and the reason they gave was that there wasn't enough people riding the 18 Leila, but the people who were using it really needed it, but apparently there wasn't enough, so it wasn't efficient. It was more efficient to give the service to the suburbs. But I will...I digress a bit, but the point is this, the more people we get on all of our buses, the better, the more efficient our mass transportation system will become. You know, I heard a couple of things that trouble me a little bit in regard to the U-Pass. I am voting for this, but you know, I heard that there are people, students with disability that use the Handi-Transit system and so what will happen is those...the Handi-Transit system is basically the whoever you are, whatever category you fall in on Handi-Transit, you pay that bus driver. So if you're a senior now, we're moving ahead with this if you're a senior, you're paying seniors' rates to travel on Handi-transit. So I would hope that when they're looking at exclusions and who's participating at the University and they're voting, technically, why shouldn't a person with a disability not get the same deal, paying 260 for that and still using the equalizing Handi-Transit system? The other point is, is I heard a little bit that you know if you live in East St. Paul or West St. Paul, and actually I know some university students, friends of my own son who lives in the city. They live...one lives outside of the city and travels, but you know, park and ride. Maybe if you live in East St. Paul and you have to pay the 260, maybe you drove your car to a point and you hop on a bus, park and ride. That will help. Keeps more cars off of Main Street for sure. I have to say, so much traffic on Main Street, it's crazy, it's dangerous for pedestrians anywhere to cross there. Every day, there are near misses all the time because when I was at, you know, of university age, you could walk across Main Street in between traffic flows. Today, it's crazy, like the only time you might be able to do that is at 3:00 o'clock in the morning, but you would be surprised at the traffic on Main Street at 3:00 o'clock in the morning. Anyway, the...so, more cars off the road on our roads, I think it's good for pedestrians, it's good for everybody, university students yeah, you know, things are costly, and I as a parent you know am helping to pay my son's university education and you know, this is a cause. If my son...well, he is not attending university at this point, but he will be in September. The point is though is that you know like that makes it a bit easier on the family, so it does affect families and families who have bus users. I use the bus every day. I have no choice, but you know the bus is good. So the more people we get on, this is a win for everybody. Yes, it will cost us a little bit to subsidize it, but definitely the experience in other cities as the presenters presented to us today, it is a known fact that once you get used to changing your behaviour and utilizing the bus service, you will be more oriented towards using that bus service as you get older. So like we really have to go ahead with this and I thank Councillor Gerbasi and the Mayor for moving forward the U-Pass, let's get it done. According to my calculations, and it's changed a bit, because the numbers did change over different periods, but it sounds to me like we're talking about a subsidization here of less than a quarter of a percent of an increase to the City's transit, budget overall, but over not transit budget, but overall budget here. So but remember it's about the sustainability of our mass transportation system and for the future. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Swandel to close. Here's further speakers. Okay. Councillor Fielding followed by Councillor Havixbeck.

**Councillor Fielding:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. And first of all, thank you very much for allowing me to present. I want to thank some of the advocates of this program that came from both universities and I appreciate their passion on the subject and I respect your opinion. I disagree with it, but I respect your opinion on it in terms of the way you...and you worked hard. I know you worked and you met with most members of Council in terms of this, in terms of your support for it. For me, you know, I'd love to be able to support this. In fact, I have been a supporter of this. We currently have a...we currently have a subsidy right now for our students. Right now, if you buy a bus pass and by the way, I'm a bus user. I mentioned before at another Council meetings, I had some car issues. If you take a car on a normal basis but in all September and all of October, I actually took a bus every day to...to City Hall and actually I found it a very...it was a great experience, great experience for me to do that. I hadn't taken a bus for in a long time, but it had extensive period on that. It was a great service. It got me there promptly. It got me there efficiently and so for the most part, I'm very much supportive of it and I do support the current subsidy that's in place, it's what...20 dollars off of what current rate is. If you actually have an adult pass right now, I believe it's around \$84 a day. The students have a rate of about \$67 a day and quite honestly, I'd love to be able to support this, but I just personally don't think that we're in a position right now to be able to afford a subsidization that's there. And I wish them all the best of luck in terms of their initiatives and sounds like you might have support within the Council that's there. But I think as a Council, we really need to set



some priorities, that's there. I think it's a perfect example of, you know, why I say that I think the city is broken to certain extent because you hear the arguments all the time from municipal politicians, you know. We don't have enough...there's infrastructure crisis. There's all this money that's to and fro, we're not spending the right places. Why do we need to make it a priority? We need to make a priority on fixing the roads, it's the first priority in terms of getting us back to a sustainable level in terms of our infrastructure that's there. I think that we need to take a look at...fixing the streets before we have a further subsidization of some of the bus transit passes that are there. I can tell you I've talked obviously...it's well known that I'm considering running for Mayor and I can tell you it would be the easiest thing in the world for me to stand up here and say, "You know what, I support...I support what's going on with the students that's there, be really easy for me to do that. Just smile and nod and agree...but I think as leaders we need to take a stand and I personally think with the dollars, we know how further stretched back and forth that we need to take a standard way to address this. And so I think that with the horrible state of the roads that we're in, the millions of dollars that could be spent towards a subsidizing a further subsidization of the transit passes could go to fixing the streets. And I will address some of the numbers that Councillor Gerbasi brought up. I also think that a part of this, and I'll talk about what my plan was that giving jobs...kids...giving students actually jobs, whether it be a job placement here in the City of Winnipeg, you give them some job training is probably priority number one for students in my opinion. So my proposal is, what I suggested instead of spend \$10 million, spend \$9 million and enhance the TBO Program. By the way, buses do travel on roads just for the record, they do travel on roads. You could do and this is estimates from public works, you could do 90 streets in five years to fix that. That wouldn't go the whole way, but I'll tell you it would go a long distance way. I'd also spend a million dollars in terms of some job placement in co-op programs that I think would go a long way, helping students either get a job here at the City of Winnipeg or get the experience they need to get a real job in...with private sector or non-profit, which I think make sense. The final thing is...not the final thing, one other point is the reports and there's been a lot of talk about the financials that are there. I guess the question I have for you and I do have the actual report, and by the way, this is the report that we're voting on just for the record, it clearly states that the Winnipeg public service provide budgetary implications of the U-Pass Program and report back to Council. So part of this motion, there's...and this is what we are voting on. This is the financials piece. There is no financials that are attached to this, so you can argue whether it's my...my numbers are right. You can argue whether you know the other groups are right whether Councillor Gerbasi's numbers are. The fact of the matter is there's no numbers that's documented in this proposal. We also know that Councillor Gerbasi has spoken extensively about Red River. Well, I mean, how could you argue with Red River not jumping into this program if they pass a referendum, if U of W wants to do it, U of M wants to do it. Surely, Red River can jump in...you could add other community colleges. My point of this is that can add 25,000 students to the rolls in the numbers that are in place right now. So with all the financial data that's there, we don't have the financial data and I'll just remind you sometimes Hansard is a great thing because you can go back, you can take a look at what other people have said in terms of Hansard. I did have...specifically, I'll jump to my good friend Councillor Gerbasi, who's been a proponent of this, and in a very passionate about this in a lot of ways. We don't agree with a lot of things, but I've got a lot of respect for Councillor Gerbasi because she's passionate if you look at Transit in Winnipeg Book, she'll be the number one that are there. But she also talks a lot about reports, administrative reports to Council. So there is actually something on property management service review that we talked about November 14th, 2012. So I'll just quote how the importance of having appropriate administrative recommendations with all the financials was important to Councillor Gerbasi at that point. It says...but the problem is that we don't have an administrative report. It goes on to talk about administrative report advises us on the risks, the costs and advises us any other perils in terms of the program, the decision making going forward. So obviously it's really important to have the financial data that's there. I think Councillor Gerbasi has been there. I know Councillor Havixbeck has also talked about the importance of getting a financial report just in the last report I see, it was...was when we were talking about brown water and the damage. Councillor Gerbasi talked or Councillor Havixbeck talked exclusively about the fact that the motion, however, we have no idea how much this will actually cost the City of Winnipeg, and yet we're moving in this direction simply without any report. And another element that's further kind of going down here, she talks about passing a report like this is like throwing darts in a dark...well, to certain extent, we've got the darts here because we don't have all the information that's there. There's some other quotes that's there, but my point is there isn't a financial report that's attached to it. Does it make sense? Are the financials there? I just don't...I personally don't know. You could have this program that come up with other students that jump on void that could cost millions of dollars that are there. There's no financials that are there. This is what we're voting on. One other thing, I'd like to say and this is an e-mail that I received, it...actually, Councillor Eadie's constituent that e-mailed both myself as well as Councillor Gerbasi earlier in the week. I'm not to give the person's name, but what I will say and I'll quote from this and, it is an e-mail that's got from other constituent that talks about this part-time issue in terms of the passes and this resident says part-time students and advocates against imposition of this program on all students. My ward clearly do not resonate and she talks about when the leaders of U of M. I won't mention who it is, they suggest. But they go on to say that it doesn't seem...you know, they didn't seem to care of what my opinion is because they had a lot of concerns for their part-time students. It says it's remarkable in 2011 and 12, 35 percent of students in post-secondary students were part-time students and that's pulled from the Stats...Stats Canada post-secondary education. It goes on to say, the letter goes on to say that I've owned a home since 2003 and during the time, we've watched the school for the City of Winnipeg is responsible for this creep into

territories unnecessary. It's just another terrible example, poor public policy making and desire, order of a government to do everything for everyone. So what I'm saying is there isn't necessarily consensus going on this item. Another people...

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Mayes moved extension. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Councillor Fielding:** Thank you. So my final points in this, you know, through the debate, it's...you know, I've gotten some comments and it almost sounds like my position is a very radical position. I know Councillor Browaty supports it, I'm not sure who else, but I also was quite interested in the Winnipeg Free Press. I always read the Winnipeg Free Press, one of my favourite dailies to read in the morning, but there was an actually, an interesting poll and I captured this and the question talked about should Winnipeggers be subsidizing transit. Now I would have added: should they be investing in infrastructure beforehand or roads, but really, what they are saying is that the people to ask, there's over 5,000 people that were asked over 36 percent at least to this point or over 61 percent said that they shouldn't be subsidizing this to begin with. So my point with this is, this isn't a radical position. I think that it's something that makes a lot of sense when you look at the whole financials that are there. We can't afford to do everything. We need to focus in on the main processes. Another item that's been talked about, I'm sure people will stand up and say, well, does this money actually exist? Well, you know what, this money actually does exist, because this is money that we're going to spend in the future. The reality is there's tax supported dollars that would go into this, whether the estimates are 1 to \$2 million and by the way, I'm not sure if those numbers are actually accurate because I understand that the buses that we pay for a hundred percent of the buses, so how could it be half that we're paying a half the province base? At the end of the day, I know the Mayor has talked you know, coined the phrase, coined the phrase, you know, there's one taxpayer. At the end of the day, this is a whole bunch of money that's in play, whether it's \$10 million, whether it's \$15 million. This is money that that could be spent first on roads. And I personally think until we get out of this financial crisis in terms of infrastructure, we need to focus on the main areas, so this is money that will be spent in future Councils that's a part of it. We don't have all the financials that are there. Bring about financials back. Let's take a look at that point, but until we have a priority, till we make a priority of infrastructure, you know I hear from all politicians so we don't have...you know, there's infrastructure prices at all, but when you have two or three of these types of programs you have on yearly basis, it takes money away from the core services that are there. So that's why I will not be able to support this, Madam Speaker, and I'll stand down at this point. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck followed by Councillor Smith.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Well, you never know what you are going to hear in a day on the floor of Council. First of all, I'd like to thank the students. They've shown great leadership on bringing this forward and it's not always easy. It's not always popular and there can be divides, but now it's our turn to show some leadership and be forward thinking in this city. Yes, some Councillors are arguing money could be better spent on roads. But that's not what this money is intended for. Councillors who are not supporting this are not looking forward. They're looking in the rear-view mirror, and some maybe need to be reminded. It's surprising that the two we heard from were noted earlier in the day as the younger members of Council who were willing to walk to their mailboxes, yet aren't willing to embrace this for our students. And I know that both of them have graduated from university and gone to university and maybe they need to think back to those university days and think about today now. I know when I went and did an undergraduate degree in the late 80s, you could get a summer job and pay for your tuition and your books and still have money left over. And now we are seeing students with triple those costs with record debt and then they go on to graduate studies and even bigger debt. This is a small hand to them. In a \$1.7 billion budget this is not even a million dollars. Let's put that into proportion, not even a million dollars. That might do two blocks of street repair. So two blocks of street repair verses maybe getting 25,000 cars off the street? I'll take the latter and shame on you for not supporting our future leaders in this city. I still teach at a university level, University of Manitoba, University of Winnipeg, CMU, Booth University. I ask on the very first day of class, why are you here? What do you want to accomplish with this course and where do you want to go after your degree is finished? And still, 25 percent of students in this city want to leave our city. They see better opportunities in Calgary. They see better places like Toronto. And I say, why? Let's get to this issue and let's talk about it. And the number one reason is that they can't get to point A and point B in our city at the pace they want to get to and at the price they want to get to. So let's make this, let's try to facilitate this, let's move our city forward in this direction. We have 40,000 people going to the university. It's considered a small city, the University of Manitoba. We have 20 to 30,000 going at varying times to the University of Winnipeg. If we could get 25,000 of those cars off the street, that in itself would reduce the wear and tear on our roads. Imagine Pembina, Route 90, Portage Avenue, all having fewer or less congestion. Yes, our roads, our water, our sewer, our community centres, all are problematic, but we need a comprehensive plan. This continual notion of budgeting based on one offs is ridiculous and it has to stop and we have to stop putting misinformation out there. I want to reiterate that this is less than a million dollars a year in a \$1.7 billion budget. The money from other levels of government are dependent and intended for this use only. So how can we suggest that we would put them into road reconstruction? There's a referendum coming from students, that will be another deciding factor, so to say that there is no financial report, there's no financial report because maybe the University of Winnipeg or maybe the University of Manitoba won't pass this or maybe somebody else wants to pass it.

Then we do a financial impact analysis and look at how it impacts the budget. Some people would argue or are saying and I have had a couple of calls from...in my office saying that students will now be not paying anything. That's not true. So I need to...to clarify that. One member of Council commented on why would we offer something that is perceived to be unfair to one group. Well, if we didn't support public transportation in this city where would people be who have disabilities? My mother takes Handi-Transit and it costs her \$2.60, but the real cost according to the department is somewhere in 14 to \$15 range per ride. So we are subsidizing. Are you saying we're showing preferential treatment because somebody is disabled? That's unfair. I would argue that we need to invest more in our public transportation. I look around this council chamber and every single one of you has attended an FCM conference since I've been on Council. At the last one in Vancouver, you might've received a public transit pass which you may have used or may not. I know I used it. I found clean, safe facilities. And I raise the safety concern because I think we need to invest in more infrastructure. When we were in Vancouver in the skytrains, there is a safety bar that somebody can ring. We don't have these kinds of things and we have further issues with that. So, I just wanted to reiterate that and I'm all for polls. The Free Press poll saying 61 percent, saying we shouldn't be subsidizing transit. I believe if Councillor Fielding were to listen to all polls, he would recall that in the race for Mayor, he was polling at 6 percent and dropping. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Smith.

**Councillor Smith:** First of all, I disagree with Councillor Fielding. It was him...as part of the Mayor's gang on EPC who hired Phil Sheegl who got us in the mess with the fire halls, Police headquarters et cetera. His judgement on this issue also is completely wacko. Where does he get his cost figures from?

**Councillor Swandel:** Point of order, Madam Speaker. That terminology, that's actually legitimate, not like the one I got this morning.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Smith, I believe you are getting to your point, but...

**Councillor Smith:** He's shown his bias against public transportation once more. He does not realize taking cars off the road as residents choose to take the bus benefits those car drivers who's telling to insist on driving. Reducing traffic benefits all of us. Students and the general public will benefit from the U-Pass program. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Smith, I'd like to ask you to retract your statements that you started with at the beginning of your comments. And I want to remind everyone of the rules in this chamber. Can you hear me, Councillor Smith?

**Councillor Smith:** If I can't say wacko...

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Smith.

**Councillor Smith:** I'll just say insanity.

**Madam Speaker:** You made inappropriate comments about the motive and that won't be tolerated in this chamber. I think I sent out three reminders in total today already. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. The debate has been very interesting, but sometimes I guess I'm surprised that common sense doesn't prevail. We had two delegations here and they're still here, Zach and Rorie. And if you look up there, what do you see? You see our future. That's what the city is all about. It's about our young people, okay? The realities here, our young people are our future leaders. Our young people are going to make the city continue to grow. Do you want our young people to stay here? Or do you want them to leave for the many reasons that have existed over many years and for the first time, we actually have young people coming back to our city. That to me is a good thing. I want them to stay. I want everybody that goes to U of M god willing to stay. I want everybody that goes to U of W to stay. I know that's a high goal, may not be realistic, but it's my goal. And when it comes to U-Pass, let me get down to how this all started. U-pass is a good thing. The problem that existed was the gap. The gap of what the transit department thought made sense and what was on the table. Well guess what? They came up and filled that gap. They came up to \$260 and you know how we got that number? A conversation between Councillor Gerbasi and yours truly saying, "Can we find some common ground?" That's what we should be doing, trying to find some common ground. I went to the Director of Transit and said, "What is the number that you can live with?" Is 260 a number? Is it 270. Is it 250? 260 is a number that they can live with. That's how we got to that 260, 260 is the number that they believe will get the support. We'll find that out in the very near future. And in the meantime, it's been put on the record from the Director of Transit, Dave Wardrop that the cost is approximately a million dollars. It's in black and white. Councillor Fielding has it, Councillor Havixbeck has it, Councillor Gerbasi has it for all I know, every Councillor here has it. It's on the record. He sent it. They asked the question, they got the answer. So let's really look at what the scenario is. There are some people who may not be big fans of rapid transit and may not be a fan of this. I respect your opinion, but please use real

numbers as the director has said. And I'll point out when it comes to playing with numbers, let me point out, everybody has a copy of this. It's a public document. It was handed out by Councillor Fielding. I call it the Fielding manifesto. It talked about how we could publicly balance our budget, and the first recommendation was take \$3 million from year end surplus. We don't have a year end surplus. We had a \$1.8 million deficit. I guess you could call that being out about \$4.8 million. So let's not play with numbers. Let's do what's right and you know what, if you are in a situation where you think that everything is on an even playing field, better give your head a shake and wake up, okay. There are many people here who use the bus every single day. There are more people here who use their vehicle every single day. There are some people who when their vehicle is down, they use the bus and when it's over, they thank god, they can go back to their vehicle, but here's the scenario, we all subsidize transit, every citizen subsidize transit, approximately \$79 million. We subsidize transit. There's so many other things that we subsidize. There are situations where people can't go to certain events because the ticket is too high priced. We subsidize everything, so let's not start talking about transit. There was nothing...every time something comes here, we're talking about...it's a subsidy. It's taxpayers money and we are approving it because it's good for the big picture. Universal pass is good for the big picture. Universal pass is accepted in almost every Canadian city, every Canadian city and this is one of the higher u-passes and we still have a situation where some think it's a bad thing. It's a good thing. My only hope is these young people can convince the rest of their peers to support this because that's not a guarantee whatsoever, Madam Speaker. That's the only question that's out there and you now have the director, because when we talked about the 260 that was a number that they said, yes. That makes sense. We can live with it. So let's all be practical and reasonable and open and honest and say you know what, we care about our city. We want the Rories, the Zachs, the Susans, the Harriets staying in this city, having a family in this city, creating a business in this city. That's what this is all about and you know what? This is a part of that puzzle. I will be supporting the motion, thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Vandal.

**Councillor Vandal:** That's a tough one to follow, Madam Speaker. Of course, I've been following this file for a few years and I am very supportive of this. I think Councillor Fielding said that there is no report, well, there is a report. And I have it in front of me and before I get into what the report says, there's a part of me that's just a little bit disappointed, Madam Speaker. Because I think this is something we could've done this year. The report which was before us ten months ago, outlined the numbers and the numbers which was accepted by the student is 170 and at 170 U-Pass per semester, there was a subsidy of \$3.6 million divided by 2, brings it down to 1.8 and that was the gap for the U-Pass and I was there at the meeting when people said, "Well, there is a gap, there is the gap of 1.8 per year, which is still as Councillor Havixbeck has pointed out as relatively modest in a budget of a billion dollars. And the gap however is a lot wider than that. If you look at the gap for transit subsidy in the City of Winnipeg, it's approximately \$50 million essentially. So whether it's 50 million, whether it's 51.8 million, my argument...and I lost the argument at Executive Committee of Council was that for the benefit that you're going to get for U-Pass, it's worth the 1.8 million. However, there was a process, the students have signed on to the new process. There was a negotiation and it appears that everybody is on the same page to bring up the 170 per semester to 260. So that gap is going to go down substantially and I understand it's about a million dollars now per year. And I think that's a small investment for the benefit that you're going to get. The report says we are not cutting edge on this. And I am almost embarrassed as someone that's been here a long time at the lack of bold and transformative decisions that we've made over the years on rapid transit, on transit, on rapid transit and on U-Pass. This works in Vancouver, it works in Victoria, works in Edmonton, it works in Calgary, in Saskatoon, in Regina. And in fact, in the report, clearly states the institutions in B.C. and Alberta has seen an increase of up to 50 percent of student ridership, which not only reduces the congestion on the roads leading to the institutions which is good for the infrastructure, it reduces the emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants which is great for the environment. The additional benefit is that the continuation of transit use by students after they have graduated. A follow-up study completed after a three year U-Pass pilot program at Edmonton showed that over 50 percent of students who have been using U-Passes intended to continue, using transit as their primary mode of transportation. Madam Speaker, isn't that what we're trying to build as a city as leaders? We need to make those bold and transformative decisions that are going to change the transportation habits of principally young people and this is the sort of thing that is going to do that. I'm a wee bit disappointed that we're not doing it this year, but I'm very happy that there's been a process. Everybody seems to be on board to do this in the future, but let me be a little bit of a skunk at the garden party here. There's many ways that this could fall off the rails, not the first one of which is the vote that they're going to have at both universities. And I sure hope that they're going to work hard to get majority support. I have a feeling they will because there's passion in this issue and I think there's good will to do this, but let's look at our own chamber. We don't know what's going to happen in the next election. We do know that there's going to be a cost analysis done. There's been a report that comes back to this Council for approval. And who knows what's going to happen. We don't know if Mayor Katz is going to be here next year, we don't know if he's going to run again, for all we know Councillor Fielding could be sitting where Mayor Katz is.

**Councillor Swandel:** He would be alphabetically in the wrong place then.

**Councillor Vandal:** I know I'm not running again. I know that Councillor Havixbeck is running for Mayor. And several of us here, we don't know the makeup of this Council. We don't know whether this Council is going to say, "Okay, let's implement the U-Pass in 2015 or 2016 whenever the report comes back." So that's...I would be, again, I'm not trying to be the skunk at the garden party, but there's several hurdles that this has to fly by before we actually say that we have a U-Pass. But nonetheless, Madam Speaker, this is an incredibly positive initiative. We're not breaking ground here. It's been done in other cities. It works well. It transforms riding habits amongst young people and that's what we're all trying to achieve, Madam Speaker. So I'm proud to support this this afternoon.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Swandel to close.

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Boy, imagine my surprise when I heard Councillor Gerbasi was out there negotiating something on behalf of the City. Is it okay to say bloody hypocrite? Oh, it's a little different? Okay. Let me start. I could've been successful with a little wisdom around the table. Let me start by saying this is not this Council's issue. This Council...this issue has been around for a long, long time. When I first came to this building some 15 years ago, I was the assistant to the former chair of the Public Works Department. At that time, the student unions had brought this issue forward and it wasn't the first time the student unions had brought the issue forward. So it's decades old, this issue. And the answer has always been the math doesn't work. Until the numbers get right, the City is not going to support this. Well, guess what? Thanks to some strong leadership at the universities and thanks to some hard work by Mayor Katz and Councillor Gerbasi and others. I know Councillor Orlikow was pushing hard on this. The math works and even if it's short a bit, just put a value, try to quantify public good. A lot of people have made their representations of what they think the public good is in this, but you know, there is a public good here. Do I think it's going to stop people from staying or leaving the city? I don't believe so, but you know, that's up for debate. But there is public good here and I am more than satisfied with what the cost of providing that public good is right now. We are in the middle of a process here as well. Let's not forget that this still has to go to the referendum and I think Councillor Vandal has mentioned that. And when it goes to referendum, I hope there's some good conversation out there. I heard some of Councillor Browaty's comments and I quite frankly don't agree with most of them. The one as to whether or not people will be able to afford to do this, people will always have the ability to make a choice. They could choose not to use their car a couple of days a month or a couple of days a week. And you know, they...there's all kinds of choices you can make to offset the cost of having to add this to your cost of attending university. Some cars will actually benefit by having less cars in their driveway, cost to gasoline, cost to cars, cost to parking. So there's really good arguments to be made out there and for, you know, I can remember when I was young and struggling as a very young person, trying to scrape another peanut butter sandwich out of an empty jar peanut butter. You know, we didn't drive cars. You know, we took buses, we walked, we bicycled, we did whatever we had to do get around. And so, there's some really good decisions that can be made by students here because now their transportation is in their pocket all the time and it's far more convenient. Also the comment that the City is a hundred percent subsidizing many of the pieces to do with transit and in particular there was the mentioning of buildings, the new transit garage went up. The City of Winnipeg was a very small player on that. I think the project if I'm not mistaken was 17 million? I think it was 12 from the feds I thought, okay. I'll go with the Mayor's numbers, but the federal government was actually the largest player on that out of the gas tax monies. And so it isn't the City that's carrying the burden and being loaded with all of these pieces. I know some time ago, I put forward a proposal trying to get rapid transit going where we just raised bus fares by...I used a quarter and I think it was six or \$7 million that that would have created an annual revenue, so we're talking about less than a nickel here or a nickel in a transit fare cost. Also, we get this one versus the other thinking that goes on. We heard it this morning around some planning stuff and we heard this afternoon, they get roads versus buses. We've got to stop that. This is not my agenda versus somebody else's agenda. It's not roads versus buses. It's all of those things to build a great city, you know, buses are important part, public transportation is an important part of a great city, so is good infrastructure. We're moving hard to try and do more and more infrastructure. Actually, we're probably moving faster than we can actually deliver right now. And if I thought that this Council could digest it, we'd start talking about the use of our money right now for some of the infrastructure projects we're putting forward because we're probably putting them forward far faster than we can do them. And this particular year, you're going to see the Provincial government put half a billion or more in highways projects out there which is going to create some inflation for us. Is this the wisest time for us to be doing more work? When you look at it from a value perspective, it might not be. But I'll tell you, if we can get some of the cars off of those roads, it's...you know, by something as simple as this, you know, it...we are well on the way to making better decisions. And Councillor Vandal already mentioned that the report actually does exist for anybody who wants to look it up. It was December 9, 2013, it was the date I found it on which is only three months ago. You know, it's difficult to read some of the financial pieces in there. It's not as clearly laid out as some of our financial reporting, but it's there and Councillor Vandal's numbers are accurate at that time based on \$170 pass price or U-Pass price that the City's cost of that would've been 1.8 million, approximately 1.8 million. So we're now at a \$260 fee so you can see that that will greatly reduce that 1.8 million. So I hope I would've liked us all to be unanimous on this. It's been many, many decades in coming. I thank the young people from the universities for doing the work that they have done. I wish you God speed in getting out there and handing the message home and getting the referendum through because this is important and I

**COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG**  
**February 26, 2014**

---

think it took a great deal of courage to get to the number that you got to and to put that in front of your students. So thank you and let's support this.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. I'll call the question. Recorded vote. All those in favour of Item No. 1, please rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

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

**Nays**

Councillors Browaty and Fielding.

**City Clerk:** The vote Mr. Speaker, yeas 13, nays 2.

**Madam Speaker:** Item carried. Thank you. Made an exception today for your demonstrations in the gallery. Thank you. We have Item No. 6, Mr. Clerk.

**Item 6 - Request for Release of Stantec Traffic Study relating to the Fire Hall located at 1705 Portage Avenue  
(Station 11)**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Swandel to introduce the item.

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll introduce the report and wait to hear the comments from my colleagues and respond in closing.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Havixbeck.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am rising in opposition of the current wording of this report. I believe that this report has now been watered down and that we are gone a full circle here and that no further information will be reported to Councillors. And it's already been four months. I stand by my original motion with Councillor Orlikow from November. The wording is right there that the entire report be released. Now, some may argue that there are sensitivities around some of the information. Well, that's fine. However, we as Councillors, I believe, deserve the right to know. We've heard that during question period. We've heard that during delegation and you know, we've all signed nondisclosures for certain topics over the years. I fail to see why this Council cannot be briefed on what the contents are specifically, those sections, six, seven and eight which were redacted. That would be the analysis recommendations. I have concerns...I have heard from current staff, former staff. I have concerns about the placement of the station in the cloverleaf now. I have concerns for our firefighters and paramedics who are coming and going from the station, and I just would like more information. I don't think that's unrealistic to ask for or unreasonable. I'd like to have and be privy to the information on what concerns were raised and what was shared by the engineers behind closed doors, and know once and for all of that things are safe. The committee concurrently at this meeting asked for a report about the light and we heard that that was the first for the use of that type of traffic light to allow emergency vehicles in and out of the fire paramedic station and this light is used elsewhere in Canada. So some comparator and the time to do that is now. I believe the committee stated that they wanted that a month or a year out and I think that there should be some data on its success or inefficiencies or short comings. So you know, this would be the best way to make sense of something that continues to drag on and to be transparent and to know full heartedly that each of us who supported the building of this fire hall that it is safe and secure for our staff and for the public. So the fire hall audit, the report on this, did not address this...the release of this report, this issue was not addressed when we received that report in October and this will continue to drag on. So I fail to see why we cannot have this information even if it is in camera simply for the assurance that nothing is wrong here. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Thank you, Madam Chair. When decisions are made, I...being, we know that when things are made, there is good in our decisions. But we can't just ignore the fact that some of our decisions we waive the options of

the good and some of the possible, maybe not so good parts of it. We can't expect every decision to be a hundred percent great. There is always a little bit of give and take, but what we need to be doing and this is why I agree with Councillor Havixbeck is too many of those decisions or of those balances I call them are done exclusively by a few people only, not done by full Council. So things like the traffic study, why...when we ask these questions, I as the decision maker am equal I think, I hope but don't feel it, an equal decision maker on Council even though I'm not a part of EPC, even though for whatever reasons, we don't get all of their information. There's some information we can't get. But again, I like to be able to go to the public saying, yeah, you know what, traffic wise there was a few little things here, but we think we've dealt with it properly, but overall the whole project makes a lot of sense and then I can go look at the public and say that quite comfortably. But when I'm denied the opportunity even as a City Councillor, even in the opportunity of an in-camera session where we can get this information and equally share, all Councillors equally share the same information so we can make proper decisions. When I tell people in the public that non-EPC members don't receive the same information as EPC members receive, that's just called a democratic deficit. How are people who are supposed to be engaged and make decisions able to do so when only a select few are able to get that information? And again, that's just talking about me in my own roles on Council. I'm...personal view is the public should also be given that opportunity and we should be comfortable at the end of the day to say here's all the information we have people, all the reports. It's available to everybody and this is what we as Council and equally every Councillor has based their decision on. To me, that is a fundamental tenant of democracy. I am appalled just in these last couple years on how non-EPC members don't receive that equal access. How am I supposed to vote on issues? Oh, Councillor Orlikow, trust us, just trust us. We are working for you. It's all good. Well, that's nice. Again, what we need to be doing is all of us need to be sharing all the same information. Again, so for me when I look at this one issue of the really, the resistance to put out a traffic study, well, there's some other issues in play here as well about who owns the traffic study, who does that. I can wait. Thank you. So when we start not to give out that information to us as leaders and ask the people around it to public now and say, oh, so you don't even know what you were voting on. We should all have that same information and it should all be public. It's paid for by the public dollar, it should be public. If there is some confidential information in there, which I would say would be an exclusionary kind of thing, not really all inclusive, then we may have to deal with those specific small issues, but generally, the fact that some Councillors continually are being blocked by getting the same access to information, that's what this represents to me. So I believe if we just release the information, we can move past issues faster. We can regain the public's trust and we can actually start building the Civic government that everybody will be proud of.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. In the summer of 1981, I had a summer job in Winnipeg for Emergency Planning Canada going around looking at potential fallout shelters, kind of a dated reference. One of my coworkers on that job said to me that her boyfriend was an engineer and he guaranteed the new Trizec Building, dating myself a bit there, the Trizec Building at Portage and Main was going to collapse within a couple of years, guaranteed. He was an engineer. He looked at the drawings. It was going to collapse. Now, if I stood up here today and said, "You know, I wonder how they voted. I wonder if they had full information. I want that report from 1981." Most people would probably say, "Do you have any evidence that it's unsafe? Do you have any...?" It didn't actually fall down though. It didn't actually do what was threatened. You don't actually have any evidence that it's unsafe". And I would say, "Well, no, but I just want to know. I just want to know what the report was from a few years ago because maybe I would've voted differently and let's draw the analogy to what we have here. We have people saying, "I want the report from a few years ago before the building was built because I...even though I could've requested that information at the time at community committee or elsewhere, I didn't, but now I want to know because I might have changed my mind about a vote about a building of which there is no evidence that there is any safety or road concerns." So we talk about transparency and we have the yes man theory and the EPC gets all the inside information. I haven't seen the full unredacted version of this: Sorry to disappoint people of the conspiracy theory on this. I haven't. When I will, I'll be interested in that is if somebody can show me, there's a safety issue. What we have so far? We have Councillor Havixbeck at EPC saying, "I have an independent legal opinion." In the interests of transparency, do we have that? No, we don't. We have Councillor Havixbeck saying...people have said to me they have concerns. And I'm worried about the workers who work there. That's pretty serious if you are worried. Let's have some evidence of any safety or traffic concerns. I'm quite happy to change my vote on this at the next meeting if somebody can actually bring me some evidence that there are safety concerns as we speak. Well, then we should be asking for a report on that. Well, that's what the motion does as a matter of fact, Madam Speaker. It says that the Winnipeg public service is to report back in an appropriate time period to the Standing Committee and evaluation update on the new traffic signalization system at the fire hall. We're going to get a report. If the report says this is dangerous, we should immediately take action. What do we have before us? We have the non-existent independent legal opinion that I would love to see in the interest of transparency, but when people are saying to me, "You're not being transparent. I have an independent legal opinion that says otherwise." I have people telling me their concerns, not going to tell you their names, not going to give you any written information about why they say it's dangerous, but you're the one not being transparent, let's all be transparent. Let's have the evidence of lack of safety, instead of getting up here and saying, people are saying to me, it's dangerous,

I have concerns about safety. We'll all have concerns. Do you think any of us really would want our firefighters and paramedics in an unsafe facility? Of course, we wouldn't. What we've got here is a request...and I have notified a bunch of groups in my ward to stand by and file any FIPPA request they can dream up and just send us the bill because if we keep getting these FIPPA requests, we're conforming with the legislation, and now the criticism is you're confirming with the legislation. We had the right to appeal. We didn't appeal and we still fault you. If you're going to file under piece of legislation and invoke your legislative rights and then it doesn't turn out the way you want, you can't then say, "it's all your fault because you made us follow the legislation". You file a FIPPA request. We all play by the FIPPA rules. Yes, do we have some discretion to release the information? I'm sure we do. What's in there? I don't know. I haven't seen it, but what my concern here is not debating the abstract of what was said three years ago because I might have changed my vote on a station that turns out to not have any problems at all as far as we know. We've got millions of issues we should be debating here. We're spending enormous amounts of time debating FIPPA requests. Should we pay for them or should we not pay for them? You heard my request earlier today. Do you have any evidence that this is unsafe? Do you have anything? And the answer was this is part of a larger sleazy fire hall debate. It is...the audit was incredibly damning of the fire halls. This has nothing to do with that audit. This is about a traffic study, most of...large parts of which were released, there was a right to appeal to the ombudsman that wasn't invoked. And now somehow, with conspiracy theory, and it's all corrupt and it's all being withheld. The report was there at the time that the community committee voted on it. If it wasn't requested, well then people should've requested it. Bring some evidence that there is some safety issue with the station and the signalization. Please do so if you have it. Please do so. You keep telling us you have independent legal opinions, that you have people expressing concern. Let's bring it forward. Let's take immediate action if there are immediate safety concerns. We're getting a report back. I think it would be valid to say in 30 days, what's appropriate, define appropriate. That's a valid concern because it says bring it back in an appropriate time period. On that I think Councillor Havixbeck has a point, which is let's get this evaluation and update. If it's not back in 30 days then maybe we should be asking when we're going to get it. But to come here and say, I have independent legal opinions, I have friends, I have people, I have whispers, but you're the guys who aren't being transparent. Bring it on. Bring everybody down. Let's have the concerns about safety. Put it in writing, come and speak verbally, but until we have that, I'm not too sure why we're looking at an issue about...it's about this... You know, my analogy, I stand by which is look if the thing hasn't been a safety issue then why are we alleging there's some cover-up here? Let's get the report on the safety issue and we can take the action. Happy to do so. I'll demand full disclosure if somebody can prove there is a live safety issue here, but don't keep coming here and saying you're not, you're the ones not being transparent because I've bought an unanimous tips on legal opinion I'm not going to divulge. Let's all be transparent. Show us the evidence of lack of safety. Let's take the action, but until then, all we're doing is debating in the abstract about what is in classic legal terminology, a moot question. I would've voted differently, had I known there was a recommendation it was going to be unsafe even though it's no evidence that it's safe now. Why don't we get a current report instead of one that's a few years old about and the theoretical design? Let's get the current report and take action. That's what I want to do. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** I'd just like to take this out of the legal realm not being a lawyer myself and as a member of Council, I think...and I was there at the Public Works meeting when we had a discussion about this and I think what I said at the time was we just want to know what the staff recommended at the time and I...we realized the fire station has been built, but there were questions that many of us had about whether it makes sense to have that there. And yes, it's already there and it's in the past and that is one of the reasons...the second clause here is in there which was saying that we have the public service evaluate the safety and take a look at a year or so or once they have time to evaluate. So that's not something that's going to come back right away just to clarify that. That's going to evaluate how this traffic signal that was brought in for the first time in Winnipeg because of the location of this building to manager the fact that it's on or round about whatever you call, the right of way...what do you call? Anyway, so yes, we need to look at in the future, we need to look forward and make sure this thing is safe, but honestly, can't we as members of Council simply see the report? And I think that's what I said at committee. That's all this is about. Let us see it in whatever form we're legally allowed to see it. It doesn't make sense to us and to many, anyone looking at us why members of Council cannot find out what the administration in our Public Works Department said made sense at the time and I think we have a right to see that information so I hope that that will be forthcoming. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, some clarification and I very much appreciate the fact that it's already been stated once, but I think I'd like to re-emphasize what Councillor Mayes said. We're all elected by the people. We all represent the wards. I represent the City. And we all have access to information and we all want to be on an even playing field, but the facts of the life are for anybody and this may be because they actually believe it, I know Councillor Mayes has said he has not seen it. I have not seen it and I don't believe any members of EPC have seen it. So we're all in the same boat and that's through you to Councillor Orlikow, so he does realize that that's just a statement of fact that no one has seen that. That's number one. No member of EPC, okay, no private club, whatever the case may be, no gang, whatever you want to refer to EPC as, has seen it. That's the first thing I want to say. Number two, if there



is someone raising the concern, the issue of safety. I appreciate that, I respect that. But when I hear an individual go on the public record and state that access and egress is safe and that's the individual that represents the people driving that equipment in and out every single day, that's the person who I'm going to believe, number one. And Alex Forrest who is the President of the UFFW has publicly stated that to the media. Now, I want to bring something up here because it's rather interesting. So what I did is I pulled the actual...the committee, Assiniboia Community Committee meeting of Tuesday, July the 12th, 2011. I'm just going to give you a couple of quick excerpts from it, okay. There's a question, Councillor Fielding I believe is chairing that meeting and he makes...he says, "From a land perspective in terms of the traffic flow, that's in a report. I don't know if any of you guys can answer that". The administration says Public Works approved it based on what the Stantec Report had prepared. Stantec Report is in here July, 2011. And then Councillor Fielding says okay, the administration says on mitigating some traffic reports. Councillor Fielding says, okay, so they agree, there is no concern with the traffic though. That's there? Good question. The answer, yes. I just want to put that on the record and then Councillor Fielding, there is agreement from our department? Okay, good. That was number one. Number two. It was then put forward from Councillor Fielding: "So they were generally supportive of what you are doing. What do they...what's their sense on their part?" Reid Douglas: "Their comment to me, it would be crazy not to support this. It's on the public record, it's all there". Another quick excerpt, this one, Councillor Fielding: "Okay that's the kind of answers. That kind of answers most of my questions. Do you have any questions?" Councillor Havixbeck: "No, I think you answered them about the design, about the trees. There was some issue that was presented to us by e-mail about elimination of green space and it sounds like you were replacing and perhaps even relocating some of the trees. I think that answers a lot of the issues that were there". And the last one would be Councillor Fielding: "If there is any further questions that Councillors had, although there wasn't anyone in opposition to it, do you have any further questions you want to ask Chief Reid Douglas?" Councillor Havixbeck: "No." Councillor Havixbeck: "No, it looks really thorough." And finally, Councillor Fielding, You can see they went through this in pretty good diligence. "Okay, but just to be crystal clear, so what I understand from the traffic management plan that's been put forth by the consultant and by the Fire Department in terms of their application, our departments are very supportive, are supportive of the traffic management plan that's in place. Administration, that's the communication that I received from Public Works." Yes. I would say the chair did a heck of a job and the committee asked all the questions, but in light of that, Madam Speaker, I would be more than happy because I believe all members of Council should have the opportunity to ask questions and get answers and if it's of any benefit within the next two weeks, I would gladly or sooner call a council seminar, have our administration there, have all members of Council appear and ask any question and get an answer before we leave that room. I would be more than happy to do that.

**Councillor Eadie:** I am having a hard time hearing from the sound system. Anyway, thank you, Madam Speaker. I was just hoping to just vote on this, but you know, listening to the debate and actually hearing from one particular person who sounds like the lawyer who's up against me at...from MTS in Federal court who spins and spins and spins, you know, this is a simple thing. I mean, like really, so we have a private sector company do a traffic study, okay, in the area and you know what, I'm...anyway, so they do a study. In other circumstances, we have our City departments do traffic studies, okay? Our City department's traffic studies, I get a report, it's got all the details in it, what the recommendation is, what the criteria, all these stuff, right? It's all there, right? It's saying whether you know this will work or that will work and I seem to recall actually with the Chief Peguis Trail was being extended from Henderson to Lagimodiere. There was a good public consultation, there was a traffic study and that traffic study was proposed. I was looking there and there was a proposed design of Chief Peguis Trail based on that traffic thing and through the public consultation, a number of us including myself pointed out that you know, really, if...like I thought the predictions for traffic on Rothesay were quite off, given that that would be a great way to sneak away from Henderson Highway and still get on to the Chief Peguis Trail. And you know, they went back and they looked at that and they said yeah, okay, you're right. So now, they did something to mitigate that perspective there on Chief Peguis Trail, works really fine. And you know, but that traffic study, all the information was there. And there was public consultations, you know, and the fire hall thing, I'm not quite sure what consultations were done. At community committee, I heard some quotes from the record, you know, about there is green space and I heard from some residents at some functions I was at that they were concerned that we got rid of green space. I don't know what the process was on that, but with the traffic study, you know, so Stantec prepares a traffic study. The City of Winnipeg prepares a traffic study. We get to see in all circumstances from what I know, we get to see the traffic study. Why...what? Like, I don't understand the problem here. Why can't we see the traffic study? Because you know what, Stantec isn't liable. The City of Winnipeg's experts in Public Works as the Mayor eloquently said, that Public Works made a decision. It was stated in the record, Public Works agrees it's safe. Okay, well, all right. So that's good. Use in that private sector report. I don't see how Stantec is liable and the only reason I can see that we're getting redaction and so on is that this was prepared by a private company, like for the life of me, I don't understand why we are blocking this. I know that some people are trying to attack our administrators saying it's wrong. I was a little concerned actually when I heard there was some egress coming off as a blind person who sometimes walks towards Queen Street across that, you know, the walkway. It's pretty clear, I mean, when they're coming out of the egress. I thought this through, and I thought oh, that's dangerous, but you know what, you could hear the fire engine flying through there. You're going to stop. I mean, it sounds safe to me. I don't know, but anyway, all is I'm saying here is

I'm actually voting against this report because I don't for the life of me, I don't understand why we just can't release the report. Thanks very much.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I actually agree with Councillor Eadie on this one, actually. My understanding is the consultant Stantec has given us the green light to release it. If there was some sort of original terms of a relationship, a contractual relationship between the City of Winnipeg and Stantec that prohibited to release this information, that's one thing. My understanding is that that is not the case. I mean, I do trust our city staff. If they told Assiniboine Community Committee that there's nothing to see there, chances are there probably is not or at least nothing of consequence in their professional opinions that needed to be released publicly. But I think a release at this point, there's been you know questions about other aspects of the fire hall piece in the past through the audit. I have no concerns releasing the full report publicly and that would be my preference. I'll support it because it's part way there, but my preference would be to do the whole thing. Yeah, I guess the more concerning thing is to have this discussion of comparing what was redacted in the version of release to the Canadian Taxpayers Federation versus what's...what else is in the report. I think it's time to have a bigger discussion about FIPPA and perhaps if FIPPA is not there, look at proposing amendments to the Province so that more information or less information will be released. I think that's perhaps an exercise that needs to take place to also. I'll be supporting it, but again, would like to see more.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any other speakers on the item? Councillor Swandel to close.

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to remind you what we're talking about here. We are talking about the Freedom of Information and Privacy Act and we're talking about how we apply the rules of the Freedom of Information and Privacy Act as the City of Winnipeg. Our first responsibility, our fiduciary responsibility here, as the Council of the City of Winnipeg is to protect the City of Winnipeg. I wholeheartedly believe that we should apply the FIPPA standards the same way across the board. We have hundreds if not thousands of traffic studies happening in this city during a term. Now, if you want to do this then I suggest you should all take it just as seriously and we should block day after day after day so that we can all sit in a room and take roll call and make sure that the public knows that you're reviewing all of these public studies. We should do that if you think that it is a great importance. What we have here is a political action group, you know, special interest coming forward trying to make a mountain out of a mole hill. Listen to what your fiduciary responsibility is. Your responsibility is to protect the City of Winnipeg. Do that! Give out the least information you have, force the enemies of the City to ask for more. Force them to ask for more. These people standing in front of us aren't here to represent the best interests of the City. They are here to represent the best interests of a political agenda. Stop the madness. You went to a public hearing, to a meeting, the administration represented that they had a traffic study. The traffic study mentioned some issues and they were discussed, addressed and mitigated and these are the recommendations they're bringing forward. Are they satisfied that the traffic is fine? They say it's fine, it's good, it's safe. It's within our standards. It's what we do. Pretty simple. You know, I listen to the Mayor praise Councillor Fielding for the wonderful job he did in making sure that that information was clear there. Who is this Fielding guy? It's quite different from the Fielding guy who did the math on the U-Pass program but, I couldn't resist, sorry, Councillor. Sorry, Madam Chair, I'll tone it down. I...but we've got to pay more attention to what our responsibilities are. I think Councillor Orlikow made reference to you know some of the pieces about the Executive Policy Committee, what information we have and other Councillors don't have and it's two different pieces. I would encourage all Councillors to read the charter of the City of Winnipeg, the City of Winnipeg Act in the Province of Manitoba. It does outline different responsibilities for Executive Policy Committee. And so you know, it's like we could do this all day long, you know, we'll do the boogie man politics thing, you know, all the sky is falling, the sky is falling. Well, remember what happened to chicken little, and all of those that followed him too. You know, I think Councillor Havixbeck put it really good in the last debate when she said, we've got to stop putting this misinformation out there. And a lot of this is what that is. It's just a bunch of misinformation being twisted for political purposes. So listen to your own advice, Councillor. Let's stop putting this misinformation out here. Let's be responsible. Let's protect the interest of the City. Let's use FIPPA to protect the interests of the City to ensure that that is happening. That's what this Public Works Committee did. We said, give, according to what FIPPA says, to all Councillors, the information that they're asking for. Do we want you know the nuances or what's being debated between engineers that we're going to stand up and now start debating the professional merits of the pieces that would be considered with...under the professional standards of an engineer, we're going to start second guessing that? Is that a responsible way to run a City when it comes to life safety issues? Are you going to make those decisions or do you...would you prefer to put those in the hands of engineers? I would prefer to put them in the hands of engineers and I would prefer not to be twisting them, you know, out there in the wind, in the public suggesting that somebody did something untoward because that serves somebody else's political purpose. So the recommendation is really clear here. You know, do what we are supposed to do is what the recommendation is saying. You know, the committee listened to...we listen to the director explain what it was that was in the stuff that was in the report and how it was used in making the decision to ensure that it was the proper decision to allow this to happen and proceed in the way they proceeded when we have that...all that information there. I mean I don't have anything more,

you know, to add other than you know this stuff keeps coming like this, keeps coming, keeps coming and it's really what Councillor Havixbeck refers to as putting misinformation out there. That's what this is, you know. This is FIPPA stuff. We've got to stick to the way that we do FIPPA all the time. Don't deviate from the way we do it. Don't set a precedent and allow somebody else to argue that well you did it here, so therefore you should do it here. It's because this could be a lot more serious than just a little political dance like we're seeing going on here now and don't kid yourselves. That's what this is. It's the stupid political dance that we're...just think of the time and the energy and what all of our people are doing. We talk about not having the capacity to do stuff and yet we've got our people, you know, stressed and trying to figure out what they're supposed to do here. It's really simple. Let's have a standard for how we deal with FIPPA. If you want everything out there, then live by the consequences, but I don't think that's what your fiduciary responsibility suggests you should be doing. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. I will call the question on Item No. 6. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have no motions. No by-laws. Any questions for Councillor Swandel? Councillor Havixbeck followed by Councillor Smith.

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

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Thank you Madam Speaker. It's taken a long time to get to this point in the meeting, but I think that there are a lot of constituents out there who have some serious concerns about the water flow in this city, and I specifically speak about frozen pipes. Can the Chair please tell us what he is doing to improve the rate at which we are responding to getting water to people? Some people are waiting ten to fourteen days and have no water in their homes.

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you for the question. I myself don't go out there and negotiate those types of things. Our administration has provided all of us on Council here with a detailed explanation of what we're doing and actually we are going now 24-7. We've got all the equipment that we can get our hands on, all the things we're doing and I'll be glad to forward that information to the Councillor by way of the email system, which I thought went to all Councillors but I'll make sure that you get another copy of that Councillor in case it was missed by your office.

**Madam Speaker:** Second question.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Well I'm glad the Councillor can make light of something so significant to so many people but I'm very concerned for citizens because I'm hearing from them repeatedly.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Two minute preamble is my understanding.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

**Councillor Havixbeck:** I'll be quicker then. It was recently...

**Madam Speaker:** Do you have a question Councillor?

**Councillor Havixbeck:** It was recently reported in the media that there is a significant number of snow clearing equipment that are inoperative. What is the Chair doing, or what action has he taken with the department or what can he tell us that the department is doing to either rent, borrow, repair, so that our streets and sidewalks are getting cleared.

**Councillor Swandel:** I greatly appreciate this question because it really speaks to how poor a job the media did in reporting this. The discussion that was had at EPC that was reported in the newspaper and actually it could be out of order to actually talk about whether or not something was accurate in the newspaper, talked about snow clearing equipment in general. It was not snow clearing equipment in general, it was a specific piece of sidewalk clearing equipment that we were talking about. All steps have been taken to try and get more of that equipment to improve the serviceability of that equipment, to find outside resources, to get that equipment repaired. Because of the compaction of snow and the amount of snow that we have, the traditional blade type of equipment used on sidewalks is not very effective right now which causes us to go to using a piece of equipment we don't have a great deal of, and is much more prone to breakdowns and that's the snow blower/grinder thingy...auger...whatever they call it. And that's where we're having difficulty but yeah, there was a really bad job done reporting that and it seemed to make it sound like we were talking about all snow clearing equipment. As you can see our streets are quite clear and we've actually done, I think, an amazing job getting all the snow cleared off the sides of the streets even so that we've got capacity just in case...and we

pray it doesn't happen...we get another large volume of snow, so I'd like to thank all those involved, both the City staff and all the contractors for getting that done. Citizens will be able to see improvement on the sidewalks as we ramp up the deal with this equipment, you know, in this unprecedented levels of snow. And so I appreciate the question and any others that would help me clarify those things.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Third question?

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Thank you Madam Speaker. I recently was informed by a Charleswood – Tuxedo constituent who happens to be a realtor, that she was showing some property in Bridgwater Lakes and there was a concern raised that there was no transit and no transit plan to that area. This responsibility rests with the Chair of this committee but also this is, I believe, the Councillor's ward. Can you tell us whether Transit will be made available to Bridgwater Lakes and if so when?

**Councillor Swandel:** As all Councillors should be aware, and I'm surprised this Councillor isn't aware, in new developments it takes approximately one to two years to get them into cycle for the transit. You need a certain amount of development to happen before it makes financial sense to do that. Those changes are made at two times during the year in the spring and in the fall as we transition from winter cycles of transit into summer cycles of transit, so I'm sure the constituent was misinformed by the Councillor or by somebody else as to whether or not there was a plan to bring transit. Absolutely one hundred percent plan, and it's actually one of the first enhanced transit developments in the City of Winnipeg. It was a key component when the Province of Manitoba, through the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, who is the developer in that area, brought that plan forward. The Councillor can find all the detail in that in the transit section of both the area structure plan for Waverley West and the neighbourhood plans for those specific areas, both Bridgwater Lakes and Bridgwater Forest. That detail is in there, and you'll see that play out throughout not only the structure plans but also down into the rezoning and subdivision applications where it talks about the specific distances and the connectivity to the transit plan for active transportation through the neighbourhood, so really an amazing development. Great transit opportunities in there. That's coming very shortly. The residents will be very pleased. But it's done in an organized and orderly fashion.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Smith?

**Councillor Smith:** Yes Madam Speaker. Councillor Swandel, in that email sent yesterday by Diane Sacher, she says (inaudible) "to respond"...and this is about the frozen pipes..."This is a problem caused by winter conditions and is being experienced elsewhere in other cities. I am aware that some of you are hearing from your constituents so as a result we have prepared the attached fact sheet providing information on the issues and what we are doing in response. Note that in addition to responding to frozen services, we're also taking steps to try to prevent frozen services from recurring." Now what steps are they taking to prevent frozen pipes from occurring?

**Councillor Swandel:** Well in particular there are two steps being taken...pardon me. Two steps being taken. The first issue is where they have people who in recent years have experienced frozen pipes. They've gotten out in front and sent them out notices advising that they should run their water at a trickle. Regularly there would be a cost to that, but when they do that in the case of, I think there was...I think there was over a hundred particular properties that are known to be problem properties, that the City would deal with the billing. There wouldn't be an increase. And there are some that many years ago have had issues with that. They advised that they do it and in that case they said it would be the homeowner's decision to choose to do that and they would have to pay for that protection themselves. Those are the two particular that come to mind. I'd have to go back and review the correspondence in more detail to give you the rest of it, but I encourage the people to be as proactive as they can in getting as much information out there as we can. You know, this is about frost driving down into the ground, so even as it warms up, this problem isn't going to go away just because the temperature gets warmer. It's going to take weeks if not months for the frost to get out of that depth of the ground, so people are going to have to run water for a significant period of time.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question?

**Councillor Smith:** And then Miss Sacher went on to say "We're continuing to investigate whether there are other possible resources available to us". What other possible resources is she talking about?

**Councillor Swandel:** I think if you read in the preliminary section of that diagram, it talks about the type of equipment that we use. Traditionally we've only needed one piece of that equipment. A few years ago we bought two more because they were no longer manufacturing it, so we've actually got three pieces of that equipment and I think what it actually does is they electrocute the pipe so it creates some heat in the pipe to thaw the line out. It's very technical equipment and you need certification to do it, so they're going out there trying to acquire some new equipment but in order to get it and to get the people properly trained to do it, it takes a period of time to do that. Nobody could have

anticipated that we'd have this level of frozen pipes. When you look at the history in the City of Winnipeg, it's unforeseen, so they are looking...whether or not we'll get it in time to help make an impact right now, I'm not sure but I'd encourage you to send direct questions to the director and these people are working as hard as they can trying to find any solutions they can from anywhere, whether its private sector, public sector, other cities that are experiencing these problems. Whatever resources we can get here we will and we will do everything we can to alleviate the problem.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you Madam Speaker. You mentioned that usually we have one piece of equipment that does the electric current to thaw these out and that's normal. We have three now. You already said they're being used almost around the clock. I'm wondering if you could enlighten me. I heard the comments and unfortunately Mike Davidson has left, but if you have three pieces of equipment, they're basically going to be used around the clock. If you hired another hundred people, how could that possibly help us because I don't quite get it? Could you help me explain that please?

**Councillor Swandel:** You know, there's a lot being said and I think a lot of what went on with CUPE and in reaction to comments that Councillor Wyatt had made. We don't need to get into that Mr. Mayor. Suffice it to say, every resource that we have is out there. A hundred more people is not going to help us if we don't have the equipment to do it. There's also the difference between what's happening on private property and what's happening on public property. I mean, a lot of our resources right now are being deployed into private property situations, you know, and we're trying to monitor the priorities. When you're going into private property, looking at people with illnesses, there's assisted living centres, and other places, so a lot of it's priority based. There's not a labour issue here. There's not a...well there's an equipment issue you could argue if there was actually more equipment to get your hands on, but we don't have more equipment to get our hands on and I could appreciate CUPE's frustration and I think there was some frustration from Councillor Wyatt, but I think some of that was really a misunderstanding from Councillor Wyatt, because when I read the story about snow clearing stuff that was reported, it was so out of whack. Even the comments with the newspaper reported this morning, it was a characterization of something that I said, which when I went back and I read it, I did it by email. When I read the email I thought to myself how could anybody come up with that characterization out of the email that I sent? It was, you know, it was silly. And it was funny because there were side by side stories in the paper. One side was Bartley Kives, you know, sort of series...you know understanding of what the events are. What was known...it was very sort of fact-based. Then the other side was the other story which was this characterization. It just didn't make sense. So I think there's some misinformation going on out there that's borne out of frustration.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie?

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you Madam Speaker. Without malice, actually this part of this report, and this is what I've seen with the frozen pipes, so for example, the Sir Sam Steele Legion went at least a week without water. The priority is, as I understand it, prior to us having this...it is extreme. You can't hire enough employees. It's hard to hire enough employees to deal with the worst circumstance when it's been, what since '79. I can't remember how long, but anyway. It is a difficult situation. You can't build an emergency room to hit the worst...the highest number of emergencies you're going to have once a year. It would cost an immense amount of money. But as I understand it though, the face has changed here a bit in that yeah, we're limited with the number of equipment and we don't...at the time we didn't have enough staff to help hook up water. So we now have a new priority that's there too, and that priority is to establish water supply from a neighbouring residence or from somewhere. I even understand in some really severe circumstances they're utilizing the fire hydrant to hook up water to these places and so it is my understanding that, you know, we are and could use more people and I believe we are looking at hiring private sector people who are qualified to hook up water service while these places wait to have their pipes frozen. Is that true Chairperson?

**Councillor Swandel:** That was a lot of stuff there. I'm not sure if all of it is true. I could say that we're doing everything we can. If that means using private service to help hook up temporary water supplies then yes, we would do that. You know, we always try to hook up temporary water services. All of our trucks are equipped with different means of doing that and the most common one we see is running water from a neighbour's residence, but you need a neighbour to be home, you need permission from the neighbour. You've got to do all those things, and so those situations don't always work out, but everything that we can do we are doing.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question?

**Councillor Eadie:** Just the second question is, I mean it is in the report that they had to switch priorities so would you agree that it's important to switch...or to have two priorities. One is to supply water where it's needed. Do you agree with that?

**COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG**  
**February 26, 2014**

---

**Councillor Swandel:** I think...two priorities. I think there's always only one priority. You choose what your priority is on any given day. If it makes more sense to be hooking up water on that day, then you do that. If it makes more sense to be getting the pipes thawing done then you do that. If you can do both you do that. You know, it's pretty easy to sit here and try and armchair quarterback this situation. I'm extremely confident in the people that we have out there that are doing the work. You know, they're long shifts, they've got the equipment going. They're looking...our managerial side of things are looking at private sector opportunities but remember too that the private sector is going to be getting called on to do work on private properties, so their resources may be limited as to what we can actually pull out of the private sector, so everything we can do we are doing.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. That ends question period. Moved by Councillor Steen that Council now adjourn. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

**ROLL CALL**

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

**Council adjourned at 3:42 p.m.**