

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

The Council met at 9:36 a.m.

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

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Fielding.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We're joined today by Pages, Elizabeth Walker from Fort Richmond Collegiate. Elizabeth, welcome. This is your first day as a Page and we have a...one of our regulars, Midori Matthew from St. Mary's Academy, and we welcome you too, Midori. Thanks for being here. (Applause) We have our regular friends in the media here, but we're also joined by some people who want to be in the media and that would be the journalism class from Red River College and their instructor, Duncan McMonagle and the students from Creative Communications, so welcome. And to my right, we have some folks from the University of Manitoba led by Leanne Falconer and these are...the program is New People to Canada, so welcome to our city, welcome to Canada. (Applause) At this time, I'd ask His Worship, Mayor Sam Katz if he has some comments.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This week communities across Canada are making Waste Reduction Week in a number of ways. Today I would like to draw Council's attention to two things that while relatively small, have a significant impact on our environment. Cell phones and batteries are part of our everyday life. We take great care in choosing these items. But when they come to the end of their usefulness that care is often pushed aside. Cell phones contain numerous toxic metals and compounds, including cadmium, lead and mercury. When improperly discarded these dangerous materials can enter our ground water and ultimately our food supply. Dry cell batteries such as alkaline can also pose significant environmental problems when callously sent to the landfill. Recycling these items can keep hazardous materials out of our landfills and help to keep our community healthy. The City is working with Call to Recycle to collect old cell phones and batteries which in turn will be safely recycled. Winnipeggers can drop off used cell phones and batteries at any City of Winnipeg library branch. In the spirit of friendly competition, there is a contest to see which library branch can collect the most during Waste Reduction Week. The winning branch will receive the title of Winnipeg Waste Ace and a prize for the community to enjoy. I would like to encourage all Winnipeggers and my colleagues on Council to take part in this initiative and do this one small thing for the environment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Appreciate it. St. Charles Ward may have a head start. That's sort of...the St. Charles Library. Anyway, we appreciate that.

MINUTES

Councillor Gerbasi moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on September 25, 2013, be taken as read and confirmed.

All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: We have one delegation with us today, and we'll invite Mr. Avrom Charach. If you please come forward and it's with regard to the Heating Standards Fines as a part of The Neighbourhood Liveability By-Law that will be dealt with later this morning. You have ten minutes, sir.

Avrom Charach: Yes, I have copies of my presentation.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, just give it to the Page, please.

Avrom Charach: Just leave it there for the Pages?

Mr. Speaker: There we go. You have a little timer right there that you can keep an eye on your time.

Avrom Charach: Perfect. I'll start off in just a second once they distribute them, I guess.

Mr. Speaker: Sure.

Avrom Charach: In the interests of not wasting time, I'll start, but it's...

Mr. Speaker: Go right ahead. They'll do it as you speak. Here we go.

Avrom Charach: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor and Councillors, thank you for your concerns for Winnipeg citizens. The PPMA, the Professional Property Managers Association is also concerned about Winnipeg citizens. I come today to oppose the changes before you in regards to By-law 1/2008, not because the intent is untoward but as you will see through my presentation, the by-law change is not likely required and if passed, could end up doing more harm to honest citizens than provide help to those in need. The fines are being proposed to deal with what some argue is a major issue with bad landlords. I will show you that this is a small problem which is already got another solution. I will also show that to be fair and effective, you'd require the City to set up systems and provide resources that are likely better used to solve problems which are not already under control. Canada Mortgage and Housing reports approximately 70,000 privately owned rental units in the city. There are another 12 to 15,000 Manitoba Housing units and rental units that are not being counted by CMHC That makes a likely rental universe of approximately 85,000 apartment units in Winnipeg or rental units. The PPMA's 72 member companies manage more than 68,000 of these rental units. We house approximately 150,000 of Winnipeg's residents. We are told that there were 300 complaints received last year. Well, I'm not convinced that all 300 of these complaints were valid and all were from different tenants, I will just for this argument concede that they represent 300 different valid arguments and suites. With that concession made, we see that .35 percent, that's approximately one-third of 1 percent of the apartments in Winnipeg are affected. That means that 99 and two-thirds percent of Winnipeg's residents in apartment units are not being affected. This is a tiny problem, though not for the few legitimately affected tenants. The proposed change to this by-law might create a huge problem for yourselves and the more than 99 percent of tenants with landlords who are not the issue. As a side bar note, I do mention that all complaints that we've heard of to date were for properties not managed by PPMA members. Will a fine help the tenants? No. It will not force the landlord to repair the issue. It will not give the tenant any money to fix the problem themselves. There is, however, already a system in place which will force repairs, fine guilty landlords and give the tenants money back in their pockets for things such as auxiliary heat, which they're required to pay for themselves. This is enforced by the Residential Tenancies Branch of the Province of Manitoba. And if you read the media reports last year, every single time the RTB got involved, the problem was quickly resolved. Under the RTB system, when a tenant complains to the Health Department or the RTB an inspector is sent out. The RTB can order repairs; they can order administrative penalties, fines on the landlord if they do not effect repairs or if they are repeat offenders. They can redirect tenant rent. They can use that to pay for repairs. They can order the landlord to refund or discount the tenant's rent due to inconvenience or the cost of buying or operating space heaters. I've read orders compelling landlords to do all of these things on their publicly available order system. This branch has the laws, the staff and the systems in place to deal with this small but important problem and does so effectively. I do not see any of these controls or measures in place in your proposed changes to the by-law. Finally, the RTB system protects good landlords from abuse by bad tenants. I'm not saying there aren't bad landlords, there are. I'm going to suggest from my experience that approximately two percent of each is problematic. Given the PPMA's 72 landlord members, we likely have one bad landlord, hopefully not me, and approximately 3,000 problem tenants along with many good tenants. In our monthly meetings with the RTB, they concur that the vast majority of landlords and tenants are good, but based solely on the size of the groups, the number of problem tenants is huge compared to problem landlords. The proposed changes before you do not address the thousands of bad tenants. It is not balanced. The current RTB system is balanced. I'll provide you with a quick summary and I'm probably only going over two of these. You have all four of them written in detail. Experiences that I've faced and these are things you're going to face if you pass this by-law. I had a staff person who owned a duplex. The heating controls were in one area, the tenant kept complaining it was too cold. What happened? The health inspector came to look at that unit. They pulled up, they parked for a couple of minutes on their cell phone, whatever, saw the windows open in that unit, knocked on the door, went in. The windows were closed, the unit was too cold. They asked the tenant, "Do you ever leave your windows open?" The tenant replied no. They lied. The suite was too cold, but the health inspector said, "I saw your windows open a minute ago. I'm not dealing with this issue. You're lying." Fridge temperature set too low. The RTB came to investigate one of our fridges. In summary, they found the temperature control was turned to minimum. They asked the tenant what they were doing. They said, "I want a new fridge." Away they went. The fridge temperature was not cold enough, but the RTB said, "Turn the control up. Call me

when the control is up." Window closed, poor air quality. I was in the hallway talking a health inspector who told me the air quality was bad in one of my apartment units and sure enough I have my maintenance person open the window while we were talking in the hallway. They came back in a minute and a half, two minutes later. The air quality was fine. They said we're not going to order you to repair now. Obviously, the tenant lied when they said they opened their windows every day. Now, my company was cited on a heating by-law violation, or shall I say, not cited, investigated. This is the most interesting one. Our tenant complained his unit was not warm enough and told them that the heat was off. The inspector arrived. They found the tenant shivering in a parka and indeed found out that our boiler was turned off. This is where it gets interesting. Twenty four degrees centigrade in the suite. Twenty five degrees outside and it was July. This particular tenant had a different tolerance for heat. I insert the story both because it's mildly humorous that this person didn't get it, but it's also more of a sad statement on what law abiding property managers and well-intentioned inspectors deal with every day. They deal with a lot of not good complaints along with the good ones, so at least two if not all of these examples, have tenants who wrongly tried to use the system to penalize a law abiding landlord. It's only by luck that these tenants were unsuccessful. In cases where the tenants is found partially or completely responsible for causing a problem, the RTB allows the landlord to pass cost back to the tenant. Your by-law amendment as written will force me to go to...will force me to pay a fine, will not cause for something I did not cause, will not provide me protection from tenants' abuse. In fact, under the Residential Tenancies Act, I then have to go to the Residential Tenancy's Branch to make a claim against the tenant whereas if they use the RTB system, it's already there. I suggest that attempting to protect one-third of a percent of tenants that may have a problem while not providing any protection to the over 99 percent of landlords who are not causing the problem. It's not fair and appropriate. This leads me to the use of City resources. It's been reported that our by-law inspectors are spread very thin without having to respond to many calls from tenants who may just be trying to get you to use you to get back at landlords if they don't like us. Your fines will not cover the costs likely of hiring new inspectors and setting up a proper system. Any system would be redundant to the Province's current system. Let the Province spend the money on this one. Civic taxes can be spent on problems, that the Province is not willing to police. As such, I recommend you not pass this motion. The solution for City Council is really simple. Inform 311 operators to advise tenants how to deal with their issues using the current system in place, a system which is effective and proven. If you wish to enhance your by-law in the future to be fair and balanced, please call the PPMA, we would be happy to help you revisit the motion so that landlords who are failing to provide heat are appropriately penalized. For example, if the RTB orders a fine to a landlord, you can just put one on top of theirs. You don't even have to put any energy on that. In closing, your proposed change is a simplistic answer to a problem, which is not simple. I predict that if passed, this will become a monster, being misused by disgruntled tenants and not providing protections to the tenants who are truly affected and need protection. Please do not pass this motion. I thank you for your time today and the effort you put in every day for our city.

Mr. Speaker: Question, Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Through you to the speaker. If 99 percent of the landlords are providing adequate heat, why are you so opposed to this? It seems to me this is a streamline method. You would have the landlord knows what the fines are. The landlord has recourse to the courts if he wants to go that way. I don't understand your opposition.

Avrom Charach: Well, Mr. Smith, my presentation made it fairly simple. A Summary Conviction based on temperature is too simple an answer. Yes, I know that I should keep my unit warm. Yes, I know that my boiler should be turned on, however, if my tenant chooses to open the windows and turn down their heating control and your inspector shows up without knowing that this is what they did, I get fined under a Summary Conviction By-Law. Where is the fairness in that? What if I'm not the cause of the problem? I completely concur that there are bad landlords out there and they should be dealt with appropriately using politically correct terms. But, why stain the 99 percent of good landlords for the 1 percent of bad landlords with a system that's not set up as the RTB system is, to investigate the matter properly and a system which does not force the landlord to repair. I can sit there and get fined every day and just not repair the boiler. How's that helping the tenant? The RTB system will force the boiler to be repaired and will take the money away from the landlord that they would normally put in their pocket to make the repair if the landlord refuses to do so. So the system is in place and it works. That's why we're opposed to this, not because it's ill advised to fine bad landlords. It's ill advised to make such a simple solution for problems that's not so simple.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I have a...actually, I'll ask three questions, but the first question is would our delegate agree that the small percentage of landlords that are a problem, would you agree that usually there is a lot of other Neighbourhood Liveability and other problems with those households?

Avrom Charach: I would agree with that, yes.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
October 23, 2013

Councillor Eadie: Okay. Also, I'd also ask you...well, By-law Inspectors will come down and inspect if somebody's got their thermostat turned down, they're going to see that, they're not just going to come in there and say the temperature is bad. But really, the fine is at the end of the process in this by-law, so are you aware that the first thing is that we present an order to fix it and it's when they don't fix it that fines come into play. You're aware of that?

Avrom Charach: To be honest, I don't see in the by-law where it states that, so I'm not aware of that, but at least, that's part of the system that I'm supposed...that the RTB uses, so that seems reasonable.

Councillor Eadie: I would also agree that it is...can be a complex problem, but would you also agree though that...well, anyway, I don't see...this is not a simple thing with the fine, but when you mention that there is 3,000 abuser renters, I don't know where you're getting those numbers from, but would you also agree that there are a number of people and I know they exist in my ward, there are a number of people who are afraid to go anywhere and do anything to protect themselves and they live in very extreme conditions. Would you agree that exists in the city today?

Avrom Charach: I do agree that exists, yes.

Councillor Eadie: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for Mr. Charach. Seeing none, thank you, sir.

Avrom Charach: Can I just make one comment based on Mr. Eadie's last question? The one comment is those people won't complain under this by-law, but if they complain they would complain to the Residential Tenancies Branch as well. Thank you for your time. Oh, sorry.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, go ahead, Ross.

Councillor Eadie: Well, no. This city has identified that derelict and vacant housing is a problem in this area and I would point out that and did you know that there are by-law enforcement blitzes in certain neighbourhoods where they're coming and looking at all aspects of these houses to determine what the problems are, and so they're not just looking at heating problems, they're looking at...so you're aware that our by-law enforcement officers are looking for many other things that are in this by-law and in other by...the Vacant Derelict By-Law?

Avrom Charach: I'm very aware of that. As a matter fact, they've also started to attend all of my apartment buildings to look for any possible problems with any of my buildings. Thankfully, they're not finding anything or anything major at all because we take care of them properly.

Councillor Eadie: We appreciate you are a good landlord.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Mr. Charach. Okay. All right. I guess we'll move into the heart of the meeting and move to Executive Policy Committee. The report of October the 2nd. Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 2, 2013**

Mayor Katz: thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to move...let's see...the consent...Okay, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to move...introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 4 and 5.

Mr. Speaker: So, have we pulled one, two and three?

Mayor Katz: I've just moved four and five for the time being, Mr. Speaker. I believe there is some discussion.

Mr. Speaker: All right, four and five. Any further discussion? Comments on four or five? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 1 - Precinct Plan 'T' – North Inkster Industrial Neighbourhood

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I believe Councillor Sharma was motioning on one, two and three so I'll let her speak.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to send Items 1, 2 and 3 back to EPC. We're still working with the administration and there's some housekeeping and other matters that we still need to work on so I would appreciate the extra time to get things done properly.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Mayor, do you want to respond to that or you...?

Councillor Sharma: I would like to refer Items No. 1, 2 and 3 back to EPC so we can just clean up some of the housekeeping matters (inaudible) outstanding.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. The report of October 9th.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 9, 2013**

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I will introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items...I'll move one, two and three. I'm sure there will be many people who want to speak on three, but I'll move one, two and three.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: I haven't read it yet, but...yeah; you can't read it. A Doctor must have written it. Okay we'll move consent agenda...

Councillor Eadie: Point of privilege. Speaker Nordman, Speaker Nordman..

Mr. Speaker: Yes, sir.

Councillor Eadie: I'd just like to rise and just explain that I don't know what's going on with my computer, so I'm not sure, I can't quite remember what report items one and two are in order for my...

Mr. Speaker: Sure, I'll just read those off, Ross. One and two are the ones we're going to deal with right now. Subdivision rezoning of 828 Weatherdon Avenue is no. 1 and no. 2 is the opening of southwest corner of Pembina Highway and McGillivray Boulevard. Any comments, questions? One and two, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item 3.

Item 3 - Operational Review of the Public Works Department

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Councillor Mayes: Mr. Speaker, I'd very much like to hear from my Council colleagues and as you know, there is a motion which we are trying to read at the same time.

Mr. Speaker: I think Councillor Wyatt, maybe you could read this motion so that the rest of us can.

Councillor Wyatt: I remember a teacher say that everybody (inaudible). Anyway, yes, following the Finance meeting where there was a discussion regarding this point, even though it wasn't on the agenda, we did suspend the rules so we could have that discussion, that I did receive a phone call from the Director of Public Works following that meeting who did indicate to me, Mr. Sacher, that there maybe was a misunderstanding that the Public Service was the ones that actually were going to be implementing in full, the recommendations of the KPMG Report. The idea of having KPMG hired was more of an issue, if they have questions, they can contact them. My view is, is that the report is pretty self-explanatory. They've worked well with KPMG up to now to bring forward these recommendations and if they need a situation in the future where there's a one off, let's say maybe in terms of expertise for design build, they can definitely come forward with a proposal to...at that point to engage KPMG. That was the only area that...in the discussion I had with him...he had a potential issue, but outside of that, they're very familiar with the recommendation and of course, we're not...as you know, Mr. Speaker, we are not today adopting and moving forward with the implementation plan. The implementation plan has yet to come back. So again, if there is another issue that's identified, that could be also

identified in the implementation plan. I think it's premature just simply to say let's rehire KPMG for the purpose of doing this when we've already hired them to do the extensive work already, which really is a lion's share. So based on that conversation with Mr. Sacher, I felt that our Public Service is the one who I stood...I stand corrected the Public Service is the one who's going to be doing the implementation, and so I'm happy to report that to Council and I think this is in keeping with what was communicated to me. I didn't...do you still want me to read the motion? So, "Whereas the Director of Public Works, Brad Sacher has now indicated the Public Service intends to implement any recommendations adopted as part of the future and yet decided implementation plan. And whereas internal implementation of the operational review will save ratepayer dollars previously earmarked for consultant fees. Therefore be it resolved that Clause 3 be deleted and all clauses renumbered accordingly".

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie had...you had...oh, I think, yeah, just hang on. Councillor Vandal had his hand up first so...he is the chair of the Public Works.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to reiterate that when this came to Executive Committee, there were a couple of changes made. Number one, the winter control surcharge, the snow tax was deleted unanimously by Executive Committee. That was one of 25 recommendations that were presented through the audit and I want to also stress to Council that report no. 2 or recommendation no. 2, the wording was changed from "endorsed for implementation" to "reviewed for implementation". And I know that there's several of these recommendations that could be fairly contentious with the folks we represent. Those recommendations are going to go back to the appropriate Standing Policy Committee, Public Works, and for those recommendations...some recommendations that have cost savings that have a different way of doing business that are going to go to the ASD Committee for review in business planning so there is going to be ample opportunity, in the future for all of the Council to look at these issues. I know the...I've talked to several of you on the snow clearing and there are some concerns, so I anticipate that issue is going to be at Public Works, at our next Public Works meeting for detailed discussion with our administration on the changes that are recommended in the report. It may be approved, it may not be approved. That's going to be a decision of the Standing Policy Committee. That recommendation will go up to EPC and up to the floor of this council. So, I want to simply make sure that all of Council is on the same page as that by endorsing this report; we are not endorsing any changes to winter snow clearing policy at this point. That's a discussion to come. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman and I'm happy that the chairperson of the committee that will be looking at most of the suggestions here reviews and I was going to rise to just remind him if the media is reporting it, its review. I'm getting a lot of calls and stuff saying you're doing this and you're doing that and there's actually... There's a misconception out there that somehow we're also talking about not plowing residential sidewalks, which is not in this report. That will continue to happen. And the other thing I would mention is and I'm glad that it is being reviewed as we had our Access Advisory Committee meeting last evening and it was made very clear that there would be a number of implications depending on what we do and this is good that it reviews, that it might affect how persons with disabilities use our streets in the winter time, and so I appreciate that the chairperson of the Standing Policy Committee of Public Works actually made sure that the change was done than that this is strictly about a review and looking at ways of our being able to have our services more effective and efficient. So thank you very much. I'll be voting to support this.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Well, this motion puts a new light on it somewhat for me. When we discussed this in a Council seminar, I asked whether CUPE, outside contractors, other stakeholders were included and I have significant concerns that they were not. I think what this does is it makes it be a top down implementation strategy which has proven in many organizations to not work. When employees throughout the organization are organized in a way that they can offer suggestions about areas for savings, areas for improved service, areas for improved tools to do their jobs better, we see better results. And I think there would be much more buy-in if our employees actually had that consultation as part of this process. I see no reference in this report to re-engineering what we are doing, engaging all of our employees and I think that's critical to making this be successful. All staff at all levels of the organization need to be engaged. This top down approach is just not working. Us telling the administration they will implement recommendations just does not work. I had a call a couple of weeks ago from a constituent, Mr. Chuck Golfman. He is a partner at Harris Consulting and he said to me, "Why have you gotten another set of consultants to do a report that we just did in 2011?" And some of us around this table were interviewed in that process. Harris Consulting was hired the summer of 2011. I, in fact, had a list of suggestions when I was interviewed by their representative, who was Sherwood Armbruster and our staff person was Brian Gray. At a minimum \$60,000 was spent on that consultants' report. Where is that report? That's my question. This is the same information that we got. I understand it was delivered to the CAO at the time. I understand nothing was implemented and here we are again, spending more money on the same results. So we don't like the results so we hire another consultant. Surely some understand or recall that study that was done and those recommendations that were

prepared and perhaps somebody can answer that question about where that report ended up? I'm concerned because I've heard from a number of constituents about some of the changes being proposed that could impact safety in our city. Items like graffiti removal and stopping any money towards graffiti removal I am against. I believe that this problem is finally under control and the swiftness of the responsiveness of getting rid of graffiti is helping to prevent it. So here's what I'd like to see going forward with this because it's clear that most councillors are going to support it. I hope that the chair will take it back and will include CUPE in some discussion. Incorporate their thoughts on areas for savings and improvements and improvements to service, service that we actually provide to citizens. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments on item 3? Councillor Swandel, go ahead.

Councillor Swandel: Just a few quick comments. I think this has kind of gotten off the rails in a number of ways. I won't be supporting it or the motion to amend it, but this started as a conversation in our budget working group that it was about as we sat sort of wrestling with the administration and trying to figure out how to better shape some numbers, we realized it was very difficult to argue or to debate and find the right place to land. We didn't have more knowledge about how the internal operations work and all the money was managed within. It's more a budget exercise than what it's ended up becoming here. And the usual thing, ask any department what they want to do as far as saving money for the City. They'll always come back and say you know, stop or just...we'll close all the parks, we'll close all the swimming pools, we'll close the libraries and so we constantly have this sort of politicians always want beat up on our administration that we've got this belief that there's people holding these magic bags of money somewhere. So as part of the budget process, this was meant to help us understand how things work and how some of the processes work. There was things like comptrollers in the City of Winnipeg. Do they report to the CFO or to the Central Control or do they report to the directors in the departments? How do those relationships work? In Public Works, we had the issues of capital dollars coming down into Public Works and work being done by the City for capital projects. How is that money managed and how is that value assessed every year? Are we getting real value by bringing capital dollars into having City crews? Are they including all the expenses? These types of things and at the same time we wanted to have the Police Operational Review, too because you can't sit there throwing darts at line items in the Police Department. The Police always come back and say well, these are all major safety issues, you can't argue that unless you have some more detailed information. That's what these are intended to be and somehow it grew to be this beast in front of us. It was a pretty simple, it was not to be out there as some sort of public, political tool. It was a tool to assist the budget working group in understanding the departments better. It was...we just picked those two departments as they were places that where we knew that we had a knowledge deficit. We could've picked any two departments, and so what we got was I don't know, very, very different than...well, I was sitting there and part of it, what we set out to do because it was really about getting the right information to assist us so maybe we're not arguing so much with the administration. We better understand their position or they better understand where it is that we're trying go and we could do it where we're communicating with the same information. This got very much away from this and I have no idea why we got to here, but anyway, I won't support it and hopefully we'll get back to sort of finding the proper nuts and bolts that will help us shape the tools to make our budgeting processes better.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Yeah, I wasn't going to speak, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to address something that Councillor Havixbeck brought up. First of all, it's completely inaccurate information. Harris Consulting was contracted. It was when I was chairing Finance and also Alternate Service Delivery. What they were tasked to do and we'll provide any information you want, was to find efficiencies within the system. Councillor Havixbeck is wrong on two points. Number one, she voted on two of the initiatives that were brought forward to them. Number one was a cloud base solution as we know, brought forward to Council, which she voted on of course, was a cloud-based solution to find efficiencies in terms of our infrastructure, in terms of our IT infrastructure. Another basis system that Councillor Havixbeck also voted on was the manage competition piece which was of course, it's been adopted by the City Council. Those are two examples right now and I'm going to have my office send up other initiatives that we brought forward. So was there other initiatives that we looked at for efficiencies within in the system? Absolutely, there was, but it wasn't contained to a Public Works related item. There was a system-wide system, the two examples I gave you aren't related to Public Works, but related to a number of this initiatives to save money for the City of Winnipeg. So just to clarify the record that's inaccurate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Okay, we have Motion 6 from Councillor Wyatt on the floor, so he will close on your motion.

Councillor Wyatt: I call for the question.

Mr. Speaker: And the Mayor now closes.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
October 23, 2013

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. One, I will be supporting the motion. Number two, I think as Councillor Swandel basically said the whole purpose of this was to make sure that we're providing the best possible service for our citizens and to make sure they are getting bang for their tax dollars so I will be supporting both, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. All right, so the question on Motion 6, all those in favour? Opposed? Recorded? Okay. Councillor Swandel is recorded in opposition. All right, so vote on the amended motion or item 3, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. The report of Executive Policy Committee October 16th.

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

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no comments or concerns, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And what do we have next here? We have three motions if I'm not mistaken, motion 2, 4 and 7, that should be in your possession now. All of them are automatic referrals, but anyway, Councillor Vandal.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS**

Councillor Vandal: I'd like to move that item 2...we suspend the rules to deal with item 2 today.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Actually, I don't have a copy of that...two, yeah, thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I'm sure it'll be done, but I haven't had a chance to read it or have it e-mailed to me that I know of. If...therefore be it resolved could at least be read so that we know what we're voting, standing down would be great.

Mr. Speaker: Sure.

Councillor Vandal: I just want to spend one minute on why I think it's important that we deal with this today.

Councillor Eadie: Maybe Councillor Vandal will read it out.

Mr. Speaker: First of all, we'll vote on the suspension of rules so that we can bring it forward.

Councillor Vandal: Can I read it out for Councillor Eadie or should we...?

Mr. Speaker: After we suspend the rule.

Councillor Vandal: But he's not...

Councillor Eadie: ... don't suspend the rules, I need to know how voting on this.

Councillor Vandal: He doesn't know what the motion is.

Mr. Speaker: He can read it. Okay, go ahead and read it, Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Okay, I'll read the motion. "Whereas the Fire Paramedic audit revealed that one developer was provided information not available to other proponents in respect to separate requests for proposals, whereas this information places the City of Winnipeg at risk of legal action from other developers or companies. Therefore be it resolved that City Council send the entire Fire Paramedic audit to outside legal counsel which specializes in the law of competitive tendering processes and procurement practices of government, and quasi-government entities, for review to determine potential illegal activity by the civic administration as well as potential legal and financial liability by the City of Winnipeg, and be it further resolved that the findings of outside legal counsel be shared with the entire Council."

Mr. Speaker: Right. Vote to suspend the rules, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. All right, Councillor Vandal you can introduce your motion, oh, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: ...to step...I guess, just put, suspend the rules for motion no. 4 as well, please.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, No. 4. You're going to have to read it.

Councillor Eadie: The motion reads...I'll just get to the therefores. "Therefore be it resolved that the report 'Review of the Proposed Land Exchange Transaction and Related Processes with Reference to the Construction of a Fire Station at Taylor' presented to EPC is made publically available. Therefore be it resolved that the report 'To Seek Council Approval to Declare Three City Owned Properties Surplus to The Needs of the City Pursuant to the Fire Paramedic Facilities Replacement and Relocation Program' report presented to EPC also be made publically available and finally therefore resolved that all other reports presented to EPC related to the New Fire Paramedic Stations Construction Project be also made publically available".

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour for suspending the rules to deal with motion 4 also? Opposed? Carried. Do you want to do no. 7?

Councillor Browaty: I'll move the suspension of the rules to deal with no. 7 today as well. "Whereas Phil Sheegl is no longer employed by the City of Winnipeg, and whereas many appointments made by this Council are not automatically rescinded upon his departure, therefore be it resolved that Council rescinds the appointment of Phil Sheegl to BBB Stadium Inc., the Convention Centre Board of Directors, Civic Employee Benefits Program (both pension and disability), Winnipeg Police Pension Board and that they are held vacant until new appointments are made by this Council".

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of suspending the rules? Oh, point of order from the Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this morning I did have a conversation on this topic last night and I believe I do have Mr. Sheegl, "Please accept this letter as my formal resignation from the following boards, BBB Stadium, Winnipeg Convention Centre, Winnipeg Civic Employees Benefits Plan and the Winnipeg Police Board. This resignation is effective immediately." This was done by Mr. Sheegl, so I think it's already been taken care of Mr. Speaker, and we'll get something in writing as well. I just have it on an e-mail, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: What's your wish, Councillor Browaty?

Councillor Browaty: Well, I guess that the Mayor has the information I'll rescind the...

Mr. Speaker: You'll pull seven. Okay, so we're pulling motion 7.

Councillor Vandal: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Councillor Swandel: Which one?

Councillor Vandal: My motion is...I wrote my motion, I know what it means; I know I can explain it. I'm not sure what Councillor Orlikow's motion exactly is asking for and I don't want the two to be lumped together to kind of dilute the message or mix the message that because...so are we going to discuss this separately? Can we discuss it separately?

Mr. Speaker: We can discuss them separately if that's your preference or request. But we are, so we pulled item 7 or motion 7 and so now we'll go back to motion 2. Introduce your motion, please, Councillor Vandal.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Vandal,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

WHEREAS the Fire Paramedic Audit revealed that one developer was provided information not available to other proponents in respect of two separate Request for Proposals;

AND WHEREAS this information places the City of Winnipeg at risk of legal action from other developers or companies;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City Council send the entire Fire Paramedic audit to outside legal counsel that specializes in the law of competitive public tendering processes and procurement practices of government and quasi-

government entities, for review to determine potential illegal activity by the civic administration as well as potential legal and financial liability by the City of Winnipeg;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the findings of outside legal counsel be shared with the entire Council.

Councillor Vandal: Yes. I will try to be succinct. Forty-eight hours ago, members of Executive Committee were briefed on the Fire Paramedic Station's construction audit. It's not a long time to digest and to...basically all of this information and to formulate next steps. We were briefed 48 hours ago, the rest of Executive Committee were briefed probably five or six hours after that. So we had a thorough discussion at Council seminar. We had a discussion yesterday on the floor of Council. I'm happy to say we approved all of the recommendations of the audit, but I think we need to go a step further, Mr. Speaker. There was some very provocative and troubling observations, recommendations in that report that I have itemized in my motion and I think that now that we've let the forensic auditors do their job, I think they've done a good job. I think there's lots of information in there, I think we now need to send it to a law firm, an outside law firm that specializes in competitive public tendering processes and procurement practices of government, quasi-government agencies to determine for review to determine if there was anything illegal that was done by our civic administration as well as potential liability. Because it's one thing that's clear to me and I'm not a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, and if I can figure this out I know lots of people can, is that when you look at the information that's in this report, you realize that if I'm in competition trying to build some of these fire halls, I'm talking to my lawyer and I'm looking at my options of addressing of redress in one form or another. Mr. Speaker, I hope that I can get unanimous consent for this. I hope that all of this is for not, but I think it's incumbent on us as elected officials, leaders of the City, to go that extra step to begin to continue the rebuilding of public confidence in our, in City Hall and our processes and our procedures, and I think for me, it's common sense. I've wrestled with this for a few hours, Mr. Speaker, and as much as I think we had a good discussion yesterday and we approved the recommendations. I think we need to take it from the forensic auditors to the lawyers and see what they say and I'm recommending an outside legal firm with this specialization. I think it's as simple as that, Mr. Speaker. I thank Council for suspending the rules and I hope we approve this unanimously.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Speaker Nordman, I'm glad that we've decided to discuss and debate this particular motion. I strongly believe in its intent and what it proposes to do. I think that it will have a somewhat of a different look at it if we're having experts in the legal, these processes that the Councillor is speaking of. However, I will point out...I will be supporting the motion...but I will point out that a forensic auditor has looked at this and went through it and they have the ability as well to interpret certain things but I think one of the problems with this is having even external legal look at this, there's a number of blockages that didn't allow the forensic auditor to make any decisions as to legalities and so on, because certain individuals decided they would not discuss what happened at certain meetings and that in itself is somewhat of a problem, in that there is no ability even if we give it to external people to look at this, that they're going to be able to bring somebody under oath to say you know, what happened, what was done, what were you told to do. Because in those procedures and how they proceeded and we heard in the media from the former fire chief that he alluded to a certain verbal conversation. Again, not under oath or having that kind of legal tension, so I really appreciate that we're doing this, but and I think it's probably the only thing we as City Council can do and I'll say what I said yesterday again, and I know that the Mayor could write a letter to our provincial government who our mayor is the person who actually deals with and I think he's appointed a couple of people as well to deal with the Province, but it is the Province who can actually strike some kind of legal methodology to allow for people to swear under oath what happened, what was done, and actually to be protected as well because I think there's some real difficult things that have happened and it's a shame that it has, we do need to restore the public, but so while I will be supporting this motion, I still think that we need to communicate to the Provincial Government who does have the ability to actually bring people under oath to speak, and to be grilled on what exactly happened because we'll never know, I don't think, what really happened. So, I'll leave it at that. Supporting the motion, but we really need to go further in restoring the trust of the public here and this will help, but I think we really need to have something that can really restore that kind of trust. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to say a couple quick words and I'm going to leave the floor. I think we already have the authority to do this. I think by dragging this out here and trying to do this publicly, this is more for publicity and it could potentially cause harm to others and I don't want to be a part of causing that harm because I think it opens us all up to some form of liability, so I'm going to leave the floor until this is it dealt with.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, I'm going to stay on the floor, Mr. Speaker. And I just...I would like to thank Councillor Vandal for bringing this issue forward. I believe that...I agree that this audit was shown to us Monday and here it is Wednesday morning. It's been a whirlwind of processing what has happened here and I think when the audit came out, it was very, very clear, and I don't think what it says is sitting well obviously with some of the members around this chamber and we need to make sure that while the audit was very supported by everyone and agreed that it was a good audit, we just want to make sure that every step is taken that can be taken to ensure and restore the public trust. So I support the motion wholeheartedly. What got me to stand up as well as Councillor Eadie mentioning going to the Province and I just wanted to remind Council that back in 2009, this Council approved a motion to call on the Provincial Government to bring in legislation enabling an ethics commissioner such as they have in the modeled based on what happened in the Province of Ontario. And in Ontario, it enabled municipal governments to set up an ethics commissioner now, one with teeth though, not just set one up and have a name of somebody called an ethics commissioner but one that could actually have the kind of investigative powers and ability to address the kind of issues so Councillors would have somewhere to go so people would have somewhere to go if there were concerns about ethics and how things were being done on Council. The other...there was more to it than that as well, including a lobby registry, for example, was another piece of the legislation that was included in Ontario. So that was actually...we had an interesting debate back in 2009 and it was surprisingly, this Council passed that at that time. It was around the time of the Riverside Park issue and Council was concerned about ethical issues quite a bit. The Province has not acted on it. It was...it went over there and their argument was that we can already do certain things. I guess my argument back is that we don't really have teeth without stronger provincial legislation to provide people with a way to get these things investigated and concerns looked at, like the types of things we've seen. So, I just wanted to remind Council that we already have a motion supporting that. I know there's discussion about the Province, provincial...potential provincial role, I don't know if there's other roles they can play as well, but we are at a situation where we are trying to make sure that every step is taken to restore the public trust, and so I just wanted to remind Council about that, is something we've already approved as a Council to ask the Province to do that and I would hope that the Mayor would take that forward to the Province. We have a new Minister who has now been created to work specifically with the City of Winnipeg. This brand new thing that just happened, perhaps there will be that kind of focus on those issues now, there can be a new dialogue on some of these issues that haven't really proceeded in the past so I'm hoping that will happen. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I will be supporting Councillor Vandal's motion.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise to speak in favour of the motion and the intent of the motion. I want to thank Councillor Vandal for bringing this forward. Briefly put, as I referenced yesterday, we actually...this matter has actually been looked at by an external law firm before if you look at page 23 in their report, talks about Fillmore Riley having "prepared a review of the land swap transaction related to the construction of four fire stations". I don't think the intent of the motion is looking at the rather, sorry, land swap transaction that was proposed, it's looking more at the earlier stages at the request for proposals, but I just want to point out, obviously, this matter was sent out to external legal third party advice by either the CAO of the day or the EPC of the day. This was before Councillor Pagtakhan and I were appointed to EPC so Councillor Havixbeck, Councillor Swandel and the remainder of the current EPC would've been there, so I'm not sure how, now we're referring it out to external counsel might be actionable given that...certainly a number of aspects of this were looked at by external counsel previously, and some of those concerns that Council raised are in this report that we have, things like the non-binding nature of the letter of intent, things like the fact that we will be acquiring a piece of land on Taylor that's...will activate far more land transfer tax on it because we're not getting raw land, we're getting a land that has a fire station built on somebody else's land and then we're acquiring it so a number of good concerns raised. I'm not going to prejudice which law firm this should go to. Councillor Vandal's obviously left that open, we'll try and get the best firm we can that can deal with issues about tendering and procurement, but I think we've had aspects of this matter looked at by external counsel before. I think it's in order to repeat that again today and to try and get some more answers to issues that are raised in the audit report. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to rise and say I will be supporting Councillor Vandal's motion. I think as a Council you know, we've been going through this obviously for a year when the report came back, you know, clearly there was some questions of...and I think everyone in Council asked whether it be on the seminar or the floor of Council, was there any criminal aspect to this, the auditor clearly said no. I asked as my role of Chair of the Police Board in that meeting, but you know, I think that there is lingering questions that need to be answered. I think it's fair to go through a process like this. I will be very much supportive of this. You know, back in 2009, I actually supported the ethics, creating an ethics, office of ethics, what have you, that's a part of it. I'd be, you know, I'd be there to support that again. This time whether it be Councillor Gerbasi or myself, we're usually political allies on a lot of topics in terms of policy, so you know if you created some sort of office, in terms of ethics looking at things, lobbying, I know other jurisdictions have done, created a registry for lobbyists in that sorts. I don't think there's anything wrong when people

come to visit you on issues that are important to them, but I think in terms of openness and transparency, that's another item that we could take a look at and what Councillor Vandal is suggesting I think makes a lot of sense and wholeheartedly support it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, we had a motion which was adopted by Council to incorporate interviews from all elected officials and incorporate that into our audit. This motion sends the whole audit, I'm assuming as is, without that additional work, and that's the confusing part for me because I think that that's the real incomplete piece here is, what direction did anybody on the political side give to the administration? What involvement was there? What knowledge was there? And who knew what at what points in the process? That's the missing piece. There were at least three lengthy informal Executive Policy Committee meetings and there was one that I can recall that was an emergency meeting and we discussed this at length and we had more questions than answers, same as we do today. I heard certain things. I asked certain questions. Other members of EPC at the time asked those questions of our administration of the legal department. It was a very long process and so I guess what I'm not clear about which is something I'm hoping Councillor Vandal will address in his closing comments: what are we doing then, with what came out of yesterday's meeting? I want those findings to be incorporated and I want those answers. And if certain political people gave any direction or had this knowledge earlier on, I want that in there. So you know, as the chair, I had discussions with various members of the administration. The chair prior to me had conversations about this. This is not a new topic. This has been going on for many years, so how deep is this now going to go? And I would like the chair, or the...Councillor Vandal to address that in his comments if he could, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's with unfortunate...it's unfortunate that I have to second this motion, but I'm more than happy to do so under the circumstances we're in. Again I think the public deserves a little more, deserves further answers to some of the questions that were raised in this audit. There were a lot of questions left lingering and for getting some legal advice on what options are available to us, what liability to see may incur. I think it's a quite appropriate at this time. In regards to Councillor Havixbeck's comments, I mean, every member of Council signs an oath of office. If you have information that something improper has gone on, it's our responsibility to report that. I have questions. I saw things during those meetings in September of last year when we found out about this or after we found out about this in August of last year. And I did speak to the City Auditor and the auditors that came here from Ottawa that were leading this project, they said if we had any questions of Council, they would've asked for them. Again, this Council's decided to further be interviewed by them to...just completely ensure that nobody has any additional information that wasn't shared. But again, I think we can proceed now based on the information in this audit and I don't think we need to wait and drag this on further while Council is further interviewed on this matter by the original auditor.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments, questions, concerns? Councillor Vandal to close.

Councillor Vandal: Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I think the issue is fairly clear relative to Councillor Havixbeck's concerns. I don't see anything precluding the intent of her motion getting achieved by approving this. I mean we all voted for that. I anticipate somewhere in the next little while the consultant will be talking to I believe the motion said all of Council. Yeah, I anticipate that's going to happen. I don't know why approving what...the motion I have in front of us is going to deny that. This is just moving the whole audit over to a specialized outside legal firm to look at the ramifications and give us their best professional advice. It's all I wanted Mr. Speaker are people to give us their best professional advice, and I think as elected officials, that's all we're looking for from our administration and obviously it's gone off the rails in a dramatic way. The audit was scathing and I think we've got a good base from which to work, but we need to go that one step further as elected officials. So back to the question of Councillor Havixbeck, I don't see why your intent can't occur at the same time. And I think largely it will be a series of very short conversations with the auditor, but we'll see what happens. Mr. Speaker, what can I say? I think it's very clear what we have to do and I hope that we can unanimously approve this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, do we recognize that Councillor Swandel has left the room or not? No. Okay, all right, we'll call the question. All those in favour? Recorded vote. All right, all those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, yeas 15, nays 0.

Mr. Speaker: Motion carried, so we will refer that to the administration. Now, motion 4. Councillor Orlikow if you would like to open on your motion.

Motion No. 4

Moved by Councillor Orlikow,

Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan,

WHEREAS the Ernst and Young Audit regarding the New Fire Paramedic Stations Construction Project identifies reports provided to the Executive Policy Committee that were not provided to the rest of Council or the public;

AND WHEREAS transparency is required to allow Council and the public have a better understanding of the situation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the report "Review of the Proposed Land Exchange Transaction and Related Processes with Reference to the Construction of a Fire Station at Taylor" presented to Executive Policy Committee is made publically available;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the report "To Seek Council Approval to Declare Three City Owned Properties Surplus to The Needs of the City Pursuant to the Fire Paramedic Facilities Replacement and Relocation Program" presented to Executive Policy Committee is made publically available;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED all other reports presented to Executive Policy Committee related to the New Fire Paramedic Stations Construction Project be made publically available.

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, my pleasure. There's been a lot of talk recently and good talk recently about transparency, openness, things that we need to do at a City level, probably way more beyond than some people may be comfortable for but it's really required to re-engage the public. So, these reports when I was going through the audit report as a non-EPC member, I was shocked to see some of the reports even listed in here that we were never made aware of as Council as a whole. So therefore again, trying to find out what was said; what were the reports that were provided to EPC, I think it's quite incumbent upon us all to release those documents to the public in general. I've listed two out here already that are on pages I think 26 and 23 and 27 of our audit. That's where I got it from. There's some other reports in there that are listed, so I stand at that and I would be more than happy to hear any questions.

Mr. Speaker: Any comments or questions? Regarding...no? Oh, Councillor Vandal?

Councillor Vandal: I'm assuming that these are not reports that are on the DMIS that were presented at Standing Policy Committee? These are internal? But maybe the Councillor can clarify that as he closes.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding, did you have a comment?

Councillor Fielding: Sorry, I didn't hear what Councillor Vandal had said. I'm assuming maybe you can cover this in your closing comments. Initially, there was a report I think was made public that Mike, the CFO, Mike Ruta, was going to have a bit of a report beforehand that was going to come and that was going to...I guess explain everything just on a chronology basis, I think. That was the process that happened at...you know, when we came back after prorogue session in September, You know, I've got no problems releasing that, that was you know, the report if that's what you are referring to, Councillor Orlikow. Just so we're clear so we know what happened, we asked Mike Ruta to come back with a report in terms the areas for it. At that point, it was referred I think from all of Council to the auditor, the auditor got involved at that point as well and then we asked for external auditor to review it on what Mr. Whiteside had said so just

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
October 23, 2013

so we're clear in terms of chronology of what happened. I think it was Council that asked for an external audit but I've got no problem you know asking for the release of that document so.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be supporting the motion and certainly my understanding of it is I think an important paragraph at the bottom there that all other reports presented to EPC because we'll soon have reference to the Fillmore Riley report here on page 23 and it's unclear whether the review of the land swap transaction related to the construction of four fire stations is the same thing as review of the proposed land exchange transaction and related processes with reference to the construction of a fire station at Taylor so it would appear there are two or possibly more reports out there, some of which may have been prepared by third party so certainly my understanding of the intent of this is to get all the reports and make them all public.

Mr. Speaker: No other comments? Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to second the motion and just for clarification on my part here that it's my understanding that these reports that are talked about here in Councillor Orlikow's motion, the auditor already had access to them and so we're just asking that they be made available.

Mr. Speaker: I'll call the question, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Somebody can go find Councillor Swandel. Mayor Katz we have some by-laws.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll move that By-law No. 86/2013 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed?

Mayor Katz: Time out.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I realize this is a by-law. It's actually changing a map; changing what area and what's there. If somebody could just quickly give me what portion of the city this is changing, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker: Sure.

Councillor Eadie: It just refers to the lands in this picture.

Mr. Speaker: Yeah, Andrew is going to read it.

Clerk: The City of Winnipeg and Council assembled, enacts as follows. Number one, that the Complete Communities Direction Strategy By-law 68 of 2010 is amended by this By-law. Number two, that figure 05b entitled "Employment Lands" is amended by removing the land shown outlined on the map below from lands having the employment lands designation. In brackets, prior to this amending by-law, the subject land had the "General Manufacturing" sub designation within the "Employment Lands" designation. For greater certainty, as a result of this amending by-law, the subject land will no longer have either the "Employment Lands" designation or the "General Manufacturing" subdesignation, and...

Councillor Eadie: (Inaudible) that the figure, I guess is referring to a section of land around King Edward and Jefferson. Did we not just send back three reports related to this particular area? So why...I want to know why we're passing this by-law.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you for pointing this out, Councillor Eadie. We actually just referred this by-law back to EPC, so we are going to pull that particular one and retract the initial second reading and it'll get dealt with by EPC. Okay. So we'll just carry on. We have other by-laws, Mayor Katz, 117.

Mayor Katz: Thank you. Yes, we'll move the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 117/2013 and By-law No. 118/2013.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 117/2013, By-law No. 118/2013.

Mayor Katz: And I'll move that by-laws numbered 117/2013 and 118/2013 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law 117/2013 and By-law No. 118/2013.

Mayor Katz: And I'll move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 117/2013 and 118/2013 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Opposed. Carried. Question period for Mayor Katz. Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Orlikow, Councillor Wyatt.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned in my earlier comments regarding what happened in 2009 with Council's vote to create an Ethics Commissioner, one of the key points of contention has been that the Province has said we have the authority to just do it. I would argue that we might be able to create something in name and give someone a job, but they wouldn't have the authority to proceed with meaningful sanctions or investigative powers and such. That would be required in Provincial Legislation so we've been kind of having this back and forth, but Council has this position that was approved in 2009 and since the recent events that have happened and the concerns, I guess I'm just wondering, just to refresh people's memory, the Ontario legislation, which our motion asks that this be modeled on, has lobby registry, it has the creation of a position that would have investigative powers and teeth, so nothing's happened on that now but as we know, the Province has named a Minister Responsible for the City of Winnipeg, Minister Kevin Chief and what I want to ask the Mayor is, given this hopefully new chapter in City-Provincial relations, that maybe this dialogue can begin again and re-visit that issue. Will you, as the Mayor, champion this issue to the Province that we will create a meaningful Ethics Commission with teeth and powers that we need the Province to give us?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, as Councillor Gerbasi has pointed out, we've asked the Province on many occasions to move forward on that legislation and they have declined, saying that we have that authority. I would be more than happy, and I will probably go back directly to the Premier and I would certainly be happy to ask once again and see if maybe there will be a change of heart. Absolutely Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much for that answer. And to switch gears, which we've hardly talked about anything else, but, to talk about...to get back to the business of Council, the Mayor has stated in the media that there's some kind of a deadline in our negotiations with the Province on rapid transit in terms of the deal to complete Phase 2 of the rapid transit corridor, and I guess again, I'm asking what will happen if that deadline isn't met. I believe it was December I heard. Are we saying that it's possible that we're just going to not proceed with rapid transit in the City of Winnipeg?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Gerbasi, no that's not the case at all, and that's an internal deadline that we basically, Mr. Speaker, have imposed upon ourselves through the administration request to get the Province and the City on the same page so that we can move forward and get our application in on time. Unfortunately it's been represented in the media that there is, you know, let's say that we're not seeing eye to eye with the Provincial Government, and I've said on many occasions that's anything but the truth. We've had nothing but positive meetings in

recent times and we hope to move forward. The key thing was for us to be successful, we need the endorsement of the Provincial Government when you're applying for a P3. That's one of the key criteria and I can tell you at our last meeting, when we combined all three projects...there was the rapid transit, there was also Jubilee and there was the Calrossie land drainage, we put them all together as a package, presented them to the Province; they saw the big picture; our administration did a great job. As a matter of fact, it was Deepak Joshi who was at the meeting. They definitely got it. They said it made sense and now I think they're just trying to get, dot your i's, dot your t's, get everybody together to make sure they know exactly what it involves and then move forward with that application to the Federal Government so we don't miss the deadline and I want to re-iterate one more time in case the media is listening, that all the conversations on this project have been very positive.

Mr. Speaker: Last question?

Councillor Gerbasi: I thank you for that answer and that's very encouraging. I'm a little less encouraged by your Chair of Finance shaking...nodding his head as if it would be possibly cancelled and it would be a deadline...body language only. I hate to point out on the floor of Council but I get a sense that not everybody is in agreement that this is going so positively, so I'm glad to hear that. So you're saying that there is support to continue with this and that this is going well and that this is actually going to happen very soon, and we will be hearing an announcement soon, is that what you're saying Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you, unfortunately, to Councillor Gerbasi, I was looking at you. I wasn't looking at anybody's facial expressions, so my apologies for not seeing that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That's my body language.

Mayor Katz: Your body language was perfect Mr. Speaker! Just perfect. And just to re-assure Councillor Gerbasi, everything that I have said is accurate. These conversations are on-going. That's not to say that something may come up. I will tell her that, you know, one of the issues that has come up, which isn't anything new, I've said it many times before. As you recall on the first phase of rapid transit, it was the City who basically put up all the money including the Province's share. We went out and borrowed money and the Province is paying us back over a period of time. I have told them emphatically that we're not in a position to do that. We're up to here as far as borrowing is concerned and any borrowing we do we're looking to do for other major infrastructure projects, and I can also tell you that there are other solutions to that. So I can only tell Councillor Gerbasi that at this stage of the game, I believe we are on track and moving forward and if I hear anything contrary to that, I would be happy to let her know. I certainly can't speak for all the other members of Council. When that time comes, every member of Council will have their vote.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. I'm going to start off...my first question is...we'll just stick with the audit. My first question is, in the report, in the audit report, on Page 21, Legal Services is informed by the current Winnipeg...the Chief of Winnipeg Fire and Police Service, Taylor land is still being negotiated, Mulvey land more valuable than originally thought, but underneath that, which I thought was quite surprising in which my question is about, is other groups interested in Grosvenor land. Other City groups...sorry...interested in Grosvenor land. So my question to you Mr. Mayor is we know now that this Grosvenor land that was initially swapped without Council approval, was declared surplus by Council and this summer, in the middle of August, in a twenty day window, with incredibly bad information on our administration's part, we decided to sell the building against my wishes. You were cc'd on all these emails. The information that the administration was going out with was generally we have to destroy this building. It is not viable for any re-use, however, it was quickly discovered after many, many conversations when I was in Europe trying to deal with this, that that information was wrong. The building is re-useable. The issues that they were identifying were minor, definitely not the major catastrophe that they were talking about. So my question to you Mr. Mayor is why, when this land was declared surplus, why weren't these other City groups identified in that report?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as the Councillor knows, when Council declares a piece of property surplus, within the organization, the City of Winnipeg, they go to all the other Departments and ask them if they have a need for that building, and when they get those answers, that's when they move forward. Once it was declared surplus Mr. Speaker, they then put it out to sale to everybody and my understanding is, that has closed and now they're going through that. And I can tell you Mr. Speaker, the only way...the only way to ever determine the real value of a piece of property is what a willing buyer is prepared to pay a willing seller without all sorts of conditions, so the good news is, in the near future, we'll actually know what that property is worth.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Orlikow: I'm not going to ask my second question if why it wasn't actually in the report, so I'll move onto a new topic. I've noticed in the River Heights area that the signs are going up for school zones, I guess to reduce speed limits. They're all wrapped up right now. So I guess my question to you Mr. Mayor is can you tell the people if the enforcement of these reduced school zones will be done by photo radar or, as I strongly recommend, will there be an actual safety officer enforcing the reduced speed zones around schools?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as you may recall, this was something that I championed to get speeds reduced in school zone areas, protecting our greatest asset, our children. It has now come to fruition. It was later than we wanted to but we did finally get the okay from the Provincial Government, then our administration has to draft the by-laws. The signs are going up and I can tell you Mr. Speaker that I am not in a position to give a definitive answer to that question because only the Chief of Police can make that decision. He doesn't take direction from me, or you Mr. Speaker, or the Councillor. He makes the decision on how to use whatever resources they have.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Orlikow: My last question is, presently there are a number of tanker cars, I believe oil tanker cars, parked along the rail line that cuts through the middle of River Heights, and my question to you Mr. Mayor, is have you been lobbying the Federal Government to force rail lines to disclose to municipalities, such as FCM is trying to do at this present time, to tell us what's in those tankers? It's causing an enormous amount of concern in the neighbourhood. We've seen disaster after disaster and now we see rail line tanker cars parked in the middle of River Heights that I'm very sure are full of nasty diesel.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Orlikow for that question. As Councillor Orlikow is aware of, I've communicated with several Members of Parliament. The realities are, and I believe the majority of Council would wish that we could just move those rail lines out, they're basically not advantageous to our City, unfortunately with the railways that helped build the City as well, but the facts of life are we should have moved a long time ago when the City started growing and have those railways move now. As you always hear when there's any discussion put forward, it's going to cost billions and billions of dollars, and everybody loves the idea Mr. Speaker, but no one's ready to write a cheque, so that's extremely unfortunate. But in the meantime we should take every necessary precaution to ensure the safety of our citizens and I not only will ask the question, but I'll actually write a letter to some of our Members of Parliament to find out if we can get that information which I think would be valuable, especially if something is sitting there, whether it's sitting there for a day or whatever. It's too long to sit. But I think as Councillor Orlikow has found out, fighting the railway is not an easy matter, unfortunately, but that's something I think we should all do everything we can to change.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Mayor, the rapid transit issue is still before us, as Councillor Gerbasi asked the question. Originally it was 350 million approximately to complete the line to the University of Manitoba. It's now been combined with other projects which have raised the total value, I believe, somewhere in the range of \$600 million. I agree with you that the issue of borrowing, which I think is very unfortunate because, you know, we've seen it was announced in Ontario where the simple rapid transit line, an LRT line in the City of Ottawa and the Province there is putting up over \$600 million and they're forwarding the money without having to borrow...the City of Ottawa having to borrow any of the money on behalf of their Provincial Government. Why don't we simply just simplify the issue, de-link it from the Calrossie and Jubilee matter. Let's just get the rapid transit line built and let's get it built and tell the Province, you must borrow your own money. You have a sales tax coming in now of 1 percent. It's going to be generating 300 to 400 million dollars a year to you now in new revenues that you've never had before. Surely to goodness you can borrow your own money. We'll borrow ours and you borrow yours and let's build this rapid transit line and get it done so that we can start building the rest of the rapid transit lines in the City like to the east and to the north and to the west so that we can start to see...the City is growing Mr. Mayor, and the demands as you know...it's a successful City thanks to your leadership, and the demands that are there are going to get even worse if we don't address these concerns. So can we not...my suggestion would be at this point to simplify this and let's just get to the heart of it and make it happen. That's my...listen I listen to your lead-up on question so don't...you know I mean...your lead-up on questions and I'm very patient Councillor Havixbeck...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. Order. Order. Order.

Councillor Wyatt: So, I'm speaking about something that I think we all have a great concern about. This is a massive project, the future of the City, and I think we're all frustrated that we don't have the co-operation we need. I'm optimistic both the new Minister...you know. I think he did a great job with WASAC. Hopefully he can do a great job of rapid transit. So...

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Wyatt, I think it's incumbent upon Council, if there's an opportunity to get funding from other levels of government to do that. When he talks about de-linking I understand what he's saying, but the realities are, if you put the whole package together and we get the Federal Government P3 to pay 25 percent of it, that's a significant contribution and then the City and the Province would pick up the balance 50/50. That's a direction we've been trying to go in. In addition to that Mr. Speaker, you know, it's not unusual to try and negotiate a deal and hit a brick wall. It's then incumbent to look for other solutions and it's no secret, as the Councillor has said about the Province not wanting to borrow money, us not wanting to borrow money, so we are looking at other solutions to that problem whereas both can be...it can be, you know, if the City and the Province will be 50/50 at the table with whatever the contribution is from the Federal Government which is up to a maximum of 25 percent and the balance we would share 50/50, and we are exploring other ways that it can be done, and all I can tell Councillor Wyatt right now, it just makes sense from our point of view to try and do that. If you don't do that Mr. Speaker and then you want to talk about Jubilee and Calrossie, major infrastructure projects that need to be done, where's the money going to come from Mr. Speaker. Building Canada Funds? Well I can tell you Mr. Speaker, unless we're getting \$4 billion in Building Canada Funds that's gone like that. Okay. Everybody's talking about Building Canada Funds. Don't think we're going to get a whole lot of money in Building Canada Funds, so I would much rather, Mr. Speaker, with these projects, combine them, get the Federal P3 Funding for 25 percent and the City and Province share equally and they both supply their own money 50/50, and then use whatever's coming out of Building Canada funds for other worthwhile projects that the City needs. So that's a direction we're trying to go in Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, and I definitely can appreciate the argument to combine them. The Calrossie/Cockburn would definitely...if we don't get the money there, it's coming out of the water utility, waste water utility's capital budget, which is the rates. The other question I guess I have then is, I hope that in the effort to obtain this agreement, that we as a City are not putting ourselves in a position where we could lose in any way, shape or form, our ability to direct and influence...and this Council's ability to be able to have its governance of the Transit Department in place; the Transit Department being Winnipeg Transit as we know it today. That we don't go down the path that we've gone down for example with the Winnipeg Police Service and the Police Board scenario, that Council still has the ability. I think that would be a price too high to pay, even for rapid transit.

Mr. Speaker: Comment.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think that what Councillor Wyatt is referring to is a transportation authority which is something that was brought up many years ago and I will tell Councillor Wyatt that is something that has been discussed. People can, in the end, define whether that's good or bad. There are many Councillors who believe a transportation authority is very positive. It's been very successful in other cities. It also takes a lot of debt off your books because now the transportation authority sits on its own as an independent body. It can go out there and borrow etc. So I'm not going to, for one instance, imply that's not something that has been brought up or discussed, but I'm also not going to tell you that we're there in any way, shape or form. Long before anything comes up, this Council will have the opportunity to know what the tentative deal is on the table and as I've always said before, in the end, Council is supreme, will make that decision, but a transportation authority has been discussed. It was also brought up by me years ago at the State of the City speech as well Mr. Speaker. So it's there, it's one of those discussions yes. And I want to be totally frank with the Councillor and I think he's probably aware that I've shared that in the past.

Mr. Speaker: Last question? No? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Speaker Nordman, as we know we've had a number of issues related to human resources with the City. It's not just with the...well anyway...there's a whole bunch of issues and there...with this particular City it is kind of frustrating that most of the HR tasks are given strictly to EPC and I'm wondering if the Mayor would be interested...I know it's coming into our last inaugural at this point, but in establishing...I should also post this by saying that while the Finance Committee does present somewhat of a function for reporting, the reporting that does happen at Finance Committee can also be done in a different manner at the various standing committees where the projects come through and other things can be done through EPC. Would the Mayor consider, instead of having a Finance Committee, having a Standing Committee on Human Resources with the City so that some of the bigger issues

that we're dealing with like the employment code of employment and, actually I don't know who the Ethics Commissioner, if we ever did establish one, would report to, if it would be EPC, but we might be able to have a Human Resources Committee that actually had that person reporting to. Would you consider that?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would be open-minded to any positive suggestion that would make things better here. I will be frank with Councillor Eadie that when it comes to Human Resources, there really isn't much involvement from any elected officials that I'm aware of. I'm not sure exactly what he's referring to, but Human Resources is a department that, you know, deals with hiring, with firing. They deal with negotiations, with unions, etc., and I don't believe that any elected officials are part of that, so maybe he might be able to clarify, and I might be able to give him a better answer.

Councillor Eadie: As a School Board Trustee in the Seven Oaks School Division, actually a number of the Trustees were involved actually in negotiations with the unions and participated in those higher function things like policy. We don't get into the day-to-day. Ultimately it's the CAO who's accountable for the employees under him and we know that, but what the function of this committee could be is, again, to work along with whomever we hire to negotiate with our unions but actually allow participation of some people in the actual higher level considerations of employment in this City of Winnipeg. It works at the Seven Oaks School Division. Councillor Orlikow could correct me but I think they have a similar function at the Winnipeg School Division and they are basically another level of government almost equal to us.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, from what I've seen over the years, when it comes to negotiating with unions, I very much believe it's probably best left with the professionals. The process that takes place is obviously a professional representative of the City of Winnipeg, sometimes it's internal; there are times I've seen it being external professionals as well, go out there, sit down, have dialogue. They will come back to us Mr. Speaker basically ask for a mandate. Whether they're looking at 2 percent, 2 ½ percent, 3 percent, etc., we will give them that blessing on that and they will go and negotiate and try and keep it within that. If they can't do that then they come back and tell us "here's the scenario". Quite often sometimes, as you've seen, they can't fulfill it under their mandate and it goes to arbitration. It goes to arbitration and very seldom does the City do very well at arbitration. I will add this thing. If Councillor Eadie wants to get together with me and discuss this and throw around ideas, more on this, I would be more than happy to listen and maybe bounce it off some people after that.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Last question.

Councillor Eadie: I would agree with some of the process that, Speaker Nordman, the Mayor has mentioned. But I have to say that that process that he was talking about does happen at the School Divisions and what happens is it actually is beneficial to avoid huge fights and so on with your unions, to actually have City Councillors or the Trustees involved in negotiations and it's always the professional negotiator that actually deals with most of the meeting, but having everybody at the table is also important and I would also point out that at least one union of the school divisions is one in which arbitration does exist but having been directly involved in negotiations related to that, some points can be resolved if we have the different levels at the table to discuss the issues. So the question basically is, what date should we meet Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I have very little doubt that Councillor Eadie has good intentions here, and I also have very little doubt that serving on a School Board is not an easy task to say the least. By the same token, I wonder what would happen to every member of Council if we had been increasing our property taxes the way the school taxes have been going up year after year after year. So Mr. Speaker, I don't think we might want to use the School Board as an example that we want to follow but I'm still happy to hear about Councillor Eadie's suggestions.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In view of the fire hall audit and how bad of a scenario it is, can the Mayor tell us why he allowed the CAO to leave the organization?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I very much love hearing rhetorical questions because I think the Councillor already has an answer to that, but I'd be more than happy to share it publicly. Mr. Speaker, it really wasn't something that I initiated. For anybody who pays any attention, I think they heard about a letter and the realities are, a decision was made. There is no doubt in my mind that if the status quo had been maintained, and then waited till after the audit, that would have been a

much better scenario, but the facts of life are, what was done and I heard the Fire Chief yesterday say that specifically, you know, nothing happened except his contract was honoured. The realities are, there are legal contracts and every time a situation like this happens, the contract is honoured; it's in black and white. By the same token, if you ask me did I have a preference? Yes. I had a preference. I wish that letter had never ever been sent to me, but the facts of life, it was. And there's not much I can do about that, but in the end, action was taken and I think it was the end of that scenario and now we're moving forward, but I'm pretty sure the Councillor is very much aware of the letter. It's been in the media, everybody's talked about it, and I don't know exactly why she's asking that but I'm sure I'll find out very shortly, but Mr. Speaker, exactly what happened is pretty much black and white. I think most people here would have preferred a scenario, including yours truly, that the audit be completed and then any action taken. I think most people here would also have been in a situation when it came to the Fire Chief; that the audit be completed and then any action taken. In two situations, action was taken. Did I like either one of those? No. I've already stated to the media on several occasions, I was not happen whatsoever with the timing of the Fire Chief being let go. I think many members on the floor of Council have said the exact same thing, and on top of that I think many were upset about that, but the realities are Mr. Speaker, I guess some people have to comprehend that everything is not in your power or in my power. They are decisions that are made. I believe they are made for good reasons. I believe that one was a good reason and if I had a chance to resurrect everything and do it all over again, there's no question the best thing that should have happened was absolutely nothing; nothing Mr. Speaker, until Ernst and Young completed it, until all members of Council got to review it and then you could've determined what, if anything, because keep in mind Mr. Speaker, any employee who is under contract, you can ask them to leave at any time you want and I'm talking about at the level of Chiefs, Directors, etc. It's in their contract. You can do it anytime you want, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: That concludes question period for EPC and Mayor Katz. We'll now move on to the Standing Policy Committee for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Vandal.

**REPORT OF THE
 STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
 DATED OCTOBER 1, 2013**

Councillor Vandal: Yes, thank you. I'm pleased to move Items 1 to 3 as consent items.

Mr. Speaker: Stand down three? Anything else, no? Okay, then we'll vote on one and two. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 3 - Alternative Traffic Crossing Models

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you. This was a motion that was moved by Councillor Gerbasi at our last Council meeting referred to Infrastructure Renewal and this was sent off to the administration to do some analysis and bring a report back at a later date. So, I'll stand down and see what the comments are.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Speaker Nordman. I just wanted to rise and actually say I'm in support of having this studied. It is reflecting and I believe it is directly related to opening up Portage and Main, this report and I wanted to say as a person living in this city I do distinctly remember crossing at Portage and Main as a pedestrian and I distinctly know what it's like to try to deal with a closed off intersection at Portage and Main and I wanted to speak to this is, is you know, this will present a lot of concerns for people about how traffic will flow in the city. Apparently, many feel that it is a very efficient intersection for traffic to go through. But you know, I would also point out though that I guess the historical situation with this is that we blocked it off so that customers could...and we created these entrance ways down into...into some areas of what I'll call them, tunnels, mazes of tunnels I'll call them, and just for a little historic perspective because there are some concerns that this won't be accessible, all that accessible to persons with disabilities depending on how it precedes, but I will point out something that at one point, there was a blindness advocate organization here in the city, who was about to take 20 to 30 people who were blind and jump the wall at Portage and Main and demand that it be opened up, so we wouldn't be pushed down into those maze tunnels and get lost forever. So that...I just thought I would bring that to the attention and I know that we have a very good traffic department, a very good department that will consider all aspects and dynamics about opening this up and I know there is money, a cost, of money to this, but you know, I do remember that...distinctly remember the days when I could see

and cross Portage and Main and it wasn't closed off until shortly after I lost my eyesight and I was able to cross it. It is a very wide street and so hopefully and I know that they'll consider all kinds of designs as to how we can bring pedestrians and also utilize traffic in those spaces so I just wanted to say that you know, for the public's purpose as well, that don't be concerned, all aspects of what the needs are for pedestrians and traffic will be considered by the City and looking at ways of doing this, but I know there's a huge amount of support for having more people walking around at Portage and Main and I know many of us around this table are old enough maybe, my one on the left and right might not be quite old enough to remember all the people that used to walk around at Portage and Main and I don't think it will have any effect really on the number of customers that go to the businesses in Lombard Place, Winnipeg Square because there's a lot of different entrances into those places and the majority of people who shop and eat and do things at that are people who live right in the buildings that are above them, so I don't think that opening up the intersection there is going to have any effects so I'm in support the motion and am looking forward to seeing what they come up with.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much and I'd like to thank Ross for that very compelling image of people taking back Portage and Main. I just wanted to point out a bit of context to this motion that I think is important for people to understand because I know that the major concerns that people have had over the years are pedestrian safety and traffic flow. But I wanted to point out that it was 35 years ago that that corner was closed to pedestrians and Portage and Main still, even though right now, you don't see many people there, most people avoid that part of the downtown when they're walking, this intersection remains a key identifier for the City of Winnipeg. It's what people think of when they think of the City of Winnipeg. And there's been some momentum lately and some of the reason there's been momentum is that the window of time is closing on an opportunity to reopen Portage and Main. In 2017, there was an agreement that's been there since the beginning of 35 years ago, keeping that intersection closed with the seven property owners. Also to give you a little bit of history, back in 2007, there was a report called for; there was a design study; there was a plan in place to look at opening the corner; part of the time initially and all of that basically went nowhere. We did have permission of six of the seven owners at that time and now the seventh owner is a different owner. So, for years I've been urging that we have those discussions with the owners and that we revisit this, but it really hasn't gone anywhere but now, I just wanted to make people aware that there is growing support for this. If you look at our downtown and the impact of having this closed is you basically divide the downtown. You have the East Exchange, you have Portage Avenue, you have the rest of the downtown all chopped off, people can't just walk to the Forks. Imagine if that was just wide open and people streaming throughout our downtown. This closure has had a huge impact on...negatively impacting downtown revitalization. And I wanted to mention that there's growing support for this. I represent the Downtown Biz on this Council. They have...the board has approved a policy position on this. They've been talking to other downtown stakeholders and you've all received a letter from Gail Asper, I don't know if you've noticed it. You're received a letter from Gail Asper, all of the Asper family is very supportive of this. I just wanted to mention I received a note from Leonard Asper the other day saying, "The point is great cities have great central locations, bridges, piazzas, town squares, the Arc de Triomphe round-about, whatever, and what that said Winnipeg should strive for." Just a little thing like well, he talks about some other things but he's talking about Portage and Main. So I just wanted to say, there is a lot of support for this from the leaders, the downtown advocates in the city. People recognize that this needs to be done and unfortunately, there's been some things standing in the way. One of them is a concern about pedestrian safety which is very important, obviously. You don't see other major intersections like this anywhere in the world, in any city, really, but in great cities in particular, closed to pedestrians. And one of the things, I was going to mention was the motion that is in front of us is just to ask the city administration to study this. In 35 years, things have changed. We have new technology for moving pedestrians; we have new methods of dealing with intersections in cities if you look at other cities and major cities throughout the world. I was just in Times Square at an International Downtown Association Conference in New York, which is amazing. They've taken huge changes in 60 pedestrian plazas that were formally areas of traffic, wasted space, really in terms of people and those...the retail benefit in those areas in New York has up, gone up 50 to 100 percent where they turned those areas into welcoming pedestrian places. It has had a massive impact, I'm sure it's higher in Times Square, on the retail benefit to retailers in those areas. So from a business point of view, there's real benefit to increasing pedestrian traffic in our downtown, but there also are methods and newer best practices that can be looked and when I raised this motion, I know the Mayor referred back to the report. We've already studied this in 2007, let's dust it off. I'm all for dusting it off because it was a really good report and it was referred to CentreVenture and it just didn't really have legs at that point in time. But now we are close to 2017, is not going to be that far away and I'm really hoping and expecting that the Public Works will do a very thorough report with...giving us a lot of options and this investment is worth it. Like, this is something...this could be the biggest you know, we've got these high rises happening, we've got residential towers going downtown. We've got the Waterfront Drive Development. We've got all this excitement happening downtown, but this one single action of opening this corner, I don't know if people will realize how big of an impact that would have. Right now, downtown is divided, it's closed off. It's not welcoming and this would open up the Forks, the Exchange District, Portage Avenue, all these areas would be welcoming to people and it would be very, very beneficial for downtown development. I can tell you the business community downtown wholeheartedly supports it. Cyclists, pedestrians, people who care about those aspects of our life

being supported would be very excited by this and I don't think it would hurt the businesses underneath there either. They've been established for 35 years. I think it would bring more people there and to their businesses and I think we already had six out of seven of them in support. We can easily get permission. We can easily do this and let's do something positive for our city, so I just wanted to thank Council, EPC for supporting the idea of studying this further. We have a couple of years, but I think it's exciting to think of something positive like this for Winnipeg. When anyone thinks of Winnipeg, what do they talk about? Portage and Main. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: This one will remind everybody that there is no report in front of us on this. This is all in front of us is that the administration's been asked to report back in 120 days. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. Winnipeg has a lot of great urban spaces even in our downtown core. The Exchange is exciting. Watching the SHED district come to life and all the stuff that's been planned very...very, very cool. I'm a little bit cautious that we start closing down one of our most major traffic hubs. I would be amenable to the notion of having it open during certain hours and certain days but during prime times, during rush hours, I don't think it's necessarily the right thing to allow pedestrians to cross there because of the volumes of traffic that need to move through that particular hub and just for...and as a point, the Arc de Triomphe, the two recommended ways to get to the Arc de Triomphe are through underground tunnels. One from the...Champs Elysees and the other from the Avenue de la Gard so, tunnels aren't necessarily all bad either, Councillor Gerbasi.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: I actually think, I really, quite like this idea. You know, I think it has to be studied to make sure it doesn't impact traffic as much, but you see this in major cities and I've been in New York City a number of times or other major cities and I think it's a real innovative way, I mean we've got some time to plan it out, 2017 as we know, that's when agreements are up and have people walking and pedestrian sense, I think...I think it's a noble idea so I'm interested to see if we can explore a little further. There's some time to make sure it's done right and do consultation, all that sorts with store owners and people that move for a living in cars and in that sorts, but I think you could implement something like this. I think it makes some sense and would create a bit of a buzz in our city, so thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further comments or...questions or comments, I'll throw it back to Councillor Vandal for the close.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Councillor Swandel pointed out, this is here for referral, but I think having heard everybody, I will say this, I think the idea of people on the streets of downtown Winnipeg is something everyone can support and we adopted a downtown first policy 10, 12 years ago. There's been many great things and I like the idea of bringing people back to Portage and Main. Doesn't have to be 24/7. We could do it after the 6:00 hour. We could do it on weekends, but I think the key consideration here is we have to consult with the property owners on the four corners and of course the people who own them all, but I think the principal is bringing people to the street level, that's positive for our city. I've had the experience actually of going down to that mall on a Saturday afternoon, and I invite all of you to share, to go experience that and see what it's like, and you will tell yourselves that this is...actually reminds me of a scene out of "I am Legend" if anyone's ever seen that movie, but we need to...that's not the methods or the image I want to leave people who visit our city on a Saturday afternoon in the downtown, and I think we can do better and we've got to start with consulting. Report's going to be back in 60 days...

Councillor Swandel: 120 days.

Councillor Vandal: ...120 days. I look forward to further discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, motion to refer, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We do have one motion which is an automatic referral with regard to some parking restrictions. So, we'll refer motion 1 for Public Works. No by-laws. Question period for Public Works. Councillor Smith to Councillor Vandal.

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

Motion No. 1

**Moved by Councillor Orlikow,
Seconded by Councillor Vandal,**

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg Public Works Department can preplan spring and fall street cleaning schedules;

AND WHEREAS presently residents who park on the respective street in front of their homes, may have signs erected after they arrive home, resulting in the failure to acknowledge and comply with the "No Parking Restriction" Regulation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Works Department be directed to report back within 30 days to Standing Committee on the Fall and Spring street cleaning program that the "No Parking Restriction" notice be posted for a minimum of 24 hours before any street cleaning is to commence.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker. You know, I understand that the Transit Department, that the mechanics are working a tremendous amount of overtime. Can you tell us how much overtime?

Councillor Vandal: No I can't actually. But I can ask Dave Wardrop at our next committee, I believe it's on Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Smith: Can you find out why we're not hiring more people as garage mechanics rather than the overtime?

Councillor Vandal: I will inquire with the Director on that issue.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Last month I asked you about some money that was being allocated. If you recall, 1.3 million was awarded August 23rd for riverbank stabilization on Lyndale Drive, and then out of an additional surplus amount of money of 7.2 found over the summer months, 2 million of that 7.2 was going towards riverbank stabilization on Lyndale Drive. I can't find that that bid was awarded, but do you happen to have...or does the Chair happen to have an update on that?

Councillor Vandal: Actually I don't. I'm guilty of not doing the necessary follow-up from the last question, but I will do the follow-up with the administration on this. My apologies Councillor Havixbeck.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for Public Works and Infrastructure Renewal? Seeing none. Thank you. That concludes that Committee. Next is Standing Committee for Finance, Councillor Wyatt.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED OCTOBER 10, 2013**

Councillor Wyatt: I'll move the report.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow would like to stand down so we'll ask you to read the item.

Item 1 – Financial Status Report and Forecast to August 31, 2013

Councillor Wyatt: I look forward to hearing the comments from the Councillor.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
October 23, 2013

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I just want to go on the record that I will be supporting it with a little bit of reservations. Mostly for, I know it's a regular process; however I understand and not being privy to the details that the budget is quite difficult this year and I'm a little concerned on point number three where it allows us to draw off the fiscal stabilization fund without actually an amount beside it. But again, I have talked to the CFO. I've actually talked to the Chair. They assured me that the deficit is maybe there, but probably...maybe not. So they're not looking at a huge hit and I've also been informed that if there is a break in the eight percent level that Council has to come back and say how we're going to replenish it back up so. I do it with reservations because I don't know the budget, but again, I've had the chat so I will be able to support it.

Mr. Speaker: Any other further comments? Seeing none, all those in favour of Item 1? Opposed? Carried. There's no motions in Finance, no by-laws. Do we have any further questions? Question, Councillor Havixbeck.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Can the Chair tell us when he expects the budget to come to Council?

Councillor Wyatt: We're working on the budget. Our hope is that we can stick to the timeframe that we spoke about before which was to deal with both the Capital and Operating Budget before the holidays.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Havixbeck: Can the Chair tell us is he anticipating a tax increase and if so how much?

Councillor Wyatt: As the Councillor knows, the budget is the budget and we need to await the budget, so I hope that answers your question.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: We potentially just found \$2 million if indeed a contract was not awarded for Lyndale Drive riverbank stabilization. \$2 million is half a percentage point of infrastructure money from 2013 that would not have been spent. Can the Chair tell us would that be sufficient to off-set part of the 1 percent at least?

Councillor Wyatt: As the good Councillor is aware, I believe the Lyndale Drive project that she's referring to is actually part of the capital program and the capital program, though it has sometimes been the past practice of this Council to raid previous capital budgets, we're trying to discourage that so that we can keep capital dollars where capital dollars are needed because of the fact that we have a massive infrastructure deficit in the City; an infrastructure deficit Mr. Speaker that is growing, unfortunately, on many fronts, including riverbank stabilization and the riverbank challenge that we face as a City, we are a city of rivers. We don't have mountains, you know, we don't have massive valleys, we have rivers, and rivers are our asset. They are beautiful. We need to open our rivers up. We need to bring more citizens to the enjoyment of our rivers both in the summer and in the winter, but to do that Mr. Speaker, we need to ensure that the riverbanks are stable. The fact of the matter is the erosion that has been taking place over the last number of years is huge in terms of the floods that we've been witnessing. It would be great, it would be tremendous, if the Provincial Government, which is I understand right now reviewing the criteria for the operation of the Winnipeg Floodway, were to change that criteria to allow for the riverbanks to be stable; the water levels inside the City of Winnipeg to be at a stable regular level, because it's the water rising and falling constantly that is causing the erosion in the banks, causing literally tens of millions of dollars' worth of damage, and so this is something Mr. Speaker that could be prevented. We know it could be prevented because of the fact...I'm answering your question and she's gone to get a cup of coffee but I mean...(laughter in the background)I shall keep talking until she returns, so...the Mayor tried to grab her and pull her...I'll speak loud enough over the coffee machine back but that was alright. Anyway I'll speak loud enough over the coffee machine. So, you know, the water, you know, it's having a huge...I mean the numbers, if you ask the Public Service for the numbers in terms of both...there's two numbers Mr. Speaker. There's the on-going infrastructure problem with riverbanks that are publicly owned and there's the infrastructure challenge with riverbanks that are privately owned, and that is a...and I am making a very good point here Councillor and that is this. We need to spend those dollars on riverbank preservation because of the fact that we have this massive challenge, and hopefully in the future we can get a new criteria for the operation of the floodway so that we could have a say...could you imagine the potential for development and for expansion near our riverbanks if we knew that water levels were going to be at a stable level and in

terms of recreation, not to mention the walkways that constantly are under water when they don't need to be or have to be, if we were to change that criteria. So, I hope the Councillor understands that's a separate budget. I think she does, and I see her returning now so she has time to ask her follow-up question, so...

her back, but I'll speak loud enough over the coffee machine. So the water is having a huge...the numbers if you ask the public service for the numbers in terms of both...there are two numbers, Mr. Speaker. There's the ongoing infrastructure problem with riverbanks that are publicly owned and there's the infrastructure challenge with riverbanks that are privately owned and I'm making a very good point here Councillor and that is this: we need to spend those dollars on riverbank preservation because of the fact that we have this massive challenge and hopefully in the future we can get a new criteria for the operation of the Floodway...can you imagine the potential for development and for expansion near our riverbanks if we knew that water levels were going to be at a stable level and in terms of recreation, not to mention the walkways that constantly are under water when they don't need to be or have to be if we were to change that criteria. So I hope the Councillor understands that's a separate budget, I think she does. I see her returning now so she has time to ask her follow-up question. So...

Mr. Speaker: Last question. No more questions. This is just like home! Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: As Councillor Wyatt is aware, we have the ability to start moving some of our capital dollars earlier. I believe we have a policy that allows us up to one-third. I don't think any of us could help but notice that last year a great deal of our roads projects were delayed in getting moving, but at the same time I understand that our City work projects got going pretty quickly because the Public Works had access to some dollars that we put there to create ready-to-go projects. Given the fact that we know most of the regional streets work that we're going to be doing and some of the residential streets works, can the consulting engineering to get the tenders ready to go as early as we can, not already be started on those projects and I'll follow-up with another question after.

Councillor Wyatt: And as the Councillor recalls last, I think it was November, we did bring forward, or maybe it was December, a report prior to because of the fact that the Capital Budget was not brought forward until January to move some of those projects up to allow for that engineering work to be done in the event that, which we hope is not the case but if there is a worst case scenario, that the Capital and Operating Budgets aren't ready. I think that's something that would have to be dealt with for sure in terms of getting to Council some of the works so that it would allow our staff to get that stuff moving, and rightfully so. I think our staff were challenged. On the local street front we had a budget that went from approximately 30 million to 62 million, so it was a jump. They were struggling to deal with that but hopefully they're getting geared up and they can keep moving in that direction so...

Councillor Swandel: I think we did a good job of getting geared up with the City crews, but a lot of the contractors that we rely on to get this work done were screaming for work at the beginning of the year. My second question then would be how are we doing at aligning our dollars with when work can be done, because we see far too often, and this is something that we've worked very hard on in previous years, that we put money into the budget but it's not actually possible. It looks really good in the budget. We get to announce these big numbers, but we can't actually get the work done. So rather than allocating money for places where work can't get done because the capacity isn't there, are we looking at ways to do that longer term budgeting, sort of coming into a three or five year capital budget that's real?

Councillor Wyatt: Well as you know right now the budget that is being worked on is a one-year capital with a five-year projection, but I think the point is well taken by the Councillor. I think the challenge in the past has been if you look at our line items in the Capital Budget, quite often as the Councillor notes, we do indicate a project with the full amount of funds for that year and then the reality is, by the time the rubber hits the road and all the work is moving, it's not in that fiscal year. The challenge...and I think it's being recognized now by Public Works...not just Public Works but by the other departments where we have capital projects for buildings, facilities, libraries, that there is a benefit to putting a smaller percentage in the year preceding that to allow for work to start-up, prepare and do preliminary design and land assembly and those sorts of details to allow for that project when that year does come to actually flow and be constructed, and that is, I think, something that is a work in progress.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I have a couple of questions, but I'm glad Councillor Swandel asked those questions about alignment of money and what 2013 projects and should be finished next year. We wouldn't want to take the money away from those. That's not a way to save money. We made commitments to do those infrastructure repairs, but I just wanted to confirm though with...we know we have a 25-year plan to deal with local residential streets, and my question is just simply: will the budget come forth with still that, I believe, in that particular plan, it would be proposing at least a 1 percent to deal with our totally broken down residential streets?

Councillor Wyatt: Well as I said before, the budget is coming forward and the budget is the budget, and when the budget is seen then you will see the budget at that point in time. We as a Council, as the Councillor is aware, we approved a one-year plan when you look at the actual budget book. The approval that we gave as a Council, based on the local street renewal reserve, was for one year. We did have in the appendix in the back of the book an outline of what that would look like, but we were very clear that every year thereafter was subject to Council approval, so we were not tying the hands of either the budget coming up or other Councils in the future in terms of that program, however, the outline of the program was placed in the book so that everybody could see, transparently see what could be done if Council chose every year to earmark that one percent for the local street renewal reserve and to ramp up on top of the one percent from previous years and keep that funding in that reserve to keep that program growing so we could do more and more streets. So I can't answer your question Councillor because the budget is something that's coming forward and we did pass a one...as...I wish I could but I can't...and it's a one-year budget that we passed in terms of that commitment, so but there was the plan in terms of the appendix.

Mr. Speaker: Okay Councillor Eadie that's good? Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: This is for you Ross. On many occasions as the Chair of Finance, you've commented on how the City is not getting its fair share to deal with our massive infrastructure deficit. You've also made it very apparent that we can't sit back and do nothing. We need to do something. Last year we actually put that one percent into effect for local streets which obviously Council did support. Would you be supportive of that for this coming budget?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: This past summer we saw that there were surplus funds in about January for capital projects and I mentioned the number 7.2 million over, because bids had come in under projected amounts. What will the Chair be doing to ensure that there's a mechanism in place that if this happens again next summer, we don't have to, you know, go back and have a Finance Committee...that we can move forward with more tenders that the administration can get out, more bids for more projects.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: That's a very good question. I'd be happy to discuss some ideas with the Councillor if she has any, so in terms of that. I think you know, the information that came forward at the September meeting of the Finance Committee was news to me and actually I think all members of Council in terms of the fact that the end of July that it was formally reported at that time, the end of July there was a surplus. And I'm glad with the Mayor's leadership we were able to get that funding out right away in terms of earmarked to projects that need to be done, so I'm open to suggestions and ideas.

Mr. Speaker: Okay that concludes questions for Finance. We'll now move on to the Standing Policy Committee for Downtown Development Heritage and River Bank. Councillor Pagtakhan.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED SEPTEMBER 30, 2013**

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce the report and move consent agenda items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: No stand downs, all those in favour of one and two? Opposed? Carried. And we have no motions for Downtown Development, no by-laws. Do we have questions for Councillor Pagtakhan? Seeing none, we'll carry right along to Standing Committee of...oh, whoa, okay...

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm just saying it's almost 12:00 o'clock and I'm expecting we may have some lengthy debate on the next agenda item so I don't know if we want to start right before lunch, but how far do we want to go?

Mr. Speaker: What's the will of Council? We have seven minutes till...

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, it will be a long debate. I'm thinking, but okay, unless nobody wants to discuss, okay, go ahead. Just my suggestion.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we'll see where we're progressing. All right, we'll open up with Property and Development. Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED OCTOBER 8, 2013**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of October 8 and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 to 12.

Mr. Speaker: Seven and eight. No others? All right, then we'll call the question on one through six, nine and ten. All those in favour? I'm sorry.

Councillor Browaty: One, eleven and twelve.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, eleven and twelve, I'm sorry, one through six and nine, ten, eleven, twelve. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**Item 7 - Ridgewood South Precinct Plan (Precinct Q of Complete Communities Direction Strategy)
SP 4/2012**

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This Council adopted a major revision to our city's master plan called Our Winnipeg and it recognized the Ridgewood South precinct as a quadrant for future development. It's an area of the city that is reasonably well serviced by a lot of infrastructure but has a lot of challenges due to fractured ownership. I know there was extensive public consultations in community meetings that went on about this particular area and I think they landed on a scenario that's very balanced. It maintains more green space than most residential developments like this and it's a exciting new community in that part of Winnipeg where, again, we need houses. Our Winnipeg recognizes the notion that we are growing up. In our downtown, we see exciting new projects getting people moving into our downtown but the Conference Board of Canada also recognizes that the population is growing and some people are looking to move into typical suburban communities. This is I think an above average, a very nice suburban community that they're proposing here and there was a lot of community consultation done on that. So that's my introduction to it and I'm certainly more than welcome to hear any comments and comment afterwards.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you know, being part of the Assiniboine Community Committee with...along with Councillor Fielding, we had two long nights of hearing from people in delegation about this. And it's unfortunate and I feel very disappointed that I cannot support it. I really had hoped to champion it and it's not because I'm against the development. This has been a very complex, lengthy process. The problems I have with it are that it appears that some policies may have been considered to be fair and part of the precinct plan, which were really more part of the subdivision and one of the problems we had I felt was that the sub...three applications came forward concurrent to the plan and this forced our administration to determine sensitive lands, sensitive lands and how they could be developed, where road alignment should be and really, the precinct plan should be the outlay for that. We heard numerous people in delegation opposed right up until the 11th hour. In fact, 4:00 o'clock before the meeting at five, I heard from the same group and it wasn't until at the meeting that I learned that a large group who had been representative of many of the citizens of Charleswood had changed their decision. They had changed their views on the amount of natural lands that they deemed important and I just felt that that seemed given the amount that the administration had told us about the ongoing, I guess for two years prior, it just did not seem to sit well for me. I don't want to send it back. I expect it to pass here today. We have subdivision applications on the way. I do support more housing in Charleswood. Much of this precinct, if you look at it, connects into existing infrastructure. It is...part of it is lots of infill to be honest, and as subdivision applications come forward, we'll see how they'll fit with the existing community, using infrastructure that's right there and available. So those are my thoughts on it and regrettably, I cannot be a champion for it but I can try to make the process better as we move forward with the subdivisions. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I find it interesting that the area Councillor is not support of a...such a significant plan within their area. I think that's something that Council should take into mind before they proceed with something like this against the wishes she just stated of the area Councillor. I...I find that quite concerning. But for me, I wasn't involved in the local area planning issue. For me, I'm looking at this more on behalf of the citizens of...that I represent and the citizens of Winnipeg as a big picture decision about the future development of our city and today, we are being asked to move ahead with a massive new development on the edge of the city that would require extensive new regional road investment and other servicing, in this first phase of this particular plan that once this one goes through then the others will go through, we'll have another Waverley West on that scale. This particular plan represents as many as 9,000 new people, which will...who will be expecting new services that will affect both our operating and capital budget. And this is and as I said, this is only the first step. This development itself is about the size of Lindenwoods. The overall development that this will encourage, which is low density development primarily will be as big as Waverley West. So this is a huge decision. Normally, I would defer to an area Councillor for a plan coming forward. This is something that is going to affect the future of the City of Winnipeg and I think it's very, very serious and I hope people are paying attention. This new neighbourhood will be dependent on far away neighbourhoods for jobs and household needs resulting in large increases in traffic throughout other neighbourhoods. All things that go...actually go against the direction and Plan Winnipeg. You can...the development will add huge pressures to rush ahead to extend the Charleswood Parkway further into this unserviced land as well as extending other services, such as transit. This will cost us big time and push aside the city's financial ability to invest in existing infrastructure and public transit. These investments that make a lot more sense in terms of the sustainability of our city then building more regional roads and developing unserviced land. Our city plan advocates that we should be encouraging mixed use and increased density in most new development. Unfortunately, as we often see in these high level vision documents, all of that is open to interpretation and stretching to fit whatever model comes forward in a reactive mode to the development community. This sprawl model of development is going to cost Winnipeggers in terms of traffic congestion, enforcement, road widenings, demands for range of services. The question really is does this development pay for itself? I don't believe it does and if you look at this model, you'll see why the cost, the model of this Ponzi scheme some people call it of sprawl development, you will look at, you will see why the cost of operating our city continue to rise and we are hitting a wall of unsustainability, lacking the resources to fix existing infrastructure. This will push investment in more unsustainable, low density, car-oriented type of infrastructure rather than building upward and inward as where we have existing services and infrastructure and the financial model does not work. The new tax revenue we would gain in the short-term does not cover the long term cost when you look at the true cost and fully cost this out. You cannot fault the developers for going where the living and the money is easy, but Council has to recognize that preceding with this development is not in our interest at this time, is not our interest as the City, in the long term and in the big picture. This subdivision is simply premature. City Council talks about the difficulty in managing the City's finances every year, yet we continue to approve these subdivisions that increase its sprawl and associated costs. We forget to acknowledge that every tax dollar we receive from a new suburban household, we need to stretch much further to a comparative urban lowered, higher density household. We need to account for the cost of the greater distance of waste water infrastructure per household, kilometres of roadways, snow clearing and extending services. There's other things that are not accounted for in our costings such as extensive neighbourhood through traffic as well as lane widenings, bypasses, add-in maintenance and new regional roads, not to mention the pressure from 9,000 new people to start with to build the extension of regional roads. In a recent election, Mayor Naheed Nenshi ran on a campaign promising to address the urban sprawl dilemma that they faced in Calgary because this is not just Winnipeg, every city faces this. In a letter, Nenshi says that urban sprawl has cost Calgary up to...over 1.4 billion, over the last decade, subsidizing the costs of new homes and new neighbourhoods. Who pays for it, he asserts, certainly all Calgarians subsidize the development of new communities by approximately \$4,800 per home. In 2012, this subsidy cost Calgarians close to 33 million. Nenshi who was just elected by over 75 percent of the voters in Calgary on Monday has said that he will negotiate a new agreement with the development industry to eliminate this subsidy and to promote thoughtful growth in the city from what's in the middle. Is this making sense to anybody? It makes a lot of sense to me. What is Winnipeg City Council doing to address this financial disaster, this unsustainable free fall? Absolutely, nothing except for speeding bound the road to sprawl hell, like a runaway train. That is what the City is doing with the number of decisions we've been making. Shortly after the 2004 election there was a discussion on this Council of a \$5,000 per lot charge to suburban greenfield development. Some of you remembered that and a lobby group was seen marching up stairs and then march back down stairs and you never heard about it again. In Winnipeg, taxpayers have been handed an unfortunate and substantial invoice to subsidize urban sprawl. At the expense of downtown and the inner city real estate market are downtown inner city development need to be incentivized to even attempt to balance the playing field. It is my hope and my belief that Winnipeggers are becoming more and more aware of this serious issue. Unfortunately, by the time they do, I feel a bit like a canary in the coal mine here because we're approving all these plans for this massive development and I don't think the public realizes that the hole that we're digging ourselves into. We are...I made some of those same points. We need to revitalize and strengthen our inner city and downtown and its real estate markets instead of continuing disproportionate suburban sprawl that leads to an unsustainable and less vibrant city, one that is costing Winnipeg taxpayers and

burdening future generations. See the decision to make it so easy to do this other kind of development is making it a lot less likely that the development we actually need can happen. The Ridgewood South Project is premature. It should not be our priority to enable this sort of massive development with the...at this time with the concurrent needs for investment in massive new regional road building to make this happen because that's what's going to have to happen. I mentioned that already. Some Canadian cities have several times the average population per kilometer as Winnipeg including smaller cities like Victoria and Vancouver, but expansive low density subdivisions stretch our tax dollars and services, service support and taxes go up. I can give you an example, Sage Creek, when Sage Creek was approved...

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

Councillor Gerbasi: When Sage Creek was approved at the time, it wasn't Councillor Vandal, it was Councillor Magnifico and he said we're not going to need to provide transit service because they'll all drive cars and it was approved without paying for that. Since then we've had to add transit service into our operating budget. That's just one example and there's a lot more where that came from. So what I...what I'm asking is that Council defer this plan. You don't even have support from the Councillor in the area. I'm sure of her reasons...are probably quite different than mine, maybe I don't know all the details and her reasons, but you don't have the support of the area Councillor. We don't have money to build this road that would have to build, that could be up to a hundred million. We need that money to build rapid transit and to fix our existing roads and infrastructure that's falling apart. Why are we doing this? We need to stop and think and reset as somebody talked about yesterday, the urban sprawl runaway train here and just stop and think before we bankrupt and handcuff our city's future. That's how seriously this should be taken. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. And Councillor Eadie is next.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Steen. Where to start? It's hard not to cross-reference with the last speaker, but I wanted to just start off by acknowledging something that the Chairperson of Property, Planning and Development said. Talked about yes, that we are building density up in the older areas of the city and I would agree with him that...and that is the better development because regional streets already exist and when we're looking at building density and having homes for people to buy, I think that's important and I think there can be a demand for those if there isn't a continual growing out of the city and to create a demand for all these big projects that are coming in the future to the downtown area, but I need to talk about what I'd like to talk about here is, I started to study our...who's paying taxes in the city and by looking at the assessments and reassessments in the city, and while I can't fully give you assurance that the conclusion is accurate, I'm still waiting for the appropriate data to come from Corporate Services so that I can complete my study. But I'm looking at this and there is a definite trends that people need to understand here, and I really think that there should be a moratorium on any or more of these precinct and subdivision plans until we figure out how we're paying to fix our regional infrastructure that already exists in this city and we all know it's a big problem. There's a plan we came up for residential streets, but there's a huge issue with a lot of our residential streets...are, with our regional streets that exist and so the study that I was looking at, and this happens to reassessment. You know, I remember I wasn't on City Council, I remember the debates about Waverley West and how that's, you know, we have this new houses coming on line and that's what's going to pay for this infrastructure that we have to build, the regional infrastructure that has to be brought in, that no developer in this city believes that they need to pay. So what I found in this, in this study is that...study so far is that of the property tax pie, which we're having to use more and more of to pay for fixing and building regional streets because we are as the Mayor and as the Chairperson of Finance will point out consistently, we're not getting money from anywhere else so we're having to pay for it through the property tax pie, and the property tax pie says that condos and apartments are starting to pick up a bigger portion of that pie and what also is happening through reassessment, all our older neighbourhoods because that's where the affordable houses are now, people can't afford to really buy all these big or buy these newer houses which cost more, but what I'm finding is, like the inner city is picking up a bigger piece of the pie consistently. Old St. Boniface, Old St. Vital, are picking up bigger pieces of the pie. They're paying a bigger portion of that property tax bill, but they're not getting things because we are utilizing new regional infrastructures being built out of payments that we are making out of property tax and that is a...that we are paying in the inner city and so you have this share of the pie. You also know that the commercial assessment in the city is slowly, is less. It hasn't been growing it's stayed pretty flat, I'm not talking about the business tax, I'm talking about the commercial. It's looking so far that that is you know, it's staying flat so again, we're picking up where this property tax and so if we continue with these precinct plans because what happens, and I want to talk about this, you know, sitting on community committee and hearing about these precinct plans and negotiating, you've got three levels, you've got politicians there, you have our administration, you have our actual, you have the developers who come to the table. I'm not against development, don't get me wrong. I mean we do need to grow the places that people need to live, but we have to figure out how to pay for this and we can't keep paying this, our older neighbourhoods can't keep paying for this green, growth and oh, the one other thing that's looking like in the trend so while we're adding new houses in Waverley West, what's happening is their piece of the pie, while their assessment is growing, their piece of the pie is still shrinking because the increase in the value of our inner city homes are going up and that's what's happening so this...if we're going to look at making decisions that are good for the whole city, I heard a mayoralty candidate, a would be, talk about

governing the city to respect that we are one whole city and we need to govern that way. Well, what we need to is look at what's really happening in these financial trends and look what is best for the whole city over the long run. My colleague has mentioned Calgary. They have run into a number of problems and they don't even have quite the same regional infrastructure problems we have. They already have a post fee, I can't remember what it is, I think it's around \$10,000 so they are getting some extra money that way but it still sounds like they have a problem, but when you get into detail and talk, you know, because of the way we've been doing our suburban development over time and I heard people refer to the old people on City Council who gave guidance and made decisions. Well, I constantly hear the developer say, "Well, I don't want to pay for an on and off ramp that's going to benefit my neighbourhood to the Chief Peguis Trail." I'm hearing them say that and the administration's trying to find the money to pay for the regional infrastructure that's going to be needed around here. I see them attempting to try to find the money because we, the politicians and our budget person is always putting pressure, we need to be able to find money, we need to be able to do this so the reality is, when we...when we face-to-face with the developers and say, "Well, you didn't do that or that precinct over there, you didn't do that to this subdivision over there because some City Councillors made these deals go through." And so now all of a sudden, we're going to respect old decisions. So you know, ultimately this is where I'm saying, I'm making a stand and I want you to know that that precinct plan that was coming that we stood down and went back to EPC, I would've been voting against that because now is the time. There's been a lot of precinct plans we have passed. Now is the time to stop it for the moment and let's reassess where we're going here because the developers have to get with this and we do need to negotiate and they need to understand that we have a real problem here and they need to help us out and be part of that solution. And part of that solution is we know, yes, you bring new homes on line but they're not picking up enough of the pie to pay for that infrastructure. So Waverley West, they'll eventually pay for all that infrastructure we had to put in there, but it might be 30 or 40 or 50 years down the road, but we paid for it out of the existing property taxes and some, you know we get some grants from other levels of government and so on. Let's just stop this. I'm voting against this simply because we need to have a better plan. Let's stop this for the moment, let the downtown stuff go through, let's bring in some of those bigger developments, slow down the green growth and people will take the option to live in a condo because that's the other thing I discovered is in certain older neighbourhoods where density is being built up with condos and that, they are picking up more of the property tax pie and their regional roads and infrastructure already exist. So let's get...you know, I'm asking all of you and yes, the area Councillor isn't supporting it at this point, maybe not because of the arguments I'm making, but there's no way we're going to support 9,000 homes. That...

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

Councillor Eadie: That...that regional road, the William Clement Parkway, that...you know, you're going to need that extension for that and you know what, where is the money coming from? Where is the money coming from? We need the Chief Peguis Trail and I support that, but where is the money coming from for us to pay for all this thing? Let's figure out how we're going to do that. Thank you, I will be voting against it.

Councillor Fielding: Well, you know, I hate to break up all this unity here that we've had this morning on a number of different items.

Councillor Fielding: You know, so let me...let me just bring things to the forefront. I know Councillor Nordman was there at the meeting, we spent two very, very long nights. In fact, we were there until 2:30 in the morning on the precinct plan for the Charleswood. It originally came to us, I can't remember what month it was but it came back about two, three months later. Councillor Havixbeck, of course, was there as well and had some very good comments representing her people in Charleswood. I can tell you this is a very extensive program. This is something that hasn't just drawn up on the back of a napkin, it's something that has...there's been extensive consultation. I believe the, one of the proponents, there was a precinct plan, one of the developers spent close to \$800,000 in terms of the consultation that's there. They hired some good, thoughtful people in terms of the planning. They thought this out well. They had original plan that came forward. They listened to concerns in the community of the people that said. For sure, there wasn't a united agreement on this, but I think they looked at all the natural lands that were there. They made a number of changes. In fact, I think the Charleswood habitat group obviously supportive of that, came on board at the end in terms of the agreement that's there. We know that...I guess in terms you know, there was some talk and I'll just go through a couple of points because we were at the community meetings. There was some talks in terms of the cost benefits. Well, the cost benefit, it was clearly indicated to us at the Community Committee, was that the benefit showed greater revenue for the City of Winnipeg so this isn't going to cost the City money at all. In fact, the traffic flows, there is another issue in terms of traffic flows and in terms of cars, and by the way, you know, my good friend Councillor Gerbasi likes to talk about cars, how evil they are, cars are not evil. Cars are (inaudible) benefit. I know there is some good politics you know from left wing politics that argue that we should create some sort of war on cars. I just don't buy it. I don't buy it. There's a lot of people that take their kids to school, that take their kids to businesses that are going to use cars and we're trusting, we're not bad people if you take cars. I took all September to work, some people know, on a bus, just so they know I had some car issues, got it sorted out, thank goodness. I have experienced both taking a bus but also taking a

car. My personal life style does not allow for me to take...we've got a business, we've got three kids that are in school, daycare, I need to get to City Hall. I need to go to meetings, I cannot take rapid transit or transit anywhere that's there. I'm not a bad person because I take a car, trust me, trust me on that one. Well, is kind of sounds like that for some of the rhetoric that comes on. Second of all, I'm going to talk about choice. I don't think choice is a bad thing. Do...would I want more people to live in downtown? Absolutely, I want more people to live downtown. There's empty nesters that are going to live downtown, there's young professionals that are going to live downtown. For a person like myself, we've got young family, I enjoy living in the suburbs and that's not, you are not evil for living in suburbs. We shouldn't create a war on the suburbs for residential development that's there. People deserve choice. People that deserve the choice of where they want to live, whether they want to live downtown in a condominium, whether they want to live in the suburban communities, and I choose to live in a suburban community and I'm proud of it and there's a lot of people out there that like that as well. You're never going to get everyone to move downtown and I think choice is a very important part of this and quite honest with you. There isn't supposed to be...I...there's a difference of opinion for me in terms impost fees and I'm sure even if you look at other members of the Executive Policy Committee, they're going to disagree. I don't agree with impost fees. I think if you add \$10,000 to the costs of developing a home, really what that is, it's a very much of a disincentive for people to do residential development because it's not the developers that are going to pay for this cost. They're going to pass it on to the first time home buyers, really what that is is a tax on first time home buyers in my opinion, so I very much disagree with impost fees. I will not be supporting any impost fees that come before Council. I just don't think it's right. There's development cost charges. There's development parameters that are in place where developers have to pay for certain areas, certain different parameters that come up where they pay their fair share for it. Now, should we renegotiate that? Sure. I think that there's some movement. I think that you could have a committee to take a look at this in terms of some...some sort of way to change some of the financial aspects of this, but there's also new development. Councillor Swandel will probably mention in terms of new developments in Waverley West. This ...twin sewer systems, for example, that's...you could argue benefit that...that is on the backs of new home buyers that are there...that are in Waverley West where other people are subsidizing what people in whether River Heights or St. James, other people are using. So I think that this is a very good development. There is some thorough thought put through it. There's definitely a lot of debate that came to the floor, to the committee at that point. Councillor Havixbeck I think notionally supported it. There are some elements of it that she didn't and you know granted there was a lot of people from Charleswood that were out and she needs to listen to what her constituents are saying. But to somehow just throw away the key in terms of developing any green field development I think is short-sighted, I think that you'll see an exodus of people to places like Oakbank to other areas, East St. Paul to other areas. If you don't allow any development in the City of Winnipeg, so I think this war on residential development in terms of green field development is wrong and I think that we should support this because it's a good initiative and it makes sense for the City of Winnipeg. Another final point too, there's some discussion where the ward Councillor disagreed with it and so we shouldn't do it but then also Councillor Gerbasi also mentioned in the next breath, it's a bigger initiative like Waverley West, for instance. For my opinion, although, I wasn't representing those people, Councillor Nordman is here. I'm sure he's speaking on this as well. I see this is a big initiative. This is something like a stadium where I'm not going to just you know say, "Well, Councillor Swandel doesn't agree with it so I'm going to support what he's doing." This is a bigger initiative. This is 9,000 new homes and new development's going to happen, be like Waverley West. Everyone has an opinion on it, not just going to listen to what Councillor Swandel or whomever is in that area agree to things. I'm going to look at things that make sense for the development of City of Winnipeg, and I think it's a perfectly good development and I think we should all support it. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. Thoughts here together. We have entered a great debate which I do hope we carry on forward and you're going to see definitely a difference of opinion between Councillors that represent suburbia versus Councillors that represent mature neighbourhoods versus Councillors that are politically aligned. There's going to be some great debate on this. Unfortunately, I don't think we've had that debate. What I have noticed to...so far, it's yes, we're trying to some infill. That's good for us. We really...we all agree that we need to do infill. Infills are tough. There's no way around it. I have Centennial Parkway, which is an infill on an old railway line two plus years behind schedule, causing nothing but grief. We can't even get the back lane fixed after all the construction, cars wrecked their backlanes. Okay, that's...it's an infill, every day at least three times a week I have to go out to that site because that's how hard infills are. They didn't know that they had some train issues so that happens. So infills are not as easy. If I was a developer, where would I want to do it, green field. I wanted to develop in a green field. It's...I know what the outcomes are. I know the variables are minimized. I can just develop laid out the way I want. So I want green field. I want to go right out their...and I don't just dispute the development community for that. They're trying to make a return on their investments. Again, what I do have concerns about is and I raised it way back when we accepted Our Winnipeg. When we accepted Our Winnipeg and opened up all these new lands for development and removed some agricultural lands my concern was yeah, that makes sense, but my question always was how are we at City Hall is going to manage that? Are we just going to let all this suburbia green fields to go out crazily busy because that's what the developers will want, goes as fast as we can or are we going to have some kind of balance and control on this? I don't believe we have any

balance and control on this. I'm looking forward to working with the PP&D Committee to start looking at how are we managing our lands? What are the numbers? How much infill verses green field? How are we doing this? My personal belief is that we are at least ten to one if not a hundred to one, growing out versus growing up. So we can all talk about Our Winnipeg and it's a great document and it says this, but our job is to manage that document and I don't think this and many other projects are really showing that we are managing it. Do I have that data in front of me yet? No. So I can't, this is just my assumption. What that means is we stop the development like this but based upon my assumption? No. But why I don't believe this...part is a good idea is quite parochial. I'll be quite parochial on this, but it's a good example of what the problem faces all of us. All this traffic, car traffic, Mr. Fielding, Councillor Fielding will have to get downtown. Where are they going to go? They're going to go somehow crossing Kenaston which again we know the flow rates are terrible. Grant and Kenaston, one of the most dangerous intersections in the city, Kenaston and right by Ikea is a mess, okay, so but they're going to have to get across here somehow and they will, but anyone that they get across that street, what are they going to do? Waverley underpass. Oh, don't worry the Waverley West program, we're get that Waverley Underpass done because we're already facing all this traffic flowing in from Waverley West and they're hitting that underpass on the Waverley Taylor intersection and backed up forever. Same thing on the other side as you're trying to leave. Well, let's go down Kenaston; let's take the Kenaston Route 90 route. Guess what? Nothing. It's still the same road as always been just worse shape. Nothing is going forward on that as well. So, now I'm supposed to sit here and say these new tax revenues will help us develop this, but we were told that with Waverley West. That's what we were told. Nothing's happened for us. We've done, we've built our regional roads outside the city to bring more traffic into the city from capital region. Yeah, we've done that. The Waverley underpass, not done yet. Yes, I think...we're going to have a little consultation on that yes here. And I could be completed wrong and Councillor Wyatt says we'll see when the budget comes, hopefully the Waverley underpass will be there as a capital project as for a few years, hopefully we'll see it there. But again, the budget will be the budget when I see it. I haven't seen it yet, so I don't know if any Waverley underpass is on the books. I know Kenaston is on the books. We're not even close. We've got no agreements there. So what are you going to do? You're going to ram this traffic right through my neighbourhood. Ikea, I can tell you, has had a huge issue on south River Heights and a couple of neighbourhoods in my ward already. Because, they all take Taylor. They whip down underneath the Kenaston underpass, the one that we have and then they all just flow into Taylor. Guess what they do when they flow into Taylor and they hit that Taylor-Waverley intersection? They flow right down the residential street. I have residential streets and I assure some of us do, that are highways, especially in rush hour. I advise people and I have to tell my residents "don't let your kids out then, don't", because I can't do anything to stop this traffic until we get the Waverley underpass done and or the Kenaston done. So now I've been asked today, trust us, we'll get it done sometime, just approve the Ridgewood South, don't worry about it, we've got money coming somehow after we build this huge road, if anybody's driven it, it's an incredibly huge infill. We just repaved, re-asphalted I guess, Wilkes, but it's a huge pathway, some beautiful forests in there. I'm definitely hoping that they'll save some of it but again, this is actually only Part 1, 2 as we know. Once we build this section because Ikea was Part 1. Now, we've got the water pipes going there and the sewer pipes going there. We avoided that problem getting through Charleswood. Now, the piping is all going out there. So we have Wilkes on this side, there's huge Waverley West Part 2, I think they're calling it. Nothing compared to the lands on the other side, which should be able to be connected to the new infrastructure. So we start this. We're going to be dominoing through and all that's going to happen to the River Heights-Fort Garry Ward is we're going to get crushed because there is no focus on dealing with mature neighbourhoods. The mature neighbourhoods that have paid the taxes for hundreds of years that just want to have some reinvestment, making sure traffic goes around us. We talked about some sewer things. We still have combined sewers in the River Heights-Fort Garry. We dump raw sewage into our river. No money is available to fix that, we did a few this year, this year not yet, but again nothing. Streets are shambles, intersections. I don't know how many intersections have failed in the River Heights-Fort Garry Ward. Again, and so now, we're sitting here to say, "Oh, it's okay. They're close to the new-door neighbour. It's a pretty good infill. Again, for the River Heights-Fort Garry Ward, including Lindenwoods, which again, maybe used to be a suburbia, but I definitely, when I talk to people in Lindenwoods, they don't believe they are suburbia anymore because they're feeling the pain that we feel or we all feel that are more in the mature neighbourhood, let's call Greater Winnipeg area. Again, it's nice that I can just have to deal with my half hour traffic because I'm getting out of the city or hour whatever it is and go to my nice home somewhere, probably in Oak Point or Morris. That's wonderful for them but River Heights-Fort Garry is going to take the brunt of this. So I haven't seen anything that's going to help alleviate the concerns of the River Heights-Fort Garry residents. I believe that we aren't managing Our Winnipeg properly and we are allowing sprawl which I'm not saying is a bad thing or a good thing because again Councillor Fielding did point out which is a good thing. If we don't allow some development, which we have,,,Transcona we've allowed development. We've allowed development, green field development in a lot of places, but we can't just say no more development because then you're right; we've already built all the nice roads out to the regional, to the capital region area. So people just pay half the taxes and drive into the City of Winnipeg, which they're presently doing so I understand that balance. However...

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi moves extension.

Councillor Orlikow: I think holding back on this project at this point, if you want my support, Waverley underpass. That's about it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Premature development. I think Councillor Gerbasi has been drinking some of Mayor Nenshi's Kool-Aid. I rise today in support of the Ridgewood South precinct plan. It's a plan who's been on if not the physical books, the mental books of people in west Winnipeg and Charleswood for over 40 years. The first phase will be a...you call it green development. I call it a dirt area that is just off the overpass of the Perimeter Highway and Wilkes Avenue. It lays there quite often summer fallow. It doesn't, you know, produce any crop and the good folks at Qualico are prepared to develop that as the first phase of this project. The reality is, folks and Councillor Orlikow quite rightly spoke about this at the end of his presentation and I'll put my partnership with the Capital Region chairmanship hat on for a minute. If we are not prepared to build inside the Perimeter Highway, our partners in the Capital Region are quite prepared to start building on the outside of the City of Winnipeg and there's 15 of them and we're now in the process of maybe inviting another municipality to participate. So if we are happy to let the growing population and they say by whatever the year is 2030, that we're going to look at another 180,000 people in the City of Winnipeg, let them go to the Capital Region, but...and I'm sure my partners there that I sit with regularly will be you know grimacing as I say this, but I'm going to be wearing my Winnipeg hat as I make my comments and say, we need developments like the Ridgewood South precinct. Councillor Orlikow talked about mature neighbourhoods. Well, I can't think of a neighbourhood that's really much more mature than Charleswood. Charleswood has been there for a long time. Yes, there's certain aspects and elements of Charleswood living if you like ditches, you know, Charleswood is the place for you, but the reality is a good portion of Charleswood already has, you know, the appropriate infrastructure in place to accommodate particularly this first portion of the precinct. So I would, you know, in the most humble way, and not wanting to offend the local Councillor but both Councillor Fielding and I felt at the time of our marathon meetings and consultation and public hearings, that this was the right thing to do. I've got to say that for the most part, West Winnipeg and the suburban aspect of West Winnipeg inside the Perimeter Highway was largely developed in the 60s. We haven't seen a lot out there. There's been pockets, but largely while the south end of the city and certainly, Councillor Sharma's ward where Amber Trails is growing like crazy, have had that opportunity. This is...they put stress on infrastructure I don't disagree with that probability. Nine thousand homes will take a long time to build. It's not going to happen overnight. We know in Council Swandel's ward, the Waverley West has been a work in progress and yes, it's populating but it's still you know a long way from being totally built out and so will the Ridgewood South corridor so we will have the time and the luxury of planning to be able to address some of the issues that have been brought forward by folks who feel that urban sprawl is you know rampant within our city. I don't believe that for a minute. We have to provide for the new population that's going to be joining us. What many of the homes in...I'm saying this as sort of the community...the community committee of Assiniboia, which is my ward, Councillor Fielding's ward and Councillor Havixbeck ward, the community of Assiniboia. We are a trade up area. People have owned homes that are probably in the 100 to \$200,000 range that built some equity into their homes and are now they're trading up to the a three, \$400,000 home which is great, that's good news for our community, that's good news for the property tax people and the collection of that, that goes into supporting the infrastructure. So I don't want to limit the numbers of trade up opportunities, I want to create more trade up opportunities. I don't for a minute suspect that the developments that we're going to see in Ridgewood South will be...and I will just use from my own ward, which is just a little pocket of 120 lots, but it's not The Oaks. You know, we're not going to have large lots there. We're not going to have seven, \$800,000 homes. These are going to be trade up type properties that are going to be in that two to \$400,000 range, which is sort of middle income these days. So at this point, I would encourage you to move forward on this precinct project. I'm a strong supporter of it. I'm old enough to remember when they talked about this in...when Unicity was created and Charleswood became one of the 13 entities that formed what we call Unicity today. This was very much on the books of Charleswood and God bless, Councillor Clement, he was certainly aware of it and wanted it, managed properly. I think we're doing it effectively by proceeding with this precinct project. So I'll encourage you to support it, I know I will be and we'll go for lunch soon.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nordman. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I really had not planned to...really, I haven't planned to rise on this issue, but somehow in a debate on Ridgewood, proposed development of the Charleswood area, we had the remarkably inaccurate, ill-advised and ill-researched comment from Councillor Eadie that neighbourhoods like Old St. Vital and Old St. Boniface, are paying more property taxes because of new development and getting nothing for it. That's the assertion. They're getting nothing for it. Well, I don't remember the last time I got up and claimed people in Councillor Eadie's ward were paying more taxes and not getting anything for it. So if that comment was in order, I'm not going to let it sit on Hansard unanswered so I'm going to talk a bit about what's going on in Old St. Vital because I was out there on Saturday, opening up a resurfaced tennis court along with a number of people in the residence by a school that's over a hundred years old. Was that paid for by something other than property taxes? No. I allocated some of the money arrive from property taxes in my ward budget for property or park improvement to getting that tennis court

improved. Perhaps, we could look to it, issues like transit. Are the people living in areas like Old St. Vital, mentioned by my friend, not getting their fair share of transit? Well, actually, if you go and look at where the new platforms that are going to be put in or being put in for the new bendy buses that Council Vandal has talked about. The...can I talk? I mean, you've talked...said,

Councillor Eadie: (Inaudible)

Councillor Mayes: You indicated my people in my ward are getting nothing for their property taxes, that was ruled in order. I believe I...in order to respond that the articulated buses are going to be serving those old areas that we heard are getting nothing due to suburban areas going in. We didn't hear about Save Our Seine, I was at the annual general meeting of Save Our Seine last night, gave me a nice t-shirt because I've given them to hire an executive director out of my ward budget. They talked a lot about the clean-up efforts they do in the north part of the Seine River, which is Old St. Vital. Gaye Park has been...Gaye Park's been renovated by the City recently, memorial park which is the City park in Old St. Vital. I lobby to get the Province to put in a new field there, \$900,000 investment by the Province. City taking action on that. Windsor Golf Course in Old St. Vital, getting improvements for the property tax dollars because I'm putting in money to improve the facility there and I believe Councillor Vandal is also in discussions on that. Repaving at a number of areas, back lane improvements in other areas, take a drive down Des Meurons in Old St. Vital, right near the border of St. Boniface, you'll see improvements there going on in major road realignment. Final two things, multimillion dollar improvement to the old, to the library that serves Old St. Vital. It's over 50 years old, St. Vital Library is getting over \$2 million. How's that being paid for? Is it from people holding out there hands on the street corner, not it's from property tax revenues. Finally Glenwood Arena, Federal, Provincial, Municipal cooperation for the arena that has been the heart of Old St. Vital getting upgraded, getting improved from property tax revenue, so well, maybe the point is that they're still paying higher property tax values and somehow the suburban areas are not. Again, any research would tell you that the initiative that Councillor Browaty and Councillor Swandel and I are part of the...which oversees the joint venture at the south end of St. Vital that is putting millions and millions of dollars into the City coffers this year. Some of which will be mixed in, will be part of these improvements that are going on in Old St. Vital, so it's completely off the topic of Ridgewood, but I didn't raise it, one of my learned and friends here did. So I just don't want anything to sit on the record this assertion somehow older neighbourhoods particularly, one in my ward are not getting anything because Councillors are sitting by and approving suburban development and that's somehow this is increasing the property tax burden on older neighbourhoods who aren't getting anything for their improved taxes. That's...I really do take offence to the type of comment that assertion, it's ill-researched, it's ill-advised and frankly, I could go on and on, but I think I've made my point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, let me tell you this. I would tell Councillor Fielding to throw away the key. Don't support this. People who support this are in effect supporting higher taxes. You know, 9,000 homes, I mean, you get people wanting increased services. All you have to do is travel outside to the suburbs to see the development that the old City of Winnipeg is paying for and you know it doesn't make any sense whatsoever. I think you should be concerned about your taxes and we should not be building new roads, new infrastructure. Can we build this at the expense of the older neighbourhoods? My neighbourhood, Daniel McIntyre is helping to pay for much of what's happening in the suburbs and so is Ross Eadie's Mynarski, so is Orlikow, so is Jenny Gerbasi's. These wards are actually helping to pay for the infrastructure and improvements in the suburbs. Just get in your cars and travel out to the suburbs, see the development that's taking place and it means high taxes for all of this. I want to maintain what we have. I don't want to go ahead and improve new suburban sprawl. To me, it is just foolhardy. If people who vote for this, they're voting for higher taxes in the long run. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Smith. And Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How quickly our colleagues forget, Mr. Speaker. Not too long ago, I think I stood alone. Perhaps not, but we had amendments to our transportation master plan which included the acceleration of the Charleswood Parkway. You know, in this time, when this...in particularly this week when we put so much emphasis on adhering to policy, if you stood up and you voted for that, you were saying this is where our orderly development is going to go. You were very clearly saying that. This is where our orderly development is going to go. Great cities have a full range of housing. They don't just have uber-dense high rises in downtown and older neighbourhoods. They have a full range of housing. Many young families want to have new schools, new community centres, different amenities than some of us as we age and change, our needs change, but we're looking for our changes. So let's make it very clear. This is orderly development. This Council sent a very clear signal that it wanted development to go here that this is what we considered orderly. Let's not forget that, and we are not building this. We are a policy body. We are not building this as Councillor Smith suggested. Remember too that these neighbourhoods are paying for the sins of the past. You don't think so, let's talk about combined sewer overflows. My ward, I believe is 100 percent twin sewers, no combined sewers

at all, but yet all of those people pay rates that include costs of dealing with our combined sewer overflow issue. Newer communities are paying for the sins of older developments, older neighbourhoods, older styles, whatever you want to call it. Sins is just a term I'm using here Councillor, not suggesting that you did anything terribly wrong. You know, one of the other things that we have to worry about and it's interesting to hear Calgary brought up, because I listen to some of the stuff on Calgary and reminded me of a bit of what would've happened in Portland just in the past decade or so and I encourage you all to go look at the impact of what Portland did. The impact of cost and the doughnut effect that happened, the driving up of prices, the leapfrogging over developable land to get to land that was outside of this regulated zone. Look at the cost, look at the impact on the environment and you talk about Our Winnipeg, you know, remember environmental, social and economic were the three sustainability pillars that we're looking at. You know, it's very to just go at this sort of new urbanist thing, this is what we love this, what do we like, you know, again get all the chance go on, but when you look at it under all three lenses, it fails miserably. There is a place for it. There is a market for it and we do live in a market driven society. We need to respect that. We're going to have housing prices shooting up here pretty quickly or land value shooting up pretty quickly if we don't start addressing the diminishing land supply that we have. You know, our next really decent developable land is not in the City of Winnipeg. Our next really decently developable pieces of land are inside our Perimeter perhaps and maybe some of the just outside the Perimeter, but you look at RMs like Springfield, Rosser, we know the issues with Rosser with the Centerport pieces that are going on there and you know, the RM of Macdonald, you know, just adjacent to Waverley West and you know, everybody wanted to make reference to Waverley West. You want to talk about getting roads built, Waverley West has got major regional infrastructure going in. And that is being paid for by the developer and the public at large. The public at large portion is the part that the public at large uses. The developer portion is the part that the development uses and those costs are transferred in to the cost of lots when they are purchased in the development. You know, Waverley West had a positive cost benefit analysis, it was built you know, one scenario was \$80 million positive net present value, the other scenario approach to \$100 million depending on whether you were signing all of the regional costs to the development or whether you were just taking to development's portion of those whether you were at 80 or 200, but in both cases, a very positive net present value and that's what we use to continue to move our city forward and renew some of the infrastructure that we have in these older communities. I get, you know, most of all, I just want you all to stop and say...I want also...want people stop using the words, "sprawl" inappropriately. Orderly development is not sprawl. A lot of the sprawl you know people, it's really exurban sprawl that happened in the United States, when it was the creation of freeways. Winnipeg is for the most part, is a pretty orderly developed city and it's a fairly dense city when you look at cities like Ottawa that are spread out over you know 1,000 square miles, Winnipeg I think is spread over a couple hundred square miles, you know, you look at the things that are really dense, that you can argue the other side of equation. They usually have very strict geographical boundaries whether they be mountains or oceans or what have you. So, you know, let's stick to our policies, let's follow our policies. You know, I thought it was foolish to put the Bill Clement Parkway in there and I thought it was foolish to accelerate rapid transit to an impossible deadline. So when we start doing them, let's not criticize them. There's no...you know, when we built it, when we started building the infrastructure in Waverley West, the regional infrastructure, we didn't build four lanes all at once, we started with two lanes. As the development built out we added another two lanes. We didn't go out. We still haven't gone all the way out to the Perimeter. That should happen hopefully by the end of next year; it will be all the way out to the Perimeter and has a full overpass in at Bishop and Kenaston, but you do it as required. You don't do it just to you know, for the heck of it. And so you know, this...this we said, we're going to make this developable. We want to develop in this area, it's one of our areas that we've identified. I don't know what the hullabaloo is. Let's get it done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I'll wait till Councillor Havixbeck is...

Mr. Deputy Speaker: She spoke already.

Councillor Vandal: She's already spoken.

Councillor Wyatt: Oh, you spoke already? I wanted to hear the Councillor from the ward, I was...You know, I'm torn on this because the area Councillor for the area is not supporting the plan but and so, you know, you take that into consideration when you're about to vote on this. I...you know, there is no such thing as you know the perfect plan. I think there's definitely...I recall speaking at length about this with her predecessor, Councillor Clement, who in the last number of years was working to get this proposal moving and the issues with regards to services and servicing the area was definitely outstanding. There's no doubt that you know ideally and the ideal scenario and I think you know Councillor Gerbasi and others, if we could have the ideal scenario, the ideal scenario, no doubt, would be if you look at the land and if you look at what we're opening up in terms of the development in this area, you have a major rail line that runs just to the south and it dissects portions of land that will no doubt, there will be pressure once this comes forward to open up that land for development that's still within the City of Winnipeg. And then indeed, it's been referred to the lands on the outside of the city. Ideally, the ideal scenario for us as a city, is instead of building underpasses and having

to spend 70, 80, 100 million dollars on these underpasses, the ideal scenario would be to get the railways in the room and to move them the heck out of our city and to use the right-of-ways that the railways leave behind to use for active transportation for rapid transit, for BRT, one day LRT, there's no doubt our city is moving in...we are pushing, I think we are beyond 700,000 now. We are now in the range of a city that is you know, I know the debate in the past, LRT versus BRT, the reality is once you start getting into 700,000 plus, you're now in the LRT world as a city and so there's no doubt that if you look at what's done in Western Europe and you look at how they opened communities up. First, not just the roads, but first comes the train and then there's the community. If you look at new communities that have literally sprung up in places that are growing, in West Germany, in other parts of Europe, or what's Germany today, you will see the train line that will be servicing so you...from day one, this is actually modes or choices of transportation. People actually look for homes based on the fact that it's close to that option. And they'll pay for it, believe it or not. And I mean this is something that you know I know we've, there's no doubt, we subsidized the regional road network, the expressways as the definitions as referred to in this plan. You know we subsidize them. So we're subsidizing the regional streets so why aren't we subsidizing the rapid transit and opening these lands up? I mean, that would be the ideal scenario. However, I can't see us doing it alone. There's no doubt that those are moving into this area. Those who are moving into these new communities should be partly contributing towards that cost and that's where the so called debate of the impost fees or development cost charges. We have the lowest Mr. Speaker, the lowest in the western Canada of any major city of development cost charges. That's a known fact. There's no debate about that. You want to look at development, look at Saskatoon. Go to Saskatoon now and see the roads that they're opening up, the regional expressways. The city is growing. I predict that within 20 years of the rate of growth Saskatoon been having, they may rival this city in terms of population. They're not slowing down. They've embraced development cost charge and the development community would...sees a direct benefit by having those charges and the benefit of the growth and development that's taking place and that there is an inherent connection towards that funding and the improvements that are happening in terms of infrastructure. So the ideal scenario would be to have those issues addressed, but the reality is that's not what's before us today. We've had...I think the issues that were predominant from what I understand from reading the report are issues in terms of the nature or the natural setting of the area, the forest, the trees, the deer,

unknown: frogs.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, them too, and you know, there's a growing you know, I mean, all joking aside, there is a growing consciousness in terms of the environmental issues especially amongst young people. You know, amongst young people, I mean, we joke about it but I think that they're more conscious of the environmental issues and the issues in terms of the climate and everything else than we are and that's a good thing. So I think those are the challenges. I believe they tried you...the Councillor and the work that's gone on his...the Public Service who deserves a lot of credit, has tried to work to address some of those sensitive natural areas. Is it ideal? No. Is this a provincial park? Is this a natural preserve? Is this a national forest? No, it's not. This is what's inside the City of Winnipeg. This is land that would...we knew was going to be developed one day. This is land which probably should've been developed many, many years ago. It's really one of the...you know, we talk about suburban sprawl, but we forget Winnipeg is actually a city of 13 original municipalities. This is one of the original municipalities. If Unicity had not occurred, I can assure you this land would've been developed a long, long time ago, all right? And the fact that we have Unicity and that we can bring some sort of perspective to the challenge we have is that we should be bringing the transportation perspective that needs to be there and we are playing catch up. We're definitely playing catch up. We're definitely catch up as a city and there is no doubt, I hear what other Councillors are saying that the transportation issues here are going to spill off and I think the word was "crush River Heights". I would never, would ever want to crush a beautiful community like River Heights. You know, so but I mean, it's a fear, it's a concern, but the reality is if we did have real and serious alternatives such as the rapid transit option, I don't think we would have to be talking in terms of crushing any community or anything else, but the pressure, Councillor Gerbas, in terms of the growth is going to create the pressure to do what you're hoping will happen. It will happen. The challenge is if you shutting it down now, it won't happen. It will...what will happen is what's been predicted by Councillor Swandel, there will be a leap-frog effect, which will mean the provincial government which has signed carte blanche to the rural municipalities outside the City of Winnipeg to allow for development at place. They're licking their chops north of us, you just have to read the newspaper to see about how we're...they are getting our sewer services and they're more than eager to see the development occurring on Main Street and Lockport and elsewhere in this city. They're just...they can hardly wait, they would love for us to see us shut down this project, this development for us because they will move, and they are, RM of Macdonald, right there, building industrial parks and by the way, sub-standard, sub-standard, the service levels are not the service levels that we have been mandated by the same provincial government to supply, therefore they are able to offer a rate of taxation that is far below ours because they are able to provide sub-standard services and still open their lands for development, hypocrisy, absolutely. The Province has allowed this wide open and we are now dealing with the challenges facing us. So what do we do? We have to ensure that we're doing our jobs we have providing services and we can hopefully pave the vision, the Mayor has been working towards getting the rapid transit building the southwest and continuing it throughout the city. I think we have to go forward, we can't shut...

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

Councillor Wyatt: We cannot see this and now considering the fact that this has taken 20 some years at this point because it is...has been a 20 year debate with the predecessor on Council. This has been going on that long, and so I support the decision that came out the community committee, which I think had strong support from the community committee and go forward from there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Browaty to close.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Again, this isn't just about we have to do all or...I think Councillor Swandel called uber dense downtown living or you know big lot, you know, suburban homes. This is about offering people choice, people different times in their lives. I mean, honestly, urban living is quite popular amongst newlyweds and nearly deads, young people and old people. Where people, where's people...where there's a lot of people that have young families, they want a big...they want big parks, they want to have you know areas with the kids and run and explore and...you don't see that in condo marketing packages, do you? But, nonetheless, it's about offering choice for people. If we're growing, and if we don't offer the opportunities in the City of Winnipeg, they are going to go to the bedroom communities. They'll use our infrastructure; they're going to come down our roads; they'll still use our buses and park on our residential streets at the residents in our communities. This is an opportunity to build our tax base, to build our city. I was reminded by the area Councillor, she was 95 percent of the way there, don't take her opposition to mean that she's against this whole thing. There are handful of issues which she identified in her presentation she was against. So again, I believe, this is progress and development for our city. It's in an area, the city where there is definitely demand, and I think this is a positive move forward.

Councillor Eadie: Recorded vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Recorded vote. All those in favour rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Smith.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion carried.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: What's the will of Council? Keep going. Okay.

Item 8 – Leased Accommodations – Charleswood Library

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. All I'm asking for at this point is that Council referred this back to the strategy to redevelop libraries, moving forward at this point with a proposal to its expression of interest that came back to build a branch for the Charleswood Library, currently, it's located in a 4,000 square foot, I think it was (inaudible) those built onto over the years on a civic property. This new property is literally meters to the east. It's part of a small...well, part of a regional mall of a 34,000 or not regional but a strip mall of sorts, it's about 34,000 square feet. This would be now a 13 to 14,000 square foot branch. Again, through the special interest process, there are seven options that came forward and using the rating criteria that established...has been used for the library branches. This was the recommendation. Again, with the growth that's been expected in this...Ridgewood neighbourhood. Again that's passing

us. This is proper order to deal with these items. The expectation that perhaps regional centre with you know combined with the swimming pool and that could be contemplated in the future. This is only a 15 year lease with two five year options that's been proposed. So again, should there be an interest you know as Ridgewood develops out, there's certainly an opportunity to potentially to go with a regional centre you know with other amenities such as the successful one that we've seen over at Cindy Klassen there on Sargent. So I'll introduce this and hear what kind of questions or comments are coming forward.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck, you stood this down.

Councillor Havixbeck: That's right. Thank you. All I am asking for at this point is that Council refer this back to the administration for maybe 30 days. I would like an opportunity to work with the administration to work with some community groups. As you my know, this is a...as Councillor Browaty said, a trailer on most like library now on a very small parcel of land with limited parking. There's also very close proximity to it a municipal building, an old municipal building, the old City Hall in fact at Charleswood. And there are a number of user groups in there who would like to have some input into what kinds of space is available and allotted for them in the new library and this library is so far behind.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, sir.

Councillor Wyatt: ...on the floor, because there is a...you can't speak to the clause and then move a motion to refer. You have to do one or the other.

Councillor Havixbeck: Can I ask a question then for clarification, if I move my motion to have it referred back to the administration for 30 days, we can still debate the item number after that or no?

Councillor Gerbasi: No, then it just goes back.

Councillor Havixbeck: But if it loses the vote...

Councillor Gerbasi: If it loses the vote then you debate it.

Mr. Speaker: Yeah, you're going to lose the opportunity on this possibly.

Councillor Havixbeck: To...yeah, and you know what I think it's important that everybody has information about...because I was not allowed to speak...

Mr. Speaker: You can't talk to this if you're going to refer it so...

Councillor Havixbeck: Okay, I'll move to refer it back to the administration for 30 days to work with me as the area Councillor and members of the community, so that's my motion.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour?

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Okay, we're doing it without instructions then.

Councillor Havixbeck: Fine.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, so we're voting to refer this back for 30 days with no instructions to the standing...okay.

Councillor Havixbeck: Well...

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Havixbeck: No instructions.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillor Browaty, close.

Councillor Browaty: Well, again, the property that's...

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: He gets to rebut for three minutes? Against referral. Okay, and you get three minutes to rebut whether you want it referred or not.

Councillor Browaty: Okay, I don't have clear evident...I don't have clear confirmation that in terms of what the time frame is in terms of this going forward. That said, I mean if the Councillor would like to consult with a couple of community groups that are in that area, I...I'm okay with the 30 day lay over at this point.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of referring it? Opposed? (inaudible) Okay. That concludes items for Property and Development. We have...referrals carried, yes. Okay, we have some motions. Councillor Browaty, you have Motion 3, 5 and 8.

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

Motion No. 3

**Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan,**

WHEREAS:

(a) *Pursuant to its By-law No. 56/2013, The City of Winnipeg ("the City") authorized the expropriation of the following lands:*

the lands taken for Works and shown as Parcels A, B, C, D, E, F, and G on Plan Deposit 636/2013, prepared by Kenneth Max Yerex, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

("the Land")

for the purpose of the construction of the Plessis Road Twinning and Grade Separation at CN Rail, and executed a Declaration of Expropriation dated May 29, 2013 ("the Declaration");

(b) *The City served notice of the intended expropriation upon all owners of the lands intended to be expropriated, and published notice of the intended expropriation in a newspaper having general circulation in the locality in which the said lands are situate, in accordance with The Expropriation Act;*

(c) *The statutory period for owners to object to the intended expropriation has expired, and the City was served with two notices of objection, one of which has been withdrawn;*

(d) *The City has entered into a temporary construction easement agreement with the other objector, the owner of Parcel G of the Land, therefore the City no longer needs to expropriate that parcel;*

(e) *The City has entered into a temporary construction easement agreement with the owner of Parcel F of the Land, and has entered into a purchase agreement with each of the owners of Parcels C and D of the Land, therefore the City no longer needs to expropriate those parcels;*

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

(1) *The Declaration is amended to:*

a) *Delete Parcels C, D, F and G from the Land; and*

b) *Replace the original Plan Deposit 636/2013 with an updated version (which, after deleting the above four parcels, redesignates Parcel E as Parcel C in order to meet the plan registration requirement of consecutive parcel lettering);*

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
October 23, 2013

(2) *The Declaration as amended herein and accordingly replaced by an Amended Declaration of Expropriation dated October 23, 2013 is hereby CONFIRMED.*

The Land excepts:

a) *mines, minerals and named substances which are excepted from or not included in the Certificate of Title of the registered owner of the surface under The Real Property Act or are not owned by the owner of the surface under The Registry Act; and*

b) *reservations in favour of the Crown as excepted from the Title of the owner of the surface, or to which Title is subject by implication under the provisions of The Real Property Act.*

Councillor Browaty: Okay, on Motion 3. This is a housekeeping matter with regards to the declaration of Expropriation dated May 29, 2013, issued in accordance with Expropriation By-law 56/2013, which authorizes the Expropriation of Lands for construction of the Plessis Road twinning and the grade separation of...at...sorry, at CN and Rail. Since the passing of By-law 56/2013, the City has entered into temporary construction easements with the owner of Parcel G and F. The City is also entered into purchase agreements with the owner of Parcels C and D. As such, the City no longer needs to expropriate these parcels. Under the Expropriation Act, the City may confirm that declaration with such modification as it considers proper. The motion amends the said declaration by deleting those parcels, which expropriation is no longer necessary. It also amends the original plan, deposit, 636/2013 with an updated version, deleting the four parcels and re-designating Parcel E as Parcel C.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Andrew. Do you have...is there debate on this?

Mayor Katz: Doesn't require suspension.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Okay, we have Motion 5, and we have 5 and 8, they're both automatic referrals.

Motion No. 5

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

WHEREAS Community Committees on occasion consider development applications that require an environmental license to be issued by the Province of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS development applications have been forwarded to Community Committees for a public hearing, before an environmental license has been approved by the Province of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS it would be prudent for an environmental license, including the potential for a Clean Environment Commission (CEC) Public Hearing, to be considered prior to Community Committee consideration of a development application;

AND WHEREAS the Development Procedures By-law 160/2011 stipulates that a Community committee must "make a decision regarding the development application(s) ... by the third regularly scheduled meeting", which may not permit enough time for an environmental licence and / or a CEC Public Hearing, to be first obtained by the applicant;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Development Procedures By-law 160/2011 be amended by adding the following subsection under "DECISION TIME LIMITS"

The public hearing may be rescheduled beyond the third regularly scheduled meeting due to:

- "ii. c. the requirement of a Provincial environmental license for a development application being considered by Community Committee."*

Motion No. 8

Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

1. *That the Director of Legal Services be instructed to initiate expropriation proceedings, including the necessary by-law for the submission to Council, to acquire the lands identified in the attached Miscellaneous Plan No. 14096 as "Proposed Fire Station", required by the City for the maintenance of a Fire / Paramedic Station.*
2. *That the Winnipeg Public Service continue negotiations for the purchase of the subject lands.*
3. *That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing, including execution of any necessary documents and preparation of any necessary by-laws.*

With the concurrence of the Seconder, Councillor Orlikow, and the permission of Council, Councillor Wyatt withdrew the motion.

Councillor Wyatt: I've spoken with the Public Service and with the seconder, and request a withdrawal of this motion in light of the fact that discussion is under way with our Public Service and the other party and hopefully it can be resolved.

Mr. Speaker: All right, so we're pulling 8. Thank you. Five has been automatic referral. All right. consideration of By-laws for Property and Development. Councillor Browaty.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that By-law numbered 112/2013 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 112/2013.

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

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-law No. 62/2013 as amended be read a second time.

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

Councillor Eadie: Nay. Recorded.

Clerk: By-law No. 62/2013.

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-law No. 62/2013 as amended be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

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

Councillor Browaty: I move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 114/2013, By-law No. 115/2013, By-law No. 116/2013.

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

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
October 23, 2013

Clerk: By-law No. 114/2013, By-law No. 115/2013 and By-law 116/2013.

Councillor Browaty: I move that by-laws numbered 114/2013 to 116/2013 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 114/2013 to 116/2013 both inclusive.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rules be suspended and by-laws numbered 114/2013 to 116/2013 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question period for Property and Development. Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: Councillor Browaty, at the last meeting, came out in favour of better cell phone tower coverage which better cell phone coverage probably does unite us. My question to him repeats the question from last time which was, does a new protocol...Councillor Gerbasi has worked on I believe or been aware of it. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities has developed a protocol, more consultation on cell phone tower placement. Councillor Browaty was going to talk with the administration about what progress, if any, where that stood within the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, and I thank my colleague for the question. We do have members of our public service that have been working with the steering group that was initiated by FCM in terms of this protocol, and at this point they're looking for political direction from us as to how to proceed with this. I believe we will have something move...I'm prepared to move something forward at the next meeting and consultation with our FCM rep and Councillor Mayes and that should be at our next meeting of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development which I believe is on November 5th. Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Councillor Mayes: Just to be...so we'll have that added to the agenda on November 5th, is my understanding? Okay thank you to Councillor Browaty.

Mr. Speaker: Alright. No further questions for Property and Development. Carrying on to Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. Councillor Fielding.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED OCTOBER 3, 2013

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of October 3rd and move adoption of consent agenda 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith, two, okay. Nothing else? All in favour of one? Opposed? Carried. Item 1...item 2.

Item 2 - Amendments to the Neighbourhood Liveability By-law No. 1/2008 –
Set Fines for Heating Standards

Councillor Fielding: Sure, you know, I'll stand down and Councillor Smith, he was the one who brought this issue up. I know it's an issue for people in his ward as well as Councillor Eadie had raised this at committee. Report's before us, I think it's pretty straight forward. I hope it has the unanimous support. I think it makes a lot of sense, but I'll yield to Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: First of all, Councillor Fielding, this is a concern of renters everywhere throughout the city of Winnipeg. You know, this procedure, issuing a ticket just like someone gets a speeding ticket, will mean that the individual landlord will deal with it and they won't have to go to court for it: a long, drawn-out procedure. So this would say the City money, you'll make the people who are renting, suffering from the cold will suffer less day or two. So it seems to me this is something that we should all be supporting. There's no doubt in my mind, when we had the presentation this morning, he talked about the bulk 99 percent of the landlords were good and that's true. But the fact is the landlords will now know what the penalty is and will be in tune with maybe providing heat and it will save thousands of Winnipeggers from being cold; from landlords thinking of the bottom line at all times. This, we should be supporting wholeheartedly. It'll save...it will save our workforce, legal department et cetera, et cetera. This is beneficial to all of us and let me tell you this: the reaction I've gotten from putting this forward has been tremendous. Even the Mayor issued a press release before it even reached our standing committee, showing support for it. This is something that we should all be supporting because it means no one should have to be cold. We have...we have a Liveability By-law that sets the standard and let's maintain that standard. This by-law will do it. This amendment will do it.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Seeing none. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: You know, I don't have too much further comments. I want to thank Councillor Smith for his leadership on this file. I think we're going to have unanimous support for it. Obviously, this is an issue that people face right throughout the city. I thank you for bringing it forward and I know Councillor Smith has that thick beard so he is able to stay a lot warmer than the rest of us, but we're hopeful that this new policy and the fines that are...can help out residents that are...and yourself, Councillor, so thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. We have one by-law. We have no motions for Protection Community Services and we have one by-law. Councillor Fielding.

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

Councillor Fielding: Sure, I'd like to move that the By-law No. 111/2013 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 111/2013. I'd like to move that the same By-law No. 111/2013 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law 111/2013. I'll move that we suspend the rules and By-law No. 111/2013 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Now we have question period for Protection and Community Services. Questions for Councillor Fielding. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Actually I have a good news question I want to ask about which is last year I think all of the Councillors on the eastern half of the city, I believe Councillors Wyatt, Steen, Vandal, myself and Browaty, endorsed a plan to have bike service provided by Winnipeg Police Service. There was some confusion over what...how best that should be funded but we worked that out. I had a call recently from people asking about the status of that initiative to improve bike patrols by the Police in the eastern portion of the City and I see Councillor Fielding is fidgeting with some electronic device to have a response ready, so as Chair of the Committee I'm wondering if he can advise on what actually took place to improve the bike service by the Police.

Councillor Fielding: Well, I'm in trouble at home a lot for fidgeting with lots of devices. I love my gadgets here, but in any event, I did...thank you for the question Councillor Mayes, and I did receive response from Mr. Art Stannard, the

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
October 23, 2013

Deputy Chief of Police, so I'm happy to say that at 2012, we received the bikes, spring and summer 2013 received the additional gear which is equipment, clothing, etc. Also the members participated in a mandatory bike training course, one week in duration. The course is mandatory by the Service under the guidelines of the Workplace Health and Safety, of course WCB issue. Latter part of the summer and fall of 2013, Community Police Officers are conducting bike patrols and will continue pending weather of course. 2014 will continue on with this initiative. So happy to say that they are out there and patrolling.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Fielding. That wraps it up. No more questions. We'll move to Councillor Havixbeck. Yes.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm asking this because the Chair oversees libraries and animals and on October 12th, the media reported that the Millennium Library Pond was drained and a number of fish, unbeknownst to, I guess, the people draining the pond, were left homeless. And a woman from Charleswood actually collected 700 fish and has been housing them and giving them away. She's a private citizen; she collected over 700 and she's now down to about 275 fish all at her own expense, all on her own will to do that for the goodness of the city I guess and for these fish. But it's concerning to me that I see all over the Millennium Pond area outside that there are signs that people are to not dump fish, people still seem to do it. Is the Chair open to having something creative done next year so that maybe kids can come and take the fish away before we drain the pool? It's no expense; there's no cost, maybe just to advertise something like that. Would the Chair be open to some ideas on this? Because this woman still has 275 fish in her home and I think that if anyone's listening and can help her take some of these fish she'd be open to that, but is the Chair open to this?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: I love fish! I love fish! You know, I'm not...you know I'm open to it. You know, I'm not 100 percent sure whether it's a library issue or Public Works would be the one that would be administering it. I know Councillor Vandal doesn't like fish as much as I do, but if there's a way we can go together and come up with some creative solutions I think we're all on board, and I will talk to our administration about that. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Fielding. No more questions.

Councillor Nordman: I have a question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh, yeah, Councillor Nordman has a question. Sorry about that.

Councillor Nordman: As a good Iclander, I will not ask any fish questions. Councillor Fielding, I'd just be curious in your position as Chairman of Protection and Community Services and Chairman of the Police Board where we're at with that. I understand we've retained an Executive Director. Maybe you could report to us on that.

Councillor Fielding: Yes, very much so. We've hired Don Norquay. Don is a former Deputy Minister with the Provincial Government. I think he's had over 28 years of experience as an ADM, as a Deputy Minister; a whole bunch of different roles. We're really happy with the type of quality of candidates that came forward and we're really happy that Don has been approved with the Board earlier on in the week and he's started with the ball rolling. I do want to mention...and a good St. James man actually too Councillor Nordman, just for the record. I do want to mention that the police operational review, while you're talking about this, is ready and we are planning a Council seminar, I believe it's going to be Tuesday. We're just kind of coordinating schedules. I think it's at 9 a.m. We're going to send out a notice after this. As mentioned, the police operational review will be fully public document that will be out there. I'm going to just double check the date. It's Monday or Tuesday...I've got it on my system here, but I will...the Council notice will be out so everyone will be invited. The consultant will be in to speak to it and so that's everyone's opportunity to take a look at the consultant's report at that point. But I will get the actual date to you. I'll send it out to all of Council by the end of the day. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Fielding. And that wraps up Protection and Community Services. We'll move to Governance Committee, the Report of October 3rd, 2013, Councillor Nordman, introduce the report.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED OCTOBER 3, 2013

Councillor Nordman: Yes, as a Chair of Governance, I'd like to move Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of item 2?

Item 1 – Annual Audit of Mayor's Office and Chairmanship Funds

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor...Councillor Nordman to introduce.

Councillor Nordman: No, I'm happy to hear what Councillor Havixbeck does have to say having...seeing that she stood it down. I know this has recently come back to our committee but we will answer any question she has.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: I'm particularly concerned because as it is here, this item is essentially filed. And it's disappointing; I did attend the Governance meeting. I basically am...had asked in this motion when I brought it forward that we have the Mayor's Office expenses as well as the chairmanship budgets, subject to the same rules that the auditor outlines for all City Councillor ward allowance budgets. I don't think that there's anything wrong with doing that. I don't think there's any additional, supreme additional work to do in that. I think it's five budgets of \$8,000, plus the Mayor's Office so it's something that's done regularly in terms of our ward allowances and I'm simply looking for consistency and particularly after given the events of what has gone on at City Hall of late, every dollar we spend needs to be spent consistently and fairly, so those are my thoughts.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you and Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My only question is to...maybe for clarity. It says "a future." Sure, if the future's pending quite soon and they want to wrap it up in more of a larger discussion. I can respect that. But a future means...It says June in there? Well, they're going to answer that, so if the future is really long away, then I'll have a problem but if it's short term then I don't have a problem.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you, Deputy Speaker Steen. To speak to both Councillor Havixbeck and Councillor Orlikow, the...it's being looked at in a larger scope of the CRA in general. We'll see what our budget shakes out this year for 2014 and puts some real policy in place so that a future Council, a year from now, will have new standards to go by, so my expectation is we will come forward in the new year with a new policy regarding both the Mayor and the standing committee chairs as well as my Speakers' budget and I would suspect that it will be on the floor of Council before June so that's sort of the framework we are working on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nordman. And Councillor Smith, do you...actually were...Councillor Nordman was already closing, so you are too late.

Councillor Smith: I had my hand up.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It was already closing, Councillor. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Move adjournment. Councillor Wyatt moves adjournment. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 1:25 p.m.