COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday February 22, 2006

The Council met at 9:30 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Pagtakhan.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor Eadie, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors O'Shaughnessy, Benham, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas, Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: I would like to introduce the Pages who will be working with us during today's meeting. I know they've been busy distributing last minute motions. Elaine Manipol of Kildonan East Collegiate, who lives in Transcona, Michael Dwilow of Ft. Richmond Collegiate who lives in St. Norbert and Tayva Pannell of West Kildonan Collegiate who is in Old Kildonan. Welcome, thank you for assisting us today.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any guests or announcements? None.

MINUTES

Councillor Benham moves the Minutes of the meeting held on January 25, 2006 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

MOTIONS

Motion
Moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan,

That Councillor Lazarenko be granted leave of absence from today's Council meeting due to absence on City business.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: We have two delegations.

Councillor Magnifico: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute. Two delegations registered with regard to Clause 1 of the report of Property and Development of February 14th. Councillor Magnifico you have a point of order?

(Point of Order)

Councillor Magnifico: Mr. Speaker I would like to move to suspend the rules to allow some additional delegations re that P & D report of February 14th.

Mr. Speaker: Maximum of four or five minutes each, no questions.

Councillor Magnifico: Fine.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

All in favour? Opposed? That's Carried.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Norm Gousseau, Enterprises Riel, with regard to that clause and followed by Mr. Leo Ledohowski of the Canad Inns also in opposition to the clause. Mr. Gousseau will have the 10 minute spot and Mr. Ledohowski, the five minute spot. Is Mr. Gousseau here?

Mr. Norm Gousseau: Thank you. Thank you Your Worship and thank you Councillors for giving us the time to address you today. My name is Norm Gousseau and I am the Director of Economic Development with Enterprises Riel. Enterprises Riel is a not-for-profit economic development corporation serving St. Boniface, St. Vital and St. Norbert.

Over the last 10 years St. Boniface has done great strides in positioning itself as a desirable place to live, work, invest and visit. We at Enterprises Riel have worked diligently with local residents groups, the Chamber of Commerce, the business improvement zones and other community organizations to encourage new

investments and foster positive progressive change for St. Boniface.

In 2002 we partnered with the Old St. Boniface Residents Association and initiated a Housing Summit to solicit public input in our development strategies. We also sought to demonstrate to investors and developers that St. Boniface had a united front and offered much opportunity for new investment and was poised for infill development projects.

Less than four years later over 450 new housing units are being built and over $100 million dollars of construction activity is happening in Old St. Boniface alone. In 1996 Provencher Boulevard had a 40% vacancy rate. Today Provencher Boulevard has no vacancy and developers are working to fill that demand.

The Housing Summit also set out a series of priority initiatives. Through this process we received a clear mandate to identify strategies to move industry out of and away from residential neighbourhoods as this, we were told, was an impediment to development.

This same message was conveyed in 2001 when City administration conducted a public consultation process to determine the fate of the Old Public Market site in St. Boniface. Asked to prioritize options put forth to them, public record shows that those consulted gave first preference to a housing development, second to a mixed recreational and community uses and light industrial and the third and last preference was it see that site used for light and medium industry. Furthermore, they were asked their opinion on the option to amalgamate a series of City work yards on the most easterly edge of the property. It is important to note that the question that was asked was very site specific.

Today you have in front of you a recommendation by the City's administration to disregard the findings of this consultation. To disregard the wishes of the community, which were made clear at the 2001 public consultation and echoed at the 2002 Housing Summit in St. Boniface. You are being asked to expand the work yards, to put them in the centre of the site, not on the eastern edge as it was previously noted and to return the balance of the site to an industrial use while homes are being built and sold next door.

Mr. Mayor and Councillors, some would have you believe that no other projects have been put forth that fit the standard of highest and best use for this property. Over the last six years, we are aware of at least five proposals ranging from a housing development to a 4,000 seat arena complex, to a hotel and water park, to a sports and recreation campus, all of which are consistent with the wishes of this community.

Proponents of such innovative projects have been mostly marginalized or ignored instead of being encouraged to massage their ideas so that the City, the neighbourhood and the proponents become winners.

The latest project proposal by local developers for a world class sports and recreation campus is innovative, visionary, in our opinion, merits serious consideration and study. We are asking Council to not accept the proposal in front of you today as St. Boniface does not deserve this setback and today Winnipeg can do better planning than this.

Industrial sites belong in industrial parks, not in residential neighbourhoods. We ask that you reject this plan and allow the community of St. Boniface the opportunity to work with you and the administration to elaborate a proper strategic development for this site.

I also have a letter, if I may read it, a letter from the Resident Association, Old St. Boniface Residents Association, if I may read that and I'll circulate copies for the record. "An open letter to City Council: It is with great concern that the Old St. Boniface Residents Association learned last week that the City of Winnipeg administration is seeking Council approval to amalgamate a number of City work yards on the Old Public Market site in Old St. Boniface.

In 2001 a public meeting by the City's administration was held to discuss the future of this site. It was clear that the intent of the meeting was to get a reading from the local residents as to the thoughts, their thoughts on the amalgamation of a series of work yards on this site and more specifically, on its east extremity.

At that time, residents made their concerns known and clearly set out their site development preferences. The first preference was to turn the site into a residential development. The second was to encourage that half the site be used for recreational and community uses, and the balance to light industrial. The third and unmistakably the last preferred was to have the entire site return to industrial uses.

Over a year ago the Association was delighted to hear what visionary conceptual project brought forth by the private sector, our Councillor Magnifico, and Enterprises Riel which supported a private/public partnership that would turn this forgotten ground filled property into a world class sports destination. This project was seen as an important step towards the revitalization and renaissance of St. Boniface, as it was to create the buffer between industry and the residential neighbourhoods of Old St. Boniface, Archwood and Windsor Park. Central and accessible, this initiative was seen to be in line with progressive development strategies, encouraging smart infill projects, and in very close proximity to the downtown.

Today we learn that not only has the administration neglected to consider the latest and legitimate development plan but completely ignored the wishes of the very residents it consulted. Furthermore and contrary to the presentation made to the residents in 2001, the plan is now considering more space being allocated to a City works yard in the centre of the site, and not on the east end as previously cited with the balance being left to light and medium industrial purposes.

Since holding its Housing Summit in 2002 the Old St. Boniface Residents Association received a clear mandate and has been working with local development agencies such as Enterprises Riel, to find the right balance between commerce and housing initiatives while encouraging the exile of industry from core residential neighbourhoods.

St. Boniface does not deserve another industrial site in its backyard. The community of St. Boniface has been laying down a solid foundation for its revitalization and it is progressive in its approach and committed to its plan.

The administration's proposal in front of you today is fully and completely contrary to the direction we have received from our members. We are not only asking you, members of City Council, to allow for a feasibility study and business plan to be done for the sports and recreation campus to be conducted prior to committing to any other plan, but we are asking you to help champion the study with its proponents.

We thank you for your consideration and trust that you will make the right decision for the citizens of St. Boniface" and it's signed Robert Lafrenière, Vice-President. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Gousseau. Mr. Ledohowski, in the five minute spot.

Mr. Leo Ledohowski: Hello. Thank you for allowing me to speak to this very important issue. Your Worship, members of Council, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Leo Ledohowski. I am President and CEO of Canad Inns. In addition I have the honour to serve on the board of Destination Winnipeg and as a member of the Tourism Committee of the Manitoba Business Council. I'm also on the board of directors of the Canadian Hotel Association, incoming chairman of the Manitoba Hotel Association.

I've always taken exceptional pride in our great City and have worked hard to build our company right here with care and foresight. Our business and community responsibilities often intersect. We believe we do good in business by doing good in our community. That's a cornerstone of our corporate philosophy.

Building our City's destination or building our company, destination is an example of that philosophy. We have privilege, been privileged to witness exciting growth of many parts of our downtown in recent years, including CanWest Stadium, our new Centennial Library, Hydro building, MTS Centre and others.

I'm especially proud of our Canad Inns first involvement with the downtown project and that is the Tavern United attached to our fabulous casino, ah casino, arena. We're also working on other downtown destinations and some of the plans are quite well advanced.

Winnipeg is building its destination appeal to compete for business and leisure treasures. Of course at Canad Inns this is important to us because after all we are in the destination business. It is in fact the reason I've taken time to come to City Hall today.

It is our understanding that a recommendation to locate the Public Works yard to the Canada Packers site in St. Boniface was originally made about five years ago. What's important for all of us to understand is an awful lot has changed in five years. Winnipeg is on the move. There are many projects in process, have been done, will be done. The development of our City, especially the downtown, has progressed with new found energy and the St. Boniface site with its size and close proximity to our downtown, has tremendous potential to further enhance Winnipeg's reputation as a desired destination.

I don't know of a location across Canada with this kind of a rare opportunity to have this kind of a land base, so close to downtown that's owned by the City. We at Canad Inns are currently working on a number of major development initiatives, at least one of which could be placed on the St. Boniface site.

We believe our proposal provides added value and would compliment other proposals and concepts that are in discussion. I'm not prepared to discuss the details of our proposal right now because there are other partners involved but trust me it's a fairly significant proposal.

I wanted to, I would like to thank the EPC for bringing this forward so that presentations such as ours or the previous ones, so we can have a discussion about what is appropriate for the site in St. Boniface.

I understand there is a number of concepts, different groups besides ours that have some great destination ideas and by bringing forth, I hope that EPC bringing this forth, we can discuss it and perhaps pursue some of these things.

There is no question that a Public Works yard is important. I don't think it's just that this is the site for it. I would strongly recommend that Council not put the Public Works yard in this site because of the potential for some really significant destination type developments, some of which other people are working on, some of which our firm is working on and I thank you for the time to make my presentation.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much Mr. Ledohowski. Were there any questions of this group? None?

Councillor Benham: Sorry Mr. Speaker. Yes I have a question…

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Oh you did now?

Councillor Benham: Are questions allowed to the two speakers then?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. That's why I was asking are there any questions for this group? Okay Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through to you Mr. Ledohowski and I can understand your reticence about giving out a lot of details about the plan but we are sort of being asked to put off something that is very definite, that is a plan, that we know what we're doing for some very vague promises of something that could happen in the future with the land. Could you give us at least some kind of more of an outline of what it is

you're talking about so that we would be able to balance better?

Mr. Leo Ledohowski: We are working on a number of destination concepts which would require a large land base, and some of which might be a private/public sector combination. The thing is, if you had a specific development here that added to a destination concept or added to the quality, or if there was no other place for the Public Works yards to go, I see this as a no-cost move or deferral and the City is on the move now. This is really a unique opportunity.

If they were stuck and there was no other place to go, but I'm sure there are many sites, just a little further down in the St. Boniface Industrial Park might be a better site. So if there was a real cost, if you had a real proposal here that, that you had to decide on and there was no alternative, well then obviously you want to, you would get more specific plans but right now if you leave this open for awhile there are people coming up with plans. We will be coming up with proposals, and I think the site should be open that way because I think the cost to the City of moving the yards or holding the site open is nil.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary? No. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I'll ask you then I'll ask the first speaker the same question as well. This is, this is the clause, recommends something that is actually for us. And normally at the last minute, I don't try to interfere in land negotiations but it is something to our self. Would you feel comfortable if there was a motion to move it back to Executive Policy Committee to allow negotiations to continue?

Mr. Leo Ledohowski: Well I don't know what the correct step is, yes, but some movement to delay this.

Councillor Thomas: Okay.

Mr. Leo Ledohowski: Something that would put it into play and ask for specific proposals and… Like I say, Winnipeg is really starting to get on a roll now and it's like a motor you get going and it would be a shame to take a big cog out of this motor as things are getting cranked up especially if there are alternatives.

Councillor Thomas: If I could have Mr. Gousseau also answer that question if he feels comfortable?

Mr. Norm Gousseau: I think that would be an option that you could consider. I still think that we have a perfect opportunity here, as the other speaker mentioned, we have an opportunity here with a large land mass, to work together, City Council, City administration and people with ideas, other people with ideas, to work together to really find the best use for this site.

We have tons of change since 2001, since there was a study made. We have time to have, we should take the time to look at what kind of opportunities we may have on this site. Putting it back a month, allows us a month but we all know that a month doesn't allow for a lot of negotiations to happen. I think our preference and I'll, hope I'm not speaking out of turn, but I think our preference would be to not have it on that site, to find another location and allow for this, give us the proper time to have a look at this, at the opportunities that exist.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor?

Councillor Thomas: No.

Mr. Speaker: You're okay.

Councillor Thomas: That's what I wanted to know.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Just so we're clear here. All you're asking for is that with this concept plan is that the chunk of land not be designated for the Public Works yards?

Mr. Norm Gousseau: Yes that's correct. That we're, what we're asking for is to allow for proper discussions to happen between proponents of projects, not only

the sports and recreation campus but others and the City of Winnipeg administration and politicians to look at the best use of that site.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor?

Councillor Swandel: So you would agree then that the concept plan as put forward, taking the designation of Public Works yards out of those particular lands would allow that process to move forward?

Mr. Norm Gousseau: If in fact City Council is willing to take the time to consider other options, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Mr. Norm Gousseau: I'm not sure where you're driving with that. Are you suggesting maybe that the balance of the land should be industrial anyway?

Mr. Speaker: Councillors will ask the questions. Thank you. You've answered it.

Mr. Norm Gousseau: Fine.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Magnifico.

Councillor Magnifico: Mr. Ledohowski, just to clarify, first of all thanks for taking the time out of your busy schedules to come here it's much appreciated. It's an important issue to St. Boniface and I hope people realize that.

For the Councillors that are leery about the project or projects that might come on to that site, would it be fair to say, first of all as one of Canada's top 50 best managed companies for I don't know how many years in a row, Canad Inns, credible as you are, sometimes there is doubt in people's minds.

Would you venture to say it would be in the realm of a huge recreational or hotel-ish or water park-ish or some destinations kind of, some project possibly of that magnitude Mr. Ledohowski?

Mr. Leo Ledohowski: Well, the beauty of it is what you're describing there is a possibility, given the site and the fact that the City already owns, I think it's 170 acres, which could accommodate a great sports campus among other things and that can be quite extensive. I do believe there is some extra lands there even if they were required it wouldn't be very hard to expand this site.

But yeah, it's the type of, we're in the destination business. Winnipeg is becoming more of a destination place. There are some other projects we're working on downtown and across town. Anything that would add to the destination appeal and something of the nature you have described certainly would be in the way I would perceive things for that site.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Magnifico? Direct question.

Councillor Magnifico: No I don't, I just wanted to thank Mr. Ledohowski for coming down.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question would actually be directed more to Norm Gousseau, but during the presentation of Mr. Ledohowski he referred to the site being a very large site and in significant close proximity to downtown which I think we all agree there are very few of those. You read the letter from the Residents Association which I think everybody heard very clear and we certainly heard your comments.

My specific question is this. It's been 25 years. We all know that. We've been sitting and looking at that for 25 years and nothing has happened. A sports campus, exciting idea. Whatever concept Mr. Ledohowski has I'm sure it's an exciting idea. And there could be other exciting ideas which may be embraced by the residents of St. Boniface.

My question is, what if these exciting ideas are not able to be brought to fruition, for whatever the reasons may

be? Can't find the funding, too much of an onus on one level of government, whatever the case may be. At that point in time if that were to happen, what do you believe should take place there? Because you know what the existing zoning is. It's "M3". You know that there are problems with certain types of developments there, because of the environmental situation.

I'm wondering in a worst case scenario if all these wonderful ideas that are surfacing now cannot be brought to fruition, what are you thinking should be there?

Mr. Norm Gousseau: What we're saying is that we believe that there is an opportunity for us to work together, as opposed to ideas being brought forth and they are really set aside, not looked at seriously, or they are not given the time of day. We should have a serious look at these projects and see if there is ways of massaging them, maybe the idea as was put forth may not work because we haven't dealt with water drainage issues, for example. Well, how can we deal with that in a concept that Mr. Ledohowski or others may bring forth, how can we address that issue? If we were to know what the City's issues are, what the Residents Association's issues are and what the proponent is bringing forward, how can we make these mesh and work well together? That's what we're asking City Council to consider.

We haven't had that opportunity and over the last 25 years you're right that site has been vacant. We all know that there were issues around buildings that were on there, the cost of taking those down, there was environmental issues that people aren't really, proponents aren't really sure what those issues are. If we were to work with the City together as a unit to come up with solutions, I really strongly believe that we can do that.

And let's not forget that 25 years ago the City of Winnipeg was not moving as it is today. Even the last five years, some serious changes has happened in the City of Winnipeg and in St. Boniface, times have really, really changed in St. Boniface specifically. It's pro-development. It's not, it's pro-smart development and I think there is a real opportunity here to have a look at this again.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I believe the time for questions has expired. Thank you very much gentlemen.

Now we have four additional delegations. I don't have their names but whoever the four are could come forward now, one at a, we'll deal with you. Would you identify yourself please and you have five minutes.

Mrs. Jodi Plochinski: My name is Jodi Plochinski and I am a resident of the Promenade de Park subdivision. I just recently as of yesterday heard about some plans around having the, or having the Public Works yard put basically in my backyard. And when we purchased our home a year ago we moved in, we were very excited about potential growth in that back lot, and we are a young family who are moved in, excited about different opportunities that may lead for our child, and to have potentially the Public Works put in there is just not something that we want.

We would love to have some sort of recreation facility in there but definitely not the Public Works. They work 24 hours a day. It will be a lot of large equipment. Just something that we don't want to enhance the community. My husband and I looked at very many different subdivisions to build a home, and we came to Windsor Park because we wanted, it was more of a close-knit community, it felt good to us and what the future would bring, and I'm basically here to say that I don't want to, as many of my other neighbours, do not want to see the Public Works going in our backyard. That's it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The next one, please. Is there anyone else? Provide your name please. You have five minutes.

Mr. Norm Boyle: My name is Norm Boyle. I'm involved with the development of the Windsor Park area that Jodi lives in. I'm also involved with selling the homes right along the very north side of

that development. Between myself and my partner we've sold every one of the homes except for three that have backed on to this area. We didn't do it blindly. When people were asking what are they moving into, etcetera we were trying to keep our fingers on everything that was going on in the district. I did attend a meeting in 2002 which did give the various option plans that could go in here. Not being entirely naive I knew that a residential area would not go in there and I told everybody as such. I also knew that a lot of parkland would probably not be happening just because of logistics and because of cost.

However, talking with Mr. Vandal at the time at that meeting and talking with the representatives that were there, I believe it was ND Lea that was there, I was led to believe that if a light industrial would probably be going in behind it. They didn't know for sure but would probably be going in along the same lines as Terracon on Dugald Road which is a very aesthetically pleasing type of light industrial park and does not affect the neighbours that are living right beside it.

What a Public Works yard was indeed proposed but it was proposed at the very far northeast section of the property, and the people that were moving in there when they asked me what's going on, I said to the best of my ability this is what I could foresee may happen.

Public Works yards, when I saw yesterday, when I saw that the Public Works yard was proposed for being right in the centre, well, Public Works yards are not known to be completely aesthetically pleasing, and it would, I took it as to would set the tone for the whole industrial area.

In real life, when something is not aesthetically pleasing in the centre of things, everybody that moves in across the street tends to point to it and say look at what they're doing. I also noticed in this proposal that instead of being light industrial backing onto all of these homes that I've sold, it is now medium industrial.

Well, there have been no, when I develop land I have to go to the public, I have to do a public meeting, and let people know what we're doing beside their houses. There has been absolutely no consultations with anybody that's been living in there. Since the 2002 consultation we've moved 135 different homes in there. None of those people know anything about this. They've all invested probably the biggest purchase they've made in their lives and in my opinion they should be at least asked what they can live with.

Now, the biggest thing that I saw in here, and I still don't have a question for, is I notice the City is buying a strip of land right behind their houses. And I'm talking inches behind their back fence. I don't know why, you know I've read the reports, I didn't have time to study them. It might be in there some place. I need to reread. I was doing this Monday night. But, it just raises a whole bunch of questions.

I'm not here to say yes or no, I'm only here to state that my customers really should be informed as to what's going on within inches of their property. That's all I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Is there a third individual here? Name please.

Mr. Tony Nocita: Tony Nocita, I'm a with, a partner with Man-Shield Construction. Thank you for giving us the time to speak. I just want to echo basically what's been said here. I really believe that what Mr. Ledohowski is saying and what Norm Gousseau is saying is very important.

I think, we've been, Man-Shield Construction is one of the proponents that has been brought forward the idea of a sports campus on that site. I think it's a wonderful opportunity and I think we're at the point now where we need to get into I think a formal business plan study and we've been working on the project now for at least seven or eight months, and we've been trying it deal with City administration and we're trying to, because the site is very, very sophisticated. It's not a simple site. It's a unique site but it's a sophisticated site and we need input from

the City because it does affect the residents. It affects what is going to be happening on Marion Street. There is a lot of issues there that we need to tackle and we would just like to feel like we have the support of City Council and the administration to pursue something like this. Because it is not a simple piece of land where you can just come in and plop a building down and create a business plan and away you go. It's much more difficult than that.

But I think that the benefit from it is that it's a wonderful, wonderful site and it's a unique opportunity for the City to really have and create a destination for sports in our case. And I want to reiterate that I think there is a lot of good ideas coming forward now. And I'm sure Mr. Ledohowski has some ideas of his own. I think we need to have a chance to look at those things and I think by saying that the Public Works yard is the place for this, for this, or the site is going to be for a Public Works yard really just kyboshes any opportunity for anyone to come forward.

So I hope that serious consideration will be given to the motion that's been put forward today and that we don't have the Public Works yard there on that site. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks very much. That's the fourth and final individual. Only three? All-righty that concludes the delegations then and we'll proceed now to the agenda. The report of the Executive Policy Committee of February 1st.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED FEBRUARY 1, 2006

Mayor Katz: My apologies Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It's all right. Report of February 1st, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent agenda items 1 to 4.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? That motion is Carried.

Report of February 8th, Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED FEBRUARY 8, 2006

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would like to introduce the report of February the 8th and move adoption of Consent agenda items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: 3 has to stand down, there is an amendment proposed to clause 3.

On clauses 1 and 2.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clause 3. Do you want to?

Item No. 3 - Rapid Transit Task Force Recommendations - Implementation Plan of Transit Improvements
File TT-8

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz did you wish to introduce the clause?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker there is a motion that's been moved by Councillor Wyatt and I was more than happy to second it. If anybody has any questions on it, we'd be happy to address it. We're just doing our due diligence.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz,

WHEREAS Item 3 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee, dated February 8, 2006, provides a comprehensive response to the detailed recommendations of the Rapid Transit Task Force for Council and addresses technical recommendations regarding route improvements, rapid transit planning and on-street improvements;

AND WHEREAS the Rapid Transit Task Force also made recommendations in Section 7 (pages 52-53) of its Report addressing policy proposals to improve transit service in Winnipeg through changes to policies regarding access, customer service, governance, development planning and linkage to

economic development strategies, for which no response has yet been received;

AND WHEREAS Council and the Executive Policy Committee are best-placed to properly initiate discussions of changes in policy with respect to the recommendations in the Task Force Report;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Section 7 of the Rapid Transit Task Force Report be referred to Executive Policy Committee and that the Executive Policy Committee report back to Council by June 28, 2006.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Motion No. 2 is moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Mayor Katz, that Part 7 be referred back to Executive Committee to report back to Council by 28th of June. Did you wish to introduce it or shall we take it as read?

Councillor Wyatt: Well just very quickly for an explanation for Council, Mr. Speaker. The, this section has to do with the *Rapid Transit Report,* what's referred to as Rapid Transit Policy Recommendations. By and large the report coming to Council today is concentrated more on the nuts and bolts of the diamond lanes and so on and so forth of improvements to the City, as well as the planning for the future busways.

But it was fairly silent on the issue of the work that was done by the Task Force on policy recommendations. So it was being suggested here or what's been recommended is, would therefore be resolved is that that section be referred back to EPC for the administration to have an opportunity to look at that and report back. And so that part of the report is not missed.

Mr. Speaker: Okay on this motion Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I just saw the motion just now so I haven't really had the time to look at it thoroughly, but I am wondering if it should be amended or when it gets to, I don't know what the process is here for, I guess we're dealing with this immediately without referring it back.

Because the other part of the Rapid Transit Task Force that hasn't been discussed or put anywhere to discuss is the financial recommendations in terms of proceeding with intergovernmental negotiations and all of that too. Perhaps that could be amended, as a friendly amendment then, to add that in and that that also be referred to EPC so that we can have some analysis of how to move forward with those aspects of the Task Force as well in terms of trying to obtain funds from the other levels of government.

I'm concerned, like I totally support the idea of doing this. Let's move the policy recommendations forward and start looking at them. I realize we had to deal with the nuts and bolts issues immediately in terms of the Capital Budget and now we're dealing with these the policy recommendations but what about the recommendations to do with the financial process of getting funding for rapid transit which we obviously still need to do. As I said in my comments yesterday, particularly from the Provincial government.

So I guess I would ask that we also ask, a friendly amendment, I don't know if that's in order, that we ask them to also look at the financial intergovernmental discussions around the report as well. And that would be, I'm just wondering if that's possible procedurally. Thank you

Mr. Speaker: I just don't believe that would be even a friendly or a substantive amendment. This is a very specific motion on a very specific section. I think if you look at recommendation 2 in the clause that's in front of us it speaks to the budgetary requirements and future Capital Budgets and negotiations and discussions between the other orders of government which I think would be covered over the course of the next year or so as we roll forward with financing. So I, but I couldn't accept that as an amendment, friendly or otherwise, to the very specific referral motion.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay. Well, it's pretty hard it deal with a motion that's handed to you right before Council of this magnitude so.

Mr. Speaker: I agree.

Councillor Gerbasi: I apologize. I don't know. I'm kind of frustrated.

Mr. Speaker: There should be better process of getting these in well ahead of time but this was distributed at the very commencement of today's sitting.

On this motion Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker, just for my procedural guidance as well before I make my comments then, we are voting on this motion today.

Mr. Speaker: Motion No. 2.

Councillor Benham: As an amendment. Motion No. 2 will be …

Mr. Speaker: Yeah. It asks that a section of this report be referred back to EPC and that they report back to Council by end of June.

Councillor Benham: Okay and that's because we're referring back. The clause is in order? Okay. Well Thank you Mr. Speaker and I really had a good deal to say yesterday on the Capital Budget and people know where I stand. I support, we are, and I suppose we are just debating not only the amendment Mr. Speaker but the report itself as well?

Mr. Speaker: I think we should deal with this referral motion and either pass it or not and then, well we'll take them together that's fine I think.

Councillor Benham: Can we take them together? I think that would be more convenient Mr. Speaker I if I may suggest, and I will be very brief on both. I'm happy to support Councillor Wyatt's motion and seconded of course by the Mayor and showing a good partnership there because these are other issues which should be examined.

But of course, Mr. Speaker, I believe, and there is a reference to Capital and so on in this report. But Mr. Speaker as I said yesterday really this is all for not if we don't start building the busway.

Councillor Wyatt as chairperson of the Rapid Transit Task Force recommended that. Councillors Gerbasi and Pagtakhan as members of the Task Force supported that recommendation. All members of Council accepted the Rapid Transit Task Force as information last October, and I believe that it will only stay as information if we do not take concrete steps immediately to begin setting aside the money to build the busways and to in fact undertake those, the construction of those busways Mr. Speaker.

So I will be supporting Councillor Wyatt's motion and the Executive Policy Committee motion but I again put on the record the absolute necessity of this Council putting aside money, seeing ahead into the future, and putting ahead some, putting down some concrete plans to in fact lay down some concrete, build a road. It's not complicated. And I think Mr. Speaker, I hope that Executive Policy Committee will within its ambit, within the ambit provided by this motion, get back to building a busway and get on with it without any more delay. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Any further debate on this specific motion? Do you need to close Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah. Thank you Mr. Speaker. Points well taken by both Councillors. Actually, I think either it can be accomplished separately what Councillor Gerbasi was referring to, or as part of this to a certain extent under the clause as a governance and Provincial issue. It does raise the issue of lobbying the Province to negotiate for a greater share of Transit subsidy including a portion of the Provincial gas tax as one of the ideas that would be looked at by the administration and strategy coming forward hopefully. So I agree with you.

And this was just, it caught my eye that this was not part of it and so I apologize

for the last minute motion but I thought it was crucial at this point that we get this on the table and it's referred back, so.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Mayor Katz did you wish to close on the main clause? Mayor Katz did you wish to close on the main clause?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I believe, yeah. I think Councillor Wyatt has addressed it.

Mr. Speaker: All right thank you. Debate is closed.

On Motion No. 2.

All in favour? Opposed? That's Carried.

On the clause as amended.

All in favour? Opposed? That's Carried.

I believe By-laws, are we? By-laws Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would like to move that By-law No. 214/2005 be read a first time.

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

Clerk? Oh. Second reading Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I would like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 16/2006, By-law No. 75/2006, By-law No. 85/2006.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 16/2006, 75/2006 and 85/2006.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would like to move that the By-law Nos. 16/2006, 75/2006 and 85/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law Nos. 16/2006, 75/2006, 85/2006.

Mayor Katz: I would like to move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 16/2006, 75/2006 and 85/2006 be read a third time, and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

We have additional By-laws.

Mayor Katz: Yes we do.

Mr. Speaker: Which there are many.

Mayor Katz: I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and the following By-laws be read a first time. By-laws, I'm wondering Mr. Speaker if I can just go By-laws No. 34 through to By-law No. 70/2006 as opposed to reading each and everyone of them?

Mr. Speaker: Be read a first time.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws Numbered 34/2006, 35/2006, 36/2006, 37/2006, By-laws numbered 34/2006 to 70/2006 both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: I would like to move that By-laws No. 34/2006 to 70/2006 both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws Numbered 34/2006 to 70/2006 both inclusive.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I would like to move that the rule be suspended and By-laws Numbered 34/2006 to 70/2006, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor De Smedt,
Seconded by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,

WHEREAS on November 25, 2004, the Executive Policy Committee conducted a public hearing to amend Plan Winnipeg to consider the realignment of the North-South Transcona Route from Plessis Road to Bradley Street, and adjourned the hearing with direction to the Administration to outline a thorough traffic and cost analysis of route options;

AND WHEREAS the Director of Planning, Property and Development has withdrawn the application;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the application to amend Plan Winnipeg By-law No. 7630/2000 by re-aligning the North South Transcona Route, and By-law No. 130/2004, not be proceeded with.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors I just overlooked an EPC motion that I lost in my stack here. It's Motion No. 1, moved by Councillor De Smedt, seconded by Councillor O'Shaughnessy, withdrawal of an amendment here. It's been circulated. Taken as read? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Question on procedure. Is this, do we, can we deal with this motion now or does it have to be given notice or how does it?

Mr. Speaker: We can deal with it now if you like or…

Councillor Wyatt: Deal with it now. Sure, all right.

Mr. Speaker: It's in the hands of Council.

Councillor Wyatt: Question.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? It's Carried.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor De Smedt,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS Civic Government functions best when fully responsive to the electorate;

AND WHEREAS the public interest is well-served through a mandated rotation of its elected officers;

AND WHEREAS the public interest is enhanced when the electorate has more opportunity to unfettered access for public service to the office of mayor and councillor;

AND WHEREAS term limits have been implemented in other democratic jurisdictions with positive impacts;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed desirable to limit the terms of Members of Council to 2 full four year terms, with additional terms possible after a four year stand-down between each set of 2 full four year terms;

AND WHEREAS civic government functions most responsively when matters of significant public impact are tested through the will of the electorate;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that:
The Council of the City of Winnipeg submit a referendum question to the electorate during the 2006 General Municipal Election to seek public support for term limits for Councillors and the Mayor, as described;

The Council of the City of Winnipeg request that The Winnipeg Charter Act be amended accordingly with the limitation on terms commencing November 7, 2006, if accepted by a majority of the electorate;

The Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

Required to stand as Notice of Motion in accordance with Rule 17.1 of the Procedure By-law.

Mr. Speaker: Questions? Executive Committee Questions? Councillor

Gerbasi, Benham, Smith, okay, got you. Councillor Gerbasi.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the Mayor, considering the large public discontent that is continuing to grow around the Olywest Plant going into St. Boniface. And given that the Councillor for the area has made comments in the media that he's implying that he's still willing to reconsider the issue, or still somehow that the decision isn't final or that there is some possibility of that. I wanted to hear from the Mayor as to whether or not the Mayor and EPC are still committed to this subsidy package for Olywest and is this decision being reconsidered at all in the light of the public opposition?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you Mr. Speaker to Councillor Gerbasi, thank you very much. Number one, we are still totally committed and we've certainly had conversations with the Councillor for the area as well as residents of the area. And as everybody knows what takes place at this stage of the game is this matter will be dealt with in a public forum, through the Clean Environment Commission. And I'm sure everybody will have the opportunity to have their input, to have their say and hopefully be heard loud and clear. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Gerbasi?

Councillor Gerbasi: Yeah I had a question on another matter.

Mr. Speaker: Fine.

Councillor Gerbasi: The Aboriginal Strategy when it was originally adopted, included one of the five commitments was community consultation. And by community that doesn't just mean the political leadership of the major organizations but the grassroots community groups. And meetings were held with hundreds of people, with the former Mayor and Councillor Vandal and myself and there was a commitment to continue those meetings. And I'd like to know if there is going to be further community, real community consultation, not just with the head of the organizations, but the people who live and work in the communities? As one…

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Question has been asked.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. From my point of view I am happy to meet with any members of the community for public consultation if that is part of MAPS and it certainly should be fulfilled and I'd be happy to do that. Unfortunately, I guess what I should say is I want to thank Councillor Gerbasi for pointing that out. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a, excuse me, do you have final supplementary? No. Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Mayor chose yesterday to speak publicly about, to comment publicly on a newspaper report that suggested that the City is losing up to $50 million dollars revenue over the course of the photo radar contract. The Mayor promised to fix the contract, and I'd like to ask him through you, how he intends to do that?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: As I said earlier that I would not comment on a specific report that is In-Camera. What I did yesterday Mr. Speaker is I commented on articles written by certain people of the media. And in order to fix something, first of all you have to identify what the problem is. It appears those problems have certainly been identified and I think now it's up to the Mayor and all of Council to make sure that we do not make the same decisions again as we did the first time.

The other scenario is quite obvious. It's no secret that the agreement is coming to an end. A decision will have to be made by Council what we intend to do in the future. I believe the agreement comes to an end in spring of '07, if we decide to continue this, I can assure the Councillor that negotiations will be done much differently then they were five years ago.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Benham?

Councillor Benham: I do Mr. Speaker on another question on a new issue. Mr. Speaker on the same day the Mayor had said, on the Tuesday, February 14th the Mayor is quoted in both newspapers and I realize Mr. Speaker that the Mayor pointed out to me yesterday that perhaps sometimes is the message does not always get across, but on the one hand he said that the City, the top City bureaucrats are not overpaid and in the other he said that they were, they continue to receive administrative salaries and bonuses that are simply too high. So my question to the Mayor through you Mr. Speaker is which is it? Are our public servants paid too much or are they paid just right? Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: It's unfortunate that some people just don't listen because Mr. Speaker I have said this a hundred times and I will say it one more time for the benefit of all. The direct comment was that one, bonuses are something that have to be addressed. Bonuses in my opinion were not appropriate for senior management. Bonuses also in the opinion of the CAO were not appropriate for senior management. That's number one.

Number two, when it came to raises, which is the step program, and I'm hoping that the Councillor is aware of how it works. We have 18 steps, three different categories, a, b and c. And all you have to do is just be here and you gradually, every year, get an automatic raise, and what I was saying is that's not appropriate, raises should be earned, they should not be automatic.

The only issues I have ever discussed is the step program, which I referred to as hidden increases in my City of the State speech and bonuses. Hopefully that answers the question and there is no further misunderstanding Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Final supplementary Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker, on the same topic, what steps does the Mayor intend to take to address these salary and bonus issues that he's now identified?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: The steps are many fold. Number one, for the contracts that the Mayor and EPC are in charge of, we are in the process of eliminating all bonuses and eliminating steps that already exist in two out of the three that we are in charge of and the other one is being dealt with as we speak, through negotiation. When it comes to the balance of management that goes through the CAO.

As I said the CAO is committed to getting rid of bonuses. On top of that there also is, there will be a briefing on the step program, which I believe should take place within two weeks Mr. Speaker, by the administration, and then we will probably be doing a review and coming up with a decision in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, through you to the Mayor. At the last Council meeting, I asked you a question. I asked you "Mr. Mayor the Executive Director of the Winnipeg Arts Council left on September the 9th last year. We have not had a new Executive Director, why is that? What's the problem? Five months have gone by."

Your answer was "Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Smith, I must confess I do not have an answer for that. I'm happy to look into it and get back to Councillor Smith on that." I still have not heard from you. What's happening on this? You

know I haven't a reply today, at today's meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Smith, thank you, I recall the question vividly. It's my understanding that the Councillor had a very long and extensive conversation with the Manager of EPC Secretariat on this issue, that's number one.

Number two, that as far as we are concerned, they should be proceeding and going through the process of hiring someone. I assume that Mr. Duncan is going in that direction.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Smith?

Councillor Smith: I have another question. Mr. Mayor the website for the Winnipeg City Summit 2006 tells those who get on the site to attend pre-conference forums and activities. What pre-conference forums and activities have been organized?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Smith, those, the whole purpose of the Summit is to get involvement from everybody, all citizens. Some who may be able to attend. Some in other views. Right now everybody has the opportunity to express their thoughts and concerns. We are also organizing other events which will be coming up in the near future.

I am excited to see that Councillor Smith is following that on the website and I'm sure that in the very near future he'll be seeing more events coming up answering that question.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a final supplementary Councillor Smith?

Councillor Smith: Supplementary. The Winnipeg City Summit 2006 website also states that the major keynote speaker for the May 3rd dinner will be announced in October, that's last October. Now it is February and there has been no announcement as who the keynote speaker will be. Is it Councillor Steeves? Who is it? (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much. Unfortunately it appears Councillor Smith is right. Our objective was to get Councillor Steeves but we could not afford his fees, so we declined. (Laughter).

We do have, we hope to be making an announcement very shortly and I think that everybody at Council, as well as every citizen in the City of Winnipeg will be very excited. I would say the announcement should come within two weeks. We do have it confirmed. We're just waiting to work out all of the details and that announcement will be forthcoming and I can assure you that I'll be very surprised if everyone here is not very impressed with the calibre of speaker we have coming.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the Mayor. In light of recent headlines in local newspapers and now this morning in both Edmonton, major Edmonton newspapers, regarding the criminal charges laid against the firm that we employed for photo radar. Will some independent body be asked to review the process that we went through? In this particular case in Edmonton it was the RCMP that was used. I think there is other entities that could be used through our Provincial Justice Department, or through our Police force. Will an independent review be asked to be had on behalf of the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I am not going to answer that question today and I'll qualify why. This report is going through the process. This report will be coming to EPC. It will then be going forward to Council. Once this report is made public I will give you a

definitive answer to your question but I am not going to do it today.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Swandel?

Councillor Swandel: Yes, does the Mayor, or through you Mr. Speaker, can the Mayor comment on the ability of the administration to function with the growing shadow of impropriety hanging over it without an investigation being asked for?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I very much believe that the administration is able to function, we have a very large administration. This is a very, this issue is something that will be dealt with very shortly.

By the same token I do not believe it's, it's a good assumption or a fair assumption to believe that the administration cannot do their job. And as I said this will be dealt with by EPC, as well as Council, in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor Swandel? No.

Councillor Swandel: Can the Mayor put a little tighter timeline on what the very near future would mean?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker the very near future is following normal process. We have a matter that's In-Camera. It will be going to EPC. At that point in time it comes out of Camera. At that point in time I will definitely address those type of issues and in the meantime there have not been any suggestions of impropriety that I'm aware of. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas. I'm sorry, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker, with regards to the Olywest decision with regards to the hog plant. It is now becoming clear that there is a growing amount of businesses in the area who are, who have become aware of the decision, specifically in the St. Boniface Industrial Park and are expressing concern privately and publicly about the decision to locate. And the concern of their businesses, many of the businesses are medium to light industries, many are involved in the health industry, and are concerned about the reputation of the industrial park and the image and the impact that this will have.

And now in light of the fact that we are seeing that there is a motion for us to on top of this locate a Public Works yard in the area which will be news to them, I'm wondering what discussions has the Mayor had with any of the businesses in the site and what matters have been put on the table to address some of their concerns?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you Mr. Speaker, thank you Councillor Wyatt. I can tell you this, that two weeks ago last Sunday, I visited the site, and drove through the entire area of Transcona. You have a lovely ward. And I actually met with some homeowners, as well as a business owner. I can also tell you that we have been approached, the Mayor's office, by I guess a consultant who is acting on behalf of the business owners and we will be meeting with them. A meeting has already been scheduled.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt do you have a supplementary?

Councillor Wyatt: Has any of the issues been discussed at this point with regards to this such as the need for road infrastructure, buffering and other of the concerns that they've been raising?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: The one issue that was brought up was the potential traffic on Plessis Road, which I guess would be just north of the Intermodal, in order to try and eliminate as much traffic going by the residents. And that actually came up in a visit to a resident per se.

As I said to you earlier we have not met with the group of business people or with their consultant and that is coming up and

I'm happy to hear what issues they have on the table. But that has not taken place, as yet.

Mr. Speaker: Final Supplementary Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. On a completely different subject. Back in November in the Question Period I asked about having meetings with the AMM or a meeting with the AMM and Council, with the AMM and Council, and at that time the Mayor indicated that it was probably a good idea to extend an olive branch to at least have a dialogue in the new year. I'm just wondering where that is at right now? This is with the AMM and ourselves.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Mr. Speaker I've already been in touch with Mr. Ron Bell and we do have a meeting set up with myself and Ron Bell just to talk things over, see how life is, and then we'll proceed from there Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Now it's Councillor Thomas' turn.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I will go back to the report on the contract for our photo radar and I will ask given the comments that have been put forward in the media and given in the past when we've had serious concerns with regard to contracts, we've either had a special notice as members of Council so that we could attend an In-Camera EPC meeting or we've had a special seminar arranged so that we could get the details. And my question for the Mayor is either or both of those options going to be pursued in this manner?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I thank Councillor Thomas for that question. I think the first thing I'd like to address Mr. Speaker is as everyone knows this is an In-Camera matter. And everybody here knows what In-Camera is. I think it's very unfortunate that we were not able to deal with this in the usual manner because this report was leaked out in its entirety to many people in the media. I think that's very sad. I think that's very unfortunate.

As a result of this, prior to our meeting yesterday there were already two major stories and many more to come on this issue. I certainly hope in the future, that does not take place. We can deal with this much better if we can deal with things properly In-Camera.

I can tell Councillor Thomas that yesterday when we did meet In-Camera that there were Councillors who did attend. As a matter of fact I believe Councillor Swandel I know was there for sure. There may have been others who came in and as Councillor Thomas knows, any Councillor is welcome to come into an In-Camera meeting at any point in time. So that's very open to them.

At this particular point in time, a decision has not been made on Councillor Thomas' request. When it comes to EPC I think at that point in time we will deal with it and I'm certainly happy to address that.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have supplementary Councillor Thomas?

Councillor Thomas: Yes. Are you aware that in the past when there have been reports issued, in one case with regard to a Property and Development matter, the Scurfield report, and other matters such as this that there were opportunities in the past for a special meeting In-Camera EPC and also special seminars that have occurred in the past with these kind of issues and are you going to arrange that?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I am very much aware of special meetings and I'm certainly aware of Council seminars, considering we call them on a regular basis, and in this issue that may very well be something that would be appropriate.

By the same token I still think that we had a meeting yesterday which was In-Camera with the Audit Committee. This

matter has not even gone to EPC. It will be going to EPC and at that point in time we'll address the idea of having a special meeting.

In the meantime I believe that report is available to every Councillor who sits here today. I'm assuming every Councillor has received a copy and has read that report. So at least if we do have that special seminar everybody will be well informed and can ask the appropriate questions. I certainly am open to the suggestion 100%. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor Thomas. You okay?

Councillor Thomas: Yes. Are you aware that it is one thing to have a written document; it's another thing to be able to ask questions of the people?

Mr. Speaker: A direct question please.

Councillor Thomas: So, I still don't believe I've gotten an answer to the first question. Will you be arranging either a special In-Camera EPC with regard to this issue or a special Council seminar in regard to this issue so that Councillors can ask the questions?

Mr. Speaker: I think he did answer that Councillor. He said he would consider it.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I know I answered it. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham on the second round.

Councillor Benham: Yes, thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Mayor in his, has already referred to his State of the City speech and in that speech Mr. Speaker, he told the audience that there would be a cap on business tax. A cap of course can mean a limit at the current revenue level or it could mean a cap at a certain amount of increased revenue or a certain amount of increase per taxpayer. I'm wondering Mr. Speaker if the Mayor would clarify what his intentions are with the word "cap" on business tax?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I think the reference was very specific. What I said is that we will not be taking major windfalls. It's quite simple. It was very clear. It was very specific. That is something we are looking at. That is something that will be coming forward to Council in the very, very near future.

It comes as no surprise to everybody here that we are obviously working on the Operating Budget and that will be taking place within the next month. So just to reiterate what I specifically said is that we will not take windfalls, okay. We will take growth but we will not take windfalls.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Do you have a supplementary Councillor Benham? No. Councillor Wyatt in the second round.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I thank the Mayor for his responses to my previous questions.

Back in November I had the opportunity to come before EPC along with a delegation of the Manitoba Real Estate Association with regards to the issue of property taxes and school taxes on property.

And as a follow-up to that we, questions on the Council floor in November of last year, it was indicated that basically by yourself Your Worship, that there was a general consensus that on, that school taxes should not be on property tax, on the property tax bill. And you indicated at that time that basically in the new year, as quickly as possible that there would be a way to start addressing this with the Provincial government as this is a high priority with the City of Winnipeg. And I'm just wondering what progress has been made on that file since that time. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I thank Councillor Wyatt for the question. I remember the presentation vividly, like it was yesterday and there is very little doubt that I believe the majority of

Council, if not all Council excepts the fact that school taxes should not be on a property tax bill.

Unfortunately the Provincial government may not be of the same opinion as we speak here. I can tell you that this is a conversation that has come up between myself and the Premier. They believe they are working at it very slowly. They are trying to get there. They are looking at ways to replace that revenue.

I was very surprised and disappointed to hear approximately two and a half weeks ago, the Minister of Education basically say that they are not going to be doing anything with that and the logical explanation he gave was that if we did that that would just give the City the opportunity to tax people more. I'm not impressed to hear those comments. They were made public through the media.

I can certainly tell you that we've been, we're working towards arranging a meeting with the Premier very shortly within the next few weeks. This certainly is a serious issue. This is going to be an uphill battle but it's something that we certainly have to discuss and I certainly, I hope I can count on everyone's support here on the floor of Council.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes Mr. Mayor, you have to forgive the Minister of Education. I think he is from Gimli so cities are a relatively new thing to him, so.

Mr. Speaker: The tarring and feathering…

Councillor Wyatt: Don't go to Gimli soon. But anyway, in light of that, what is, because of the fact that we are now announcing the school divisions talking about their rising property taxes, that they are planning on inflicting on us, and we're going to be in the next Council meeting or two having a vote on their school bills to be forwarded on to the taxpayer, what is the strategy to immediately take this to the Province and make this a top priority so that we start to see some results on this fast?

Mr. Speaker: Question has been asked, thank you.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In the past after there has been an assessment, it's no secret that the school boards have taken this windfall, while the City has changed the mill rate and kept everything the way it is. I can tell you, through you Mr. Speaker to Councillor Wyatt that this is an issue that I did address with the Premier and told him that we cannot stand by and let that happen.

I believe the Premier is on side. And by the same token we'll find out in very near future whether there has been dialogue with them and whether something is going to happen or whether they'll have to take action. But there is a concern. I'm also concerned that your opening comment may not exactly be great for my next meeting with Ron Bell, so thank you for making it a very pleasant meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Not with Ron Bell. Final supplementary Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: And I guess I come back to the question again and that is what is the strategy? We're going to have these tax bills coming out again. The Province is not being specific. What is the strategy on dealing with the Province to directly? I appreciate the fact you've met with the Premier. What is the ongoing strategy to bring this issue to the floor to make sure that this is dealt with and that we don't have another year and year and year with regards to this being consistently on our tax bills?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through to you Councillor Wyatt, it would be very nice to have a strategy when you're in control of a situation. I think as everybody knows here we are not in control of that situation. We have to work with the Province on this matter. And the bottom line is, is that we've already been told that this is something that's not going to happen overnight.

By the same token I think it's important that we all speak with a united voice. I'm talking about all citizens, all Councillors, everybody, saying this has to be changed. Keep in mind, it's the public, it's the citizens who elect Councillors, who elect MLAs, okay, who elect the Mayor, who elect the Premier. I think it's up to the people to raise their voice, supported by Council because we are not in control of this. We certainly can have an impact if that's how we do it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the Mayor. Given that it's public knowledge that the company that has done our photo radar project for the last several years has been charged with offering secret commissions. And further, that our Auditor has stated publicly, our review of this photo radar clearly demonstrates that citizens deserve better stewardship of financial resources. Knowing that we need to have our people vindicated, will the Mayor commit today to an independent outside review of how, of our process that we went through to end up with a photo radar program that we have today?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I thank Councillor Swandel for the question and let's not pretend that this is not a serious issue because it is a very serious issue and I do have genuine concerns about it. And I'm not going to pretend when I read reports in the media about what is taking place in Edmonton; you know I don't start thinking just like everybody else. So this is something that yes, I am concerned about, thinking about on a regular basis.

By the same token, you know, the Audit Committee met yesterday. We saw the report. EPC will be meeting next week and is this something that I'm prepared to look into? Absolutely. Am I going to just do a knee-jerk reaction? No, Mr. Speaker. Okay, but when the time is right and if it's needed we will act, I can assure you of that.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Supplementary very quickly.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Timing is of the essence here. Time is of the essence here. The potential to be public …

Mr. Speaker: Question? Question?

Councillor Swandel: Will the Mayor commit to an independent review of our photo radar contract process?

Mr. Speaker: That question's been asked. Mayor Katz.

Councillor Swandel: It hasn't been answered.

Mr. Speaker: And it's been replied. Okay. Time for questions has expired. We move on to the report of the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee of February 7th, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED FEBRUARY 7, 2006

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the minutes of the meeting of the Committee on February the 7th and I'll move clause 1 as a Consent item.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? That's Carried.

Are there any questions for Public Works? Councillor Smith. I saw you first.

Councillor Smith: Well, I noticed by the way he always looks over that area first and gets Benham and Gerbasi.

Mr. Speaker: I tilt to the right a little more than the left Councillor. I'm sorry. (Laughter)

Councillor Smith: Anyway my question is this. We're having tremendous problems in my ward with garbage collection. And in fact, this morning I got an email and this person said "I had a

meeting with my lawyer today and I've decided to explore the possibility of filing a formal lawsuit complaint against the City of Winnipeg. I believe West End residents are being subjected to an unfair manner. They're being forced to live in an unhealthy inhumane circumstance. The fact is the department has always said at Christmas time that there is a reason for the delay. But there are still delays and it was the delays before Christmas. This is not an isolated incidence. We are taking about a massive problem and I would like you to look into it. Would you?"

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement. Maybe if you provided him with the information.

Councillor Clement: I was actually, I actually never actually heard the question other than will you look into but I'm not sure exactly what I'm supposed to look into. He didn't really tell us, I don't know what the problem is.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith. Okay, Councillor Smith on the supplementary.

Councillor Smith: "I'm writing to let you know that garbage collection has become, once again a serious problem in the area. I phoned the City several times already and no solution has been found so far. There are mountains of garbage all over the place. Some autobins are already overflowing. The garbage issue has become an acceptable situation." In other words, there has been delay after delay in the West End in picking up garbage. It's not isolated instances, it's you know, I went down for example one back lane …

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith you're out of order. Perhaps if your just forward Councillor Clement your email then he'd have something he could deal with with the staff rather than, rather than, rather than being rhetorical.

Councillor Clement: I'd be happy to look into it, Mr. Speaker. I know that anytime that a constituent contacts me about waste removal I simply call Dan McInnis on my own. His number is 986-4471 and when I phone him he usually handles the issue. But I don't know whether that's been happening or whether this is, you know, somebody just wants somebody else to do the work, but I'd be happy to look into it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Final supplementary? No. Okay. Anything else? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Through you Mr. Speaker, Councillor Clement given that any future building of an indoor soccer facility will come under Public Works, the building itself will, has there been any conversation with Public Works about the building of an indoor soccer facility for the south end of the City of Winnipeg?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: No there hasn't at this present time Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Councillor?

Councillor Swandel: As the chair of Public Works, Mr. Speaker through you to the chair of Public Works, is the chair aware of any timelines that have been put forward as to when Public Works may be looking at a building being made available?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: The only timelines that I'm aware of in terms of the dispersement of the $43 million dollars is that there is a plan to spend that money over five years, which everybody knows because that's how the money is coming from the Province as I understand it, over a period of time. And my understanding is, is that the $6 million dollars that would be made available out of that pot of money for a soccer facility flows in 2008. That's the only timeline that I'm aware of at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary? No? Any other questions? Then we move on to Fiscal Issues, Councillor O'Shaughnessy, report of February 7th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED FEBRUARY 7, 2006

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Before I get into my in-depth, lengthy Committee report I would like to take this opportunity to invite all Winnipeggers to visit Gimli and to enjoy the Capital of New Iceland and all that it has to offer. And with that, I would like to introduce and move adoption by concurrence of item 1 of the report of February 7th.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? That's Carried.

I'm sure Mayor Chudd will be sending you a cheque. By-laws, Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Move that, pardon me, I move that By-laws No. 71/2006 and 97/2006 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 71/2006 and 97/2006.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I move that By-laws No. 71/2006 and 97/2006 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 71/2006 and 97/2006.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'd move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 71/2006 and 97/2006, be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Any questions for Fiscal Issues? Seeing none we'll move to the Committee on Downtown Development, Councillor Magnifico.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 30, 2006

Councillor Magnifico: I'd like to introduce the report of January 30th and move adoption of the Consent agenda item 1. Or am I on the wrong page?

Mr. Speaker: No I'm sorry I was distracted.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Any questions for Downtown Development? None. Property and Development Committee. Councillor De Smedt, report of January the 10th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 10, 2006

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, with the amendments from Executive Policy Committee, the Waverley West Area Structure Pan, which will be proceeding with an amending By-law for first reading.

Mr. Speaker: Just hang on, sorry. You're moving clause 14 of the report and you want it?

Councillor Gerbasi: I'd like to stand it down please.

Mr. Speaker: Do you want to introduce the report Councillor.

Councillor De Smedt: Yes very briefly if I may. I'm not sure what some of the questions may be but I think we've had an extensive review with the administration as we are trying to move forward with Waverley West. As you all recall, about 13 months ago we all had a, there was a public hearing with respect to an application to move forward with Waverley West to look after a housing lot issue that was emerging very rapidly in the south and southwest part of the City.

And this 3,000 acres is evolving, which is a partnership, though not signed and

sealed officially and run as a partnership, but there are two major players. We have Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation in the north half of Waverley West and we have a private sector developer in the, which is Ladco Corporation in the southern half. And there are other property owners but essentially these are the two major players.

I don't want to spend too much time on the issues here because this goes for a public hearing following our acceptance of first reading, so that the Community Committee can do their due diligence and the appropriate processing of a rezoning of the Area Structure Plan.

But it became very much apparent to many members of Council, that the Waverley West area development is a huge opportunity for growth in the City. It's also with these opportunities, presents some challenges to the City of Winnipeg, in the financials side of things. I say that in reference to a major expressway that has to proceed through the middle of this area, which would be the extension of Highway 75 and the long range plans for Transportation department, and the Province of Manitoba. It is our north-south corridor. Ultimately you would see Highway 75 bypassing St. Norbert, linking up at the Perimeter through to the extension of Kenaston and this is a major commercial route.

There is absolutely no way that this City is able to undertake those financial obligations, as envisioned by the applicants in this particular case. MHRC, for a very innovative design on a split pair, what they call a couplet building in a town centre, and having a one-way, north and south through-way in this particular area. The delta costs are quite significant.

We don't debate that particular issue. I think it has great innovation but I think the message that we have to send not only to ourselves but to our partners over in the Province, is that major trunk highways through the City need to be supported by the Provincial government, and in this particular case, one of their Crown Corporations, MHRC.

And so, the development parameters do apply but we need, in terms of when we're dealing with private sector whether it's a Crown Corporation or let's say private sector, that we would have shared expenses. In this particular case, it is a major trunk highway coming through the system.

And if we do want to look and vision ahead and get off this regional street concept that we have, that sees developers coming in and demanding access because if they're going to pay really towards a major throughway, or major arterial, which we know and in the old vernacular as regional streets, in the new hierarchy that we have approved in Council back in 2001 on development parameters when transportation modeling. We call them minor arterials, major arterials, those are what you know as regional streets, not majors and minors, and we've included in that new protocol something called an expressway.

That expressway is indeed very important to the commerce of this City. It tends to reflect future corridors that are important to the business sector and it is not no longer just an immediate responsibility of the immediate developers. It's a City applied large expense but because these are major trunk throughways we believe and are recommending that the shared costs have to also not only come from the developer in certain respects, in this case MHRC, but also from the Province.

And so that's the significant protocol that's appended to your report. I think it's, if I can just flash it, you will be able to see the major report, and I think it's Appendix C, The Waverley West Financial Cost-Sharing Model Framework. And I think this does reflect our development parameters but it does accentuate the importance of when we're moving ahead in major developments in this City that we need to have some assistance from the next level of government, which is our Province, because these are trunk roads, important to commerce for the Province as well as it is to the City.

So that's essentially, the amendments have been made. With that I would like to

say that we know it has to go for public hearing so I do not want to prejudice what may have to be discussed there. The applicants will be there, both Ladco and MRHC to discuss this Area Structure Plan, a secondary plan frankly, is what it is and as they tend to move ahead.

We do know that the north half of West Waverley is the half that's under the auspices of MHRC and they have, they are anxious to move ahead. Ladco is in the southern section and they are proceeding with their plans for neighbourhood plans.

In any event my colleagues I'll take questions but I can assure you that the vetting of this particular secondary plan before we move it for first reading was carefully considered to make sure that we have the right dynamics in terms of the fiscal capability of this City to take that plan and move it ahead. With that I'd be prepared Mr. Speaker to take any questions and hopefully I could shed some light on it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi speaking to the clause.

Councillor Swandel: Point of Order.

(Point of Order)

Mr. Speaker: Sorry Councillor Swandel on a Point of Order.

Councillor Swandel: I think it's important before Councillor Gerbasi speaks on this matter, the City is actually the proponent in this as to comes forward to Community Committee. There is an applicant that is different so arguments to the specific content of the documents coming forward may not be appropriate for to us have here. Well it was appropriate for Councillor De Smedt to state what was coming forward in the document, I don't know how far we can go down that road.

I don't see anybody here from Legal but they were in our discussions as it went through the process, both Legal and Property and Development were very careful that we followed a specific procedure and what we are allowed to do. This is uncharted water for us in these green field Area Structure Plans. I just want to ask your consideration in that regard.

Mr. Speaker: I've been advised this is, this is a debatable clause but keeping in mind that if Council passes this it will go forward to a public hearing and we ought not to be, we ought to try and avoid making comments that might prejudice that hearing. So, I think Councillor Gerbasi is probably aware of that. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a comment first of all on the approach being used here in bringing this Area Plan forward. With Waverley West, I just wanted to be clear to everybody, that the planning process is being led by the developer of the land rather than our own City planners. This report before us is ND-Lea's report not the Planning, Property and Development staff report. ND-Lea is working for the developers on the behalf of Ladco and the MHRC.

EPC directed this process this way and I can only speculate as to why they would take that role away from our capable City planners. I do not share their, the apparent lack of confidence in our own Planning's ability to lead our secondary planning process. So I think the public has a right to know that's what's happening here because it's different then what we usually see.

Our Planning department has the interest of the citizens at heart first and they have no vested interest in the development and I think the public needs to know. Our Planning department now will be forced to come back later in the process and try to convince Council to alter the development's recommendations. It's not a Planning report we have in front of us. It's not our own administrative report.

If you dig deep into it, there are eight pages that are written by our Planning department out of the whole massive stack of documents. And you will find the comments indicating that the department will be proposing an amendment to the

draft plan to include a policy that addresses the density of the residential development. To translate this for you, the developers have made no commitment to a higher density development in their version of the Area Structure Plan.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker Point of Order if I might?

Mr. Speaker: Sit down.

(Point of Order)

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: What's before us is should we have a public hearing or not? You can't debate what's in it. That's the cause, that's the public hearing. What is before us is should we or should we not have a public hearing at the Community Committee level. You can't debate what's in it or you're pre-judging the hearing and you can't vote on it in Council.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I've said, yeah, I've asked Councillors to be careful of that to avoid getting into the details because this is likely to go to a public hearing and we simply don't need to put the City in a legal position where somebody is going to accuse us of having prejudiced the public hearing before it's taken place. So I just ask for some caution here and stick to the generalities of whether or not this should go to public hearing.

(Point of Order)

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of Order Mr. Speaker. Am I not allowed to speak to the comments of the administration when they just recommend it? When they commented in the report that they are going to be amending it?

Mr. Speaker: My advice is you ought not to get into the content, into that level of detail because this is going, I'm presuming to a public hearing, and I don't think either our Legal department or anyone else needs to get into a lawsuit over somebody getting into prejudicing it.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: So, it's one of those things. It's an odd thing and it's probably something that we need to get a change to in the Charter but today we have to deal what we have.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, well my initial, the first part of my comments were just clarifying the process that this is not a typical administrative report. It's a report written by consultants. So I just wanted that on.

I'd also like them to comment on the change that was made in the cost, financial cost, the amendment which was made at EPC which I believe I can comment on. I'm concerned that this, this split, one way pair configuration of Kenaston is really quite innovative and without it, as Peter De Smedt has already commented on it, so I think I should be able to comment on that, and it concerns me that we're adding more costs to that very innovative part of it. And that that concerns me greatly. But before Councillor O'Shaughnessy has a fit I'll leave that, the rest of that to the public hearing.

The other costs that are being added on concern me overall, that we're tinkering with that. I don't know what the, what the costs ultimately should be. But one of the things that the Province committed to was that the funding, any profits from this development will go to the inner city.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, excuse me. Proceed.

Councillor Gerbasi: And because EPC, I'm discussing this issue because EPC at their meeting altered the financial cost analysis so I thought it was something we could discuss at Council since we're approving their altering of it. If that's not the case, then I don't know how we can approve that. I'm just trying, I'm trying to follow process.

And what I'm saying is that I'm concerned that if we add a huge number of costs on to the Province, which in a way we want to do because we don't want to be stuck with the cost, my concern is that the inner city which was going to benefit from the

profits, from the MHRC, will not see those profits. So that's a point that I just wanted, I haven't heard anybody mention that.

I'd also like to raise the issue of impost fees which has not been discussed publicly and because we are not just seeing Waverley West, we're seeing 5,000 new homes going in in St. Boniface as well. And I really, it concerns me that there hasn't been a discussion at Council to make sure that we are fully covering the off-site development costs that come with this kind of suburban development. Most cities have these kind of fees and they are seen as absolutely necessary towards working towards sustainability in their city's budgets and almost every other major city has those kind of fees.

And we had heard about this idea and then it disappeared off the radar screen. I know that the development community was up in arms and came down here and next thing we know it's no longer being discussed. So I would really like it hear from Councillor De Smedt and the Mayor, what happened to that discussion and could Council please have a seminar or an open public discussion on this as one way of fully covering the costs of this kind of suburban growth so that it doesn't impact on the rest of the City and our ability to pay for it.

It also concerns me that we say we're making money off of this development but is that money going to be put back into the operating costs of all the increased services this new development will need? And those are concerns I raised earlier in the *Plan Winnipeg* discussion, but other decisions we make, such as operating ones affect whether this suburban development really pays for itself.

And I would, I think it concerns me that there hasn't been any discussion at Council. There was, it was in the media that we were looking at impost fees and it sounded like there was some interest in it from some members of EPC and then all of a sudden it just disappeared and there has never been a discussion among all of Council and that really concerns me.

I think we should look at what other cities are doing because in the long-term we have to think very, very long-term when we move ahead with this type of expanded growth. I mean if it's not done properly. If it's not done with the proper costing and I don't think we should making decisions on the fly at EPC in terms of changing financial cost analysis last week, at an EPC meeting and amending it on the fly. I think our own administration should have vetted that cost analysis publicly. It should have been their report that analyzed that before we start amending it.

So I find the whole process a little concerning. I realize everything is according to the rules and I'm not saying anything has been done officially that it can't be done that way I'm just saying that I would have liked to see our own Planning officials leading this process. I've said that from the beginning and I really don't understand why they haven't been given that role. I think they are the ones who should be doing that. They are the ones who have the public interest at heart. They have the long-term thinking at heart and they have no vested interest in this development. And I'm just baffled that something the size of Waverley West, 40,000 homes in the future, is not being controlled in terms of bringing forward a Secondary Plan by Planners. And I just can't believe it and I'm very concerned about it. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel on this clause.

Councillor Swandel: Just a quick comment on procedure process as this Waverley West document has come forward. The original process that was put forward, agreed to by the Planners, by everybody, was one that there would be a consultative process that would end in a document of consensus between the, involving the developers and our Planning department. Our Planning department was involved in this process all the way through. They were part of it, they were at every step of the way. They put it forward as consensus with one line as an exception and they asked if that one line

be added in the document around the issue of density and that line in itself was more just creating the connection to *Plan Winnipeg*, so.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker how come he's allowed to talk about the issue of density? I would like to talk about it.

Councillor Swandel: This is process that I was talking to. I thought I was very clear.

Mr. Speaker: Just sit down please Councillor. You know Councillors we're really, I'm almost at the point where I don't care if we prejudice this thing. The lawyers are going to have to handle it. If this is a debatable clause, I'm just asking keep, try to keep outside of the details of what might be considered at a public hearing and especially Councillors since you're going to be sitting on it. So if we can just skirt, skirt the details please.

Councillor Swandel: So to be perfectly clear again, what I was talking about was the process that got us to this point, not any particular argument to do with the document. Councillor Gerbasi made reference to the process, I wanted to correct her on her inaccuracies. This was one of consultation and consensus and I will leave it at that. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker can I ask for some procedural guidance off the top. Councillor O'Shaughnessy, Councillor Swandel made a Point of Order at the beginning, Councillor O'Shaughnessy made a Point of Order at the beginning, both of them suggesting that we couldn't debate anything at all of substance. You as Speaker have ruled that we should be careful but as a new member of Council I'm simply not aware of what you're intending there. Could you clarify to me what is in our ambit to discuss here and what isn't? Councillor Gerbasi raised questions of density and was ruled out of order. Councillor Swandel (In Audible).

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I've got you. I've already indicated, in case you weren't hearing, that avoid getting into the details of what is going to be considered at the public hearing. Really, stick to whether or not this should go to a public hearing and that's probably on the safest ground. So, let's try to do that if we can please.

Councillor Benham: Well Mr. Speaker, I'm still puzzled because of course Councillor O'Shaughnessy maintains that that was the only issue here but that is not the only issue here. Executive Policy Committee has amended the report in a number of different respects and I believe that those should be, I would submit to you that those should be debatable as well. That the motion is not simply that this should go to public hearing Mr. Speaker. The motion, that motion was amended several times. Should not those amendments be properly debatable?

Mr. Speaker: Continue Councillor. Let's go ahead.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker:

Mr. Speaker: Start the clock please.

Councillor Benham: All right Mr. Speaker on the clause, I would like to, first of all thank Councillor Gerbasi for her comments because I believe it is true. When I was listening to Executive Policy Committee here the submissions on Waverley West last January, a little more than a year ago Mr. Speaker, I was very concerned because the members of Executive Policy Committee consistently raised this question of let's turn the planning over to the developers. Let's make the developers take this on and give us the plan and then of course we retain our right to say yea or nay as City Council.

But Mr. Speaker, I think that our City Planners are paid to think about the City as a whole. Our City Planners are paid to think about the future of this City and the best way it should go in the public interest, Mr. Speaker, not in the private interest of developers. So I believe that that was a mistake to begin with but now that it has happened, we have a chance to go to public hearings, I of course Mr.

Speaker will support the motion to go to public hearings but I think it is very proper that we as City Councillors make some statement about the general principles that should guide us in this discussion.

And that's what I think should properly be debated here is that this should be like first reading in the House of Commons, a debate in principle about where we're going, with this very, very important suburban development. Something that will have thousands and thousands of Winnipeggers that will be residence for thousands of Winnipeggers and it should be well thought out, well planned, under some ideas and some guidance from this Council and in the public interest.

I believe that we need different kinds of suburbs. There are, there is kind of a cookie cutter approach to suburbs Mr. Speaker and the price of the houses go up and down a little bit and the lot sizes go up and down a little bit but they really are the same kind of suburbs. And Mr. Speaker, the potential for Waverley West was that we were going to have a different suburb and Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if it's going to turn out that way because of a number of institutionalized and systemic problems that are built into it.

And the first one Mr. Speaker is Transit. Mr. Speaker I voted against Waverley West in the first place because this Council had not supported bus rapid transit. We have some very nice words in this report Mr. Speaker. Transit routes, this is the vision of Waverley West according to this report, "Transit routes provide efficient transportation service to Waverley West residents. The routes provide access to the citywide network including opportunity for future linkage to the proposed Southwest Transit Corridor. Centralized transit nodes are strategically located in the Town Centre and in commercial areas to provide convenient access. Transit routes are located within walking distance of residences."

What a lovely thought Mr. Speaker except that every one of those houses will be about an hour outside the 35 minute contour that Transit has drawn on a map of Winnipeg that shows where you can get on a bus and get to Portage and Main within 35 minutes. And that line Mr. Speaker cuts right through the River Heights part of the River Heights-Fort Garry ward I represent, completely excludes the Linden Woods and Linden Ridge areas I represent, and Waverley West would be another 20 minutes or half an hour outside of that 35 minute contour.

So Mr. Speaker, what person in Waverley West is going to hop on a bus and spend 45 minutes, an hour, perhaps an hour and a half, getting downtown? And 45 minutes would be a ridiculous suggestion, more than an hour and probably an hour and a half using a bus. Mr. Speaker it's very unlikely. So all these nice words about Transit mean nothing without a commitment to building bus rapid transit.

Further Mr. Speaker, because people in this suburb, it will be a conventional suburb and it will not have speedy bus rapid transit, they'll all buy cars. They'll all use the major roadways that we will be building and Mr. Speaker when they come to the corner of Kenaston and McGillivray which will continue to exist they will have a choice. They will have a lineup of cars in front of them on Kenaston which despite the underpass we anticipate that with increased traffic and so on, I can just tell you realistically Mr. Speaker, that they will face a long line, miles and miles of cars ahead of them between Kenaston and McGillivray and the St. James Bridge.

Or for a 15 second diversion they can come in through the soft, underbelly of the south of Linden Woods. Linden Woods which was scientifically designed to repel invaders from the north and the west and the east, has a soft underbelly on the south Mr. Speaker of Lindenwoods Avenue East, or Lindenwood Drive East and Lindenwood Drive West, and people can cut through there. They already are, Mr. Speaker. I already have complaints from my residents about cut through traffic in Linden Woods and that is bound to get worse as people take a shortcut. Winnipeggers are notorious for taking shortcuts and as they take a shortcut they will increase traffic problems there and Mr. Speaker we as a City Council, we as

a public service will have done nothing to provide them with meaningful alternatives.

We'll have a lot of nice words about how we're providing Transit routes the way we provide Transit routes everywhere, nobody will take them and eventually we'll cut those routes from every hour to every two hours and then no Sunday service and we'll do everything else and then we'll say oh isn't it too bad that nobody takes Transit and there is no demand for it.

Well Mr. Speaker there's a reason. There's a reason and the reason is because this City Council has not been firm. This City Council has not provided those alternatives and this City Council as a result will build, will be part of and complicit in building another suburb just like every other suburb. It will in fact, Mr. Speaker be a complete, a complete lack of vision. It will show a complete lack of vision and on the part of this Council.

So Mr. Speaker, I will proceed, we will proceed with this. I will vote to proceed with this but I am disappointed Mr. Speaker that we aren't working harder to come up with better ideas for a different kind of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. As Councillors are aware of in the past, I voted for putting some sort of development in Waverley West. I felt that we needed to expand the amount of land. That we were running out of space. There was a lot of serious work done that showed that we were running out of space within the City, and that that area was the one that was in most in need of development.

But I have concerns. My first concern is the lack of an administrative report. The administration should be leading the process not playing catch up afterwards and I am looking for that. There is a major traffic route that allows for a single vehicle, single occupancy vehicles, but there is no comments on rapid transit. If there has been comments put on rapid transit, please bring them to my attention because I haven't seen them at this point. And I had stated that one of my criteria for supporting this was that it be smart development. And as I've said in the past I'm not anti development, I'm anti stupid development and I want to see more details on this. I believe it should definitely go to a public, public hearing, but I am looking for these things to be included in what comes back from the public hearing, and I have a lot of questions and I need those questions answered. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt closing debate.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Colleagues we are being asked to be as visionary as we possibly can. For those that have been a little bit concerned about the process and that the administration should lead, please, read these words. "The City of Winnipeg Planning department and the principal landowners of Waverley West agreed to a two-tiered planning process for Waverly West. The two-tiered approach includes Area Structure Plan", which we want to go for first reading today, "to address high level community wide issues - to be followed by specific Neighbourhood Area Structure Plans for each neighbourhood in Waverley West. This two-tiered approach ensures that the high level community issues, (transportation, servicing, neighbourhood delineation, etc.)" transit, multi-family housing, recreational properties, location of recreation centres, fire halls, police maybe, "can be dealt with through one overall plan while providing some needed flexibility for each developer to proceed with specific neighbourhood level plans on their own timeline and incorporating their own development priorities."

The City of Winnipeg, the department wasn't complicit in trying to bring this forward and sidebar us. They were part of the process. It was a co-operative approach. Think public private partnerships if you wish. This is really important to us and I'm trying not to just find one simple remark that might make you feel better but simply to say to us I've been watching this City for a few more years than some of you. And it is clearly

evident that we have not had, in many instances and don't get all excited here, a well-planned City.

For those of you who have been around for awhile you may object to that but you know we are not a well-planned City. Once Unicity happened, I'm not sure what went wrong but we had too many interests. Not friends, but interests and out of that allowed regional streets here, there, everywhere. Bridges to go in here, there, everywhere. Transportation, and if I can listen to the transportation, transit issues haven't really got reconciled. In fact if money had been no object, you know Mayor Juba, in his *WATS Report,* the late '60s, had the right approach. I'd like to see that, I'm sorry I just forget the technology, going right down the middle of Portage Avenue, the monorail. If technology, if money was no object it would have been beautiful and all over the City.

There is no question that had we had a growth development plan, this is one of the things that the Planning department has been asking for years and we have not funded it. Is that we need a growth management plan of this City so that you can absorb all these intricate issues, regarding growth, demand, destination origin in the transportation context, studies and bring it all together. And to work with our Provincial partners to decide how in the heck do we fund major trunk highways coming into the City?

Very interestingly, several years ago when Councillor O'Shaughnessy and I were standing on the corner of Highway 90 and Inkster, opening up the extra two lanes that a lot of people were aggressively irritated about but it was essential that we do that for traffic going north. Guess who paid most of the money? Not all of it but we paid more than you know it was supposed to be a third, a third, a third. We were at 35% and the other levels of government were lower because they always ask us to do more. We always seem to get caught out in this protocol.

So simply what we're saying here today is that we have to look ahead. Waverley West plan has come forward, it's been a co-operative effort. It is visionary. MHRC on behalf of their masters at the Province have some ideas of a compact urban form, that town centre that can be innovative that would include Transit. Now it may not necessarily at the outset have a rapid transit route right to it but I think as the Mayor had indicated we are proceeding towards a Transit system. We're doing the most important things first to improve the system and in the longer term I think those other iterations will happen.

If we do get this couplet and this Kenaston transportation route properly set up, as envisioned by the proponents, we will rapidly be able to get people from downtown through to the town centre where we may have some proper, multi-family infill developments and may have some other innovations.

The Province has all sorts of ideas. They have…

Mr. Speaker: Time.

Councillor De Smedt: I'm sorry. I wasn't watching the time. I didn't really want to extend this. Colleagues we could talk in detail about this but we don't want to situate what the Community Committee have to do. I appreciate some of the comments but the department has worked in co-operation. It is a partnership. So I would encourage your support for first reading and let the plan unfold. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of the clause? Opposed? Carried.

Report of January the 31st, Councillor De Smedt.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JANUARY 31, 2006**

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and I'm trying to, I move that report and items 1 to 13.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 10 is stood down because there is an amendment. Any other clauses?

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On the balance of report?

Councillor De Smedt: Right.

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

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor De Smedt
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee held a Public Hearing on January 17, 2006, concerning subdivision/rezoning application DASZ 35/2005 for property located on the north side of Reenders Drive east of Lagimodiere Boulevard;

AND WHEREAS the recommendation from the Administration for approval included a condition whereby the Developer shall transfer to the City and legally open as street right-of-way property required for a widening of Reenders Drive abutting lands fronting the Planned Area as shown on Schedule "A" which would include all of Lots 1, 2 and 3;

AND WHEREAS the Community Committee amended the recommendation from the Administration whereby the Applicant would be required to transfer to the City and legally open as street right-of-way property required for the widening of Reenders Drive abutting lands fronting on Lot 1 only as shown on Schedule "A";

AND WHEREAS the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development considered the recommendation from the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee at its meeting on January 31, 2006, and amended the recommendation of approval from the Community Committee by reinstating a condition of approval that would require that the widening of Reenders Drive extend across all of the lands in the Planned Area including Lots 1, 2 and 3;

AND WHEREAS the Developer is only proposing to acquire, rezone and develop Lot 1 at this time and Lots 2 and 3 are to remain zoned A-5, Agricultural District and undeveloped in the ownership of a third party,

AND WHEREAS the City at the present time requires only the widening in front of Lot 1 for the proposed development to proceed and the City's interest in the balance of the widening can be included in a caveat on proposed Lot 2,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council amend Item 10 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated January 31, 2006, as follows:

1) Delete Condition 1 of the Report of the Administrative Coordinating Group dated December 20, 2005, and substitute therefore the following:

"That the Developer shall transfer to the City and legally open as street right-of-way, all at no expense to the City, property required for the widening of Reenders Drive abutting lands fronting Lot 1 as shown on Schedule "A" for File DASZ 35/2005, dated January 4, 2006, as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works."

2) Add a new Clause 1. B:

"1B. That the Developer be required to enter into a Subdivision Agreement with the City stating that no development shall be allowed on Lot 2 until such time as the property required for the widening of Reenders Drive abutting Lot 2 is transferred to the City and legally opened as right-of-way, all at no expense to the City and that the Subdivision Agreement shall be registered by caveat on the title for Lot 2."

Mr. Speaker: Clause 10.

Councillor De Smedt: And clause 10, there is an amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Amendment Motion No. 4.

Councillor De Smedt: Motion No. 4 by, which was necessitated. The language wasn't quite right. It had been amended between Community Committee and P & D. We have the language right which will still obligate and secure widenings for a future opening of Reenders by the developer.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Question on the, question on the amendment?

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

On the clause as amended.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

The report of February 14th.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED FEBRUARY 14, 2006**

Councillor De Smedt: February 14th, Mr. Speaker, that is the Public Markets Use Land Plan. May I suggest to our colleagues Mr. Speaker that I would like to propose a layover for up to 60 days. Let's say to table the matter to the Council meeting of the 26th of April. We need some clarity would be my explanation. There is a lot of things going on here and I think in fairness, in fairness to the ward Councillor, in fairness to us all, it's important that we get this right. We really need to maybe just pause a little bit and get it right. And I would encourage support for that.

Mr. Speaker: Okay you moved…

Councillor De Smedt: So I would move layover to…

Mr. Speaker: To table.

Councillor De Smedt: Table it to the 26th of April, 2006.

Mr. Speaker: April Council meeting. It's not debatable. Question (In Audible).

Councillor De Smedt: Not beyond. Not beyond. It can come before if there is a, if I may have that clarification Mr. Speaker. I would like to lay it over for a period of time.

Mr. Speaker: For up to 60 days.

Councillor De Smedt: Up to 60 days, would that help?

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Magnifico
Seconded by Councillor Smith

WHEREAS on March 21, 2001, Council approved a consolidated service delivery facility on the eastern part of the City at the Public Markets site;

AND WHEREAS that the administrative report appended to the Council Decision of March 21, 2001 outlines that the Public Works East Yards was to be located on a specific site bordering Dawson Road (appended as Schedule A in the March 21, 2001 Council Minutes);

AND WHEREAS this specific site bordering Dawson Road was selected after community consultations and the community supported the specific site bordering Dawson Road on the Public Market site;

AND WHEREAS the option selected in Recommendation No. 1 of Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated February 14, 2006 recommends a location for the Public Works East Yards on the Public Markets site which is different than the March 21, 2001 Council Decision;

AND WHEREAS the community has indicated their strong preference on this matter and the citizens no longer support locating the Public Works East Yards anywhere on the Public Market site;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Recommendation No. 1 of Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated February 14, 2006 be amended so as to reflect that the Public Works East Yards be located in the St. Boniface Industrial Park (or another suitable location) as

opposed to being located anywhere on the Public Markets site.

Mr. Speaker: That would include the amendment here. So Councillor De Smedt has moved that this clause and the amendment be tabled for up to 60 days. It's not debatable except one individual can speak in opposition to that for three minutes. If not we'll call the question.

Councillor Magnifico: Could I get a clarification on the question?

Mr. Speaker: What don't you understand about up to 60 days?

Councillor Magnifico: Up to 60 days would indicate that in 10 days something could happen?

Mr. Speaker: Well the next Council meeting or else the April Council meeting

Councillor Magnifico: So this doesn't give, so this specific motion would not allow any real time then? Up to 60 days.

Mr. Speaker: Up to 60 days. It comes back to Council within 60 days. Well it will be on the Council agenda in 60 days.

Councillor Magnifico: Could…

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of the motion? Opposed? Sounds like it's Carried.

The motion was to table this for up to 60 days.

Councillor Clement: Opposed. Absolutely I'm opposed. Can I speak to it?

Mr. Speaker: Let's do a recorded vote on it then because the motion was to table up to 60 days. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Benham, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas, Wyatt.

Nays

Councillors O'Shaughnessy, Clement, Magnifico, Smith, Swandel, Mr. Speaker Councillor Eadie.

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

Mr. Speaker: The layover is carried.

So that concludes the amendment Motion No. 3.

Now we'll proceed to By-laws. I believe, or is there another motion?

Councillor De Smedt: No, I think…

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

Councillor De Smedt: Mr. Speaker, I would like move that By-law No. 10/2006, By-law of the City of Winnipeg to adopt a Secondary Plan for Waverley West, be read a first time.

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

Councillor De Smedt: I have some additional ones, I'll just scroll this.

I would move that By-law No. 141/2005, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 141/2005.

Councillor De Smedt: And I would move that By-law No. 141/2005 as amended, be read a third time and that

the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed

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

We have another.

Councillor De Smedt: I have another series, Mr. Speaker. I'll try and simplify this. I would like to move first reading of By-law 74/2006, and I'll just scroll through them, 76/2006, 77/2006, 78/2006, 79/2006, 80/2006, 81/2006, 82/2006, 83/2006, 84/2006, 86/2006, 87/2006, 88/2006, 89/2006, 90/2006, 91/2006, 92/2006, 93/2006, 94/2006, 95/2006, 96/2006, all be read first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 74/2006, 76/2006, 77/2006, 78/2006, 79/2006, 80/2006, 81/2006, 82/2006, 83/2006, 84/2006, 86/2006, 87/2006, 88/2006, 89/2006, 90/2006, 91/2006, 92/2006, 93/2006, 94/2006, 95/2006, 96/2006.

Councillor De Smedt: I move that, Mr. Speaker I move that By-laws No. 74/2006, 76/2006 to 84/2006 both inclusive, and 86/2006 to 96/2006 both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 74/2006, 76/2006 to 84/2006 both inclusive, and 86/2006 to 96/2006 both inclusive.

Councillor De Smedt: I would move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 74/2006, 76/2006 to 84/2006 both inclusive, and 86/2006 to 96/2006 both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Any questions for P and D?

Standing Committee on Protection and Community Services, Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED FEBRUARY 7, 2006

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'll introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent items 1 to 9, for the report February 7, 2006.

Mr. Speaker: 1 to 3.

Councillor Steeves: Sorry, 1 to 3, my mistake.

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

Any questions for? Councillor Swandel?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Swandel: Through you Mr. Speaker to the chair of Protection. The plan that was put before us this morning or the concept that was put before us this morning of a sports centre at the Canada Packers site, can the chair of Protection comment on how that fits in with our current recreation and leisure facilities plan?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Lockstep Mr. Speaker. I think everyone is, everybody is, everybody is aware that the discussion regarding the Public Works yard is a two-tiered discussion and I thank Councillor Swandel for the question.

There are residents in the area who, for whatever reason, have concerns that they weren't involved in the process four years ago and they want to catch up with the process, which is fine. I think around the Council Chamber there are people here who have concerns about the process. They're concerned the ward Councillor maybe didn't have, I guess an adequate say in what is going into the property. I don't know what the distribution on Council is with respect to that very important issue.

But I think the issue beyond that is the issue of construction that might occur on that property, ultimately and of course there is a "plan", that's been, well, I don't know distributed that might be too strong a word, but there has been a plan that has been drawn. I know at Executive Policy Committee there was a 8" by 14" sheet. There was only one copy that was passed around the Executive Policy Committee wherein it showed an indoor soccer complex; it showed a skateboard park; it showed a very, bigger and smaller soccer fields. To my knowledge, there has never been any endorsement whatsoever from this Council and a Committee of Council with respect to that project. I think it's important that everybody realize that and that everybody make a very strong distinction between those two items.

When we heard from the residents who spoke on this issue, they were concerned about the issue of a Public Works yard. They were concerned about what was going into the property next to where they live, which is fine. That is a completely different issue than somebody offering up an endorsation of a proposed plan to build an indoor soccer facility or some other recreational complex.

So, the crystallized and short answer to Councillor Swandel's question is, I don't believe there is any connection between the proposed recreational complexes and our administration's plan. I just don't think that connection has ever been made. Good or bad, I just don't think that it exists.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Swandel?

Councillor Swandel: A point of clarification. Question Period answers are to be brief and to the point. Is that not correct? My supplemental specifically is can the chair of Protection and Community Services, through you Mr. Speaker let us know if the construction of new buildings for recreation will require the closure of other buildings?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: On maybe just one clarification on the question with respect to this property, is that the question or just generally?

Councillor Swandel: In general.

Councillor Steeves: Well strictly speaking the answer is no. I mean where we build new buildings all the time that don't require the closing of other properties. Although the question, I guess directs my attention to the, the direction of our Community Services department specifically with respect to community centres wherein we've kind of put a limit on square footage.

So if that's where that is coming from and I think the message that's been sent through GCWCC, is that if we're looking to consolidate within communities, community centre space, then yes, maybe we would look at exchanging space, redefining space and if there is going to be new construction, and maybe in that specific context that would be one of our guidelines. But it's not a hard and fast rule right across our City generally.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the chair of Protection. Does the chair believe in light of recent events around the photo radar program and recent criminal charges in Edmonton that an independent and external review of our City's photo radar contract process should happen?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I guess, I think we have a plan pursuant to the Audit Committee yesterday that we all sat in, not all but some of us sat in on, I know Councillor Swandel was there. Regrettably I don't feel I'm at liberty to discuss what was said in that meeting so I can say I'm comfortable with the direction as come out of that meeting. I guess that's the best I can do Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the chair. There has been some recent reports that the situation with regards to the status of the four district model and this first station to be constructed, was to be constructed or as it stands, is to be constructed. A decision by this Council was made earmarking lands for the purpose of its construction. A sign now stands on the actual site saying "Coming in 2006, A New Police Station for the Community", facing onto Lagimodiere, off of Panet Road. And yet we're hearing now reports that that site may not be the site even though this Council has already made a decision. Is there a report coming forward or is there a plan to change the location of the first new police station to be built in years in the City?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: The plan is as stated and as it has always been. Again, Mr. Speaker, if that changes and if a report surfaces publicly, obviously it will be public information and we can deal with it at that time.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: So as it stands right now, there is no intention to change the location of the station, from its existing site that has been already decided by Council to another site? There is no intention by EPC at this point?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I can't speak to intentions Mr. Speaker. I'll reiterate my previous comment. Council policy and direction is as publicly stated previous. Until further notice that will be the City's policy.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. The final supplementary Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that there is now some confusion over the status of this location of the first station, plus cost overruns of $50 million dollars for the three station plan, is the chair prepared to undertake a review of the entire four district model as approved previously by this Council?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Okay I think just for clarity, what I think Councillor Wyatt was saying, the review. There was no review that was taken by this Council. He was talking about review of the plan that was accepted by this Council, just for clarity. It might have been confusing when he asked the question.

There is no plan for a review and I have no plan to order any such review. We deal with these things as per the Capital Budget. We have Standing Policy Committees. We have our Budget process. That in my estimation should act as a "review" would be my answer Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Magnifico did you have a question?

Councillor Magnifico: Yes I did. Mr. Speaker, just in defence of my St. Boniface area residents that Mr. Steeves mentioned did not have input into what happened on that site, in response to Mr. Swandel's question, they actually did have input into that site in 2001. Regarding…

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a question now?

Councillor Magnifico: Yeah, I want to know if Mr. Steeves is aware that these area residents did have input and that's why they built 200 brand new homes facing that site that we're talking about that would be right in line with that new Public Works yard?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Magnifico: He asked you among the recreation questions.

Mr. Speaker: Are you aware yes or no?

Councillor Steeves: Well yeah I was aware there was a process.

Mr. Speaker: Good. Do you have a supplementary Councillor Magnifico?

Councillor Magnifico: I didn't want one of his long answers either.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary?

Councillor Magnifico: He was starting to think and when that… Mr. Steeves, now that we tried to beat you up a little bit, are you aware of the expenses of the three districts of the fire stations that were mentioned, or I mean not fire stations, police stations that were mentioned, have risen to about, counting the re-cladding of the new building and those models, $40 to $50 million dollars in the next five years. Has there been any thought of maybe re-looking at the plan because it's so expensive and doing something a little different?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Well I think only the, thanks for the question. I mean the four district model is a difficult issue that we've discussed before at this Council and at various Committees both prior to being elected as Councillor and certainly prior to me being chair of this Committee. And it is an important question. I think the, I'm not going to try to reiterate all the history, but in fairness to Councillor Magnifico, he wasn't here, when I think that most of the discussions surrounding this issue took place.

But I think generally speaking, the idea was that we're going to consolidate many of our police stations into newer buildings. Of course as everyone is aware, the reasoning behind it is that the buildings in all likelihood would have to be replaced or refurbished or renovated to some degree and it made sense in terms of renewing our stock to go in a different direction. Now, there is all sorts of issues vis-à-vis the cladding and the backup centre and all those types of things that have been wound in.

I think at this stage of the game, in terms of our Capital Budget, in terms of the ultimate expenditures, I don't think that the lion's share of it is even really in there. So of course as a Council we're going to have to have that discussion at the appropriate time whether or not we want to proceed with what I believe we've already decided. And that is the idea that we're going to a four district model.

So obviously, I mean it's, if we want to, if we want to go onto something different, we as Council are supreme and we can do that and we can change our direction. It's just one of those decisions that we'll have to sit down and make as a Council.

Obviously it's a longer discussion than we have time for right now. I'd be prepared to sit in on that discussion though.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a final supplementary Councillor Magnifico?

Councillor Magnifico: Yes I do. When I wasn't here and that decision was made, Mr. Speaker, how much more has the cost gone up since then, since that original decision? I heard it's astronomical and if that is the case…

Mr. Speaker: Thank you the question's been asked.

Councillor Magnifico: And if that's the case...

Mr. Speaker: No, no speech. It's been asked. How much has it gone up? Councillor Steeves do you know the answer?

Councillor Steeves: You know, yesterday I forwarded the updated numbers on the anticipated cost. I could get the reflected numbers back for Councillor Magnifico and the rest of Council and I could distribute those.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillor Wyatt you had another question.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is, and I want to thank the chair for getting back to me Mr. Speaker with regards to my questions from the January Council meeting, and with regards to one of the questions I had and the costs being outlined. The costs

indicate that the revised values for construction of the east station, the west station and the north station, the west station and the north, the east station is a construction start of 2006, the west in 2011 and the north in 2012.

My question is are the values that have been revised, taking into consideration the fact that we're looking at construction in 2011 and 2012, do they take into consideration the potential for cost increases as we know now that the construction costs have been rising dramatically in the City? And is this based on today's values or potential future values?

Councillor Steeves: You know, I believe they are supposed to take into account anticipated rises, but that's very, very difficult so. And we are all aware that on more than, on more occasions than we care to admit, the costs do in fact rise beyond what's probably budgeted for. So how about this, I can ask that specific question while I'm getting the numbers for Councillor Magnifico and pursuant to the numbers that were forwarded yesterday, we can get as much information to all the Councillors if, we can have a full suite of ideas.

Mr. Speaker: Yes you'll take it as (in audible)

Councillor Steeves: I think that would be fair and if we want to have that discussion I would be prepared to do that.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary Councillor?

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, thank you. Mr. Speaker in light of the fact that we're looking at these large costs with regards to the cladding and now the cost overruns with the four district model, I'd like to know why the chairman feels that a review is not necessary of our policing model in this City.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: A review of policing model, well you mean the four district model? Is that what's, what you mean?

Councillor Wyatt: The distribution of our police model exactly and how we're proceeding.

Councillor Steeves: The building four district model.

Councillor Wyatt: The four district model.

Councillor Steeves: Well I mean I, prior to today, I don't know that it's been really a big issue for this Council to sit down and review the four district model. If, maybe what I should do with the permission Mr. Speaker, is I will get some history of the decision that's been made by Council, how it was made, the discussions that were had, the supporting reports and supporting documentation. I would be happy to redistribute those to Council, and any interested members could have a look at them and if people want to have that discussion obviously, we're the Council of the City of Winnipeg and if it makes sense to do so, I certainly have no problem having that discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. It's all available on the website. Final supplementary Councillor Magnifico. Very, very quickly.

Councillor Magnifico: Very quickly. Mr. Speaker are you aware that Cindy Klassen won the gold in the 1500 metre?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. (Applause) I was just going to announce that. Thank you.

Councillor Steeves moves Council to now adjourn.

Roll call.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Speaker Councillor Eadie, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors O'Shaughnessy, Benham, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas, Wyatt.

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 11:54 A.M.