**REPORT OF THE**

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS**

**DATED FEBRUARY 10, 1998**

On motion of Councillor Timm-Rudolph, the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works, dated February 10, 1998, was considered clause by clause.

Moved by Councillor Timm-Rudolph,
That the Consent Agenda, Clauses 1,3,4,6,7,8,9 and 11 be adopted.

Carried.

**Administrative Approval Process for Bus Transportation Grants**
**File FG-1.1 (Vol. 10)**

**354 -** 1. The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works on December 9, 1997 requested the Transit Department to provide a report on delegating authority for the approval of Bus Transportation Grants to the Director of Transit, together with an administrative grant approval process.

The proposed administrative approval process to be followed for all applications for Bus Transportation Grants is outlined in Appendix "A". The process maintains a single point of contact for the applicant providing a "one-stop shop" for determining charter bus service requirements, obtaining grant information, grant approval and delivery of service.

Evaluation of Applications

The Transit Department will evaluate all applications in accordance with the criteria approved by Council. Applications meeting the criteria would be approved, the charter service provided and the applicant billed accordingly. Applications not meeting the criteria would be denied.

Appeals

The Transit Department's evaluation can be appealed to the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works. Upon request, the Transit Department will forward the matter to the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works for final disposition. The Committee is the final arbiter in this matter.

Annual Report on Bus Transportation Grants

The Transit Department will report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works annually on the administration of bus transportation grants. The report will detail grant applications received, their disposition, the amount of grant funds awarded and year end balance.

Review of Administrative Approval Process

It is the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works that the administrative approval process as outlined in Appendix "A" be reviewed by the Committee every 3-4 years, following each civic election, or as required.

The proposed "Policy for Approval of Bus Transportation Grants" as outlined in Appendix "B", includes updates approved by Council over the last several years, as well as fully describes the evaluation criteria, funding formula and approval process.

A new application form as outlined in Appendix "C" is proposed for use by all applicants for bus transportation grants. The new form provides specific information on the grant process and guides the applicant step by step on how to apply. The new format is easier to read and more user friendly. It can also be provided in response to inquiries with very little additional information required.

**Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated February 10, 1998**

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works recommends:

I. That authority to approve bus transportation grants, within the budget approved annually by Council, be delegated to the Director of Transit.

II. That the Administrative Approval Process attached as Appendix "A" be approved.

III. That the proposed "Policy for Approval of Bus Transportation Grants" attached as Appendix "B", be approved and Policy C301 amended accordingly.

IV. That the "Application for a Bus Transportation Grant" form attached as Appendix "C" be approved for use by all grant applicants.

V. That the Administrative Approval Process contained herein be reviewed by the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works every 3-4 years, following each civic election, or as required.

VI. That the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the foregoing, including the execution of any documents related thereto.

Copy of attachments referred to in the above clause are on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Adopted by consent.

**1998 Transit Cash Fare Increase**
**TT-2 (Vol. 10)**

**355 -** ***Note: Clause 2 has been referred by the Executive Policy Committee to the 1998 Current Budget deliberations.***

Referred by the Executive Policy Committee to the 1998 Current Budget deliberations

**Take Pride Winnipeg Board of Directors - Appointment of City's Representative**
**File ER-1.5 (Vol. 8)**

**356 -** 3. On May 10, 1989, Council adopted a program entitled "Winnipeg - A Clean City", which later became the Take Pride Winnipeg Program.

On May 15, 1991, Take Pride Winnipeg Incorporated was founded for the purpose of establishing "a permanent body with Civic, business and public representation to maintain an ongoing program that will keep the City of Winnipeg clean and beautiful (the Take Pride Winnipeg Program)".

On March 26, 1997, Council approved a new mandate for Take Pride Winnipeg, identifying graffiti, litter control and beautification as the three core areas of focus for a renewed Take Pride organization.

Take Pride Winnipeg's organizational structure has a Board of Directors, which is co-chaired by the Commissioner of Works and Operations and a private sector member.

As a result of changes to the City's administrative organization structure, the Commissioner of Works and Operations ceased to serve on the Take Pride Winnipeg Board of Directors as of October 29, 1997. It is, therefore, the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works that Barry MacBride, Director of Water and Waste, be appointed to replace him in that capacity.

**Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated February 10, 1998**

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works therefore recommends:

I. That Barry MacBride, Director of Water and Waste, be appointed as the City's representative to the Take Pride Winnipeg Board of Directors.

II. That the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the foregoing, including the execution of any documents related thereto.

Adopted by consent.

**Residential Recycling Program: Container Replacement Policy**
**File WT-1.3 (Vol. 19)**

**357 -** 4. On July 26, 1995, Council awarded a five-year contract to Laidlaw Waste Systems Ltd. (now known as CWS) to collect, process, and market recyclable material from single-family residential premises. By April, 1996, the Contractor had completed distribution of one blue box to all single-family residences, as required in the Contract.

Existing System:

Since August, 1996, and in the absence of any formal policy, the City has been advising all residents that new or replacement blue boxes must be purchased from the Contractor at the Contractor’s place of business for $7.40 or $12.40 delivered. The City has also advised residents through its Customer Service Centre and informally through the Real Estate Board that the blue box belongs to the City and should be left as part of the property when moving. During this time period, the Department's Customer Service Centre estimates that approximately 30 calls per day were received from residents wishing to obtain an additional or replacement container. The Contractor has reported selling 810 blue boxes in 1996 and 1,070 in 1997. These totals do not include boxes distributed to newly constructed homes. Blue boxes are provided to these homes by the Contractor, free of charge under provisions in the Contract. Also, blue boxes are provided to some homeowners who move into a home where there is no blue box. The proposed recommendation will ensure a standard approach to supplying replacement blue boxes consistent with the concept of user-pay.

Policy Alternatives:

Customer feedback and the low number of blue box sales relative to the number of inquires have indicated that the cost and inconvenience of purchasing a new blue box are considered too high. Without a blue box, many people will not participate in the recycling program. A policy is needed on replacement blue boxes. Presently, blue boxes are lost or stolen. In the long-term, blue boxes will deteriorate and become unusable. The consequence of not providing a reasonably priced and conveniently distributed blue box is that those residents who refuse to purchase a new blue box will drop out of the recycling program. Four alternatives have been explored, which range from selling boxes at cost to providing boxes at no charge.

1. Do not subsidize boxes (Recommended)

The recommended policy is to provide replacement blue boxes at cost. This is consistent with full costing of services. The City provided each household with a free blue box to start the program and will continue to supply new houses with a free box under the contract.

A consequence of this policy is that over time the City will no longer be able to claim that the box was purchased by the City and should not be considered the owner’s personal property. In other words, the City will no longer be able to suggest that the box should stay with the property when the house is sold.

A second and more important consequence to the policy is that people who believe that the box should be provided free, will not purchase one and will not participate in the program.

It is proposed that the source for the boxes be Canadian Waste Services. It is possible to explore other alternatives such as having a supply at City offices (for which the City would incur inventory and selling costs) and or encouraging retailers to become involved. These enhancements have not been investigated at this time.

2. Sell Boxes at Subsidized Rate of $5

In December, 1997, a limited time offer was advertised in the Community Newspapers to sell blue boxes at a reduced price of $5.00 including taxes and delivery. As an added convenience, the charge for the blue box could be added to the resident's water bill. Since the offer began on December 10, 1997, the Customer Service Centre has received 25 requests per day to purchase containers. A small percentage of customers expressing an interest in obtaining a blue box choose not to purchase one at the reduced rate, as they believe it should be supplied free of charge.

The number of containers sold through this initiative suggests that there is a demand for blue boxes, and that most residents have accepted the fact that they will be charged a nominal fee for the container. Paying a nominal cost places some responsibility on the homeowner to ensure that their container is properly cared for. It is estimated that 2,500 boxes would be sold annually, at a subsidy of $18,500.00 (2500 *($12.40 - $5.00)). The City has been told that these costs would be eligible for the 80% support payment from the Manitoba Product Stewardship Corporation. This alternative does not comply with the user pay concept.

3. Re-Sale Homes

The City could supply a container, free of charge, to any resident who has recently moved into a single-family residence that does not currently have a recycling container. The original blue box belongs to the City and is assigned to the property -- not the homeowner. Therefore, residents who move to another home are asked to leave their blue box at their previous address. With 10,000 real-estate transactions per year, it is estimated that, annually, 1,500 existing homes are purchased where the new owner is without a blue box. Providing a blue box to these homes would cost the City $18,600.00 (1500 * $12.40). These costs also would likely be eligible for the 80% support payment from the Manitoba Product Stewardship Corporation. This alternative does not comply with the user pay concept.

4. Supply Boxes Free on Request

If the City were to provide a free blue box to any homeowner claiming that they need another box, it is estimated that 20,000 to 30,000 boxes would be given away each year over the next five to ten years, at an annual cost of $310,000.00 (25000 * $12.40). Providing free boxes would eliminate one barrier to recycling, but it would not ensure that all the free boxes would be used for recycling. It is unlikely that such a policy would be eligible for the 80% support payment from the Manitoba Product Stewardship Corporation. This alternative does not comply with the user pay concept.

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works recommends:

I. That for the term of the existing Recycling Contract (September, 2000), residents wishing to acquire a new, replacement or additional recycling container (blue box) be required to purchase this box. Blue boxes are available from Canadian Waste Services Inc. (CWS) at a cost of $7.40 at CWS, 70 Paramount Road, or $12.40 delivered.

II. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Adopted by consent.

**The Federal/Provincial Flood Proofing Program - Feasibility Study for Community Ring Dike Sites**
**File WH-2 (Vol. 5) [c/r PD (Vol. 12)]**

**358** - ***Note: Clause 5 has been referred by the Executive Policy Committee to the Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues.***

Referred by the Executive Policy Committee to the Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues

**Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated February 10, 1998**

**Request for Approval of a Local Improvement Assessment Exemption for Canadian Pacific Railway for the Sidewalk on the West Side of Raleigh Street from the First Lane South of Linden Avenue to the First Lane North of Dunrobin Avenue**
**File SL(1998) (Vol. 1) c/r G-9 (Vol. 1)**

**359 -** 6. Council, at its meeting on November 5th, 1980, adopted a policy governing local improvements abutting railway properties which are unfit for building purposes. This policy was amended by Council at its meeting of August 19th, 1981 and March 21st, 1984, and reads as follows:

> "If the Commissioner of Works and Operations deems that railway properties on which rails are laid for the purpose of rail transportation are unfit for building purposes, that a recommendation be forwarded to Council prior to advertising the local improvements that the property be deemed unfit for building purposes, subject to the condition that if at any time the property is deemed to be a buildable site, and prior to allowing any connection to the underground services or any access to surface improvements, the City Treasurer shall initiate steps to collect the appropriate local improvement costs (either cash or amortized) at the same rate and during the same number of years as in the original term - all subject to the provisions of Chapter 109, Province of Manitoba Statutes (1965) and Privy Council Order No. 1979/607."

The subject property as outlined in Appendix “A”, is used for the purpose of rail transportation and is currently unsuitable for building purposes, and as a result, does not benefit from the installation of the proposed local improvement. Consequently, if not exempt, representatives of the railway (as has been demonstrated in the past) may petition against the installation of the sidewalk, thus jeopardizing (if not defeating) this needed improvement.

To ensure the installation of the sidewalk, it is proposed that the property outlined in Appendix “A” which is owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway company be deemed unsuitable for building purposes and be exempt from the payment of local improvement levies in accordance with the above policy.

However, if at a future time the land use changes and consequently should it be reclassified as a buildable site, the City shall be empowered to recoup local improvement costs for the installation of the sidewalk, prior to any connections being made to underground improvements such as sewer and water mains, and access to above-ground improvements such as the improved street - all subject to the provisions of Chapter 109, Province of Manitoba Statutes (1965) and Privy Council Order 1979/607.

Chapter 109 of the Province of Manitoba Statutes allows for taxation for local improvements to C.N.R. and C.P.R. properties within the borders of the former City of Winnipeg only if the local improvements are a direct benefit to the railway operations of the companies or operations in connection therewith.

Concurrence in this recommendation would ensure that the needed local improvement could be installed, as railway property frontage would not be considered assessable and therefore would not be allowed to petition against this project.

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works recommends:

I. That the subject property on the east side of Raleigh Street, as outlined in Appendix “A” and owned by the C.P.R. which is unsuitable for building purposes, not be assessed for sidewalk local improvement charges.

II. That if at any time this property is deemed to be a buildable site, that prior to allowing any connection from underground services or access from surface improvements, the City Treasurer initiate steps to collect the appropriate local improvement costs.

III. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Adopted by consent.

(See Minute No. 374 for attachment)

**Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated February 10, 1998**

**Request for Approval of a Local Improvement Assessment Exemption for Canadian National Railway for the Sidewalk on the East Side of Bournais Drive Between Hatcher Road and Dugald Road**
**File SL(1998) (Vol. 1) [c/r G-9 (Vol. 1)]**

**360 -** 7. Council, at its meeting on November 5th, 1980, adopted a policy governing local improvements abutting railway properties which are unfit for building purposes. This policy was amended by Council at its meeting of August 19th, 1981 and March 21st, 1984, and reads as follows:

> "If the Commissioner of Works and Operations deems that railway properties on which rails are laid for the purpose of rail transportation are unfit for building purposes, that a recommendation be forwarded to Council prior to advertising the local improvements that the property be deemed unfit for building purposes, subject to the condition that if at any time the property is deemed to be a buildable site, and prior to allowing any connection to the underground services or any access to surface improvements, the City Treasurer shall initiate steps to collect the appropriate local improvement costs (either cash or amortized) at the same rate and during the same number of years as in the original term - all subject to the provisions of Chapter 109, Province of Manitoba Statutes (1965) and Privy Council Order No. 1979/607."

The subject properties as outlined in Appendix "A", are used for the purpose of rail transportation and are currently unsuitable for building purposes, and as a result, do not benefit from the installation of the proposed local improvement. Consequently, if not exempt, representatives of the railway (as has been demonstrated in the past) may petition against the installation of the sidewalk, thus jeopardizing (if not defeating) this needed improvement.

To ensure the installation of the sidewalk, it is proposed that the properties outlined in Appendix "A" which are owned by the Canadian National Railway company be deemed unsuitable for building purposes and be exempt from the payment of local improvement levies in accordance with the above policy.

However, if at a future time the land use changes and consequently should it be reclassified as a buildable site, the City shall be empowered to recoup local improvement costs for the installation of the sidewalk, prior to any connections being made to underground improvements such as sewer and water mains, and access to above-ground improvements such as the improved street - all subject to the provisions of Chapter 109, Province of Manitoba Statutes (1965) and Privy Council Order 1979/607.

Chapter 109 of the Province of Manitoba Statutes allows for taxation for local improvements to C.N.R. and C.P.R. properties within the borders of the former City of Winnipeg only if the local improvements are a direct benefit to the railway operations of the companies or operations in connection therewith.

Concurrence in this recommendation would ensure that the needed local improvement could be installed, as railway property frontage would not be considered assessable and therefore would not be allowed to petition against this project.

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works recommends:

I. That the subject properties as outlined in Appendix "A" and owned by the C.N.R. which are unsuitable for building purposes not be assessed for sidewalk local improvement charges.

II. That if at any time these properties are deemed to be buildable sites, that prior to allowing any connection from underground services or access from surface improvements, the City Treasurer initiate steps to collect the appropriate local improvement costs.

III. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Adopted by consent.

(See Minute No. 375 for attachment)

**Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated February 10, 1998**

**10 foot Lane Oiling Local Improvement Project - 10 feet wide on the first east-west lane south of Stuart Avenue from the first north-south lane east of Henderson Highway to a point approximately 112.8 feet east of the east line of the first north-south lane east of Henderson Highway**
**File SL(1998) (Vol. 1)**

**361 -** 8. The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works has been advised that a "Petition For" as been received by the Supervisor of Local Improvements and Miscellaneous Revenue in regards to a Local Improvement Project for lane oiling on the first east-west lane south of Stuart Avenue from the first north-south lane east of Henderson Highway to a point approximately 112.8 feet east of the east line of the first north-south lane east of Henderson Highway.

On January 26, 1998, the East Kildonan - Transcona Community Committee recommended that this Local Improvement Project be proceeded with in 1998.

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works therefore recommends:

I. That the Local Improvement Project for lane oiling 10 feet wide on the first east-west lane south of Stuart Avenue from the first north-south lane east of Henderson Highway to a point approximately 112.8 feet east of the east line of the first north-south lane east of Henderson Highway, be approved to be funded at a cost of $1,000.00 from the 1998 Unused Borrowing Authority, Capital Estimates, Local Improvement category.

II. That the City Solicitor/Manager of Legal Services be requested to prepare the necessary Local Improvements By-law in accordance with the foregoing and submit same directly to Council for approval.

III. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing, including the execution of any documents related thereto.

Adopted by consent.

**Removal of 32 Parking Meters on Main Street Between Sutherland Avenue and Stella Avenue File ST-2 (Vol. 21)**

**362 -** 9. Mr. Norman Dhaliwal, New West Hotel, 786 Main Street and a group of petitioners submitted a petition requesting that the parking meters on both sides of Main Street between Sutherland Avenue and Stella Avenue be removed and limited time parking be installed.

The only parking meters on Main Street north of the Higgins Avenue underpass are between Stella Avenue and Sutherland Avenue on the west side, which consists of 21 parking meters and between Sutherland Avenue and Euclid Avenue on the east side, which consists of 11 parking meters.

Guidelines regarding the installation/removal of parking meters, stipulate that consideration should be given to removing parking meters on those streets where the cost of operating the meters exceeds the revenue obtained from them. Based on the $430,000.00 annual Parking Meter operating budget for 2,300 parking meters, and assuming 300 meter-days of operation, the average operating cost of each parking meter is $0.65 per day. Applying the principle of cost recovery and a reasonable rate of return on investment, each parking meter should produce a revenue of at least $2.00 per meter-day ($600.00 per year).

The 32 metered parking spaces recommended for removal generate as little as $1.13 per meter-day, and in no instance more than $2.34 per meter-day, and therefore should be removed and relocated to an area that would generate more revenue. Although the block on the west side of Main Street between Stella Avenue and Dufferin Avenue did generate $0.34 more than the $2.00 minimum deemed to warrant their removal, this block would then be the only metered block in the general area.

**Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated February 10, 1998**

In order to ensure that parking turnover continues to be promoted on these streets, the parking meters should be replaced with signs indicating time limits. Even though the time limit on the blocks north of the metered parking is one-hour, the petition submitted is for a two-hour time limit. The petition in favour of removing the parking meters represents 70% of the property owners affected. There are a fair number of vacant properties within this three block area (5 blocks when considering each side per block). The petition did represent 100% of the establishments that were open for business.

The 32 meters will be relocated (as in-fill) to the central business district where it is anticipated that they will generate significantly more revenue as compared to this portion of Main Street.

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works recommends:

I. That the one-hour parking meters on the west side of Main Street between Stella Avenue and Sutherland Avenue be replaced with two - hour parking signs between 09:00 - 17:30, Monday to Saturday;

II. That the one-hour parking meters on the east side of Main Street between Sutherland Avenue and Euclid Avenue be replaced with two - hour parking signs between 09:00 - 17:30, Monday to Saturday;

III. That the City of Winnipeg Parking Meter By-law be amended as follows:

i) Schedule “A” to By-law No. 6547/95 of the City of Winnipeg be amended by deleting the following:

“West side of Main Street between Stella Avenue and Henry Avenue”; and,

“East side of Main Street between Pacific Avenue and Euclid Avenue”;

ii) Schedule “A” to By-law No. 6547/95 of the City of Winnipeg be amended by adding the following:

“West side of Main Street between Higgins Avenue and Henry Avenue”; and,

“East side of Main Street between Pacific Avenue and Higgins Avenue”.

IV. That the City Solicitor be instructed to prepare the necessary amending by-law in accordance with the foregoing for submission directly to Council for approval.

V. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Adopted by consent.

**Installation of Metered Parking on Portage Avenue File ST-2 (Vol. 21)**

**363 -** ***Note: Clause 10 has been laid over by the Executive Policy Committee.***

Laid over by the Executive
Policy Committee

**Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated February 10, 1998**

**Amendment to The City of Winnipeg Noise Control By-Law No. 2480/79 Respecting the Use of Engine Retarder Brakes File ER-1.2 (Vol. 14)**

**364 -** 11. The former Committee on Works and Operations on April 9, 1996, in response to a concern expressed to Councillor Shirley Timm-Rudolph about truck traffic noise on Lagimodiere Boulevard, requested a report on the policy in Alberta regarding the prohibition of the use of engine retarders (often referred to as a Jake Brake in the industry) within City limits and of the feasibility of implementing a similar regulation in Winnipeg. On June 10, 1997, the Committee on Works and Operations received an informational report dated May 28,1997 prepared by the Streets and Transportation Department.

On October 14, 1997, the Assiniboia Community Committee, after considering a petition from several citizens, asked that the Streets and Transportation Department report to the Committee on Works and Operations regarding the feasibility of prohibiting the use of engine retarder brakes on the Perimeter Highway between the Portage Avenue Overpass and Saskatchewan Avenue.

Although portions of the Perimeter Highway are contained within the boundary of The City of Winnipeg, the entire highway is under the administrative jurisdiction of the Provincial Department of Highways. The Department of Highways has advised that, based on a policy that has been in effect since May of 1997, if requested by a municipality, they will install "Engine Retarder Brakes Prohibited" signs on highways where the Minister is the traffic authority, such as on the Perimeter Highway, provided that:

- such sign installations are included in the municipality's noise By-law and are requested by resolution of Council.

- the entire cost associated with the installation and maintenance of such signing be borne by the municipality.

In the opinion of the Police, the existing provision in Section 179(2) of the Highway Traffic Act related to unnecessary noise, and in Section 3.2.5 of The City of Winnipeg By-law No. 2480/79 regulating noise nuisance generated by equipment including motor vehicles, are not deemed to be sufficiently specific to enable the Police to enforce the prohibitive use of engine retarder brakes. As the By-law now stands, the Police would have to make a subjective decision. Specifically identifying engine retarder brakes as being a prohibited use would eliminate this subjectivity in that the noise generated from engine retarder brakes was excessive in the prevailing circumstances.

Inasmuch as this is the second public request for this type of regulation, it is recommended that an amendment to The City of Winnipeg Noise Control By-law No. 2480/79 as indicated herein be approved.

The engine retarder brake is a supplement to rather than a replacement for the vehicle's service brakes and is intended for use primarily on high speed highways where significant slopes are encountered, thereby minimizing the use of service brakes and preventing brake fade and runaway. Prohibition of the non-emergency use of engine retarder brakes in the City will not have any adverse impact on vehicle performance and will, therefore, not compromise safety.

Upon adoption of the necessary By-law amendment, the Public Works Department will make arrangements to install "Engine Retarder Brakes Prohibited" signs of the type and design specified by the Provincial Department of Highways to maintain consistency of message, at appropriate locations. The cost associated with the fabrication, posting and maintenance of these signs will be funded by this Department's Current Estimates.

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works recommends:

I. That the City of Winnipeg Noise Control By-law No. 2480/79 be amended by the addition of the following:

"Engine Retarder Brakes

3.2.5.1 No person shall engage, operate, apply or otherwise use an engine retarder brake on any vehicle driven within The City of Winnipeg, except in an emergency where it is necessary in the circumstances to do so."

**Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated February 10, 1998**

II. That the City Solicitor/Manager of Legal Services be instructed to prepare the necessary amending By-law for submission to Council for approval.

III. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Adopted by consent.