COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, December 11, 2002
CONTENTS

The Council met at 9:38 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 Clement.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy, His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt and Lazarenko.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: We have two Pages with us this morning. We have a first, Nicholas Plett who resides in the Transcona Ward is home schooled, our first home schooled Page ever, welcome Nicholas. We have Allison Forzely from St. Mary's Academy, who resides in the Fort Rouge Ward. Welcome.

Under announcements perhaps the Mayor might like to take this opportunity to explain his most inappropriate attire this morning.

Mayor Murray: With all due respect to my friends in Calgary, at least it's better than wearing a Calgary jersey. Last year Calgary was 8 and 10, it was kind of humiliating wearing that.

As you know I'm absolutely unapologetic died in the wool Bombers fan, and I know we will get the Grey Cup yet. Before I retire as Mayor, Lyle Bauer assures me it will happen. I've obviously lost another bet Councillors, and I'm wearing a 33 which was the score the Edmonton Eskimos got over the Winnipeg Blue Bombers in that very fateful game but I still maintain our team has more heart and soul and brains than any other in the league, and it's just a matter of time before we get our just desserts.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor.

MINUTES

Councillor Wyatt moves the minutes of the meeting held on September 25, November 5 and 13, 2002, be taken as read and confirmed. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

COMMUNICATIONS

Councillor Pagtakhan moves the communications which were received too late to be placed on the regular agenda be received as information. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Delegations. Mr. Nick Ternette in opposition to Clause 5 of the Report of EPC dated December 4, 2002 regarding transit fares.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Nick Ternette: Thank you Mr. Speaker, Mayor Murray, Members of City Council.

First we had the notion of the City is to be run like a business, then we had the notion of efficiency instead of democracy, and now we're faced with a notion of irrationality instead of rationality. Even the Winnipeg Free Press acknowledged that the City had a plan, Plan Winnipeg 2020, you know that, the one that you approved last year that supposedly guides all decisions made by City Council with the Downtown First as its core principle. That is all policies adopted by City Council must reflect the concept of attracting people to the downtown. So instead of doing that we have now a piecemeal policies coming forward like rising transit fares and parking fines which will discourage people from coming downtown.

Why did you pass Plan 2020 in the first place if it was not ever going to be enforced? Transit activists have continually raised objections to transit fare increases over the past eight years, including the four increases in the past three years. Increased fares neither deals with the crisis of transit in the short

term or in the long term. In the short term the City's own document published three or four years ago, Direction to the Future - A Guide to Better Transit in Winnipeg, admitted how seriously deteriorated and weak the transit situation was and is. Specifically it suggested that between September 1992 and 1999 bus hours had decreased from 6,300 to 4,730, or a 21% reduction in real service delivery.

It further admitted that in 1984 there were 564 buses and since then the number has decreased to 535 even though the city's population and density has increased.

Bus fare increases it had been reported had been implemented annually over the past decade. Since the 1980s, the rate of transit fare increases have been greater than Winnipeg's inflation rate and much greater than the rate of increases of automobile operating costs. Cumulative increases in fares over the past decade have resulted in reduced ridership levels among young people and those on fixed incomes. And that's its own report.

No one including the Mayor disputes these facts, but as long as transit continues to lose money they say, someone will have to pay, that is the consumer.

(9:45)

What they don't understand that this is a vicious circle. The more we raise transit fares the fewer riders there will be.

If you don't believe that, then you ought to examine a Stats Canada Federal Government document by Harold Cohen on transit use, which I have included with the material for you to look at. Which compares major Canadian cities in terms of usage of transit in relationship to improved transit services and transit fares. Lo and behold Montreal which we figured out they didn't use the names of which cities had the best ratio of transit users based on the fact that the transit services had been significantly improved and fares had been lowered. I'll go through the specific thing in the document that I have which states. That between 1992 and 1998 in city one as they claim which we discovered was Montreal, average fares have declined, and at the same time the number of service hours increased, that is revenue earning hours that buses are on the road. In that case passenger growth was 30% over that period of time from '92 to '98, and revenue increased over 29%.

Now the second best city did increase bus fares and we have to admit that, and they are now increasing bus fares as everywhere. But also significantly improved transit bus services, that is in terms of usage of buses significantly improved it, and they made reasonable revenues at the same time, they were second place.

This ought to tell us that ridership is dependent on either improved bus services and/or lower bus fares neither of which unfortunately is happening in Winnipeg.

In the long term solutions to the crisis of transit are even more complex no question about that. They deal with legitimately as everybody has raised the cost-sharing agreements between the Province and the City for transit. The cost-sharing between the Province and the City used to be 50-50 over a decade ago, today it is about 20-80, the City paying the greatest amount. Most other provinces do provide much more funding for their transit systems per capita than Manitoba does. Specifically Alberta provides its share of transit funding through a share of the gas tax being allocated to both Calgary and Edmonton transit systems.

It is significant to note that Bill 39 the new Charter Act will allow the City as Mayor Murray has indicated at the last meeting of EPC to have a percentage of a gas tax that will be allocated one would hope to the cost of transit within a year, which I think would leave a significant impact on the whole system, and could but I hope, but I'm worried that it's going to be unlikely lead to a freeze or decrease in transit fares and/or improved bus services.

On the other hand, as long as the City of Winnipeg does not proceed in developing

a light railway transit system a LRT, transit will continue to be seen as a service for the poor, those on fixed incomes, seniors and people with disabilities and students, thereby as I've argued ghettoizing the transit system. Middle and upper class Winnipeggers will continue to use their vehicles to go to and from work and won't care one way or another about what happens to the transit system. The result in the long term in the next 10 or 15 years I predict will be complete privatization and a complete destruction of transit as we know it today.

I would strongly urge City Council to recognize that if additional monies for transit are forthcoming within a year, that we either decrease bus fares today or if we cannot do that freeze the bus fares as is, or if we have to go with a five cent increase go ahead with the five cent increase but then increase bus services, as clearly indicated the more revenues come in if you increase more bus service. If you're not able to do either of those things because this is a Council meeting, then set up some kind of a task force today at least move a motion for a task force to be established to deal with transit in relationship to the possibility that within a year we will have a gas tax which we would be able to apply hopefully not just for infrastructure which is what I'm concerned with, but specifically that it be applied to the use of transit to improve transit to get us out of this mess of continual transit fare increases over the last decade. I think that that would cover the $2 million deficit and I think it would at least move transit forward and this Council would understand that transit must be saved, transit belongs to all the people of Winnipeg and not just to the inner-city. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Nick.

Questions, Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Ternette for taking the time to come down and present to us here this morning. You referenced improvements to the transit service. Could you allude to us what types of improvements you might be contemplating?

Mr. Ternette: Mr. Speaker, while I have various ideas of improved bus service but this specific report I want to deal with it because it talks specifically, talks about hours of bus services being put on roads that people will use. As I've indicated that the bus hours between 1992 and 1999 here in Winnipeg decreased a 21% reduction from 6,300 hours to 4,730 hours. This report is talking about increasing the hours that the buses are on the road providing services which increases the ridership, so obviously we have to bring back the 21% reduction in bus hour services that we have at the present time and increase it somewhat more at least 10% or 15% more in order to bring the ridership up and bring the revenues up, that's what the report argues, is the best method that a transit system ought to go.

I will also of course argue about heated bus shelters we've talked about, and other kind of amenities that we need to look at to improve the services. We need to move towards better accessibility in terms of the low bus rider, I know we don't have enough of them on, and public education in terms of the disabled being able to use regular bus systems instead of handi-transit systems, those are all legitimate factors. But I think the key that this report talks about and it's a Canada Stats report, deals with increased bus hour services. That will increase ridership. Lower bus fares of course will also increase ridership. It shows you the relationship between the two and the amount of monies that the transit system would raise.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Ternette can you give us some more information on the revenues that we can derive from the gas tax. What would it mean? How much could we derive? Is this not a direct hit at motorists?

Mr. Ternette: Mr. Speaker, actually I would refer this to Mayor Glen Murray who is the one that indicated at the EPC meeting the possibility of home rule and a percentage which I'm not aware of what

the percentage is. But I know that in Alberta and Calgary, in Alberta the gas tax is a significant proportion of the transit fares. So maybe the Mayor could answer you even more specifically on that. I don't have the figures as much as he has because he's been the one who's mentioned the gas tax and he's the one who also mentioned the possibility of having a percentage of it within a year.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Ternette thank you for your presentation and by the way congratulations for you receiving the Order of Manitoba.

I just want to ask you, you mentioned in your report you referred to light rail, what's always often been talked about here lately is the transit bus ways. You obviously see light rail as a greater benefit than the bus ways, could you elaborate on that?

(9:55)

Mr. Ternette: Absolutely. The bus service thing is not going to change anything, it will continue to ghettoize the transit system as is, because the only people who are going to continue to use a bus system even if you have a way for it is basically the poor, the fixed income or whatever else. The middle class and the upper classes that live in suburbia and as you know urban sprawl is one of the biggest issues, and I lived in Calgary for five years, I was there when the LRT began its construction in 1982. I saw the ending, well I didn't see the whole ending because they've added several lines since then, but I saw it grow between 1981, 1982 and 1985 just before I left and came back to Winnipeg. It was amazing in terms of becoming a transit system for all the people, that is all suburbia, significant elements of suburbia would use the LRT system with car park, if you build a LRT system you have car parks established in all the stations outside of the downtown Calgary, you have car parks. So you move your car, you bring your car and you park your car as you do at the Airport here, you get on the LRT and you're downtown or wherever you're going within 10 minutes in a comfortable environment to the point where everybody will reduce car use in the downtown of Calgary within three to four years of the establishment of the LRT was reduced by 50%. I think if you want a proper public transportation system that isn't a ghettoized system that isn't just for the poor and the fixed income, if you want a transit system that is for all the people in Winnipeg and deals with urban sprawl in an effective way an LRT is the only way to go.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Ternette you've been to Europe and so have I and seen many European cities where they use their existing roadways with rail, Heidelberg, Manheim, many cities like that. A lot of European cities would envy Winnipeg with the size of our regional streets and four lanes of traffic coming into downtown in some cases. Do you think we could use better our existing regional street system to adapt it for bus ways and whatnot using technology as well such as GPS?

Mr. Ternette: Yes of course. We're not going to completely eliminate buses, when I'm talking about an LRT system, I'm talking about us being a primary goal of moving people to wherever they want to in an efficient and very quiet and very environmental way.

Did you know that Calgary is going to be wind powered. That we who have the electricity and the cheap electricity of anywhere in this country and we are so far behind we're continuing to talk about improved buses in terms of emission. Well the LRT in Calgary is going to be completely wind powered over the next four to five years, they've already have several of the lines being. That's how far they're in advance in terms of environmentally controlled safe, healthy, lack of pollution or whatever else. Of course you have bus systems who are operating off the LRT's and whatever else, and you need a different realignment of streets and whatever else to work that together. You could also

have a heritage car downtown which we are now talking about and I understand there are some developing plans that could relate the Forks and the Exchange District whatever else with a heritage car system. So all of that is part of a total transportation planning process. We haven't talked about transportation as a whole since that report was published Better Guide to Transportation about four and half years ago. I wish if nothing else we could start getting another task force set up that would start looking in the long term ways of how we can really establish a really effective transportation system, public transportation system for the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Nick.

Try and group things on the agenda. We'll now hear from Mr. Jim Jaworski also in opposition to Clause 5 of EPC of December 4, 2002.

Mr. Jim Jaworski: First of all for the benefit of those new two councillors and to the new City Hall reporter for one of the newspapers, my name is Jim Jaworski. My main political passions are public transit and downtown revitalization.

I want transit to succeed and so do most other people in Winnipeg. But in the past few years it seems as if there are some who hold the keys to public transit in Winnipeg namely the decision makers and the politicians have let Winnipeg Transit slide to such a degree as to make it almost undesirable to use today, even for those living close to the downtown area.

We want a transit system that is there to provide public transportation to all peoples of Winnipeg. It needs a big cash infusion now just to maintain basic daily services. The Province hasn't put a cent into the operation of WT since the mid '90s or earlier, and their contribution remains the same at around $17 million per year. The Feds, well the new Minister of Finance, John Manley has recently told Canadian cities not to hold their breath in the next budget for urban affairs projects like transit. Thus reversing the policy of its predecessor Paul Martin who ironically seems against Kyoto.

The next fleet of New Flyer buses delivered to Winnipeg are not something to enjoy riding. At the front passenger side of the bus is a thing sticking up that all I can compare it to is like an ironing board in storage. The object makes viewing the street from the front of the transit vehicle very difficult. I would prefer that these were not installed in any further transit vehicles and the ones that are currently installed would be removed.

Added to that the white colour that was chosen as the new paint scheme for WT will not be easily seen from afar, especially during a white Winnipeg winter. Soon after the new buses were introduced on the street, the Free Press devoted a whole page of letters to the Editor where people complained that the white was too plain and boring looking and that the colour would be too difficult to see in winter and cause people to miss their bus.

You have also done similar damage to the downtown spirit transit service in that they are completely covered in advertising. I've made a resolution to not ride the Downtown Spirit buses if they are covered in vinyl wrap ads because I resent being part of a rolling advertisement for KFC, for Chapters for MPIC, for Remax and their ilk. If you want to have advertising at the top inside of the bus as has been from several years or small ads below the windows outside of the bus this is fine, but I would rather walk to my destination or ride my mountain bike then feel embarrassed to ride one of these buses. If one person feels this way then there must be several others who agree with me and also do not ride vinyl wraps because they're an insult to our intelligence. Thanks but no thanks Winnipeg Transit and City Council.

In May 2002, Winnipeg Transit had installed a lit sign at the corner of Broadway and Donald. For the longest while this sign was not lit until I e-mailed the transit people and my city councillor in late summer. So they went ahead and lit the sign but only for seven days. I even sent a thank you card to Winnipeg Transit expressing gratitude that they had worked

on this and that it would help brighten up the corner. What is the current situation at that corner? The t-man sign is still not lit and this makes the sign look cheap cheap cheap, and therefore the neighbourhood and the City looks cheap.

(10:02)

I understand that Winnipeg Transit and Hydro were having difficulties with this sign but it has already been six months since installation, and there's been no further work on it as far as I know of. Please make it a priority to put this sign into service as soon as you can. All these reasons are no justifications to increase transit fares and I recommend deferring the fare increase until the next federal budget where there may be funding for urban transit in Canada. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Jim. Mr. Chappell has deemed it unnecessary to speak before us. We'll now hear from Paula Mitchell, Chairperson, Downtown Winnipeg BIZ, opposition to Clause 8 of EPC of December 4, 2002, parking fine rates.

There will be a follow-up delegation on the same side of the same issue. Lisa Holowchuk if you could come down and be prepared.

Ms Paula Mitchell: Thank you. Your Worship Mayor Murray, members of Council, good morning.

I'm speaking to parking fine increases as they affect the downtown. On December 4, 2002 Executive Policy Committee of Council approved a report recommending rate increases for all parking fines effective March 1, 2003. For each of the 32 infractions listed under the by-law 789/74, the fine rates proposed would represent an increase of between 66% and 200%.

Now the City has argued that the proposed rates will bring Winnipeg in line with other jurisdictions and will generate an additional million dollars in general revenue. While we don't oppose increases to the majority of parking fines, we strongly object to the 66% increase in fines for expired and overtime meters. We believe that an increase in fines for meter infractions penalizes the downtown. That the timing for such a move could not be worse.

Increases to parking meter fines as recommended are arbitrary. They're well above the levels charged in Vancouver, Toronto and Calgary, they will be perceived as punitive by the public and they're out of context. We need an integrated and coherent strategy relating to downtown parking and transportation.

We strongly believe this proposal is counter-productive to all the good work that's been done by the City and it's been done by downtown agencies to move the renewal of the downtown forward. We believe that the new momentum in the downtown which is tangible and which is precious to all of us and which has been so hard to achieve will be severely compromised.

At our management board meeting this last Monday a motion was passed to present to Council at this meeting this morning the Board's very strong opposition to any change to parking fines related to parking meter infractions. The decision of the Board was unanimous.

We know that we speak for a large majority of BIZ members. In order to gage and confirm the response of our members we undertook to collect signatures, we did that yesterday, and we collected 560 signatures many of them with very animated responses in opposition to this recommendation. I have these responses here and anybody is welcome to peruse them at your leisure.

The Downtown BIZ represents 1,600 businesses within a 90 block area in the central heart of the City. And over the past 13 years these downtown stakeholders have contributed well over $12 million to core biz programs which strengthen and enhance the downtown experience.

In addition to core programs the BIZ is currently partnering with other downtown

agencies on initiatives which examine Portage Avenue in its new context, the conversion of downtown streets from one way to two way, walkway expansion and way finding signage, options of connecting the Forks to other areas of the core and a marketing strategy to promote the downtown. All initiatives intended to build on the foundations for downtown renewal laid in the past several years and intended to keep the momentum growing.

At the same time as it approved the parking rate increases, EPC also approved the creation of an agency that would oversee all parking issues within the downtown and bringing five decision areas under one roof. We strongly support the integrating role of such an agency. Under its umbrella we would expect a coherent review of metered parking rates and metered parking fines. These considered in relation to all aspects of the parking and transportation system to and from the downtown. And within the context of what is best for the City and what is best for the downtown.

Increases to meter fines as proposed are really pre-emptive of the work of this body. Any changes relating and affecting meter parking should emerge from the business plan of the Alternate Service Delivery model on parking in the context of an integrated vision.

Our downtown is poised for economic renewal. The other side to the equation of economic renewal is people. As we strengthen our policies and strategies for economic development we know that we must attract in increasing numbers Winnipeggers to the downtown. We won't do this without a coherent parking and transportation strategy.

The imposition of arbitrary and punitive increases for meter infractions in isolation of a larger plan is a shortsighted strategy that sends a loud negative message about parking in the downtown. And it will be one that will be counter-productive to present and future real games. Thank you.

(10:10)

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Ms Mitchell thank you for coming down, we appreciate your long standing commitment to the downtown and the restoration of Main Street.

How long have you been a merchant on Main Street?

Ms Mitchell: Well Mitchell Fabrics has been there since 1946, I, on the other hand have not been there quite that long.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the delegation. Ms Mitchell were you contacted by anyone in the Administration or anybody politically about your thoughts or your group's thoughts on the changes which you've referenced as being punitive and arbitrary, did anyone contact you in advance?

Ms Mitchell: No. And I don't believe that the BIZ was contacted at all, and we had sort of very short notice prior to the EPC meeting about these recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplemental Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: You had indicated that you're supportive of a parking agency. Do you think it would be appropriate then for the new downtown parking agency to come forward with a business plan and not proceed with the arbitrary impunitive measure that we have before us here today?

Ms Mitchell: Absolutely, that would be our recommendation that these increases be considered in the context of a larger plan for parking and transportation in the downtown.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Would your opposition to the increases be the same if all the money the City received from parking fines went to providing facilities to deal with the parking problem in the downtown so that you'd be on equal par

with the suburbs, with the shopping malls?

Ms Mitchell: I don't think the flow of revenue could compensate for the negative impact in terms of bringing Winnipeggers downtown. We're at the point where we're just beginning to sell our downtown to ask Winnipeggers to take a new look at it, to take ownership, and I believe as they stand the fines would be a negative impact and that revenues for marketing the downtown and other services need to come from elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Would you be comfortable if we were to with the other fines that are being proposed the other changes to the system of collecting fines that don't have to do with meters, does the BIZ the people you're having discussions with have any problem with the other aspects of it other than the parking meters themselves?

Ms Mitchell: We haven't considered those fines in detail in the same way as we've considered the fines relating to parking meters, but our opposition is today against the fines relative to parking meters and how that impacts on parking and accessibility and welcoming in downtown.

No, we are not opposing the other increases.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Are you aware that there is a motion that was moved by the Mayor relative to freezing the parking fines for expired meters?

Ms Mitchell: Relative to the present recommendations there is a proposal to freeze parking fines. Well that's a very appreciated motion and clearly one that we are asking to be supported. That's excellent.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lubosch followed by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Lubosch: I'd like to thank you too for coming down and making presentation here for us. The report that we were provided in the very first paragraph it articulates that without time limits in the downtown area available street parking would be monopolized with business employees leaving those spaces for business customers and whole lanes of traffic would be lost during rush hour. Ultimately this whole parking issue is supposed to be one that benefits and works synergistically with the business community. Is it your intention to participate in a consultative process with the new parking SOA, and try and develop some new ways of dealing with parking in the downtown to make shopping there more attractive?

Ms Mitchell: Absolutely, and I think that we need to look at some of our earlier assumptions about parking in the downtown. It would be our present recommendation that one hour the remaining one hour meters be converted to two hour and there's many other areas I think where we can bring technology to bear. Smart technology to bear on the ease of parking in the downtown and the generation of revenue. Yes we wish to be an active partner in any effort to come up with a plan for parking and transportation in the downtown that incorporates the vision of our new downtown and energized downtown.

Councillor Lubosch: Just for my own edification and what you're telling us is that because City Council is creating the alternative service delivery model for parking which provides for a more entrepreneurial more flexible system the business community would like to have an opportunity to participate not just in terms of the fine amounts and the way fines are structured but to try and come up with creative ways to manage parking in the downtown as a whole to benefit the entire community.

Ms Mitchell: That's well said.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you for coming forward and expressing the concerns on behalf of businesses.

Just further to the note earlier that there's a motion on the floor, I just wanted to get your opinion on fact that the motion on the floor refers to the penalty from day one to fifteen staying at $15 for parked meters expired, but then after that the recommendation of Executive Policy Committee is to increase that fine to $50 after day 16 and not have the third option as well after day 31, what would be your feeling on that matter?

Ms Mitchell: Well I don't have, it's a new proposal to me I don't have a considered opinion, but it strikes me that what is important is the first fifteen days. I think that I could support increases to fines beyond the fifteen days. I don't see that as the same kind of punitive move.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Just to point out that all the other parking offences that are listed here before us that they still will go up if the recommendation of Executive Policy Committee and the Business Improvement Zone doesn't object to that?

Ms Mitchell: We differentiate between increases to parking infractions in general and those related to parking meters which directly impact on the downtown as separate from other areas of the City.

Mr. Speaker: Second round, Councillor Steek.

(10:20)

Councillor Steek: Just one last question through you Mr. Speaker to the delegation. In view of what you've heard here and the way this motion has come to the floor as a last minute gesture would you prefer to see this whole thing stood down for a couple of months so that it can be reviewed in its entirety with your people in view of the fact that this motion still means that these fines do not come into effect until March 1, 2003. Would you like to be part of a consultative process before this goes through, even the one to fifteen?

Ms Mitchell: I would say that if the parking fines related to meters stay as they are we would be satisfied to see that motion deliberated today.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Final delegation on the same matter, the five minute slot, Lisa Holowchuk.

Ms Lisa Holowchuk: Mayor Murray, Councillors, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this issue today. I'll try not to be too repetitive of what Ms Mitchell brought forward.

I'm with the Exchange District Business Improvement Zone and we're here because we're primarily concerned with the parking fines related to parking meters going up.

I have three points I'd like to bring forward just quickly this morning in opposition to the parking meter fines going up.

The first one is that potentially this will hurt business downtown. Parking is already a deterrent for people to come downtown, you're guaranteed a free spot at a mall in the suburbs. You're also guaranteed you'll have to drive around at least a little while downtown, and you're also pretty much guaranteed that you'll get a ticket if you mess up.

I don't want to call people who get a parking ticket at a one hour meter a law breaker because as far as I'm concerned if a meeting goes a little bit overtime or you're having lunch at a restaurant and that goes a little bit longer than an hour, I don't necessarily think it's appropriate to call those people law breakers. We would like to see the fines stay at $15.

The second argument we're bringing forward is that the process we believe was flawed in bringing these fines forward. We have been involved in stakeholder meetings with the City Hall District Parking Study and we've been receiving communications on the parking services special operating agency that was discussed yesterday.

We have a real sense of optimism that creative solutions to downtown parking issues are being sought, and we're very

pleased to be part of this process. We were part of the stakeholder meetings in the summer and we were told that this fall we would see some action items announced and some real creative solutions come forward for parking downtown.

The first announcement we saw was the headline, parking fines increased. This resulted in a lot of confusion on the part of our board and our members who are involved in these meetings. In doing some inquiries about the parking fine increases, it became apparent that the people coordinating these studies didn't know about the fine increases either it kind of came out of left field.

We felt that the result of this is that the stakeholder consultation process was undermined by bringing this in and we didn't know about it.

Our third argument is that the context for increasing parking fines at meters is that the context is wrong right now. City Council has been very supportive of a downtown first policy, and the investment in downtown is really leading to some tangible changes in the strength of downtown Winnipeg. We particularly see that in the Exchange District.

Increasing parking fines at parking meters flies in the face of this because 99% of the parking meters in Winnipeg are downtown. We're not Toronto or Calgary, things are still a bit fragile in our downtown and we're working towards becoming a vital and bustling downtown, and until we get there I don't think we can give Winnipeggers another deterrent and Winnipeggers love their cars and they love to park right in front of where they're going. I just think that this is something that will deter them from coming downtown.

I just found out about the motion that's coming forward this morning five minutes ago so we appreciate that this is coming forward and are glad that our concerns are being taken into account this morning. I would just like to thank you again for allowing me the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Lisa.

I believe that ends delegations. Move onto the Report of the Executive Policy Committee of November 20, 2002.

I have had a request to have Clauses 1 and 2 stood down.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED NOVEMBER 20, 2002

Mayor Murray: I would move the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 20, 2002, Clauses 1 to 8.

Mr. Speaker: As consent. Clauses 1 and 2 are stood down, any others?

If not, Clauses 3 through 8 by consent. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clause 1 - Request for Expenditure from the City Centre Land Dedication Reserve Fund - Grosvenor School File EP-2 (Vol. 30)

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

Mayor Murray: I'll wait to hear what the concerns are Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I had both one and two both stood down, they're in essence the same thing. They were stood down simply because of the fact there was non-occurrence from Executive Policy Committee. These are requests for modest amounts from the land dedication reserve. In Clause 1, it's for $8,000 for the assistance of an alarm system in, rather a PA System, and the second clause for Grant Park is for a request for financial assistance for musical instruments for their arts program.

The reason I asked to have these stood down is because I well realize that these are outside of the parameter of the conventional land dedication reserve policy which was introduced in 1973 with

the idea that there would be recreational legacies left.

These were two clauses that were supported at our community committee and our community committee like so many we have limited resources, we certainly know what the needs are in our community, both Councillors Smith and Gerbasi supported this and they went through, and we've had a history of supporting just these type of requests.

The fact remains is that in every ward needs are different, marketedly different. These are modest amounts that will be legacies to this community.

(10:27)

It's interesting when you look at Clause 3 which was passed as a consent agenda item it reads as follows: Not withstanding Council's policy $20,000 will be allocated for the beautification of murals, plantings and benches and I supported that and I'll be supporting it, it's already through.

I brought these two issues forward because of their importance not just to my community but to the community as a whole. The grant first of all of Grosvenor School is a situation where you have a school that is circa 1920. It has no PA system, it's on two floors and there was a situation where they had a person come into the school that caused concern for the staff. There was no way of alerting the students, the teachers that this party was in the school.

The Grant Park program is unique because of the fact that Grant Park's arts program is foremost in the City, the instruments that you see here are often shared with schools throughout the City. Things like cordless mics are used city-wide not just within the southwest quadrant of the City Mr. Speaker.

Subsequently I will be bringing forward a motion requesting that we revisit the policy around the land dedication reserve, I think it's well known that this was a policy as I say struck 30 years ago and in many instances is outdated for the needs that we have in our communities today.

I'm asking that each and every one of you on taking this vote think about the circumstances in your own communities and the things that you've needed in the past.

We supported for instance in our own community committee recently, land dedication reserve funds going to round out a program that assisted an area church. We've used these funds in various ways, their creative usages. The amounts are modest. $8,000 and $12,000.

Finally one of the interesting things that came up when I appeared at EPC on this matter and I'm sure Councillor Angus will remember this comment, he had stated to me at that time when I brought it forward, when do the school divisions help us repair the roads. And the answer is straightforward, they never do, they never will.

However, I think we all read recently about the stagnant population in this community. And what were the three things that we were told that we needed. At the forefront immigration, business investment and most important of all education. If you want to keep the best and the brightest here you're going to have to be creative in the way you use your funds. That's what these two requests are about. Assisting in education to ensure that the best and the brightest are looked after. So I'm hoping when you vote on this you'll think about the circumstances in each and every one of your own wards. The amount is not significant, however the message that it sends out into the community is very very significant. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steek. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I'm just going to indicate briefly that I did not support this request at Executive Committee and I'm not going to support either of these here. These are wildly out of whack with policy. As Councillor Steek has noted but I'm also going to note that on both these particular items I'll speak to Clause 1 but I'm not going to speak to the

second one. But on both of these items Mr. Speaker we are being asked to take land dedication money which is meant for recreational services in the community to buy intercom equipment, PA equipment and musical instruments for schools. In either of these cases at least in the evidence that I can see here there is absolutely zero contribution from the Winnipeg School Board, who the last time I checked have authority for schools and for equipping them. There doesn't also appear to be, well there is some community funding at least on one of the them, I can't see it necessarily on the other.

But principally Mr. Speaker there is no contribution being made by the Winnipeg School Division for equipment that is required in schools over which they have jurisdiction and for which they levy considerable property taxes to the residents of the Winnipeg School Division No. 1. We should not be using land dedication money to fund equipment for schools, no matter what kind of a legacy you want to attach to it.

If there is a concern that there's a lack of resources in this particular community Mr. Speaker, here's an example of why there is a lack of resources for the things that are really needed in a community over which city government has some authority because you're taking precious dollars that could be used for some of those things like park improvements and playground improvements that we do have a mandate for and providing this scarce money for schools, for school equipment and that sort of thing which school boards have jurisdiction for. So I'm not voting to waive the policy in this case no matter how, and I don't discount at all Councillor Steek's sincerity in terms of trying to do these things for his community. But there are school trustees who got elected on the same day that we did who should be taking some responsibility for equipping the schools under their jurisdiction for which they levy considerable property taxes.

If you want to know why there's scarce resources out of these funds to do things that are required in our community parks here's an example of why resources get scarce. They're being spent on items that are not within our jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Speaking to the clause that was here before us some time ago on Council and I had said at that time that I will be supporting the community committee's endeavour to help out a community particularly through the Grant Park and also this application that's before us.

What I've done in the past number of years, when and application such as this would come to the community committee I would grant give them a grant subject to them coming back with a grant from Community Places which is the Provincial Government and also from the school division, the school trustees, I have to echo what Councillor Eadie had said, the school trustees run on the same platform as we do, they have the same responsibility but they do not respond to those responsibilities. I'd like to see at some time when they come before the community committee with a request by a particular applicant and you'll find that there'll be a letter coming in from the MLA and with a nice photo in that letter saying that I support your endeavours and we're behind you 100%, good luck to you, but zippo no funding. I could easily do the same thing and I'm sure all members of Council do the same thing, is send a nice letter with our photo on there and say, we support you.

The problem lies because there's no pressure put on these particular people at the higher levels of government such as the Provincial Government. With the school trustees also. Where is their responsibility? In this case I will be supporting but I just hope that these community committees all the community committees in the City of Winnipeg would take this lead role that we've taken in Lord Selkirk - West Kildonan, we've been very successful you know yourself Mr. Speaker that just about every application that comes we do get funding provided by

Community Places and in a lot of cases from the school division itself. And what we do is we match the grants subject to the amount what they're asking for. In this case if it's $8,000, Community Places should have $4,000 put in there so then all the City would put in is $4,000. You have a better argument to come to the floor of Council and argue that here, the other levels have provided the grant, where's our responsibility. It's just a simple equation that has to be used, but when the other levels are not approached and no pressure is put on them we've had applications that came and a delegation and I said no, and they said well look, you're killing the project. I said, how do you figure we're killing the project, because the Province will not give us, I said have you tried. Well the MLA told me no. Well bypass the MLA.

(10:35)

The MLA responds in the same way as we do. And once the delegation and the applicants had made that approach they will get that funding. It's there for that purpose. Not only to say that we in the City have to provide all of those. But I know that in this case there was nothing in the first application nor the second application that's before us here today with the two clauses that there was effort made and I assume that there wasn't any effort made or the community committee failed to even put that condition in there subject to you getting the funding will match you.

I know in this case the dire need of the schools, this has to be done and it's our responsibility to help them. But I just hope that all community committees will see fit and make sure to follow the example of our community committee what we've done in the past, we've continued to do so and I've never even taken a threats that come in, they said, I'll never vote for you again on that subject matter. You have to take that lead role and to say to the others, look there are grant money available by the other levels of government such as the Provincial and school divisions. We've experienced this many times in our community committee.

Mr. Speaker I will be supporting, I will not speak to Clause 2 but I'll be supporting the application, not support the Executive Policy Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Deputy Mayor Thomas.

Deputy Mayor Thomas: Thank you. I will not be supporting this clause, I will be concurring with the Executive Policy recommendation that we not support it. My reasons are many.

I'm not saying that this isn't a worthy project, whether it be for alarm systems or whether it be for music systems, I'm not saying that. I'm not saying that I feel that they're less worthy than something else, I'm not saying that. What I'm saying is this is not within our mandate. The land dedication reserve is for us to buy land for recreational purposes or to improve existing recreational facilities that we have. I use the money in my ward I used it to improve many play structures in my community, and I've also used it just recently to buy a piece of property that became available from the railway to expand the Chalmers Community Centre. Now this is the appropriate way to use the land dedication reserve.

I have to tell you that there are many things out there that people need that are not within the purview of this money. If we start saying that it's okay for someone to do this don't think that they won't be knocking on your door councillors and asking you to be spending your land dedication reserve for something that's not within the mandate, and that when it comes to a group in your area that has too little land and wants to get some land dedication money so that they can expand their park system or improve their playgrounds that if you don't have it because you've spent the money on someone else's jurisdiction, this is not within our mandate, this is within the mandate of the school system, the school system completely. It doesn't have a recreational component whatsoever, it's within the teaching component and it's within their safety concerns. We've got to use our very finite resources for things

that are within our mandate, and our ability. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers. Mayor Murray.

Mayor Murray: Thanks Mr. Speaker. I have very mixed feelings about this. I do believe in one principle which is the autonomy of us community committees to make choices whether I think they're wise choices or not. Land dedication and community incentive grants are the means by which community committees have some autonomy to spend money on their priorities that these three councillors in that community attempt. The idea I think has been, there's been a bit of a firewall between Council and the ward councillors and that community committee. I was in a minority at Executive Committee in supporting this.

I want to speak in two perspectives as a city centre resident who happens to live in this particular community committee. We have a shortage of green space. I know in River Heights alone the old River Heights Ward there was issues of acquisition of rail lands for public use and for parks and parkways. When I was a councillor we saved money and we built a lot of the riverbank parkway from Churchill all the way to the Forks with this kind of money. If you go to Earl Grey Community Centre, most of the play structures there are out of land dedication and most of those facilities. The intention of land dedication because it has the potential for $50,000 and $100,000 projects or this $20,000 and $25,000 land acquisition usually leverages Community Places money and other things is extremely important.

I was up in northeast Winnipeg during the election where I heard that one councillor at the time was going around telling people that these folks in this neighbourhood have been waiting forever in this new development for a park. I was at the park dedication and one of the citizens stood up and said, with a councillor standing there, you know we have no money for parks in our community, and it's all the Mayor's fault. I spent the entire time in front of 2,000 people. I asked, I said, you know what happened to the land dedication money and that, no one had ever said the citizens groups that without even having to come down here for a whole formal process that residents of northeast Winnipeg could have gone to their councillors, it wasn't you Councillor Thomas as you probably know, could have probably gone to their councillors and said look, we need $50,000 to acquire land or to build towards a community centre. There's some responsibility that goes with that autonomy.

What I don't like about this is, I mean this is like taking candy a lolly pop from a little kid. Now we're asked to either wander away from a policy direction or go to the nice young folks at Grant Park and say, after commitments have been made to you for band equipment and stuff like that the big bad Mayor and Council are going to take away the music equipment that you've been promised. You set up that horrible dynamic because to the citizen they don't understand nor do they care that this is land dedication that this money comes from the sale of property to improve property to acquire parkland. And we often get put in that very ugly position by councillors when we do this.

I'm also in that school division. That school division collects more than 53% of all the property taxes I pay. Only 47% of City Centre's because we're in Winnipeg School Division No. 1 which I think has the second highest education property taxes and they're collected. The majority of my property tax dollars goes to the Province for education or it goes right back in the education system which Winnipeg No. 1 has done very well quite frankly getting larger increases in the provincial grants over other school divisions, or goes directly to the school division.

I expect that the councillors that get elected in my community stand up and defend that and say look, you've now got a majority of the property tax dollars going to you and you're getting growing provincial grants, you ought to be providing kids in schools with decent music equipment or providing some

subsidy program, the same way that we have to for skating and for all of the things that are in the Fort Rouge Rec Centre and the Pan Am Pool and all the costs associated with that. The Pan Am Pool right now needs major money. That's a regional facility that does not fall on the shoulders of the committee.

(10:45)

So do I agree with the decision? No, I think it's wrong headed. When I hear from Councillor Smith who has been really good about this, he's raised these issues of the need for more money in libraries and facilities and community centres. That's what this money is.

What I would like to suggest is that the three councillors from the City Centre Community Committee get together and come back with some priorities about what's important because next time I think you come down here asking for money for facilities or for acquiring green space, a lot of your colleagues around here and this is somewhat frustrating are going to say to you look, when Varsity View needed money we collected money out of land dedication and we bought that. They're going to come back to you and say, everyone else is spending their money to improve their community centres and their parks but in City Centre you're spending it albeit worthy and noble things, things that are so far outside the purview that we're not going to backfill the money. I think that's the difficulty. But I do believe that councillors have to have that autonomy in their community committees. I expect that that is paramount in this. I don't want it to be misunderstood that I think these are good decisions. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Question on Clause 1. You're voting on the EPC recommendation not to approve the grant. All in favour of the clause? Opposed? Recorded vote. Those in favour of the EPC recommendation please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, De Smedt, Steeves, Thomas.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Vandal, Wyatt, Lazarenko, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

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

Mr. Speaker: The clause is defeated. May I ask Mr. Clerk is it now necessary for a positive motion to approve that grant? So this does not approve the grant in any way.

The motion by EPC has been defeated, that does not approve the grant. There's been no positive motion by this Council to approve them. The clause is defeated, it's not before us anymore.

Point of Order

Councillor Angus: It appears to me that you should be calling the question on the Committee's recommendation. Executive Policy Committee made a recommendation it was defeated, there is still the recommendation before Council of the Standing Policy Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a recommendation before us from the Standing Committee? I don't see it, I see only a recommendation from the Community Committee which cannot be addressed by this Council.

Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Murray: I want to make a suggestion that we refer this next one back to the Standing Committee and that we ask the Community Committee and the Standing Committee to review these and maybe find a more appropriate source of funding for these kinds of initiatives.

Mr. Speaker: If I had introduced Clause 2 you could move referral on it. Clause 1 is finished.

Point of Order

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order Mr. Speaker. This was a matter that was addressed at the Standing Policy Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steek point of order.

Point of Order

Councillor Steek: On a point of order. I'm looking for leadership in this from you and the Clerk.

The circumstances here are self-evident. The attention of what happened here when the EPC motion was defeated was to have a vote to be supportive of this. I'm asking for approval on this thing because of the urgency and the timeframe.

I well understand what the Mayor is saying about a referral back. If this goes back for another 30 or 60 days these funds won't happen. We're asking that it be moved.

Mr. Speaker: Let me try this. Councillor Steek moves the rules be suspended and that we now vote on the recommendation from the Community Committee for the grant to Grosvenor School. All in favour of suspending the rules? Contrary? Don't have two-thirds. Under motions perhaps and then you'll need a suspension of the rules as well. Recorded vote.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Angus, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Vandal, Wyatt, Lazarenko, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Steeves, Thomas.

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

Mr. Speaker: We do not have the required two-thirds.

Clause 2.

Clause 2 - Request for Expenditure from the City Centre Land Dedication Reserve Fund - Grant Park High School
File EP-2 (Vol. 30)

Mayor Murray: Mr. Speaker given that there's some sympathy for the idea of what's being funded here but there's a sense of inappropriateness of the source of funding, I'm going to refer this back and ask the Standing Committee to consider another source of money.

Mr. Speaker: The Mayor rules referral. Councillor Steek up to one minute in opposition to referral.

Councillor Steek: You know what, this is simply stunning. You've seen that there's the majority of people here that support this funding. On a technicality this thing is going to be moved back to referral. The Mayor said he wanted direction out of the Community Committee. The Community Committee has made it very clear they are supportive of this Mr. Speaker. This is a situation where both of these issues have a majority of councillors supporting them. On a technicality you want to send it back for referral and we'll go through the same dog and pony show here again on the floor. These are time sensitive issues.

I'm asking you, I'm asking the Clerk, we lost this on a 10 - 6 vote, if we had one more vote than we had the two-thirds to suspend. I'm asking, this is the holiday season, let's see a little bit of graciousness here from some of my colleagues to suspend the rules so we can hear this.

Mr. Mayor you know full-well this is going to be coming back in the identical guise. I don't see how somebody is trying to help me if they're trying to send this back.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Question on the motion to refer. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the Chair)

Moving onto the Report of November 27, 2002.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED NOVEMBER 27, 2002

Mayor Murray: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would move Clauses 1 and 2 as consent. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Report of December 4, 2002.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED DECEMBER 4, 2002

Mayor Murray: Thank you. Clause 8 has to be stood down there's an amendment to it. I'll move Clauses 1 - 7 and 9 as consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clauses 5 and 8 have been stood down. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clause 5.

Clause 5 - 2003 Transit Fare Increase
File TT-2 (Vol. 12)

Mayor Murray: Thanks very much Mr. Speaker. I think this is a pretty self-evident situation. We're looking at about a $3 million increase in transit costs this year.

(10:53)

I think most people understand that that's been fairly standard. Unfortunately the division right now and how the cost has been supported is within the range where we pick up the majority of it the increase with property tax subsidies, which is $1.8 million. About $1.2 million is coming from the fare box.

We've sent a letter over to the Province asking them to consider a review of the funding formula for Transit. We've had some verbal indication back that there's some interest from the Province in having a partnership with us because it's stronger around a longer term funding formula. That's not something that's going to happen in time for this year. We're trying to move to a situation where we get out of this cycle of fare increases and stagnant ridership and that's a challenge. The issue of timing, these are always difficult issues in election years, you know we get sworn into office in November and the utility any changes in the utility charges have to be passed before the start of the fiscal year. It's somewhat frustrating because the utilities budgets are out of sync when there's changes with the budget. The issue as Councillor Angus may stand up and suggest is there's significant costs in delaying this, and it's an issue that we really have to deal with in the short term.

These costs are coming from a range of things mostly associated with insurance, fuel and salary costs going up and have to be absorbed. We're trying to do this all on the property taxes and absorb 100% of that would create an increasing amount of pressure on property taxes which creates upward another type of affordability issue to switch this all on the entire cost had to be absorbed by the fare box, you'd be looking at ten and fifteen cent increases, you've got to try and divide that.

The other option is cutting service. I don't think there's a desire right now in the short term at least to reconfigure the route systems. In the longer term we're lobbying very aggressively and I think we'll see in the Federal budget I'm hopeful, money for the first time in about 30 years for nationally funded capital programs to improve transit and rapid transit services. Councillor Wyatt raised some issues earlier in question period about the importance of that and I agree with him. We have to look at effective

rapid transit solutions for our city, there are a number of proposals forward, we can discuss the modalities and what makes most sense for our community, but that's where it has to go.

We're also lobbying the government to get the same kind of gasoline tax that Calgary, Edmonton, and Vancouver have. Every other city over half a million is supporting their transit and their street infrastructure programs with gasoline tax. I think the longer term solution is there. Given the success we've had with ambulances and given the success we've had with phase one of the City of Winnipeg Charter I'm very optimistic that with this provincial government we will see some positive direction towards a better solution.

This is unfortunately a short term situation, we're trapped in a bit of a short term situation.

I also want to thank and acknowledge Nick Ternette and Jim Jaworski for very articulate presentations. I think we have to work together with them and with community leaders to get a better deal for transit.

Our subsidy now will be over $30 million, it has grown every year. Five years ago when we started this exercise we were around $23 million, $24 million. Our subsidy has gone up at much greater rate than the rate of inflation. The fare box has gone up at much greater rate than the rate of inflation and there is simply no other real other alternative in the short term in the control of Council other than to reduce services.

I'm hoping we'll save our energy and our fodder for the discussion. The enroute to a better future for transit is a good document. I want to thank Councillor Angus, he has met with Rick Borland with Jean Friesen. There's a working group being established right now between the Province and the City. If you have questions of Councillor Angus about that to develop a longer term strategy, I think there's some sincere intention on both sides to do that. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor.

Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I have two points. One is fairly broad in terms of this transit fare increase and one is specific to some of the increases that I really question the arithmetic or at least the motivation behind the arithmetic.

First of all Mayor Murray thank you very much for bringing up the issue of our provincial opportunities that we try to motivate over at fort fumble on the Assiniboine.

You might recall several years ago we did delay consideration of transit fare increases by several months while we had a very prolonged and dedicated effort to try and get provincial support increase contributions. We were marginally successful. We do have a huge deficit in our handi-transit responsibilities that we've absorbed over many years. That's particularly one area that I hope Councillor Angus and Minister Friesen will be able to negotiate because I think that's a sociological support issue that really is a provincial responsibility but we've accepted it fully here in the City. And I think that's putting a tremendous amount of stress on the budget.

I'm kind of concerned that this transit fare increases as other increases are going to be presented to us from time to time are out of sequence and out of context in that we have not yet considered the 2003 operating and capital budgets. I mean I've been arguing now since shortly after our inaugural meeting that we really need to sit down as a group of six people to talk about the most important document that we face here in any given year and that's the budget. Whether it's the capital budget and more particularly the operating budget. We're not getting anywhere. I say this is out of sequence because I would and some of the parking fine increases though I'm quite happy to see that's there's a motion that we're going to consider later on about parking fine stability on meters.

The fact is that this is out of context with what we need to know our revenue generation abilities, our expenditures and our operating budget. And the fundamental assumptions behind our budgets.

As I look at the beginning of this report I know that the recommendation from the Director of Transit is such that considering increasing costs and financial guidelines provided and used in developing its draft 2003 current estimates. I'd like to know what those financial guidelines are. What are these assumptions? Maybe we can have them here today. But really if we had an opportunity to talk about in a sequential way where we're going with our budget our most important document, I keep repeating that we have to deal with we might have an opportunity to look at all the issues that we face in terms of revenues and financial obligations that we have in the spirit of trying to get an approval amongst 16 people rather than to have everybody going off in a different direction.

I'm trying to take you up Mayor Murray on your proposal that we have a more inclusive and open government, and we try and get 16 people on side. While I don't perceive this particular report as negative, the fact of the matter is, is that we have an obligation to everybody in the City to look at it in context of all the other revenue generation capabilities. We have an obligation for transit. We're trying to get the national infrastructure program on side, find out what we may or may not get out of that in terms of urban transit. We're trying to get the Province on board. But every time we talk in those generalities what we're trying to do is get them on board and try and find out where they will contribute and reduce this very significant impact that it has on the user at the fare box that we really don't get any results. And it's been ongoing now for well over three and a half years. We had the transit study that some of my colleagues were involved with me here some three and a half years ago, and we have really not achieved much more than the production of a very fine document that sets the way ahead.

(11:01)

But there's no results at the end of it.

I'm really arguing that we ought not to be considering these issues until we look at the overall budget. We should be deferring this for another 30 or 60 days until we can talk about the overall budget. That would be my personal recommendation. I would seek the guidance and support of the other councillors around here that we not proceed in this particular way.

Let me get to some specifics. If we had to increase five cents for the regular fare for the regular user, I suppose we may have to accept that. But what I'm concerned about and it's contained within the report and the Director of Transit has actually alerted to us, if we do this we're going to be out of policy. The fare increase will result in those reduced fares that are higher than will be the case of the transit fare policy adopted by Council is followed, and we adopted a policy in December '98. When you do the mathematics and you're going to have to go to page 109, and I know you haven't got hard copy and you're going to have to scroll through in a hurry. But believe me this is what the numbers are saying.

That if we had followed policy last year if we had the reduced regular cash fare should have been 80% of the regular fare. That means the regular fare last year for 2002 the current year is $1.70, 80% of a $1.70 is $1.36. But we approved $1.40. Of course we rounded up in favour of the department quite nice. The fact of the matter is if you continue in that theme as is being proposed in this report for next year we're proposing $1.75 and you take 80% of that regular cash fare we should be charging people $1.40, but they're proposing $1.45. So we're hitting all those people that we're trying to support those people who are going to school and the seniors to carry a little extra cost. We've hidden it last year and so the delta is significant.

What I'm arguing for here is the reduced cash fares that are being proposed or the reduced fare structure being proposed

are wrong. I agree with the Director they're out of context with policy that we approved. We have a policy, let's follow the darn thing. If you look at the other two if you buy a sheet of 10 we should have charged 60% of the regular ticket costs. That meant it should have been $0.99 or $9.90 for a packet of 10. We charged them this year $10.50. And for next year they're proposing they charge them $11 when we should only be charging them $10.20. If you look at 60% of a $1.75.

So why are we doing this? We're out of context in policy. And the same thing happens if you go to the monthly pass. We followed policy the monthly pass this year should have been $38.11, or if we rounded out to $1 a ticket rather than $0.99 we should have charged them $38.50. We've charged everybody this year $40.45 almost $2 more. For 2003 if you follow the protocol that transit is proposing here, we should actually be charging them $39.27 but we're going to charge them $42.35.

We're not following policy and I thank the Director of Transit for reminding us of that. How do we get at this? Are we going to follow the policy and we've created a protocol to adjust reduced fare structure in relation to regular fares.

I'm being nitty here I know that. But either we have a policy, either we follow it, when we bring this forward, if we'd had an opportunity frankly to sit down and 16 of us and talk about the budget, talk about all these other implications, we could sort this out so that when we have a document come forward to us would make a heck of a lot of sense. I really would like to see that we not pass this today. I know it's going to cost us a hundred thousand for another 30 days, but I think it's really worth it until we sort out what the heck you people want for reduced fares. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that we not support this increase. And why not? Because every year we do this we have a drop in ridership everytime we increase. Like if something is not working why do we keep on doing it? I think it's incredible that we have year after year after year increases and drop in ridership. The report doesn't talk about the drop in ridership. We have no idea about what has happened over the last ten years in drop in ridership. Then we have the prospects of increased revenue from other sources coming into the City. We have no idea, we haven't got a firm grip on those so we can't tell really if we can afford not to pass this.

The fact is when we pass this we're in effect saying, transit is going to be down played and it's going to go further and further and further to where it's not going to be functioning to where it helps the senior citizens, the students and the business people. People go shopping, I know all of you have cars and you don't travel by transit, but you know a lot of people use transit for those purposes.

I don't know why the Chamber of Commerce is not here opposing this because it hurts business. It hurts the revitalization of the downtown. Obviously communication from one part of the City to the next is something that's essential. And we shouldn't have to rely just on cars.

How about the fact that we have to spend more on roads and so forth because we're not using alternative source of travel, transit. When we had the commuter challenge how come all of you were not in it? It seems to me that transit is downplayed by this Council all the time. Every year we keep on doing something that's not working. It seems to me ludicrous to proceed this way. Let's vote against it, let's show some guts and let's go ahead and make some plans that will aid people going from one part of the City to the next.

(Councillor O'Shaughnessy in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is a difficult one. We had the recommendation from the Director,

and I think the difficulty that Council is faced with this morning is the way that this comes forward. We have a request for a transit fare increase and I think I could probably say categorically that everybody on Council probably supports the idea of increased ridership. Certainly as Chair of the Environment Committee I obviously support that and think that's a great great thing.

Personally I'm not certain exactly how we get there, I don't think anybody here has a great handle as to how we get there. We've heard a lot of good ideas on how we might get there. And what Councillor De Smedt and I think others particularly Mr. Ternette and his delegation mentioned that we needed a strategy to do this type of thing, and I think that's a theme that's been recurrent.

I can tell you categorily that with the environmental strategy that we anticipate coming to Council with early this spring will focus to a very very large degree on the reduction of greenhouse gases, obviously not just pertinent to the transit issue but to the overall reduction of greenhouse gases in the City of Winnipeg.

I don't have to tell you Mr. Speaker that this was ratified yesterday by the Country of Canada in Parliament.

The difficulty of course with this particular issue I guess I'll colour myself as a "friend of transit", but as Councillor De Smedt said, this puts us in a very very difficult position. We have on the one hand the prospect of supporting a fare increase which we frankly suspect might have an adverse effect on ridership, and that's probably the case. On the other hand we have the Director's report that states, that if we do not support it this is going to cost our transit system $100,000 per month effective immediately. Neither scenario is particularly good. The difficulty that I'm in personally I guess is that we don't want to do any undo damage to our transit system or to the Director in the terms of running of his department.

The difficulty of course is right now as I stand here, I don't have any great indication or any great sense that there is a will on behalf of this Council right now in the overall budget process to support transit to any greater degree.

(11:10)

That might well be the case, but as Councillor De Smedt sort of alluded to, the process is not in place so this motion and the way that this is coming forward puts all of us in a great deal of difficulty I think in terms of whether to support it or not. I can tell you I will be supporting the fare increase, I hope to over the next year to develop a comprehensive strategy to address not only the issue of transit fare increases because that isn't in my opinion, that isn't the only area even necessarily a significant part of why people in this city are not riding the bus. There has been some alluding to the idea of rapid transit.

I think what we need to do is we need to focus on the bigger question here and that is why are people in Winnipeg not riding the bus. Personally I do not think that the reason is five cent fare increase. It's not my sense that people are not riding the bus in Winnipeg because we're going to increase the fare five cents. There is a greater problem. It's pertinent to that and it's through that process we hope to become engaged with transit over the course of the next year. Just to remind the Speaker the way our strategy is going to work is we're going to have eight different subject heads underneath the strategies that we hope to get through Council. Once that is done we hope to come up with specific action plans underneath each of those eight heads we have to prioritize.

I could probably say with some I guess confidence that the reduction of greenhouse gases and sustainability in the City of Winnipeg will be one of the priorities of our committee. Within that, transit is going to play a large role. So we hope to genuinely involve transit in sort of a philosophical discussion in why people aren't taking the bus more, so that's where we plan on going.

While I will be supporting the fare increase this time we do hope over the

course of the next year to develop as Councillor De Smedt indicated a more comprehensive idea of how we're going to proceed with transit in the future and how we're genuinely going to attract more people to take the bus in the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Because public transit falls under the mandate of the Public Works Standing Policy Committee and because that committee hasn't had an opportunity to review the proposed fare increase in the context of the adopted transit plan I would move referral to Public Works of this clause.

Councillor Angus: As the Chair it's my responsibility because I brought up exactly the same points as the Chair of Public Works.

Budgetary matters fall under the purview of EPC, and directed right to Council and that's why it's here, I was overruled at EPC.

Mr. Speaker: Question on the motion to refer. All in favour? Contrary? Recorded vote.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors De Smedt, Lubosch, Smith, Steek, Wyatt, Lazarenko.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Vandal, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

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

Mr. Speaker: The motion to refer is lost. Councillor Lubosch you still have the floor.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

The factors effecting ridership in transit Mr. Speaker are fairly complex. There's a lot of study and a lot of debate on what gets people to ride the bus and what gets people to stop riding the bus.

The fact is that in Winnipeg we've had significant challenge in encouraging bus ridership from people who are more comfortable taking their cars out of convenience, out of cost. We're not a city like Toronto, we're not a city like Calgary, we don't have all the bells and whistles in public transit. Basically we've got buses on the street that pick people up take them to work or to school or to medical appointments and drop them off. It's not the best system but it's the best one that we've got right now with the resources and the means that we're prepared to dedicate to it.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the historical context of transit increases. We've been nickel and dimming mostly nickeling the transit fares up since 1985. We've gone up a nickel every year save 1989 but we made up for it in 1990 by going up ten cents. We went up ten cents in 1993, we didn't go up in 1995 but when you add it all up we've gone about $0.85 which is about double of what the fare was in 1985. You have to ask yourself did everything else double since 1985. Did the price of cars, or did the price of gas, or the price of houses, did the price of food, did all those things double? I don't think so Councillor Clement, I don't even think the price of swimming pools has doubled since 1985.

The fact is, we're out of step with inflation. Now we can talk about whether or not the price is elastic or inelastic. The Harold Cohen report which is featured now by the Federal Government in Stats Canada's review of transit would suggest that the price is not very elastic, that it is in fact inelastic. That when fares go up revenue goes up. Well that can be looked at two ways. That could be looked at as this is a great opportunity for the City to make more money by raising fares, or this is a great opportunity by the

City to hold those people who have to take the bus by necessity hostage because they've got no other way to get to work. The seniors that I represent tell me that they're dependent on transit for two reasons. Number one, where they live in apartments it's difficult to get a car park there, and number two, it's the cost, they're on fixed incomes. It's more convenient for them to take the bus downtown, in fact they're probably the only people that actually go downtown to do their shopping and do their visiting and we should be encouraging this. By raising bus fares we're discouraging this.

Then there's the students. We want students to think green. We want to think globally and act locally by using the bus. We're promoting ecopasses. We're promoting promotions at the post secondary institutions and colleges, it's part of our overall transit strategy. By raising fares we are in a direct contradiction to these promotions.

Ultimately we should be looking at getting more people on buses. Providing property tax support to transit service is going to be a lot less expensive now and in the long run than building more roads and bridges. Have you asked yourself lately what kind of property tax support goes to subsidizing the private automobile and where does this fall within the guidelines and proposals of Kyoto. We're moving in the wrong direction Councillors. Ultimately we need to improve our transit service and we need to increase the value if we're going to increase the price.

(11:20)

We are going to also learn from history that everytime we increase….

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Please direct your comments through the Chair, Councillor Lubosch please don't rise for debate Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Lubosch your clock is running.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

I won't comment on the comments that were made from the peanut gallery Mr. Speaker, but the fact is that councillors before me have made the same argument. That if you're going to increase transit fares you have to also show an increase in the value of the service. That's something we haven't done.

I'm going to be voting against this transit increase, and I will take the Mayor's challenge and I will work towards improving transit services in our city. Thank you for your consideration.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the Chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Next speaker is Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise on this item to speak against the idea of raising fares at this point in time. I have two concerns. I guess namely the first concern my fellow councillors is that I feel that this is part of a larger issue, I think I'm citing Councillor De Smedt earlier who said, this is part of the budget process, and I think this matter even though yes if we waited a little bit it might mean extra costs to transit but there are other departments and utilities that are going to be looking at extra costs in the upcoming budget. I think we have to balance that when we're considering this item as well.

I think we're kind of looking at only a very small glimmer here a little opening really of light coming through of the upcoming budget and to take it out of context now and to now vote on this or to be asked to vote on this without having the full budget before us and knowing where we're going as a city in my mind is not fair and I'm not doing my due diligence as a city councillor.

The second reason I wanted to speak against was in light of a lot of things that some of the other councillors said as well, you cannot help but speak about the fact that really this is talking about the future of public transit, and I'm a strong supporter of public transit. I really believe that the five cent increase like all the

other five cent increases from previous years is basically to transit public transit death by a thousand cuts. This is just going to slowly deteriorate the public transit system, ridership will continue to fall off as it's doing so now.

The challenge we have before us councillors in my mind and Your Worship is that we have to see how we can drive ridership back on the public transit. And to do that in my mind is to compete directly with the automobile. We have to ensure that for transit to compete with the automobile it has to be efficient, it has to be cost-effective for the riders, it has to be fast, in Winnipeg it has to be warm and in the hot summers it has to be cool. It has to be basically a convenient service almost as convenient as the automobile.

At the end of the day public transit no matter what we increase it here today, yes, it will no doubt still be cheaper than riding an automobile.

The question we have to ask ourselves is why our ridership numbers is continuing to fall. Why are we not doing something about this. Why are we always just raising it by five cents every year and then saying we're going to study it, we're going to study it.

I had an opportunity Mr. Speaker to meet with the Director of Transit, Mr. Borland, and got a very good idea of the state of transit. The fact that our rates have gone up by over 100% in the last 15, 16 years, that ridership has dropped by about a third over that same period of time. My concern is that where do we go. And the question I posed to him and to Council is we should step back and look at this because it's easy to raise the rates today but then not to do anything about it tomorrow.

I have some serious concerns about some of the ideas that are being put forward. I'm not completely sold on the idea of a bus way. I feel that we as a Council have a lot of spending priorities ahead of us and $150 million to build a bus way to service part of south Winnipeg and the east side of the City keeping in mind that it will be servicing my area of the City, Transcona, versus having to spend $150 million on fixing our residential streets, our regional streets, it's a tough question. And knowing that we have a billion dollar infrastructure deficit to date. I think that we should look at ways to use our existing regional roads and regional streets better. I really believe that we have a system in this city which in some parts of Europe would be the envy where you have three or four lanes coming into the city centre on major thoroughfares, and that these lanes are virtually other than a few cases all dedicated towards the automobile. There are ways that we can look at technology and busing and building bus shelters and warm bus stations, reducing the amount of bus stations along the major routes working our feeder lines. We could look at possibilities of GPS, global positioning systems to allow the signals to change so the buses approach the lights and so it becomes a rapid transit system for all intents and purposes.

There's a lot of things we can do in my mind Mr. Deputy Speaker that we're not doing today. I guess I challenge Council I challenge our administration as well to look at these things, not just to say right we need $150 million to build bus ways and then our problems are going to be solved. The fact is we build $150 million bus way we still have another two-thirds of the City that don't have a bus way dedicated rapid transit system and we're now going to be facing $250 million or half a billion to extend it to them.

I think we have to be realistic as a city. We have to be realistic that we have a lot of priorities and a lot of demands on our plate. I think we should be creative as well when it comes to public transit and be flexible.

I will be voting against this today Mr. Speaker because number one it was not part of the original budget process that I think should be coming before Council. And number two, this is death by a thousand cuts to a public transit system which I love and I know a lot of people in this city feel very highly of. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Very well, you did a good job.

The next speaker is Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is definitely one of the most frustrating issues that I think we have to deal with. I found it one of the most frustrating over the last my four years on Council going on five years. Partly it's because we don't seem to have made very much progress in terms of what we need in improving transit.

On the other hand there has been certain things done and it's been raised that we need to have a plan, we need to have a direction.

Some of us who worked on the direction to the future report and if you read that report you'll see that there is a clear direction and there is some clear answers and they're out there, and we're working on them. The problem is, is we haven't got the support in terms of the funding that we need to make those things happen. We haven't found the financial solutions to those problems. We don't even have consensus on this Council about supporting the bus way system which I find extremely frustrating. This is a plan that's been in our system for 30 years and we can never seem to move ahead on it. We have to get started on that. If we don't get started on that we're already behind every other major city in Canada in terms of not having any form of transit system. We're not talking about $150 million, we're talking about $30 million to start the first leg of the Southwest Corridor that's ready to go and people need to get behind that. We as a Council need to get behind that, because if people can't get where they're going within 25 minutes and it takes any longer than that, they're not going to take the bus. If you read the Direction to the Future report that's what is a major issue. Fares are an issue as well, but a major issue is the time it takes to get from A to B, and people just will not ride the bus unless it's fast and a desirable way to travel.

(11:27)

This Council we are trying to maintain service levels we have with increasing costs year after year after year, and nobody wants to stand up here and raise fares. I feel sick to my stomach about this. But on the other hand we are spending more and more millions and millions more on transit and our other partners need to come to the table to do that. This is not something the City can do alone. I think the Province's ears are perking up and at some point we need some action. Until we get that action if the City just eats the costs fully on the property tax base on every issue that we're being asked to around this table from everybody because we never want to make any difficult decisions that way. We're going to be in big trouble financially as a city and we have to act responsibly in that regard.

I'm happy to hear there's a task force under Councillor Angus' committee that's going to continue to work on this in terms of working with the Province. That's something that a lot of effort went into in the last term of Council following the Direction to the Future Report, and we weren't able to get on the radar screen at that time. I'm hoping we will now, and I'm hoping that the public will be aware that this is a problem that is not just the City of Winnipeg's issue. Countries have federal support for transit systems, and other provinces support the transit system at a much greater rate. Our funding has been frozen for years and years at the same level with the Province and it's no longer cost-shared the way it needs to be. So we need to work with them in a positive way with the Provincial Government they need to listen, and then together as a province and as a community we can stop this endless cycle of increasing fares. There are realities of day to day running the City that we just don't have a bottomless pit, and we're also sending a message that the City will just take all the costs and the other partners don't have to take them, if we just keep taking the whole thing.

That's the dilemma that we're in. It's not pretty, it's extremely frustrating. I think everybody around this table feels that and feels concerned about ridership

decreasing. Unfortunately if we just drop the rates the ridership numbers just don't add up in terms of paying the bills. That's the reality.

I would like to see us have a council seminar on the rapid transit issue so that everybody can get together and get on the same page about where we want to go in terms of really improving our transit system, so at least we're not fighting among ourselves when we go forward to try to move our city ahead into the future in our transit system because I don't even think we've had that kind of understanding amongst ourselves and we really need that.

I reluctantly will be supporting this because we have to run a city in the realities that we live in and we need to get the other players involved that have a say in this and have a responsibility in this and that's something that I'm hoping will happen over the next year and then we can take some more positive action in that regard. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Speaker. As usual everybody is right on this issue and it's a very uncomfortable situation to be put in.

Peter and a group of councillors from this Council worked on the new directions report, Report to the Future and you are part of the group of the councillors Councillor Lubosch, and you're a part of the Committee on Works and Operations.

Let me say those that wanted to refer it back to Public Works they were right. It's the purview of that particular committee to give its best advice to this particular council. It is also the job of Executive Policy Committee to manage and try to address the budgetary concerns and the issues that we have before us.

Peter was right that taking this out of context of the overall budget is not particularly palatable. I think we would all agree with that, we would all like to see the big picture. Once again as the Mayor has said, we are in a very difficult crunch time that happens once every four years. We get elected, we get appointed, we're trying to look at having what everybody wants seminars and all of that sort of stuff, and we find ourselves all too soon getting ready for the Christmas break and not even having a budget ready for 2003. We want to address that.

Having said all of that. Let me say that as a result of the efforts and the work that my colleague Councillor De Smedt did on the Directions for the Future, we have initiated a huge number of changes in the transit system in the last three or four years. We've brought in a huge number of low floor buses with bike racks to carry bikes. We have the ecopass which was suggested where businesses are cooperating and the City is cooperating in subsidizing employees. We have a university students program that is really really going well and very successful.

Why we are not getting more ridership I don't know. The price of gasoline is skyrocketing, individuals continue to use their cars, their automobiles by the hundreds of thousands of kilometre miles with one individual in the car. Until that attitude is changed very little is going to be happening. So we're caught with a dilemma as to who is going to pay.

As a matter of interest, in 1992 the Province contributed $17,450,000. In 2002 they contributed $16,339,000. I don't want to upset any progress that we are making in discussions with the Province of Manitoba. As recently as this morning I became aware of the fact that there is some movement and some discussion by the Provincial Government in relation to the overall transportation system and transit in the City of Winnipeg. I'm very encouraged by that.

Councillor Lubosch is right that we have been nickeling every year, we've been adding a nickel. The reason is of course that somebody has to pay the costs. We currently assess the individual property taxpayers $30 million, this is the property taxpayers to subsidize the transit system. Now is that fair? Is that the right balance? Is it out of policy? It's slightly out of policy yes, we are paying more in

the collection fare box than we are through the property taxes. That balance has been broken. The five cent across the board ratio we felt was better than putting the fares up ten or fifteen cents in order to have the policy fall in place all the way down which would have resulted in a nickel probably happening anyway across the board if I'm making myself clear.

The policy says as Peter has pointed out, that certain fares will be struck and everything will flow from the single fare, the persons fare. If we charge $1.75 and we charge the seniors 60% of that, in order to get the same amount of revenue we have to put the single fare up considerably more across the board. It just didn't work, the math didn't work. In this particular instance it was our opinion and certainly my opinion as unpalatable as it would be that a nickel across the board was a reasonable and fair thing to do.

I am sincerely hoping and have had communications, the Administration has had communications with Minister Friesen and with the Cabinet and I on behalf of the Executive Policy Committee and the Committee on Public Works have been trying to work out a long term solution to avoiding the perpetual increases of transit fares and finding a fair and equitable system that will allow the property taxpayers to subsidize the system fairly and the people that use the system to pay their fair share.

(11:35)

The $1.2 million that we're anticipating raising by this fare increase is going to go into managing the transit system. It is not going into roads, it is not going into community incentive grants, it's not going into pools, and it's not going into libraries, and it's not going into sidewalks, it's going right back into the transit system. The budget for next year for the transit system total operating expenses for 2003 are projected to be $101 million. That's up by $4 million from 2001. Up a $1.5 million from last year.

Ridership as you have indicated is pretty much status quo. In 2001 the actual ridership was 38.6 million, in 2003 it's projected to be 39 million. That's not a huge increase and the reality of it may be that it might be less than that, so we don't know, it's a little bit of a crap shoot.

Putting this in place now allows us to generate additional revenues to offset the expenses of running the transit system.

There is another method Councillors that we can use. Every single time I have brought it forward to the Committee on Works and Operations to try and save money and they will be reviewing this again, every time it has been rejected. There are a serious number of routes that we run at $60 an hour where very few people use the bus. And yet we refuse to allow those routes to be cancelled. Councillors, ladies and gentlemen that ride the bus there is no free lunch on the bus, there's not even a coffee service. You want to pay it, you want three or four people to use that bus that low frequency number of buses, then everybody else in the City is paying to help those people have that convenience that this Council will not visit and will not reject.

We can run a trimmer ship and we can do improvements, we can do environmentally sound things. We can look at a rapid transit system that goes for the whole city and not just a particular end. One of the reasons for the Southwest Transit Corridor proposal is that it's got payloads of people at both ends. University students going south in the morning and workers going downtown in the morning and vice versa in the afternoon. It can become economically feasible. But we aren't going to be able to do that without considerable help from senior levels of government. Right now they're looking at putting money into the floodway. So will this happen? I don't know.

But we are making progress on the report that Peter De Smedt prepared, we are bringing innovative changes in. The department is working exceptionally hard doing an exceptionally fine job in trying to provide service, adequate service. We run a free shuttle bus service downtown

because we felt that that's an important thing to do. I agree with that.

Frankly there are bus routes in my are where it breaks my heart to have to say to Mrs. Jones who uses it out on Turnbull Drive I'm sorry, but you're the only one using this bus, and so we're not going to run it for you anymore. Those are the decisions we have to make.

If we want to run those buses and if we want to continue to try and get cooperation from the Provincial Government and we want to try and balance our books in that department then we are forced with these minor increases on a regular basis. I would hope that our committee will be able to develop a better formula with the cooperation of the Provincial Government, and I repeat, I believe they are prepared to come to the table and have serious discussions on long term funding. I've had very very positive feedback in that regard and I'm hoping that we can avoid this type of an increase over the next few years. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further speakers. I'll ask Mayor Murray to close debate.

Mayor Murray: Thanks very much Mr. Speaker. There's a really easy formula in governing, it's called you won't cut services, you won't raise taxes and you won't raise user fees, and you're right, and you're right and you're popular but nothing balances. There's the other school of thought that says, well our policy says this, and our resources allow that, and that's what we're in. We're in a gap in absolutely everything. You can pull the City's policy out on infrastructure renewal, the strategic infrastructure report.

Are we there yet? No, but we do have $23 million last year in the budget for roads and we're now putting more money into it. We have a policy, we've made great progress on transit. The ecopass gives large discounts for employers at 30%. We've introduced the student discount at 20%. We have a free shuttle service in the downtown, four of them next year. We've done low floor buses, we've completely changed our signage. We have now slowly been introducing diamond lanes. All of that.

I just want to point something out. We do not get five cents a litre out of the gas tax like Calgary and Edmonton, we don't get ten cents a litre like the greater Vancouver Regional District that runs transit in Vancouver did. If we had that we could make massive investments in transit and our street system and close that. Every year because we've had campaigns now that quite frankly I and a couple of my colleagues around here have been leading for a national infrastructure program which we got. We declared a housing crisis four years and demanded the Federal Government get a national housing program which we've got now, $65 million approximately in this city right now. I stood up every year and I've just come back from Ottawa twice saying, please write letters, meet with your MLA, with your MP, get the partnerships going. Do you know how many members of Council have written letters at least have copied me on them, two. When I say to some of you that talk is cheap but if you actually want a better deal for this city you better be able to tell me you met with your MLA and they're tired of hearing about transit, that you met with your MP and they're tired of hearing about transit, and for 13 of you that you're writing letters and pushing demands on there.

When we started talking about the solutions to this, we've done pretty well. If you look at the report our cash fares are lower than Calgary, Edmonton's and Vancouver's, all who have huge gas tax funding, have tax increases 3.5% in Edmonton this year, 5% in Calgary and higher cash fares, and a higher cost structure right now passed onto the user. We as a city shouldn't be beating ourselves up. We have raised our subsidies of transit every single year. Very much in line with the recommendations of Councillor De Smedt's committee which said there has to be increased government support. We've been there every year now we're over $30 million but there is no other solution other than cash fares.

As for following budget process. Yes we could wait but the problem is we're in an election year. We as a Council now have a three year budget, so next year we'll be discussing and you'll be able to look at the budget for 2003, 2004, and 2005, Councillor De Smedt this is for your edification. That's where we move to. We're the only government in Canada that does three year budgets to avoid these problems. But we need the patience and tolerance of Council to realize that we don't have a budget yet.

(11:45)

We're just going to pass judgement on the year end reconciliation's for last year's budget, we're still looking at numbers, we are early on, and we have said you'll drown in budget consultations and discussion in January, February and March, but we've got to get the numbers ready to the do that. The problem is every single year we have to do the transit fares beforehand. Delaying them just passes on costs and it backs it up to a lot more complicated decisions.

I'm not sure where the give is. I don't think we want to cut services. I don't think we want to reduce our property tax subsidy below the additional $1.8 million because that's going to put unfair pressure on the fare box more than is there now. If we eliminate it and we carry 100% on the property tax then we deal with other pressures because we don't have a growing tax base on recreation and parks and community centres and libraries. It's about trying to be realistic about this. There is not a good solution to transit in the short term. But if we work as a determined group and Councillor Lubosch I appreciate that you're an advocate for this and I count on us working together, that 12 months from now if we really make this a priority as we have with housing and infrastructure and we get the kind of partnerships and funding that other cities in western Canada already have, we won't have these debates. We can beat each other up all we want, do you know what I mean? As Councillor Angus said, we can all be right but we're all dead right, we're not accomplishing one additional penny. And unless someone's got a money making machine in the print shop that makes really credible counterfeit money I don't see a short way out of this.

I want to thank you for taking the time to take this seriously. But let's try to work to get the deal that other cities have so we get ourselves out of this hole. I just want to close by saying this. We're operating at 25% less than Calgary per capita for services and 33% less for Edmonton. We're the most cost-effective deliverer of municipal services and we just do not have a lot of room in our budgets anymore, and I think we've delivered the cost-effective government and value for dollars that people are looking for, it simply doesn't solve the revenue problem.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are you ready for the vote? Recorded vote has been called for. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal.

Nays

Councillors De Smedt, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Wyatt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Councillor Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 7.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The clause is carried.

Clause 8.

Mayor Murray you want to introduce Clause 8.

Clause 8 - Parking Fine Rates
File ST-9 (Vol. 5)

Mayor Murray: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The Winnipeg Police Service has initiated a process of reviewing their fine

structures and I think that was part of the review that was done two years ago about effectiveness recovery and are starting to align their revenues with others for introductory fine levels, our levels were significantly below most other cities. For example on parking meters expired Winnipeg $15, in Calgary $20 and $25 in Edmonton. That doesn't add a lot of value to anyone living here because people as we pointed out don't park in Edmonton and Calgary very often. But there is a level of recovery that they've been looking at.

The report I think is self-explanatory. The Police Chief has noticed that the level of deterrence for a lot of these violations, people parking in handicap zones, parking in front of fire hydrants, abusing privileges at meters to a point that the effectiveness and turnover required is not there.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is important, I think it makes sense, I think we should support the Police Services recommendations. As you know we also have the policy on downtown parking on the ASD that will lead with meters and fares we're not proposing to increase those. We've been trying to keep those down so that people who aren't breaking the law and are following the rules are not penalized.

This also because things like handicapped zones and stuff spread fairly evenly out of the City.

I think the area that we were wrong in and I think didn't pay enough attention to because we're not perfect and we do make mistakes was the area of expired meters, and people who were going to get dinged jumping from $15 to $25 for expired meters and I think that was extremely important that there was consideration given to the numbers of groups that came forward and said look, this is not on, this is going to cause us some harm, there's a shock here, this is too high a fine for someone simply not being able to get back from an appointment, a luncheon or a business meeting to their meter in time. I think you have to listen and we made a pretty strong commitment to listening to people. You can beat City Hall sometimes. I think it was important that the representations by the BIZ and the Exchange District BIZ and the Downtown BIZ who were quite fair minded and CentreVenture all came out and said look, let's look at that. There's a lot of good suggestions for increasing two hour meters, for looking at potentially partnerships with the BIZ's and the ambassador programs in the downtown. In parking meters I think we can explore some creative relationships there that are very positive, there's been some very good suggestions which I think we should be moving towards.

I think on the issue of the expired meters I think quite frankly our recommendation in my view and I think shared by Executive Committee in the conversations with them and hopefully by you was just plain wrong. I think we made a mistake. We should just simply withdraw that and I think proceed with the structure. No one has problems, everyone understands the safety issues and the issues of handicap, fire and other problems, blocking lanes and private approaches and all of the other things that are really true obstructions to safety to emergency vehicles, to people's ability to get in and out of their property, and to a reasonable turnover.

I hope you would support both the report and the amendment that's proposed by Councillor Angus and myself.

Councillor Angus: It's close to 12 o'clock perhaps before we get into the discussion, I move that it be 12 o'clock and we break for lunch at this particular time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We'll reconvene at 1:30 p.m. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Council recessed at 11:50 a.m.

After recess

Council reconvened at 1:36 p.m.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the Chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We'll commence with the meeting that we finished at 12 noon.

I'd like to introduce the Pages. Nicholas Plett, home schooled, Transcona Ward. And Allison Forzely of St. Mary's Academy, Fort Rouge Ward.

We'll get on with the Report of the Executive Policy Committee. The Mayor had introduced Clause 8 and that's the parking fine rates.

We start first with Councillor De Smedt and it would also be on the amendment.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Obviously we're all more upbeat right now with the proposal by EPC to delete the parking meter increase, and I think I'm very supportive of that and I appreciate that everybody has come to their senses very quickly because I would not have been supportive of that increase. I think certainly the delegations that we heard and others are saying that, we were out of context of what we were trying to do in redeveloping the downtown, and so I think that's very important that consideration was given to amend and delete that from the increased protocol.

It's all of course about budget. Again I'm sorry to be a curmudgeon on it as Councillor Angus has just said, but yeah we have to drum that beat because if we could sit down again together and talk about where we're going. This is about a revenue increase that we need, and it may be justifiable in the longer term but we can put this in context with everything else that we're trying to do and set priorities. I know we're going to be considering an item here on the EPC report from December 11 and one of the items of course is increasing our housing rehabilitation investment reserve and a commitment that the City has made some time ago, we agreed to join with the Province and the Federal authorities to have a significant housing investment reserve. That is not a core service of the City of Winnipeg and the municipalities. We've made it one. I'm interested in supporting that but it comes down to priorities. In fact there are probably a few other things within the context of our budget that we might want to reconsider. I'm not suggesting that we reconsider that one but it's one of these things that we tend to do if it's fashionable and if we have other levels of government quickly coming to the table on something's that's important to them we jump in. I find it very interesting that the Feds and the Province aren't jumping on board, we've been after them for actually two and a half years, three years. Councillor Gerbasi went over and talked to them after our transit study, when she was Secretary of Intergovernmental Affairs was doing it, we're not getting any answers.

While I hear that Councillor Angus and Minister Friesen are going to be getting together about transit fares it would be rather interesting and I know I'm off the subject but it's the context of trying to get other levels of government to be excited about our programs that we're trying to deliver to our citizens.

In any event I thank EPC for making their amendment. As you will see at the end of today we do have one more item from the Alternate Service Delivery Committee, somebody will have to champion that but it's an SOA. I think it would have been under their jurisdiction that they would have decided how they partner and discuss with other bodies in the City to look at how we reinvest in our downtown and whether it's going to be done through parking meter fines or how do we get some excitement about getting people down here.

In any event, I've said enough, but it is about budget, we need to sit down together and I've seen an e-mail from the Mayor's Office over the lunch hour that we will be convening shortly in the January timeframe to start talking about that. I'm only sorry we missed the last four weeks and didn't get at it because we do know that the Administration have worked very diligently on this all summer with guidelines that have been provided to them. We're probably close, we could have been looking at options and make some considerations and be much more informed.

Having said that, I look forward to the four to six weeks in the period of January, February when we can get at the budget. Thanks.

(Councillor Eadie in the Chair)

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lazarenko on the clause and the amendment.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I stand to rise here in opposition. I think we're going in the wrong direction. We've been doing it so many times especially when we deal with the issue of downtown parking.

The merchants have made it very clear to us time and time again, please don't disrupt it because this is not going to bring more people into the downtown area. It's a deterrent, people will be shying away from it. People can shop anyplace in any four corners of the City of Winnipeg into the huge shopping malls and they could stay there all day long and they don't get fined.

What is before us here today changes have come about from the Executive Policy Committee moved by the Mayor. Number one, parking meter expired, current fine structure option A, one to fifteen remain at $15. Deleting the $10 recommended increase. What effect is it going to have on the proposed $1 million that was supposed to be raised in revenue. We don't have this here before us.

When we talk about the issue of parking meters number one, parked meter expired is to be not concurred with as recommended by the proposed fine structure. But the meter overtime parking stays in effect so what's the difference.

You park by a meter, you put your money in there, it's expired you get a ticket. You park by a meter and it's overtime and parking you get a ticket. Either the commissionaire can you use that as a criteria to say look, you were overtime. Whether you were expired or not but your overtime or expired. To me it means the same thing. We're not trying to resolve anything. I could see if number one and two would be added in here I would be reconsidering my vote.

I'm asking you councillors please, don't jump ahead in such a way when we have a recommendation coming here today from the Property and Development is to appoint a parking meter czar, a commissionaire that will be in charge, he'll be able to meet with the downtown merchants and try to resolve the problem that exists there now. We're jumping ahead of time now we're going to be implementing something that number one is going to cause confusion. Number two people will not go downtown. Number three you're going to have a delegation of merchants coming and saying look, you're driving us out of business because the small merchants in the downtown area are suffering. We're not talking about Eaton's, we're not talking about Hudson Bay Company, we're not talking about Holt Renfrew, People's Credit Jeweller's, those who have established themselves in the suburban malls. They knew what they were doing but it's the small merchants that we have to take care of barely making ends meet. You hit them with this they're going to suffer because if the customers are not there they will not get the business.

(1:45)

Council has so many times proceeded with a recommendation to say that this is what we must do because the proposed fine structure is supposed to generate $1 million a year. Not to take into consideration what effect is it going to have. We proceeded going through the backdoor the proposed True North Project. $13.5 million we pushed in there with no questions asked, no business plan nothing until there was some groups that challenged the decision of Council and took it to the courts and it was delayed by one year and four months which was an embarrassment to the City to say that we're open for business.

I don't know why we keep going in this same direction time and time again, don't we ever learn our lesson. We have a process in place and that process is to

communicate with the people that are paying the bills. Communicate with the merchants what is it they want. It's not what we want it's what's good for them. We destroyed North Portage back in the early '80s with the reconstruction of North Portage, drove away a lot of the businesses never to come back. We did Trizac back in 1974 the Trizac project which was a flop too that cost the City about $75 million or $78 million that we never got that back because the developers were a lot smarter than Council and even the Administration we had because we had given direction to the Administration to proceed but their hands were tied. And I'm sure Mr. Speaker this in itself is not coming directly from the Administration because number one, it's a profit, generating about $1 million a year, so that means one thing. We're looking to continue to decrease the taxes even it means at costs such as this.

We just dealt with the issue about the Transit fare increases. I voted against it, before I did but now I felt there was just no reason, no specific reason to vote for that five cent increase in transit fares. Each and every year that I've been voting for this roughly about twenty-five cents now within the last five years.

We are not listening. The mandate that we have our mandate to put in policies. The Administration will give us recommendation what direction we should be going and to say look, sometimes you may have to take a loss. But you have to satisfy the customers. We did the George Cuff Report, New Directions, Reshaping of the City Government and what did the consultant's tell us right from day one, they drew a big circle and right in the very top they had put on there the customer. And like a clock going down that circle to each department they were supposed to be getting a response and come back to the circle which is the customer with our recommendations for their satisfaction. We're going backwards. Clocks don't go backwards and if they would you know what would happen. Each and every time we get bogged down here with the recommendations to say and I said this right just as soon as I heard this from the very beginning, it never went to the standing committee. The standing committee could have been dealing with this and hear representations from the public, from the users, those who would be going downtown and those who are the merchants downtown they feel that they would be adversely affected.

Our City of Winnipeg Act makes it very clear that if someone feels that their property or anything is adversely affected they have a right to object. We're supposed to listen and try and modify that.

This motion number four that's before us what does it mean? Number one is parked meter expired. So it's going to stay status quo, but number two is not and all the other ones. Sure there's some that I agree Mr. Speaker, absolutely I agree on the handicapped but we've got a problem even now, you go to the handicapped zone people are parking that shouldn't be there, they walk out of there, they pretty well run into the store but there's no one to enforce it. Take a look at the shopping malls. It's happening everyday. People that need the handicapped zone are walking way out they're coming there with their cane and I was witness one time the person went and told the one who was parked in a handicap zone had no business being in there she used the f word on that particular person that was supposed to be in there. No one to enforce it.

If we have this I said before the commissionaires will have a hard time. Sure we have a lot of commissionaires their pens are red hot, they got to write because they want to reach that quota if there is a quota. Makes it look better for them. They will not take into consideration because they cannot give leeway to anyone to say look, I'll give you that grace for three minutes, five minutes. I was parked right here in the loading zone loading my car some stuff out of my office and the commissionaire came along and ticketed me. Councillor Thomas was crossing the street and said what did you do you got yourself a ticket. I didn't even know that I got a ticket but I got a ticket because I was late by three minutes. This is what the police told me,

because you were supposed to stay there 15 minutes. I stayed there for one hour.

The question of enforcement. Why cause more confusion and I will and I'm saying again I'd like someone from Executive Policy Committee to tell me why number one is on the amendment, but number two is not there. Why? Because number two may generate as much revenue as number one because the commissionaire will have leeway to use number two and impose it on number one. I'd like someone to respond. The mover Mayor Murray I wish you would respond to this and give us the reason why. If you can't or you will not then don't vote for this. Lay it over until our new commissionaire is appointed that will be able to deal with merchants and with everybody to address the issue of parking in the downtown area. We've been saying this so many times, so many years over and over again, what happens, the merchants cry, why did we give it another shot. The merchants are squeezed. This is so unfair Mr. Speaker. This is not the way that we should be doing business.

I will not be supporting if number one is not corrected by including number two, then I'll be voting against the whole clause. I'd like to get some specific answers because I think we and Council deserve to get that because we did not deal with this, this didn't even come to our committee for us to be able to address it, to be able to talk to the Administration to try and get some more information, we had complete zippo.

(Councillor O'Shaughnessy in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. And Councillor Lazarenko has moved that the commissionaires attend to the loading zone immediately to get rid of that offending CKY Television vehicle that's been sitting there for half an hour.

In the meantime Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I too share a lot of the same concerns as my colleague Councillor Lazarenko has pointed out. I don't understand the difference between park meter expired versus offence code number two meter overtime parking and whether or not that can simply be again the meter is now over time, person should be putting more money into the meter, and therefore they're not putting money into the meter so they get a ticket. To me they sound like the same thing.

As far as I'm concerned it speaks back to the issue of this item coming back with the budget process. I really feel strongly that we're jumping the gun here and we're moving on issues which are related to raising revenues and raising revenues why? Because we have a budget that's coming up that clearly by the sounds of things we're short money. We needed another five cents for transit, we need now another million dollars roughly here.

(1:55)

I just found out that apparently by doing this we're going to lose $300,000, it won't be a million dollars it will be $700,000. On top of that now we're creating a traffic czar and who knows how much that office is going to cost us as well to solve a problem which we created just by having the increase in the first place.

It seems like we're going in a circle here and I really believe that maybe we should take a step back and refer this matter back to committee as my colleague has suggested instead of going ahead with it today. I can't see us supporting this unless there's a clarification.

I appreciate the fact that the business community indicated that they're happy with the change going back to $15 and they're not too concerned about the 16 to 30 day fee or the 31 day plus fee. Rather I'd like to get a clarification. What does it mean meter overtime parking? Is this something that can be used then to issue tickets and the first clause really doesn't mean a heck of a lot.

Mr. Speaker I thank you for the time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the amendment. I'm pleased that this did come on just a little bit quickly and upon reflection I think this is an improvement to what we need to bring forward here today.

I also wanted to let people know just in case anyone wasn't aware that at Executive Policy Committee we had a more in-depth discussion about this upon hearing some of the delegations from the community at the Executive Policy Committee meeting.

One of the things we talked about when we actually directed the Administration to look at moving some parking meters to two hour meters from one hour meters in the downtown, and I think that's a significant issue. We have a downtown first policy in Plan Winnipeg. We really didn't want to send the message, we're not trying to send a message to discourage people from coming downtown, and I think we've taken a number of proactive steps here by the amendment first of all, that's the major one that people would be frustrated with if they're getting an excessive fine for that.

Another issue was that we asked the Administration to consider directing the core commissionaires, that when a ticket is withdrawn for parking at an expired meter, if the owner of the vehicle arrives on the scene while the ticket is being written to consider policies that would allow a little more flexibility there.

I think we're being as flexible as we can here. Nobody likes parking tickets. We also have to have some sort of order in terms of parking in the downtown. I think this is a situation that should not discourage anyone from going downtown. I also think it's a very positive step that we're creating this special operating agency today. Right now we have all these different departments responsible for parking. It's really hard to get a cohesive plan an integrated plan for parking in the downtown. We're making some positive steps towards that.

I think we should feel good about the fact that we've listened to the advocates for the downtown and I appreciate their input into this. I urge everyone to support this today. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

Let me start by reminding councillors that the reason we have parking meters in the downtown area is to rotate traffic. They are not meant for long term parking spaces. They are there so that you can park for short terms, one hour or two hours. If you're going to be there longer, then you should go to the library, to Trizac, to the parkades that are down there, the one across from Burton Cummings Entertainment Centre or whatever you're calling it these days.

The facts are if you're driving and trying to drive there is nothing more frustrating than having a car illegally parked in an area when you're trying to move traffic. It's frustrating for buses, it slows them down, it causes traffic jams etc. So that if people are parking illegally we tend to put tickets on their cars and say look, you're going to be penalized. So far so good.

We had a very difficult in some areas at least administratively to administer and for some people to understand three tiered penalty system. For the first 15 days if you paid the fine right away bang you were done. The second number of days you got a reduced rate and then if you still didn't pay it you had to pay a huge cost. That was sort of a progressive penalty to get the money faster and to get people to pay their ticket. Well it worked in some circles it was thought by administration and I agree with them that if we eliminated the second step and just said look, you got to fine you recognize that and we're sorry we're giving it to you but here it is. It's a minor expenditure when you compare it to the opportunity of parking full-time for a longer extended period of time.

For your information we have 2,400 parking meters in the City and they are checked on a regular basis. If people find that they feel that the meter isn't working properly and their time has been short changed on their time they simply call up the department and we check that meter, and if they're right we will tear up the ticket and we fix the meter as best we can, although they are aging.

I will also remind councillors that for $225 you can buy an annual pass. One of those ones that is gifted to councillors that they hang on the mirrors of their cars when they're out on city business. And they can park at the meter without having to dip into their pocket and put any money in there. Note we are not yet anyway increasing the cost of parking meters. The cost of parking, money in the meter and the cost of putting money on the street is exactly the same as it always was. It's only those people that are inconvenienced with their lawyer or inconvenienced in the restaurant or shopping that don't get back out to stick another quarter or another dollar or whatever it is into the particular parking meter that are going to be penalized for avoiding that or trying to beat the system.

Mr. Speaker if they hung one of those cards on they would still get a penalty which answers the questions of both my illustrious comrades from Transcona and from Mynarski one who sits on the Committee of Public Works who should know that extending over the hour even if you have a card is illegal, that's why they chalk the cars. It doesn't matter how many quarters or dollars you put into the parking meter, if you've parked more than an hour in one spot you're going to get a ticket, and you're still going to get a ticket.

What we have done we have said on these meters because we don't mind if people park beyond a difficult time and they don't want to pay the four or five or six bucks it's going to cost to park in a normal parkade, we will reduce that penalty to them because we're good hearted individuals and we'll take the $300,000 hit a year.

I think it's bogus and I was coerced into signing the amendment with the Mayor because we have a downtown first policy. But frankly I don't want to let him off the hook. I want them to park in the parkades that are there, I want them to move their cars so that more people can park in the downtown area, when they do come down the parking spots are not all taken and they can find places to park, that's what we want to do. While we're studying that we're going to leave that meter expired fee at the reduced rate. Aren't we good, Merry Christmas everybody. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Murray.

Mayor Murray: I want to thank a number of you and I'm very serious about this. For a government business to move ahead it's an imperfect business. Most councillors around this table because there has to be 9 to stand up have a little patience with the imperfection of the system. There are those that don't.

I wanted to say since this is our first serious council meeting, we can go through the next four years and we can have the people as I've said who are right about everything, they're opposed to every property tax increase. They're opposed to every user fee because they're unfair and they're harm coming. And they're opposed to every budget reduction, and they will be the first people to come with their list of ward from ballparks to you name it here and expect it to be put in the budget and they then don't vote for because the taxes are now too high.

(2:03)

I want to tell you, people are seeing through that. We are 33% less than Edmonton. Our administration has told you all we deliver services at less than any other major municipality. And don't quote me on this, this is our studies. There isn't a lot of give.

I want to point something out. Every single business representative today came forward and said, we have a problem with expired meters. We would

like you to look at the larger issue of parking in the downtown and make it user friendly and we have been consulted and bought in to the idea of the ASD to try and have parking in the downtown driven by what Councillor Angus is suggesting which is healthy turnover for businesses, to identify long term parking from short term and mid term parking and that's it.

Councillor Lazarenko you've been around here twice as long as I have and then some. You should know what metered overtime parking is, you've been voting on it for 20 years. It's if you stay beyond the time allowed, if it's a limited number of hours you cannot do that it's a simple law. We should all know that, and we should know those things before we walk in here to vote. God if you don't know what those 32 fines are about call an administrator get it explained to you, there's a responsibility councillors on each and every one of us to come in here informed.

The parking regime here is, we have now been cutting taxes or freezing taxes almost every single year. Councillor De Smedt you've raised very good points. In an ideal perfect world with perfect process and without deadlines, it would be lovely to introduce this into that. We've actually cancelled our priority setting on the 16th so that we can get the entire administration ready to do a budget. And no they haven't been working on the 2003 budget because we said to them work on a three year budget and we have further said to them, we want to make a difference in the budget strategy so we know that when we get elected there are short timeframes, the 2004 - 2006 three year budget is where we're going to make the vast changes that many of us committed to in direction and drive policy, we can't do that in the short term. It's quite frankly unreasonable to expect that of the Mayor and the Executive Committee who are trying to balance a short term budget and present you with a number of options and get your partnership in and get set up for a reasonable consultation and most people out there understand that. Find me a city government that has the kind of record on debt reduction and property tax freezes and cuts. Let's give ourselves a break here.

Edmonton is cutting ambulance service and raising property taxes by 3.5% and putting parking meters in all their regional parks, and they're reducing their response times for ambulance and reducing their police complement by 36. We're not doing those kinds of things. We've increased our ambulances from 9 - 17 at the same time. We don't have a goose in the basement that lays golden eggs that pays for this.

I hope this is unanimous councillors. You've got the business community saying, we're going to work with you on this, we're going to make it better. We're understanding, we don't want our property taxes going up, we don't want our business taxes going up. We want to get money for the downtown watch. We want stronger partnerships with you. We want to explore ways we can do business with you. How much easier does it have to be? Go to Calgary, they're raising property taxes 5% there, they're doing massive cuts to their budget. Toronto just passed a budget with $96 million the way they're balancing their budget is they're saying to the Province of Ontario, we have $96 million, can't raise taxes more than whatever it is, 5%. Can't make cuts, you solve that.

Give yourself some credit and let's just cut each other some slack. You guys want more involvement in the budget process and more flexibility then you've got to give, those of us who are trying to get the Administration who have these leadership jobs here a little opportunity to get our act together so we can build it in.

In the spirit of the season of good will to all and peace on earth and parking meters for a parking meter in every driveway if that will solve our budget problems, I hope we can pass this coherently and with a sense of humour today. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Question on the amendment. All in favour? Recorded vote has been called on Mayor Murray's amendment. All in favour of the amendment please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

Councillors Wyatt and Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 2.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is carried.

On the clause as amended, all in favour? Recorded vote has been called for.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

Councillors Wyatt and Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 2.

Mr. Speaker: The clause as amended is carried.

Moving onto the Report of December 11, 2002, as put in hard copy on your desks in front of you, Clauses 1 through 6.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 11, 2002**

Mr. Speaker: The Mayor moves that the rules be suspended to consider the report, clauses 1 through 6 of December 11, 2002. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Clause 1 - Universal Design Policy
File CR-3 (Vol. 6)**

Mayor Murray: I would move them individually. Clause 1, the Universal Design Policy.

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

**Clause 2 - Agreement with the Solicitor General of Canada regarding funding for Phase 1 of the Pilot Project, entitled "5th Season - The Healing Season"
Files GL-9 (Vol. 19 and GF-2 (Vol. 55)**

Mayor Murray: This is pennies from Heaven, money from the Federal Government, no budget requirements by us. The agreement is with the Solicitor General regarding funding for the first phase of the pilot project, 5th season - the healing season.

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

**Clause 3 - Pan Am Pool
File PR-2.2 (Vol. 19)**

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

Clause 4.

**Clause 4 - Utilization of the 2002 Forecasted General Revenue Fund Surplus
File F-1 (Vol. 16)**

Mayor Murray: I move Clause 4.

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

**Clause 5 - Winnipeg Police Pension Plan
File GU-3.10 (Vol. 7)**

Mayor Murray: I would move Clause 5.

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

Clause 6 - Amendments to the Employee Benefits Program By-law No. 5300/89, the Civic Employees' Group Life Insurance Plan By-law No. 5644/91, the Police Employees; Group Life Insurance By-law No. 5643/91, and, the Winnipeg Police Pension Plan By-law No. 6253/93
Files GU-2 (Vol. 3), GU-2.4 (Vol. 4) and GU-3.10 (Vol. 7)

Mayor Murray: I'll move Clause 6.

(2:10)

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

Motions.

We have Motion No. 1, Councillor Eadie moves suspension of the rules to consider this motion here and now. All in favour? Contrary? Carried

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Eadie
Seconded by Councillor De Smedt

THAT pursuant to Article 15(1) of the City of Winnipeg Charter Act, the City Solicitor be directed to prepare a by-law and forward same to City Council, amending the name of the electoral ward of St. James to:

"St. James – Brooklands"

AND THAT this ward name change take effect on the first day of the month following the adoption of the amending by-law by City Council.

Any discussion on the motion? Question on the motion. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motion No. 5. Moved by Councillor Steek, seconded by Councillor Vandal. Councillor Steek moves suspension of the rules. This is the clause that was before us earlier. Due to a shortcoming of our procedures when there's a negative recommendation it does not assume the opposite. However, we do the other way around. If something is recommended positive and defeated we treat it in a negative fashion. Councillor Steek is moving suspension of the rules on the land dedication for Grosvenor School. All those in favour of suspending the rules? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Steek did you wish to introduce the motion.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Steek
Seconded by Councillor Vandal

WHEREAS Council at it's meeting December 11, 2002, defeated Item 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 20, 2002 regarding a request for expenditure from the City Centre Land Dedication Reserve Fund - Grosvenor School;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a grant in the amount of $8,000.00 from the Land Dedication Reserve Fund be made to Grosvenor School.

Councillor Steek: I think it's self-explanatory Mr. Speaker and I appreciate it coming back .

Mr. Speaker: Question on Motion No. 5, all in favour? Contrary? Recorded vote has been called for.

Three recorded in opposition, it's carried.

By-laws.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Murray: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time, by-laws numbered 8140/2002, 8141/2002, 8150/2002, 8151/2002, 8152/2002, 8154/2002, 8155/2002, 8156/2002, 8157/2002, 8158/2002, 8162/2002, 8163/2002, 8164/2002 and 8165/2002.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 8140/2002, 8141/2002, 8150/2002, 8151/2002, 8152/2002, 8154/2002, 8155/2002, 8156/2002, 8157/2002, 8158/2002, 8162/2002, 8163/2002, 8164/2002 and 8165/2002.

Mayor Murray: I'll move that by-laws numbered 8140/2002, 8141/2002, 8150/2002 to 8158/2002, both inclusive, and 8162/2002 to 8165/2002, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 8140/2002, 8141/2002, 8150/2002 to 8158/2002, both inclusive, and 8162/2002 to 8165/2002, both inclusive.

Mayor Murray: I'll move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 8140/2002, 8141/2002, 8150/2002 to 8158/2002, both inclusive, and 8162/2002 to 8165/2002, both inclusive, be read a third time, and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Councillor Lazarenko: I'm calling for a recorded vote on By-law No. 8152/2002.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry there's nothing in the procedure by-law that allows, it's only second reading that you can call it on. We're already onto third and I'd already said in favour, contrary, carried. They're passed.

I haven't heard any will on Council to go back.

We have a paper by-law in front of us. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Murray: I'll move the rule be suspended and the following by-laws be read a first time, by-laws numbered 8169/2002, 8170/2002 and 8171/2002.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 8169/2002, 8170/2002 and 8171/2002.

Mayor Murray: I'll move that by-laws numbered 8169/2002, 8170/2002 and 8171/2002, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 8169/2002, 8170/2002 and 8171/2002.

Mayor Murray: I'll move that the rules be suspended and that by-laws numbered 8169/2002 to 8171/2002, both inclusive, be read a third time and the same be ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Question period. Councillor Steek.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Steek: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Mayor. Mr. Mayor as the City's representative on the Forks North Portage Board, the Administration currently has about 6,000 square feet of office down at the Forks, my understanding is that they're in the midst of moving downtown to the old Birk's Building, and I'm just wondering, can you tell us was any amount prepaid on those leases?

Mayor Murray: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I'm not familiar with the agreement, that would be a management and board decision. The Mayor and the Premier's designate is Mr. Friesen and the Regional Minister are the shareholders. There is an agreement around the relocation of the offices. I'm not familiar with all the details of it and I would be hesitant to say it without having the notes in front of me, but I would be glad to get an answer for you in the next few days if that would be adequate.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to Mr. Mayor. We

are approaching the anniversary of Council adopting the current smoking by-law in Winnipeg. I was wondering whether or not you could provide Council either in a verbal answer here or a written answer at some other point, some update as to where the smoking by-law review process is currently at?

Mayor Murray: That would be under the jurisdiction of the Standing Committee on Protection and Community Services, you might want to ask under that.

My personal views if you're asking as I said, given that I don't think we're meeting our public health objectives under the existing by-law and I think some of the intents of the by-law have not been satisfied, that given the choice my personal view as I've said during the election at this point would be to lean towards a complete ban in the absence of any better idea coming forward.

(2:20)

We are going to go through and we committed to a significant public consultation. I would presume that would probably start in February of the anniversary of the by-law that was the timeframe. So I think we all keep our minds open a little bit about other possibilities. I don't want to end up in the situation where Brandon is ending up where they're either trying to reverse the by-law, pay compensation or Vancouver went in with a flat out ban and is now got some complicated convoluted system that if you're a worker you can only work in the smoking area so many hours a day over so many hours a week. So I'm hoping we will not be imprudent, I think the approach we've taken so far which is to do this in stages and try things and move in there and get people comfortable with it has been the way to go. That will really be up to the standing committee though to decide how they want to approach that and Councillor Gerbasi Chairs that committee, and she and the other members of Council will be laying out a strategy for Council I think on that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I would like to ask the Mayor a question in respect to the sex trade committee that was approved by Council and the standing committee. Now this report of the sex trade committee was to monitor and regulate the sex trade in Winnipeg especially dealing with child prostitution dealing with the sexual abuse of young children. I'd like to know Mr. Mayor because the Minister of Justice had made a comment to one of the press people and said that Council did not give that direction. But the committee had made it very clear the responsibility of the Province and the responsibility of the City and responsibilities of the Federal Government. We're waiting for a report back and it's going back and forth, back and forth, and this is now since December of 1999. I asked you Mr. Mayor a number of times here on floor of Council before it was referred to the Chair of the Standing Committee and also to our Intergovernmental representative Councillor Eadie. I'd like to know where is it now because we're just holding back and holding back, and I don't want to introduce another motion to Council to try and get this underway. I'm just tired of listening to the Minister of Justice passing the buck because he's going to be doing something because the election is coming up next year.

Mayor Murray: Thanks very much Mr. Speaker. Again, Councillor Gerbasi is on that file and will probably be able, she's been working on that I've not been directly involved in it myself.

It's a very difficult issue Councillor Lazarenko as I think you appreciate. I think that regulating where sex is sold for money is about as far as we can go in our jurisdiction, it's criminal code and law of the Federal Government and Child and Family Services issues with the Province. It's very frustrating because the way we treat young people who are involved in prostitution that bothers me particularly is as criminals. We don't look at the fact that many of them that I've worked with for the many years that I worked on the streets of Winnipeg around the corner here and behind on Broadway are

sexually abused children who are running away from home. They develop chemical dependencies and i.v. drug use which is very severe, and a lot of them are caught up in poverty. I don't think that we as a society in Canada take the issue of prostitution seriously because we're not prepared to deal with the issue of not the prostitutes but the people who have abused these children. I do not know many street prostitutes who didn't start out there before their eighteenth birthday and trapped in a very serious situation.

Unfortunately we in City Government have very little regulation, I mean we could create a red light district and create an area because prostitution isn't illegal in Canada, soliciting is and do that which some cities have done.

We could just continue to do the licensing issue which we have that duplicity with or that double messaging in the courts about what the law actually says and how specific it has to be. But let's be really blunt about it, what has to happen to change this is there has to be people who are prepared to deal with the people who abuse children and the people who sell drugs, and I think that's where our efforts should be. And the best way to solve it and I'll speak as a foster parent who has taken into my home a number of young people involved in prostitution, in my younger years when I had more energy to keep up with them, was that it's really a tragedy. One of the best solutions we can have is foster parent homes in the City and people with the resources and training to do that. This is an issue of care and concern I think for young people involved in this, this is not an issue in which law enforcement.

We're running on the spot sending police officers out to arrest people who simply then get a mandate to be relocated to another part of the City, and after you've arrested all the prostitutes the judge puts in place a ban on that area so they move from Higgins, right now they're in the West End and who knows, they might be in St. James next year.

There has to be a bigger strategy and quite frankly we as a government don't have the resources nor the legal authority nor the ability of Child and Family Services, we're a regulator of it as a trade which is rather a belittling kind of concept in which to approach it.

Right now I know it's top of mind in the Provincial Government and the Federal Government and we're caught with something that is perfectly legal to do, but perfectly illegal to sell if I can put it that way or to advertise, and that's sort of pretty moronic kind of situation and that's thrust on municipalities across Canada. You figure this one out. It's legal to do it, there's nothing illegal about exchanging money for sex but it's completely illegal to advertise. If anyone can get their head around that and explain that one to me then I'll buy them lunch.

Number two is, I think what we should concentrate on and I'm hoping that given the success we had in the last term of Council with sending social workers out with police officers in situations of domestic violence and looking at violence against women in the home as a social service intervention, not just a police intervention, we've had great success there.

I'm hoping one of the things if you want my idea on it, I would like to set up a similar program with police officers working with Child and Family Services and with adults people involved with chemical dependency and we send the police officers into those neighbourhoods with someone to help and support and refer and get the people off the street and deal with the issues of sexual abuse and chemical dependency that a large percentage of those mostly young women but some young men are involved in. I think that if we can look at partnerships with the Provincial Government on those lines I think we'll have some success, I think we have good models as we've had with domestic violence and violence against women. That would be my personal suggestion but I don't think a criminal code solution has ever worked anywhere in the world.

As to the particular status of the report, if you could just refer it to, raise that under question period to Councillor Gerbasi.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Mayor I have a lot of respect for you on the stand that you've taken this, this plight, the problems we've got with the youngsters. I admire your position on that and I wish…

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know there's no preamble on supplemental questions.

Councillor Lazarenko: I'd like to ask to question Mr. Speaker to you Mr. Mayor. In respect to the challenges that were taken by our legal counsel on the law that was struck down by Judge Susan Devine back in November, 1999, the City appealed and lost the appeal in a court of law. I understand that some amendments have to be made. Will the Executive Policy Committee deal with this as soon as possible to instruct our administration especially the Police Department and our Legal Department to put some loopholes in the by-laws that exist there now and impose conditions like we impose conditions whoever wants a secondhand dealership license or a secondhand store or occupational permit that they must meet requirements and one is to get a report from the police, the report of their standing.

(2:28)

I'm just asking you Mr. Mayor is it possible that you might be able to get the wheels in motion and go in the direction to have something in place very soon, that these so called operators of the sex trade, and I think we all know what kind of operation goes on in there to make sure that the loopholes are there, and that they cannot fight that through the justice system and then the judges have to throw it out of court?

Mayor Murray: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. The Executive Policy Committee's job primarily is policy coordination, and any policy that affects a multitude of areas of City Government comes to us first and we deal primarily with budget. Our great fun job which I'd love to pawn off on someone else some weeks is to try and bring a budget to you and create a partnership to look at crafting that budget which is always fun.

The issue of policy development particularly around this issue is under the responsibility of the Standing Committee on Protection and Community Services. And if you would like to raise that either to Councillor Gerbasi may be prepared to do that or under the question period under that standing committee, I think she'd be happy to address that. I know she shares your concerns Councillor Lazarenko.

In closing I want to thank you for your work on this, you've been a great champion of this issue, I know you're trying to make a difference for a lot of the folks out there who are struggling.

I will certainly next time we meet with the Province, I know we have referred this matter to them because most of the recommendations fall within provincial jurisdiction, I'd get an update, and if you'd be interested in attending that meeting with me I would be happy to invite you to be part of that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I rise to ask a question of His Worship. Your Worship yesterday you referred to a report interim tentative draft report that refers in it to a four district model that will be coming before the Committee. I want to ask you if you or your staff or any members of your staff or those of EPC Secretariat have seen this report?

Mayor Murray: Actually I understand Councillor Wyatt I think you've met with the Police Chief and he's probably given you the exact same briefing that he gave me. The briefing that I received from the Police Chief was about ten pages of paper which was a power point presentation I think that's being developed for Council, it deals in very

high level with a number of possibilities about realignment, reconstruction of offices.

The detailed information that was given about it or as much detail as exists was shared with all Council two years ago when the effectiveness review was finished and presented to Council. My intention if anyone had asked and I wish you had and I suggest that before you go to the media with these things you might come and chat with me or the Chair of the Committee, if you're going to talk with the Police Chief at least give them a chance to roll this out.

Where we're going with this is that the Police Department is trying to develop I think a series of options for us that range from repairing the existing stations at one end to completely replacing them and reorganize, and completely replacing some of them and reconfiguring them. That there is a long a great deal of amount of work that has to go there. This is an internal process in the Police Department and that the Police Chief has been trying to find ways to more efficiently organize the administrative, this is not the service end of the Police Department, this is not where you go if you have a complaint, this is in a community service centre, this is not a beat office, this is where they lock people up and this is where officers go to get their assignments and the roll out call in the morning and the shift change, that's where that happens, and they're trying to provide that more efficiently.

A study was done at considerable cost that looked at how for deployment and the distribution of the administrative functions what made more sense and what were the inadequacies of the system. That report I think can be shared with anybody.

I would be hesitant to jump to some great conclusion considering how little we know about what the consequences of different choices are. It was our intention and I think that of the Police Chief to take this first through the standing committee and then the standing committee would then review it and it would make recommendations to Council.

We were also planning a council seminar because of the effectiveness review, there is a lot of changes being proposed in the Police Department to get more officers out from behind desks and onto the street. There's a lot more work that has to be done before there can be a council seminar. Because this is going to impact on the way that services delivered in the City there has to be a process of public consultation to hear from the public. And quite frankly to hear from front line officers, front line officers are very upset with the very poor conditions in many of the administrative functions because we've been putting our resources as we probably should have into the beat officers and the community services centre and not into the areas which are the internal areas where they meet and they get their assignments and they work out and do those things.

This is not something we're rushing forward, this is going to be dealt with over the next year through all of the proper processes of Council. I think it's very unfortunate that there is so much disinformation out there and I think if we're going to try and work as a team here we have to allow the Police Chief the chance to make his case and go through the process that we have to ensure that everyone has a chance to get information at the same time and participate in what the final decision is.

There is no final decision. We could decide to leave the status quo, we could decide to do a number of changes. Some Councillors quite frankly around here when they saw it were quite happy to see the relocation of some of the offices out of their constituencies because they have understood this isn't any advantage to their constituencies. There aren't police officers that are responding, citizens can't walk in the door in these places and make a complaint, that they understood that improved response times in their area and improve the assignment process and put more police officers out from behind desks and on the street and behind cars which I think is the goal that Council set. But let's give the Police Chief a chance to finish his work and do his presentation before we pass judgment on it.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Again I ask the question, has the Mayor or the Mayor's staff or the staff of the EPC Secretariat seen a draft report or a report regarding the proposal for a four district model, yes or no, has anyone seen this report?

Mayor Murray: The only report I've seen is a ten page report, it's not even a report, I think was hopefully shared with you, I don't think it's a confidential document. It's about ten pages long, it's a summary of a power point, and the writing on it is that big. There's a couple of maps that show a couple of different possible scenarios and there is some general numbers very broad numbers. We're talking about a power point. We're talking about three sentences or four sentences on a page, and we're talking about ten pages of which I think two are maps.

Is there a developed report? No. That's it and that document is a public document. You can get the same document I have. I have not seen any report nor am I aware that any member of Council have seen a report. The only report that you probably should read and every councillor should read is the effectiveness review report that came forward in which this four district model was one of a large number of recommendations that came out of the consultant's report two years ago some of which have been implemented about how to proceed with freeing up resources to get better value for our dollar and get more police officers out into the community and improve our management system in the police.

That report is very valuable. There are a number of recommendations but these are broad recommendations that each have to be studied in turn. I think Councillor Wyatt you're quite welcome to any of that information. Beyond that one document which I wouldn't describe as a report but a power point presentation I'm not aware of any other report, there may be I assume internally in the Police Department there's work being done on this and there may be a paper trail there around some of the research they're doing but nothing has materialized as a report from the Police Services to anyone else that I'm aware of.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you and thank you Your Worship for that answer. Will you supply all of Council at your latest opportunity a copy of what you've been privy to because we haven't seen it, and my meeting with the Chief was simply a verbal meeting. There was no presentation, there was no maps there was nothing to the effect that the Mayor was referring to. Will you be able to provide Council with that?

(2:35)

Mayor Murray: I'll ask the Police Chief if he will. I don't have any problem with that. From what you personally have told me you've been told is more detail than is in that power point presentation. But it's the Police Chief's power point presentation.

I'll say on the floor of Council, I have no problem with that being released to any member of Council and I'll encourage the Police Chief to do so, but the Police Chief doesn't take orders from me, if he chooses to do that he will. You might want to do a little bridge building with him Councillor Wyatt, I'm not sure that he intended his briefing with you to be on the front page of the paper, so you might want to establish some ground rules with him when he shares information with you how far a field that's being shared, and if it's not going to be on the front page of the paper he may be very generous in the amount of information he gives you.

Mr. Speaker: We'll now move onto the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, Report of November 25, 2002.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2002

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm pleased to move the Report dated November 25, 2002, Clauses 1 to 10 as consent items.

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

We have motions 2 and 3 both of which are automatic referral.

Councillor Clement is recorded in opposition to Clauses 4 and 7.

By-laws, none. Question period. Councillor Steek.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the Chair. Just following up on Councillor Lubosch's earlier question to the Mayor. Can you just clarify for Council what the process and procedure will be relative to the revisitation of the smoking by-law?

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. What happened when the by-law was passed a year ago, I believe there was if you look at the minutes from the Executive Policy Committee meeting at the time the Administration was directed to report back in one year's time. Rolling in the motion that was with the community centres as Councillor Steek will recall as he was sitting on this committee at the time.

There will be a report that's being worked on right now. I'm expecting to have it early in the new year hopefully in January. It's being drafted right now and it's going to review the effectiveness or the issues that have arisen the by-law that we now have and bring that forward to us.

As well there's also been some consultation with community centres from the Administration in regards to the issue there.

I think what will happen is that report will come to our committee and our committee will have some discussion about how we want to proceed from there. There definitely needs to be further consultation and we can all have input into that process.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Just following up on that thought. Through you Mr. Speaker to the Chair. If the report is received in January is it the Chair's anticipation that there is a recommendation to go out for public consultation in some sort of a timeframe? I assume there's been some communication between the Chair and the Director of the Department.

Councillor Gerbasi: Beyond the fact that they're going to be bringing a report forward early in the new year, I'm hoping January it could be as late as February but I'm hoping January. I haven't had discussions about specific time lines or anything like that, I haven't seen what's in the report that isn't written yet, it's being written and I haven't had a detailed briefing on what's in there. I just know that they're basically reviewing what's happened over the last year and I haven't yet sat down to get anymore detailed briefing, if they want to give me that before the report is finalized and brought to us at the Committee. I don't really know anymore than that at this point.

I think we have to look at what the Administration says their view is on how effective it's been and what the issues are and then we have to have our own political discussion and make our own political decisions. That's what we'll do once we have the report from the Administration.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Policy Committee on Public Works, Report of November 19, 2002.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2002

Councillor Angus: I'm pleased to introduce the Report of the Committee on Public Works dated November 19, 2002. I ask that Clauses 1 to 7 be adopted by consent.

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

By-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Angus: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time, by-laws numbered 8142/2002, 8166/2002 and 8167/2002.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 8142/2002, 8166/2002 and 8167/2002.

Councillor Angus: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a second time, by-laws numbered 8142/2002, 8166/2002 and 8167/2002.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 8142/2002, 8166/2002 and 8167/2002.

Councillor Angus: I'll move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 8142/2002, 8166/2002 and 8167/2002, be read a third time, and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Questions, Councillor Steeves.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Steeves: Through you to the Chair of Public Works. Mr. Chairperson are you aware, I'm certain you may or may not be aware that there was a, I know you're aware there was a urban transport showcase committee that was struck to make an application pursuant to the Federal competition across Canada. That competition was a competition that provided $40 million worth of funding. Pursuant to this competition all municipalities across Canada were invited to tender a project to obtain a portion of that $40 million worth of funding for sort of eco programs, transit based programs that might improve the efficiency and the sustainability of municipalities across Canada.

I'm not aware if the Speaker is aware that today it was announced by the Federal Government that pursuant to the application made by the City of Winnipeg which is only one of 48 municipalities across Canada. Is the Chair aware that we have been selected as one of the 15 municipalities in Canada to go onto the next phase to prepare the final levels of presentation for eventual application for that $40 million of funding?

Councillor Angus: Thank you for the opportunity to speak Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Can we have an answer shorter than the question please.

Councillor Angus: The answer to the question directly in the first phase is yes Mr. Speaker. The second part of that question is, we were one of 15 municipalities that have been selected to try and get $30,000 to try and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. But we are the only municipality thanks to Councillor Steeves leadership in the Environment Committee and the lobbying he did in Ottawa to be short listed on this initiative, is putting forward a proposal that is pursuing the rapid transit opportunities. When we get this $30,000 the real work will begin for your committee, and so the question goes back to you.

(2:45)

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Steeves without preamble.

Councillor Steeves: Just on a point of personal privilege if I may Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank all of the people in the Environmental Co-ordinator's Office, and certainly the folks in the Public Works Department who worked very long and very hard on this probably I think 60 page document that went to the Federal Government, obviously was very very well received. It's certainly a credit to the Public Works Department, the City of Winnipeg and the Environmental Co-ordinator's Office. We're very very proud and look forward to the receipt of the additional funding that carries us on to the next level of competition, and then we look forward to the eventual success.

Mr. Speaker: I must rule you out of order Councillor Steeves. No you cannot make those comments.

Fiscal Issues November 26, 2002, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED NOVEMBER 26, 2002

Councillor Clement: I'm pleased to move the meeting of November 26, 2002, and I'll move Clause 1 as a consent item.

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

Motions, none. By-laws.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 8149/2002, be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 8149/2002.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 8149/2002 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 8149/2002.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 8149/2002 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Questions? None.

Property and Development November 19, 2002.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2002

Councillor Vandal: I'll move Clauses 1 through 8 and 10 be moved as consent items.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 2. All in favour of 1 and 3 through 8 and 10? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that Clause 9 be filed because it's a duplicate item. It was handled under Protection and Community Services.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is Clause 9 be filed, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clause 2.

Clause 2 - Proposed Plan of Subdivision and Rezoning - land located at CN Rail Line (land located between Taylor Avenue and the Assiniboine River between Lockwood and Centennial Streets File DASZ 7/2002 (c/r DCU 155/2002D, DAV 574/2002D, DAV 575/2002D, DAV 576/2002D, DAV 577/2002D)

Councillor Vandal: Clause 2 is a contentious rezoning in Councillor Steek's ward, I'll let him speak to it and try to answer questions when it comes up.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm rising to speak on this issue not because I have any concern that Council will not support PP& D and it was already concurred in with EPC. But just to alert by colleagues here to the circumstances around this and of course there is a companion motion that's coming out.

This is a key consideration Mr. Speaker because of the fact this is a 19 acre parcel in River Heights that runs from Academy Road through to Taylor referred to as the Oak Point Right-of-Way. CN had come forward with a rezoning application and I would like to thank my colleagues Councillors Gerbasi and Smith who sat through two long evenings of public hearings and were supportive in the fact that this simply did not work on this particular piece of property.

However this is tied in with a myriad of issues Mr. Speaker namely the fact that the major reason for turning this down was that the developer wanted to turn a back lane into a street so that the people that exited from their garage went directly into a street at 50 km. There was no way around it. The property is only 90 feet wide but it runs for almost 19 acres.

In addition to the two public hearings that were held there were four or five informals each at which had in excess of 600 people in attendance. The community is overwhelming in its support and its desire to see this particular piece of land ultimately purchased and turned into a greenspace linking the Charleswood Forest through to Wellington Crescent.

I have also filed a motion earlier on which will have automatic referral but I will speak to in this capacity.

The Mayor had referenced earlier on in our discussions that this is the type of thing that we should be looking at through land dedication reserve. There certainly is enough in our land dedication reserve to entertain this. But nevertheless, CN on a number of occasions have indicated a desire to sell this property to the City if not outright, then via land swap. There are enough things going on in this city that I think that that can be examined.

Finally with reference to the amount and I think most people around the Council Chamber have an idea of the value of this particular piece of property. I would simply draw your attention to the clause that we passed today, the EPC clause of December 11, Clause 4. Although we constantly hear about the inability to realize money for very specific projects, a very quick tabulation to this one page tells you there was in excess of $5 million expended today and it went through as a consent agenda item.

I bring that up Mr. Speaker because of the fact that I know that it's going to be exceedingly difficult to raise the revenues required to realize this important greenspace and the Mayor continually talks about the need for greenspace.

With that I'm simply asking that once again that the members of this Council will support the PP&D recommendation that this rezoning not be supported, number one. And number two, that they will look favourably in the future at the potential acquisition of this very very important piece of property.

The very unusual configuration of it Mr. Speaker being narrower than this room simply does not allow for development. In fairness to CN they made a valiant effort, it went to great expense to try and come in with infill housing here and condominiums. None of which worked for the issues that I've cited.

This is a critical issue in the future and I appreciate the fact that the Chair of PP&D was willing to second this as a motion. That was the reason for standing it down. Thank you.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the Chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor De Smedt.

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

Just very quickly. I'm always intrigued by one of the largest corporations in the country are trying to sell us some land. I can understand their motivation to do so, but I surely hope at some point in time that we can politically try and nudge Canadian National Railways to really contribute this land to the City of Winnipeg that we can use as a park.

I find it somewhat objectionable that after years of bisecting and trisecting our city with rail lines and not having underpasses and structures in the right location that we now would have to pay what I have seen as an exorbitant price for a piece of valuable parkland.

I'd like them to contribute this. I certainly hope that the councillor could take up the plea of the Mayor as he asked us to do sometimes in talking to other levels of government on another issue, that we could start doing that and put pressure on Canadian National Railway leadership to be a good civic minded corporate entity and in this case donate to the City of Winnipeg this piece of land that we could use as a park.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Mr. Speaker I don't necessarily plan on not supporting the motion, I just would like to throw a little bit of information.

First of all, the dimensions of the property maybe I could just get some clarification on that upon the winding up of the motion if that would be okay.

My impression on driving pass there was that it was wider than that, but if it's not then that's fine.

(2:53)

I did have some concerns originally with this application not being accepted. First of all I want to say that I completely understand the will of the community committee and don't necessarily not agree with it. I understand how difficult it can be in the face extreme resident pressure to not allow these types of things.

I would just like to put on the record some of the concerns I have but not allowing projects that are proposing infill housing in the City of Winnipeg. A lot of the difficulties we're experiencing, we talked about transit for quite a long time this morning Mr. Speaker, and part of the difficulty is we're having more and more and more difficulty servicing outlining areas. I think at some point this Council is going to have to seriously consider the idea of infill housing in a little more serious way. I'm not holding this project up as an example, I know it happens all over, and these things are often very very difficult.

I would if possible if we have any sense of the cost of what it might cost to pick up this land that would be valuable for me to know. I can tell you that my impression is that this land will probably not be donated by anybody in the future.

That being said I would like some of that information if possible Mr. Speaker when the motion is wound up.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I just want to thank Councillor Eadie for correcting me, it's not Clause 9, it's Clause 2.

Councillor Vandal: I'd like to wrap up. I certainly support the recommendation of community committee. I seconded Councillor Steek's motion. I think we need to get this back to Property Committee to allow our administration to negotiate with CN. Frankly this is where we were almost two years ago before the Administration was negotiating with CN before this thing was taken off the rails.

It's still doable. This is where we were two years ago. I'm supporting the motion from community committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Report of November 21, 2002.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED NOVEMBER 21, 2002

Councillor Vandal: I'll move Clauses 1 to 5 as consent items.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Report of December 3, 2002.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED DECEMBER 3, 2002

Councillor Vandal: I'll move Clause 2, Clause 1 has been laid over.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motions.

By-laws.

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

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time, by-laws numbered 8143/2002, 8144/2002, 8145/2002, 8146/2002, 8147/2002, 8148/2002, 8159/2002, 8160/2002, 8161/2002 and 8168/2002.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 8143/2002, 8144/2002, 8145/2002, 8146/2002, 8147/2002, 8148/2002, 8159/2002, 8160/2002, 8161/2002 and 8168/2002.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that by-laws numbered 8143/2002 to 8148/2002, both inclusive, 8159/2002 to 8161/2002, both inclusive, and 8168/2002, be read a second time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 8143/2002 to 8148/2002, both inclusive, 8159/2002 to 8161/2002, both inclusive, and 8168/2002.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 8143/2002 to 8148/2002, both inclusive, 8159/2002 to 8161/2002, both inclusive, and 8168/2002, be read a third time, and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Question period? None.

Alternate Service Delivery Committee, Report of September 16, 2002.

REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 16, 2002

Clause 2 - Selection Report - Parking Services Feasibility Study File GL-5.6.1 (Vol. 7) [c/r ST-8.1 (Vol. 10)]

Councillor De Smedt: I'd be pleased to introduce this and keep it very very short.

This was brought forth to EPC on the 16th of September they chose to lay it over so they could have time to read the report. I remember that clearly, nobody had enough time to read it. All during the election campaign I know you diligently went home and read it, you know the entrepreneurial spirit that the City's trying to provide and you're excited that we're going to have a special operating agency for parking and fines and meters. And developing of course a business plan, and having an advisory body where everybody could participate in and give us advice, and the CAO advice of how he should market the downtown and parking and parking structures and having partnerships, private, public partnerships, triple P, PQ.

I move the Report, I think it's an exciting opportunity. It will be a companion to one that we did approve on the 23 of September which is a parking policy for the downtown.

With that I so move Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Secretariat Committee, Report of December 9, 2002.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE DATED DECEMBER 9, 2002

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'll move that the rule be suspended and Clauses 1 and 2 be adopted by consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'll move the rules be suspended and By-law No. 8153/2002 be read a first time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 8153/2002.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'll move that By-law No. 8153/2002 be read a second time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 8153/2002.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 8153/2002 be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I move that Council do now adjourn.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: To all of you have a good Christmas, and happy new year, drive safely and don't drink too much.

Roll Call.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko, His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 3 P.M.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, December 11, 2002
CONTENTS

ROLL CALL.....15

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.....15

MINUTES.....15

COMMUNICATIONS.....15

DELEGATIONS.....15

Mr. Nick Ternette.....15
Mr. Jim Jaworski.....19
Ms Paula Mitchell 20
Ms Lisa Holowchuk.....23

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 20, 2002.....24

Clause 1 - Request for Expenditure from the City Centre Land Dedication Reserve Fund - Grosvenor School - File EP-2 (Vol. 30) 24

Clause 2 - Request for Expenditure from the City Centre Land Dedication Reserve Fund - Grant Park High School - File EP-2 (Vol. 30) 30

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 27, 2002.....31

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 4, 2002.....31

Clause 5 - 2003 Transit Fare Increases - File TT-2 - (Vol. 12).....31

Clause 8 - Parking Fine Rates - File ST-9 (Vol. 5).....43

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 11, 2002.....52

Clause 1 - Universal Design Policy - File CR-3 (Vol. 6).....52

Clause 2 - Agreement with the Solicitor General of Canada regarding funding for Phase 1 of the Pilot Project, entitled "5th Season - The Healing Season" - Files GL-9 (Vol. 19 and GF-2 (Vol. 55). 52

Clause 3 - Pan Am Pool - File PR-2.2 (Vol. 19)..... 52

Clause 4 - Utilization of the 2002 Forecasted General Revenue Fund Surplus - File F-1 (Vol. 16)..... 52

Clause 5 - Winnipeg Police Pension Plan - File GU-3.10 (Vol. 7)..... 52

Clause 6 - Amendments to the Employee Benefits Program By-law No. 5300/89, the Civic Employees' Group Life Insurance Plan By-law No. 5643/91, and, the Winnipeg Police Pension Plan By-law No. 6253/93 - Files GU-2 (Vol. 3), GU-2.4 (Vol. 4) and GU-3.10 (Vol. 7)..... 53

Motion No. 1..... 53

Motion No. 5..... 53

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS 53

By-laws numbered 8140/2002, 8141/2002, 8150/2002, 8151/2002, 8152/2002, 8154/2002, 8155/2002, 8156/2002, 8157/200, 8158/2002, 8162/2002, 8163/2002, 8164/2002 and 8165/2002 53

By-laws numbered 8169/2002, 8170/2002 and 8171/2002..... 54

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD..... 54

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2002..... 60

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD 60

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, December 11, 2002
CONTENTS

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2002.....61

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS 61

By-laws numbered 8142/2002, 8166/2002, 8167/2002 61

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD..61

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED NOVEMBER 26, 2002.....62

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS 62

By-law No. 8149/2002.....62

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2002.....62

Clause 2 - Proposed Plan of Subdivision and Rezoning - land located at CN Rail Line (land located between Taylor Avenue and the Assiniboine River between Lockwood and Centennial Streets - File DASZ 7/2002 (c/r DCU 155/2002D, DAV 574/2002D, DAV 575/2002D, DAV 576/2002D, DAV 577/2002D).....62

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED NOVEMBER 21, 2002.....64

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED DECEMBER 3, 2002.....65

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS.....65

By-laws numbered 8143/2002, 8144/2002, 8145/2002, 8146/2002, 8147/2002, 8148/2002, 8159/2002, 8160/2002, 8161/2002 and 8168/2002... 65

REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 16, 2002 65

Clause 2 - Selection Report - Parking Services Feasibility Study - File GL-5.6.1 (vol. 7) [c/r ST-8.1 (Vol. 10)] 65

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT COMMTTEE DATED DECEMBER 9, 2002..... 66

SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS 66

By-law No. 8153/2002..... 66

ROLL CALL 66