REPORT OF THE

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE

DATED OCTOBER 30, 1996

On motion of Her Worship Mayor Thompson, the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 30, 1996, was considered clause by clause.

Moved by Her Worship Mayor Thompson,
That the Consent Agenda, Clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 be adopted.

Carried.

Old St. Vital Business Improvement Zone - 1997
Proposed Program, Zone Levy and Budget Estimates
File FL-7.13 (Vol. 1)

24 - 1. On November 29, 1995, Council adopted By-law No. 6715/95, being a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to designate a Business Improvement zone to be known as the Old St. Vital Business Improvement Zone and to establish a Management Board for the Zone. By-law No. 6715/95 requires that the Business Improvement Zone prepare its proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the consideration of Council.

The Old St. Vital Business Improvement Zone at its Annual General Meeting held of October 2, 1996, approved the proposed annual budget and program as outlined in Appendix "A".

The Executive Policy Committee recommends that pursuant to By-law No. 6715/95, Council request the Riel Community Committee to conduct a public meeting to hear representations with respect to the proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the year 1997 and to provide recommendations to council within 60 days from receipt of Council's request.

Copy of attachment referred to in the above clause is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Adopted by consent.

Norwood Grove Business Improvement Zone - 1997
Proposed Program, Zone Levy and Budget Estimates
File FL-7.6 (Vol. 2)

25 - 2. On March 6, 1991, Council adopted By-law No. 5649/91, being a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to designate a Business Improvement zone to be known as the Norwood Grove
Business Improvement Zone prepare its proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the consideration of Council.

The Norwood Grove Business Improvement Zone at its Annual General Meeting held on October 10, 1996, approved the proposed annual budget and program as outlined in Appendix "A".

The Executive Policy Committee recommends that pursuant to By-law No. 5649/91, Council request the Riel Community Committee to conduct a public meeting to hear representations with respect to the proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the year 1997 and to provide recommendations to Council within 60 days from receipt of Council's request.

Copy of attachment referred to in the above clause is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Adopted by consent.

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 30, 1996

City of Winnipeg's Fiscal Year
Files FC (1997) & FE(1997)

26 - 3. On October 23, 1996, Council referred the following motion to the Executive Policy Committee, namely:-

Moved by Councillor Murray,
Seconded by Councillor Vandal,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City change its fiscal year to end on March 31st.

Inasmuch as Council on two previous occasions (April 17, 1991 and January 22, 1992) has requested the Province of Manitoba to amend The City of Winnipeg Act to include permissive legislation that will allow the City of Winnipeg the discretion to establish and fix its own date for its financial year end, the Executive Policy Committee recommends that the resolution be received as information and files.

Adopted by consent.

Appointment to the Winnipeg 2000 Leaders Committee
File G-8 (Vol. 4)

27 - 4. On May 9, 1990, Council adopted Clause 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated May 9, 1990, appointing a number of persons to the Winnipeg 2000 Leaders Committee and the Leaders Advisory Committee and directed that any new appointment changes be approved by Council.

On October 18, 1996, a communication was received by Klaus Thiessen, President of Winnipeg 2000 Economic Development Corporation recommending the appointment of Sandi Mielitz to the Winnipeg 2000 Leaders Committee.

The Executive Policy Committee concurs with the recommendation that Sandi Mielitz be appointed to the Winnipeg 2000 Leaders Committee and submits same to Council for its' approval.

Adopted by consent.

REPORT OF THE

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE

DATED NOVEMBER 13, 1996

On motion of Her Worship Mayor Thompson, the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 13, 1996, was considered clause by clause.

Moved by Her Worship Mayor Thompson,
That the Consent Agenda, Clauses 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8, 9,10,11 and 12 be adopted.

Councillor Murray requested that Clauses 2, 4 and 11 be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

The motion to adopt the Consent Agenda, Clauses 1,3,5, 6,7, 8,9,10 and 12 was put and declared carried.

Proposed amendment to Plan Winnipeg By-law No. 5915/92 by redesigning lands located from Jefferson Avenue to Inkster Boulevard between King Edward Street and the North Inkster Industrial Area, from a "Rural" policy area to an "industrial" policy area - Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community
File EP-1.1(PW3/96) (Vol. 1)

28 - 1. On July 24, 1996, Council adopted Clause 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July 17, 1996, relative to the proposed amendment to Plan Winnipeg By-law No. 5915/92 by redesignating lands located form Jefferson Avenue to Inkster Boulevard between King Edward Street and the North Inkster Industrial Area, from a "Rural" policy area to an "Industrial" policy area and By-law No. 6842/96 was given second reading and forwarded to the Minister or Urban Affairs for approval pursuant to Section 580(1) of The City of Winnipeg Act.

The Province of Manitoba has now had an opportunity to review The City of Winnipeg By-law No. 6842/96. The Province of Manitoba, pursuant to Section 581 of The City of Winnipeg Act, recommends that By-law No. 6842/96 be approved.

The Executive Policy Committee recommends:

I. The pursuant to Section 581(3) of The City of Winnipeg Act, By-law No. 6842/96 be given third reading.

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

Adopted by consent.

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 13, 1996

1996 Supplementary Capital Budget & Borrowing Authority Cancellation

File FC(1996) (Vol. 1)

29 - 2. On January 21, 1988, The Board of Commissioners considered and adopted a joint report prepared by the Finance Department and Budget Bureau which recommended that:

- All unused borrowing authority which was authorized more than 5 years prior to the current year be cancelled.
-
- All applications and approvals for capital work which were issued under authority of the Borrowing By-law more than 5 years prior to the current year be closed.

- The City Treasurer be authorized, at his discretion, to exclude certain borrowing authorities and capital projects from cancellation and closure.

- A supplementary Capital Budget be processed annually to provide borrowing authority for ongoing projects which still require funding.

Borrowing authority may be cancelled due to project under expenditures. As there are many unknowns when estimating the budget for a project, contingency factors have to be provided for. In some cases, these contingency factors do not materialize, and consequently projects are under expended. These small under expenditures can accumulate to a large under expenditure in a given year. Borrowing authority can also be cancelled due to project cancellations. Project cancellations can occur due to a change in the priority of a project or cancellation of a project by an outside funding source.

Since the adoption of the above joint report, $87.4 million of borrowing authority has been cancelled and $20.7 million has been carried forward in supplemental budgets. To date, this has resulted in a net savings of $66.7 million in borrowing authority.

The City of Winnipeg presently has a significant amount of outstanding borrowing authority for the years 1984 through 1990. In order to reaffirm the policy on borrowing authority, and at the same time continue funding for incomplete projects that are high priority and new projects that require funding, it is recommended that all unused borrowing authority be cancelled after five years (by a cancellation by-law) and any remaining residual funding requirements be included in a Supplementary Capital Budget for adoption by Council.

The residual cost estimates for the various projects included in the Supplemental Budget were compiled by Corporate Finance from information obtained from the originating departments. An initial Borrowing By-law will be required to approve the Supplementary Capital budget.

In addition to carrying forward incomplete projects from 1990 and prior years, $20,501,438 of funding for new capital projects are included in the Supplemental Capital Budget. The following is a summary of these projects:

i) $850,000 for the Schneider Expansion on the East side of Panet Road between Mission Street and Warman Road. In total $1,700,000 was initially approved for property acquisition and construction of the proposed waste water retention pond, of which financing of $1,200,000 was approved by Council on July 24, 1996, from the Land Drainage Financing System. However, revised estimates now indicate that the total project cost will be $2,050,000, therefore an additional $850, 000 in financing is required.

ii) $1,550,000 for the completion of outstanding unsettled expropriations for the Land and Development Department. This amount is estimated to be the City's present liability for past construction projects. Issues arising from current projects such as the Charleswood Bridge, Norwood/Main Bridge, etc. are not part of this estimate.

iii) $2,588,000 for the completion of Joint City/Provincial Land Assembly Projects for the Land and Development Services Department. This is a cost shared program with the

Province of Manitoba. With the Province's share of $2,465,000, the total program cost is estimated to be $5,053,000.

iv) $1,608,000 for the completion of Joint City/Provincial East Yards Expropriation for the Land and Development Services Department. This is also a cost shared program with the Province of Manitoba. With the Province's share of $1,532,000, the total program cost is estimated to be $3,140,000.

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 13, 1996

v) $13,905,438 of borrowing authority be reserved subject to a Federal/Provincial/City cost sharing infrastructure program with the provisions that these funds cannot be used to address other requirements which may arise. If the program is not forthcoming by the end of 1997, the borrowing authority should be reviewed with the intent of cancellation of same.

The Executive Policy Committee recommends:

I. The unused capital borrowing authorities of previous initial Borrowing By-Laws in the amount of $40,987,249 be cancelled, as outlined in Appendix "A".

II. The 1996 Supplementary Capital Budget requiring borrowing authority in the amount of $40,987,249, ($20,485,811 for old projects being carried forward and $20,501,438 for new projects), be approved, as outlined in Appendix "B".

III. That the $13,905,438 of borrowing authority in the 1996 supplementary capital budget be reserved subject to a Federal/Provincial/City cost sharing infrastructure program with the provisions that these funds cannot be used to address other requirements which may arise. If the program is not forthcoming by the end of 1997, the borrowing authority should be reviewed with the intent of cancellation of same.

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

Moved by Deputy Mayor Eadie,
That the clause be referred back to the Executive Policy Committee.

Carried.

The City of Winnipeg's Response to the White Paper on The Sustainable Development Act.
File GL-5 (Vol. 5)

30 - 3. In 1987, the United Nations Commission on Environment and Development published a report entitled Our Common Future, which defined sustainable development as "development that would meet the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs".

In 1989, The Province of Manitoba established a Round Table on Environment and Economy as a response to Our Common Future and to recommendations of the National Task Force on Environment and Economy. The Round Table established a sustainable development strategy that would serve to translate the idea of sustainable development into action. One component of this strategy was a report released in 1992 entitled "Towards Institutional Change in the Public Sector". One of its recommendations was that the Premier have an umbrella SDA to anchor and provide the continuity required to guide the transition to sustainable development in the public sector. The Manitoba Round Table released "A Discussion Paper on a Sustainable Development Act" in 1994 to initiate public discussion on the key elements of the Act. In June 1995, Premier Filmon released the " What You Told Us - Sustainable Development Act", which provided the Manitoba Round Table's final recommendations concerning key elements of the SDA.

In April of 1996, The Honourable Glen Cummings announced that the Act would come out in a White Paper and provide for broad public consultation. On August 1, 1996 the White Paper on the Sustainable Development Act was released. It appears the Province wants to move quickly regarding this legislation and given its scope and potential impact it is important that the City's concerns are conveyed to the Province in a timely fashion.

The stated intent of the SDA is to achieve three main goals:

1) establishing a legal and institutional basis for implementing sustainable development in Manitoba;

2) creating an onus on all parts of government to incorporate sustainable development into their legislation, policies, programs and practices so that the government can lead by example; and

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 13, 1996

3) providing an integrated, efficient, single window approach to development decisions and licensing.

Plan Winnipeg identifies the principles of sustainable development as one of the three fundamental concepts for shaping Plan Winnipeg policy and making future decisions on the development of The City of Winnipeg. The SDA incorporates the concepts of sustainable development into a new land use application process which will apply to development applications everywhere in the Province. This legislation will override The City of Winnipeg Act for specific types of development and replaces current Provincial environment legislation. The SDA will impact the City both as a land use regulator and as a developer. Because of the provisions of The City of Winnipeg Act and because it is the largest urban center in Manitoba, the City has unique concerns about the provisions of the SDA.

A review of the SDA was coordinated by the Sustainable Development Working Group consisting of staff from Strategic Planning, Legal Services, and Business Liaison and Intergovernmental Affairs with input from line departments. A detailed response to the SDA was prepared. Major concerns are highlighted below.

Under this proposed legislation, The City of Winnipeg will be affected not only as a regulator of land use, but also as a developer. Primary concerns include the following:

- The City is required to incorporate the concept of sustainable development into its budgeting process. The impact of this requirement is not clear since no guidelines or processes are provided.

- The City will require the establishment of pre-screening criteria to determine if a development will need to be referred to the Province under the SDA for pre-licensing or a sustainability assessment.

- The legislation may impact the City's ability to plan for future developments, especially when developments concern other jurisdictions within the Capital Region. The SDA brings a number of new issues into the matrix. It is unclear at which point the SDA pre- license process will commence requiring the City to involve Provincial authorities and notify neighbouring communities.

- Significant decision making authority will rest with Provincial officials. Under the SDA the Province is given power to establish the direction of the legislation, to define its terms, to create regulations, to change the types of developments regulated, to appoint tribunals charged with administration of the SDA and to control the appeal process. This authority is not subject to any review and the City has no input.

- Council's authority is subject to review by the Province in more situations under the SDA than under The City of Winnipeg Act.

- With respect to land use regulation, although the scope of the legislation will affect only a small number of development applications annually (approximately 5%, or 10 -15), it is expected these applications will be high cost investments, environmentally sensitive and generate a large amount of public interest.

- e Act creates two processes for development applications. If a development is listed under the SDA it is evaluated under a new process which will involve a higher degree of

  participation by the Province. Developments not listed under the SDA will be considered under the process established by The City of Winnipeg Act.

- Currently the City is a developer of many types of environmentally sensitive projects. Under the SDA more projects will be considered " environmentally sensitive" and subject to a review process (eg. roads of four lanes or more at new locations, land drainage outfalls).

- It is anticipated that the development approval process under the SDA will take longer than the current process used for land use approval. This may potentially discourage development and impact the City's capacity for economic growth.

- There are a number of time limits established under the SDA which are very restrictive. A land use decision by the City under the SDA will require additional resources, special Council meetings, and fast- tracked public hearings. There is concern that the SDA does not allow sufficient time for the administration to provide adequate planning support for a development.

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 13, 1996

- Because the SDA creates new processes for approval and standards for community involvement, there will be confusion as to the role of the City. Applicants will likely still view the City as having the ultimate authority to process and approve land use issues. Councillors may find themselves dealing with residents that do not understand the process.

- The legislation allows for the creation of a Sustainable Development Commission which is charged with the authority to review many of the decisions made at the municipal level. There is concern that the Sustainable Development Commission may not possess experience and knowledge of City of Winnipeg land use issues and concerns.

There are significant additional costs identified as a result of the SDA in its current form for The City of Winnipeg as both a regulator of land use and as a developer.

- It is estimated that the City will receive approximately 5% or 10 -15 development applications that will fall under the SDA annually. Although this is not a large number, processing these applications will increase costs significantly. An application under the SDA will be different, involving complex scheduling and additional resources.

- The City will have to change its fee structure for applications that fall under the SDA.

- Notification costs of a proposed development by The City of Winnipeg may effectively double under the proposed process in the SDA. It is estimated that advertising costs for an application under the SDA may increase by $5,000 to $8,000 per application.

- As a developer under the SDA the City may face increased costs in the pre-licensing process and preparation of the sustainable development assessment report.

- Under the SDA the developer is required to pay for administrative expenses incurred by the Province as well as the costs of the Sustainable Development Commission. This currently does not occur. It is not clear what is included within the definition of " administrative expenses", and the City has no control over these costs.

- A proponent of a development may be required to provide funding for an intervenor in a development application. There are no guidelines on the scope and amount of funding that may be required.

The City has a number of concerns about the proposed Sustainable Development legislation in its current form, and is willing to participate with the Province to further develop the SDA. The review of the White Paper has revealed that while the proposed legislation begins to address its stated intent regarding establishing a legal and institutional basis for sustainable development in Manitoba, and creating an onus on government to incorporate sustainable development, the City does not believe that it will result in providing an integrated and efficient sustainability approach to development decisions.

The Executive Policy Committee recommends:

I. That the detailed report provided in Appendix "A" of this document be approved and submitted to The Province of Manitoba as The City of Winnipeg's official response to the White Paper on The Sustainable Development Act.

II. That The City of Winnipeg through the Sustainable Development Working Group continue to maintain discussions with The Province of Manitoba regarding changes to and the implementation of the proposed SDA.

Adopted by consent.

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 13, 1996

St. Germain/Vermette and Unserviced Lots in Winnipeg

Files FL-2 (Vol. 13) & FE(1997) (Vol. 1

31 - 4. On December 7, 1995, the Minister of Urban Affairs, wrote to the Mayor asking the City to advise him "which of the options presented in the St. Germain/Vermette Study is the (City's) preferred option and on any action (the City) is prepared to undertake to address the issues raised in the study".

On July 21, 1993, Council considered various options in order to provide taxation relief for under serviced lots within the City of Winnipeg. Council recommended that the ad valorem tax system continue to be the system for property taxes within the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg.

In considering the options, the Minister drew Council's attention to the lower mill rate proposal and the rural service area proposal contained in the Study.

On January 24, 1996, Council adopted Clause 24 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 17, 1996, recommending that the City reiterate that the ad valorem tax system continue to be the system for property taxes within the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg, and that the Province of Manitoba be advised that the City does not wish to see the St. Germain/Vermette Community secede.

In discussions with the Province it would appear that they do not wish to see the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg eroded through secession, however, the Province would like to see the City find a solution which would address the concerns of outlying semi rural property owners who do not have the same level of municipal services as that which the majority of Winnipeg property owners enjoy.

The City's administration believes that if the City made some concessions to these semi rural properties that the Province may be more supportive of preserving the City boundaries. In the absence of any concessions, the City stands at risk to be continually eroded through request for secessions.

Council has reiterated its support for the ad valorem tax system and it is acknowledged that because all properties in Winnipeg are taxed based on fair market value, a portion of that value reflects the degree of servicing afforded to a property. However, there is a feeling amongst certain taxpayers that they are not a part of Winnipeg because they receive significantly less in services than other Winnipegers.

Taxpayers in the semi rural areas within the Winnipeg boundaries do not have the same conveniences as other taxpayers. They must travel much greater distances for community centres, parks, libraries, arenas and swimming pools. They lack bus services and have slightly greater response times for police, fire and ambulance services.

It is difficult to identify specific households in this situation but a good indicator are those properties which do not have water and sewer service (ie. properties which do not pay a frontage levy).

It is proposed to recognize the lower level of service by offering an annual grant of $250. This grant is not related to lack of water and sewer services because these services are provided and paid for by a separate utility. None of the property taxes are used to fund water and sewer. The absence of water and sewer could be used as an identifier in order to select qualifying property off the computerized tax roll. It may be in the City's best interest to give recognition to this difference in service and to make a long term offer of compensation. The cost of concessions to residential properties which do not have water and sewer would be significantly less than the net tax loss should St. Germain secede.

There are several options to the form or manner in which the concession is provided.

Based on Section 138 of The City of Winnipeg Act a grant can be provided. This vehicle has been utilized in the past for tax relief for heritage buildings and for the water rebate program in Headingley. The Corporate Services - Legal Services Branch has advised that tax relief should have specific legislation especially when given on a large scale program. Any grant for tax relief for heritage buildings is dealt with by council on a case by case basis and the grant for Headingley was done for an interim period, individually, on an application basis. The City, by providing a grant, would not be compromising the ad valorem tax system. Property will still be taxed at a common mill rate based on portioned market values. The grant is simply a recognition that some taxpayers incur additional cost and inconvenience which most other Winnipeg taxpayers do not have to bear.

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 13, 1996

Another option is Section 164(5) of The City of Winnipeg Act which states as follows:

> "Tax Rate on agricultural land
>
> The council may by by-law provide that by reason of the use for agricultural purposes to which lands described in it are put and the services and facilities that are or are not available to the owner or occupant thereof, the city's tax levy made in respect of such lands shall be calculated by levying a rate reduced by the amount specified in the by-law against the assessed value of those lands: and it is not necessary for the council to specify the services or facilities that are or are not available to the owners or occupants of those lands in the by-law."

This Section is only applicable to land used for agricultural purposes. Farm land already experiences benefits from a preferred portion value, an exemption from the education support levy and in some instances an option, by application, to be assessed at farm use value.

In addition, a third option is the use of differential mill rates.

On July 31, 1991 in a report adopted by City Council the matter of differential mill rates was dealt with. The report stated as follows:

> "Differential mill rates by their nature create inequity in taxation. Property taxation should be based on market value and the rate of taxation should be consistently applied with the level of taxation being dependent on the value of the property. If Council supports the view that large lot owners require subsidizing related to the services they receive, this should be recognized by a credit applied to the tax or to a grant which would be administered annually to offset the perceived inequity of the tax. The credit or grant would be properly accounted as an expense and would not distort the revenue requirements and eliminate the annual determination of the share of revenue required between large lot owners and other properties. In addition, the credit on the grant would also be more visible and understandable than a different mill rate.
>
> Differential mill rates by their nature create inequity in taxation. Property taxation should be based on market value and the rate of taxation should be consistently applied with the level of taxation being dependent on the value of the property. If Council supports the view that large lot owners require subsidizing related to the serviced they receive, this should be recognized by a credit applied to the tax or to a grant which would be administered annually to offset the perceived inequity of the tax. The credit or grant would be properly accounted as an expense and would not distort the revenue requirements and eliminate the annual determination of the share of revenue required between large lot owners and other properties. In addition, the credit on the grant would also be more visible and understandable than a differential rate.
>
> Differential mill rates have the same net effect as providing an exemption of a portion of the taxable assessment. The Manitoba Assessment Review Committee (1982) in dealing with tax concessions stated that:
>
> > “The Committee believes that such recognition should not be expressed through a by-law which exempts such organizations from municipal taxes. The Council of the Municipality should be made accountable to the taxpayers for any tax concessions it makes. Such concessions can affect the total Municipal Assessment and could, if significant in size, affect the sharing of intermunicipal costs...Such assistance should, however, be provided through a grant equivalent to full municipal taxes. A grant is a more open way of expressing recognition of an organization’s contribution to a community. A grant is subject o scrutiny on a regular basis by both the Council and the public. The taxpayers in the municipality see where their tax dollars are going and to whom. They are free to oppose or question the council’s decision to make such a grant.”

If the differential mill rate option was chosen, legislative amendments would be required. This option is not recommended.

An annual grant would appear to be the most appropriate method of providing concessions to unserviced properties. It is also recommended that the level of the grant be $250. This amount is less than the $365 which was given on a limited term basis to Headingley but the $365 was intended as compensation for water and sewer costs which are higher than the costs associated with the inconveniences of accessing other services.

The $250 grant if approved, should be on an ongoing basis and it could be paid by applying the grant as a credit to the individual tax bill. Specific legislation should be requested from the Province giving the City the authority to make the grants and outlining the criteria that would make property owners eligible for the grant.

The eligibility criteria that could be considered is as follows:

> Property which is classified as Residential 1 and that has a dwelling located on it. In addition, the property must be eligible for the Provincial Home Owners Tax Assistance Program.

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 13, 1996

Rental or vacant residential (class 10) property should not be eligible for grants. The absence of services does not pose a hardship or impact on the enjoyment of the property by the property owner.

The grant would not be applicable to other classes of property for the following reasons:

Residential 2 and 3 (class 20 and 80) have no unserviced apartments or condos however there are vacant lands in these class codes. Any development of these lands would require servicing.

Farm and Farm use (class 30 and 31) already enjoy a low level of taxation due to portioning.

Pipeline, Railway and Commercial (class 51, 52, and 60) are not impacted by the lack of services. As non-users of recreational facilities, etc., these classes are not eligible for the grant.

St. Germain/Vermette's 1994 municipal taxes totaled $1,008,635. 352 of 652 total lots in St. Germain/Vermette would be eligible for the annual grant.

There are 959 Residential 1 lots with building, without water and sewer service, and which are eligible for the Manitoba Resident Home Owners Tax Assistance in Winnipeg. If a grant $250 per lot is given, the total cost would be $240,000.

The Executive Policy Committee recommends:

I. That Council approve an annual grant of $250 to each owner occupied Residential 1 residence in Winnipeg which does not have access to Water and Sewer service.

II. That a provision of $240,000 be made in the 1997 and future annual Operating Budgets of the City.

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

Moved by Her Worship Mayor Thompson,
Adoption of the clause.

Council recessed at 11:56 a.m., and reconvened at 1:38 p.m., same members present, the Speaker in the Chair.

Councillors O'Shaughnessy, Phillips, and Her Worship Mayor Thompson entered the meeting after Council had reconvened.

The motion for the adoption of the clause was put.

Councillor Golden called for the yeas and nays, which were as follows:-

Yea: Councillors Pyrstanski, Clement, Lazarenko, O'Shaughnessy, Phillips, Silva, Steek, Timm-Rudolph, Deputy Mayor Eadie, Her Worship Mayor Thompson and Councillor Angus. 11

Nay: Councillors Golden, Lubosch, Murray, Thomas and Vandal. 5

and the motion for the adoption of the clause was declared carried.

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 13, 1996

West Broadway - South Sherbrook Business Improvement Zone - 1997 Proposed Program, Zone Levy and Budget Estimates

File FL-7.8(Vol. 2

32 - 5. On March 25, 1992, Council adopted By-law No. 5921/92, being a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to designate a Business Improvement Zone to be known as the West Broadway - South Sherbrook Business Improvement Zone and to establish a Management Board for the Zone. By-law No. 5912/92 requires that the Business Improvement Zone prepare its proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the considerations of Council.

The West Broadway - South Sherbrook Business Improvement Zone at its Annual General Meeting held on October 22, 1996, approved the proposed annual budget and program as outlined in Appendix "A".

The Executive Policy Committee recommends that pursuant to By-law No. 5921/92, Council request the City Centre Community Committee to conduct a public meeting to hear representations with respect to the proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the year 1997 and to provide recommendations to Council within 60 days from receipt of Council's request.

Adopted by consent.

Osborne South Business Improvement Zone - 1997 Proposed Program, Zone Levy and Budget Estimates

File FL-7.9(Vol. 2)

33 - 6. On July 21, 1993, Council adopted By-law No. 6201/93, being a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to designate a Business Improvement zone to be known as the Osborne South Business Improvement zone and to establish a Management Board for the Zone. By-law No. 6201/93 requires that the Business Improvement Zone prepare its proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the consideration of Council.

The Osborne South Business Improvement Zone at its Annual General Meeting held of October 21, 1996, approved the proposed annual budget and program as outlined in Appendix "A".

The Executive Policy Committee recommends that pursuant to By-law No. 6201/93, Council request the City Centre Community Committee to conduct a public meeting to hear representations with respect to the proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the year 1997 and to provide recommendations to Council within 60 days from receipt of Council's request.

Adopted by consent.

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 13, 1996

Osborne Village Business Improvement Zone - 1997
Proposed Program, Zone Levy and Budget Estimates
File FL-7.3 (Vol. 4)

34 - 7. On December 20, 1989, Council adopted By-law No. 5322/89, being a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to designate a Business Improvement Zone to be known as the Osborne Village Business Improvement Zone and to establish a Management Board for the Zone. By-law No. 5322/89 requires that the Business Improvement Zone prepare its proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the consideration of Council.

The Osborne Village Business Improvement Zone at its Annual General Meeting held of October 23, 1996, approved the proposed annual budget and program as outlined in Appendix "A".

The Executive Policy Committee recommends that pursuant to By-law No. 5322/89, Council request the City Centre Community Committee to conduct a public meeting to hear representations with respect to the proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the year 1997 and to provide recommendations to Council within 60 days from receipt of Council's request.

Adopted by consent.

Selkirk Avenue Business Improvement Zone - 1997
Proposed Program, Zone Levy and Budget Estimates
File FL-7.5 (Vol. 2)

35 - 8. On September 25, 1991, Council adopted By-law No. 5770/91, being a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to designate a Business Improvement Zone to be known as the Selkirk Avenue Business Improvement Zone and to establish a Management Board for the Zone. By-law No. 5770/91 requires that the Business Improvement Zone prepare its proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the consideration of Council.

The Selkirk Avenue Business Improvement Zone at its annual General Meeting held of October 28, 1996, approved the proposed annual budget and program as outlined in Appendix "A".

The Executive Policy Committee recommends that pursuant to By-law No. 5770/91, Council request the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee to conduct a public meeting to hear representations with respect to the proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the year 1997 and to provide recommendations to Council within 60 days from receipt of Council's request.

Adopted by consent.

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 13, 1996

Downtown Winnipeg Business Improvement Zone - 1997 Proposed Zone Levy and Budget Estimates
File FL-7.4(Vol. 6)

36 - 9. On January 25, 1989, Council adopted By-law No. 5080/89, being a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to designate a Business Improvement Zone to be known as the Downtown Winnipeg Business Improvement Zone and to establish a Management Board for the Zone. By-law No. 5080/89 requires that the Business Improvement Zone prepare its proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the consideration of Council.

The Downtown Winnipeg Business Improvement Zone at its Annual General Meeting held of October 25, 1996, approved the proposed annual budget and program as outlined in Appendix "A".

The Executive Policy Committee recommends that pursuant to By-law No. 5080/89, Council request the City Centre Community Committee to conduct a public meeting to hear representations with respect to the proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the year 1997 and to provide recommendations to Council within 60 days from receipt of Council's request.

Adopted by consent.

Downtown Transcona Business Improvement zone - 1997 Proposed Program, Zone Levy and Budget Estimates
File FL-7.4(Vol. 1)

37. 10. On December 20, 1995, Council adopted By-law No. 6729/95, being a By-law of The City of Winnipeg to designate a Business Improvement zone to be known as the Downtown Transcona Business Improvement Zone and to establish a Management Board for the Zone. By-law No. 6729/95 requires that the Business Improvement Zone prepare its proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the consideration of Council.

The Downtown Transcona Business Improvement Zone at its Annual General Meeting held of October 2, 1996, approved the proposed annual budget and program as outlined in Appendix "A".

The Executive Policy Committee recommends that pursuant to By-law No. 6729/95, Council request the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee to conduct a public meeting to hear representations with respect to the proposed program, zone levy and budget estimates for the year 1997 and to provide recommendations to council within 60 days from receipt of Council's request.

Adopt by consent

Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 13, 1996

Unused Capital Borrowing Authority
File FC-1 (1997-2001) (Vol. 1)

38 - 11. On September 27, 1995, Council ruled automatic referral of the following motion to the Executive Policy Committee, under Rule 16.1 of the Procedure By-law No. 5400/90:

Moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,
Seconded by Councillor Murray,

WHEREAS the City is faced with fiscal restraint and a Council directive to decrease the amount of capital borrowing:

AND WHEREAS all capital borrowing authority is approved by Council prior to the actual expenditure;

AND WHEREAS this unused capital borrowing authority is often appropriated for other projects which may not have been priorized by Council in the 5-year Capital Program;

AND WHEREAS is the event of special or emergency circumstances which give rise to projects which cannot be delayed until the following year's annual capital budget, a supplemental capital budget could be approved;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the practice of continuing unused capital borrowing authority be terminated and that no surplus borrowing authority be transferred to any other project.

On November 22, 1995, Executive Policy Committee requested the Board of Commissioners to report back on the pros and cons of implementing this motion. On June 19, 1996, Council granted an extension of time of 60 days and on September 25, 1996, Council granted an additional extension of time of 60 days to allow for consideration of this matter.

Inasmuch as the Executive Policy Committee is recommending the cancellation of unused capital borrowing authorities of previous initial Borrowing By-laws and approving a 1996 supplementary capital budget in the amount of $40,987,249.00, that this resolution be filed.

Moved by Deputy Mayor Eadie,
That the clause be laid over to the next meeting of Council.

Carried.

City of Winnipeg Appointments to The Winnipeg Airports Authority Inc.
Files GG-1 (Vol. 27) & GC-7 (Vol. 26)

39 - 12. The Executive Policy Committee has been advised that one of the City of Winnipeg's nominees to The Winnipeg Airports Authority Inc., Kevin Kavanaugh's term expires on November 30, 1996.

The Executive Policy Committee recommends that Kevin Kavanaugh be re-appointed for a four 4) year term on The Winnipeg Airports Authority Inc., from December 1, 1996 to November 1, 2000.

Adopted by consent.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,
40 - WHEREAS in September of 1996, a Protocol of Recognition (copy attached hereto) between the Union of British Columbia Municipalities and the Government of British Columbia was agreed to by both parties and signed by the President of the Union of British Columbia Municipalities, and the Premier and Municipal Affairs Minister of British Columbia;

AND WHEREAS this Protocol of Recognition is the first of its kind adopted anywhere in Canada;

AND WHEREAS in the aforementioned Protocol of Recognition, the Government of British Columbia formally recognizes municipal government in British Columbia as an independent, responsible and accountable order of government.

AND WHEREAS the Protocol of Recognition creates a partnership between the municipal and provincial governments, especially in such areas as the harmonization of legislation, regulations, policies, programs and projects within British Columbia;

AND WHEREAS the Protocol of Recognition creates a framework for a positive working relationship between British Columbia municipal governments and their provincial government;

AND WHEREAS it should be in the best interests of all citizens in the Province of Manitoba to have a similar Protocol of Recognition adopted between Manitoba's municipal governments and the Manitoba Provincial Government;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the City of Winnipeg endorse in principle the terms of the British Columbia Protocol of Recognition and thereby requests the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities to adopt the British Columbia Protocol of Recognition as the basis for negotiations with the Province of Manitoba for the adoption of a similar Protocol between the Province and its Municipal Governments.

Copy of attachment referred to in the above motion is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

The speaker ruled automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee, in accordance with Rule 16.1 of the Procedure By-law.

Moved by Deputy Mayor Eadie,
That the rule be suspended to allow consideration of the motion at this time.

Carried.

The motion was put and declared carried.

Moved by Councillor Angus,
Seconded by Councillor Golden,
41 - Whereas the Letter of Understanding agreed to January 30, 1995 by The City of Winnipeg and the Canadian Union of Public Employees provided for a Joint Committee of City Council and C.U.P.E. Local 500;

And Whereas Council at its Organizational meeting held on November 6, 1996 appointed Councillors Angus, Phillips and Steek as its representatives on the Joint Committee; said Committee meeting on a weekly basis;

And Whereas Councillor Angus has today notified the City Clerk of his resignation from this Committee,

Therefore Be It Resolved that in the interest of expediency, that the Executive Policy Committee be authorized to immediately appoint a member of Council to fill the vacancy and apprise all parties accordingly.

Automatic Referral to the Executive Policy Committee in accordance with Rule 16.1 of the Procedure By-law

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE

CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

42 - On motion of Her Worship Mayor Thompson, By-law No. 6842/96, a by-law of The City of Winnipeg to amend By-law No. 5915/92, a By-law establishing Plan Winnipeg, being a statement of the City's policy and general proposals in respect of development or use of land in the City, was read a third time and was passed and ordered to be signed and sealed. File EP-1.1 (PW 3/96) (Vol. 1)

The Speaker called the Deputy Speaker, Councillor Prystanski, to the Chair and left the Chamber.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE

QUESTION PERIOD

43 - Councillor Golden referred to correspondence from R.K. Dowdall to W.D. Carroll, Commissioner of Works and Operations, which outlined contributions to the City of Winnipeg trust fund for the Leo Mol Sculpture Garden, and questioned if the fund raising plan had met its goals, especially from the private sector, and, if not, how the funding was found or what changes were made to the project.

Her Worship Mayor Thompson agreed to take the question under advisement.

Councillor Golden referred to the redevelopment of the Assiniboine Park pavilion and in noting that the set of criteria had been changed from the original proposal call questioned whether he community would be given an opportunity to respond.

Her Worship Mayor Thompson noted that she would meet with Councillor Golden to further discuss the specifics of the matter.

Councillor Golden noted that there were individuals interested in utilizing the Assiniboine Park pavilion for business purposes which was hindered by the park closing restriction of 10 o'clock and questioned if the restrictions were being waived for some individuals.

Her Worship Mayor Thompson agreed to take the question under advisement.

Councillor Clement referred to the Provincial Government's negotiations with doctors and hospitals which provided for an extra ambulance, and in noting that the Province had stated continuation of funding, requested that verification in writing be sought from the Minister of Health.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy noted that the City had been advised of the continuation of funding for this matter and that he would investigate the matter further with the Province.

The Speaker returned to the Chamber ad resumed the Chair.

Councillor Golden noted the November 15 deadline for SnowCap to decide on the option and questioned if The City of Winnipeg had received official notification from snowcap regarding their intent to acquire the City's land.

Her Worship Mayor Thompson noted that the deadline was actually November 30 and that the Executive Policy Committee was in the process of arranging a meeting with the group to discuss the matter.

Executive Policy Committee - Question Period (continued)

Councillor Golden requested that the mayor indicate to Council Members, in advance of the meeting, the City position and criteria.

Her Worship took the question under advisement.

Councillor Lazarenko requested an update on the status of the Mr. Canada's Touring Network proposal for the Metropolitan/Capitol Theatres.

Councillor Silva noted that the Steering Committee would receive recommendations from the Forks/North Portage negotiating team on Thursday, November 21, 1996.

Councillor Lazarenko further questioned if input on the proposal would be obtained from the City's internal and external auditors prior to a final decision by Council on the issue.

Councillor Silva noted that the Steering Committee would make recommendations to Council and suggested that Council could request due diligence from the auditors prior to a final decision.

Councillor Lazarenko requested identification of the role of the Taxation Fairness Committee in budget deliberations.

Councillor Steek noted that a chairperson would soon be appointed to the Taxation Fairness Committee and that hey would be involved in the budget process.

With reference to the Flett proposal, Councillor Golden questioned why the Forks/North Portage negotiating team made a closed door presentation to the Executive Policy Committee at the Convention Centre rather than the Steering Committee.

Councillor Silva tabled a report with the City Clerk and noted that the Steering Committee was established by the Executive Policy Committee. He further noted that her Worship was procedurally correct and within her jurisdiction as Chair of the Executive Policy Committee to request the meeting with the Executive Policy Committee.

Councillor Silva indicated that no decisions had been made and further noted that the Executive Policy Committee simply received an informational briefing on the matter from the Forks/North Portage negotiating committee. In addition, Councillor Silva advised that the Steering Committee was privy to all information shared with the Executive Policy Committee.

The Speaker called the Deputy Speaker, Councillor Prystanski, to the Chair in order to participate in the debate.

Councillor Golden questioned why the negotiating team's report had not been circulated to Steering Committee members prior to the meeting and whether officials from Legal Services were present at the meeting.

Councillor Silva noted that he had circulated the report at his first convenience and confirmed that officials from Legal Services were in fact in attendance.

In reference to a recent snow storm, Councillor Angus noted concerns pertaining to snow clearing especially related to problems of communication and coordination and requested an update on snow clearing progress and the snow clearing costs.

Councillor Clement advised of the snow clearing activities up to and after the recent storm, noting that it was the third highest amount of snow in a twenty four hour period in thirty years. Her Worship Mayor Thompson further noted that every piece of equipment was on the street and commended all persons involved in the snow removal process.