COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, July 16, 2008

The Council met at 9:35 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 Thomas.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Gerbasi, Leipsic, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas, Vandal and Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: I would like to introduce the Pages. We have two. Simone Jaman, it's her last meeting that she will be attending. She has been here for a number of months now. She is going to different ventures. The best to you and good luck and thank you for your participation with our Council (Applause). And Rory Mitchell of Kelvin High School resides in the Fort Rouge-East Kildonan, I mean Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry ward, is here today as a Page. (Applause).

MINUTES

Councillor Smith moves the Minutes of the meeting held on June 18, 2008 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

We have delegations, five delegations, and I believe there will be....

Pagtakhan's announcement. Just a minute, Gordon, just hang on. Councillor Pagtakhan I believe you have an announcement?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I would like to introduce the past president of the Folk Arts Council, Mr. Martin Pasieczka, who is joining us here today. He's from the Folk Arts Council and the reason why that is significant Mr. Speaker, is that Folklorama is happening next month. There's 46 pavilions happening throughout our City. It has been a tradition for 39 years since 1970.

And this year what's new is that Martin was on the team to develop a brand new alcoholic beverage called the Folklorama Beer, which goes down easy apparently. So I hope that all Councillors and citizens of Winnipeg will take in the festival this year. That runs from August 3rd to the 16th and the opening ceremonies are at The Forks on Saturday, August 2nd.

The next person I would like to introduce Mr. Chairperson is a really special person. She is a centenarian, which is a person who is over 100 years old. She was born in Wishaw, Scotland, on March 1st, 1906. She came to Canada in 1912 and settled in Winnipeg's west end on Bannatyne Avenue. When she was living there by the way she would walk from that street from her house to Kelvin High School everyday which is amazing.

After graduating from Kelvin High School she began her career as a bookkeeper at the Grain Exchange. In 1957 she and her late husband moved to 1090 Bannerman where she resided until her 97th birthday. She currently resides at Fred Douglas Lodge where she enjoys spending her time with her close friends, Cecile Park and family. Please help me welcome Miss Anne Davidson. (Applause).

Mr. Speaker: Miss Davidson congratulations! 102 years. That's young.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Delegations, I believe that there is a motion, Councillor Steeves that you wanted to put in an additional delegation.

Councillor Steeves: Just briefly. A personal congratulations Miss Davidson. If you were down here on the floor as one of our Councillors here you would be in the top three oldest. Did you know that? I'm just teasing.

One extra delegation, Ty Tran on the water park if I can move that for consent by Council.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Delegations. Nick Ternette. You have 10 minutes.

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, Mayor Sam Katz, members of City Council. First of all a preamble. The public has the right to know and I'm just wondering if some of you could explain it to me when we get into Question Period, why does it appear in today's paper that we're talking about the water park in relationship to a $20 to $35 admission fees. If the public would have a clue about this a week or two weeks ago you would have a massive amount of delegations here talking about that kind of fee. It has to happen when you guys make the decision. It is unfair and unjustified because the public has the right to know way before those decisions are being made.

I'm here today to support, unusual for me, the $7 million dollars being invested by the City as part of the $43.6 million dollar water park at Canad Inn at Polo Park, with two major provisos that I will outline in my presentation.

As most of you know I have continually opposed public/private partnerships whereby the taxpayer invests in private properties and only ends up with egg on the face. That is the private partnerships profit while we end up getting nothing in return. Just look at the MTS centre, public funding of the private sector $60 million dollar mortgage, we have VLT's, entertainment taxes and nearly no property taxes for 25 years. That means that the private sector makes significant profits while the taxpayer gets nothing.

While the Canadian Taxpayers Federation may be right in suggesting that the City ought not to be spending money on commercial ventures, I still believe in general, that the public is public, and private is private, and that the two should rarely, if ever, meet.

However, the fact is that $7 million dollars is being invested by the City into the water park is coming from the Federal government as part of the original $45 million dollars Federal money that former Mayor Glen Murray had secured for the first leg of so-called bus rapid transit and as you know I am fundamentally opposed to bus rapid transit.

That money was transferred by Mayor Katz into recreation which was approved by the Federal government. So that money is being spent on capital projects not operating projects, in the field of recreation to build mega projects such as the expansion of the Sargent Park Recreation Centre and the development of recreation centres to expand Bronx Park to replace the now demolished Kelvin Community Centre.

For 25 years, public access is guaranteed to the water slide, with a sliding scale fee especially in regards to inner city residents. At the present moment I understand that the plans are to give $700,000 dollars worth of tickets per year to low income and inner city residents to access the water slide.

My first proviso of support relates to my suggestion in which I have spoken to several Councillors, the Mayor's office and the CAO of Winnipeg that this matter is discriminatory, bureaucratic and unnecessary.

My suggestion is that they do what we do at Harvest and I have had long discussions with David Northcott on this, where at Harvest we identify people by their Manitoba Health Services six digit registry number. Not even the nine number or the Social Insurance Number which is (inaudible), which are private, and where they live so we can send them to the nearest food bank. Not identifying them how poor they are or by what their personal circumstances are.

My suggestion is to identify inner city residents by postal code. That is one suggestion. I'm quite open to looking at other suggestions of identification that does not force them to self identify themselves. They go to the water slides

where they live, they say where they live, and they get a discount. Avoiding the bureaucracy of having social agencies distributing tickets to so-called needy citizens or having to decide who gets a ticket and who doesn't.

No question, with Harvest, there is some possibility of abuse of the system. People might lie. They might say they live in the inner city when they live in suburbia but it's far better than doing a means test which is inherently unfair and humiliating and I'm arguing that you cannot continue to do that. You will not have people in the inner city using, when an agency says you can have it because you're poor, they will not go to the water slide. You do not identify them by their personal living. Harvest has done this for years. We decide to give food to people, irregardless of their circumstances and they get it and it works. And this kind of system is unfair, discriminatory, humiliating and will not work.

Now my second proviso concerns fees for the water park which I just discovered this morning. If in fact we are looking at a $20 to $30 admission fee and a $10 discount for low income and inner city residents, not only are the poor not going to use this facility, the fact is that the majority of the middle class is not going to use this facility! With significant rising gas and food costs, to have a family of four use the water park at a cost of $100 will be out of the reach for the majority of Winnipeg's population!

What I suggest and what we were looking at this was that we were looking at a cost per day for the water park of approximately $12.99 to $14.99 and a $5 entrance fee for inner city residents that they would go there and they would be identified by postal code.

And I have been informed that the Canad Inn swimming at the water park in Grand Forks at the present time, even though it is going to be slightly smaller than the one we're talking about in Winnipeg charges $15 for an all day pass, for 6 years and over and $7 for those who are under 6. That is 5 and under. Now, that is a reasonable fee. So where is these fees coming from?

On the other side of the argument, a privately operating mall, rather than a City operated facility of a water park at this time, is the right direction, because one, the City is in no position to spend $36 million dollars of its own money to build a water park in the inner city. Even more importantly and that is important for me, no tax breaks, no land transfers, or other exemptions are being provided by Canad Inn president Leo Ledohowski in exchange for the $7 million dollar public investment which provides significant access or will, hopefully, if you follow through on this by inner city residents, to the park and probably taxes to be paid to the City. This is, for once in my opinion, a win/win situation.

But even more importantly, this is Federal government money it is not separate money which was designated originally to be spent on rapid transit and in this case was transferred into recreation, not to be used in any other way, which will ultimately be of a benefit to Winnipeggers. But again, I will warn you, that if you do not make it accessible to the middle class as well as the poor and the inner city residents and as well as not to force them to identify themselves and what circumstances they are, you will have nobody going to use it. It will be a commercial failure, and your money will go wasted.

And I guarantee you, we will organize. We will make sure that that facility will not function if you do not follow through properly and ensure that it is accessible because we do need a water park and I like the deal because it is a clear-cut deal, doesn't relate to all kinds of exchanges, anything, but the point is, it's going to be accessible to the lower income and inner city residents in a fair and honest fashion. And if that doesn't happen, it will not go. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ternette there may be some questions. Any questions? If not, Mr. Ternette thank you for your presentation.

The next delegation is Vernon Ness, President of St. Andrews Society of Winnipeg in opposition to Item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development. You have 10 minutes today.

Vernon Ness: Mr. Speaker, Your Worship, Councillors, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Vernon Ness and I am the current President of the St. Andrews Society of Winnipeg, an organization established in 1871, virtually at the same time this Province was founded, and two years before the incorporation of the City of Winnipeg.

My earliest predecessor as founding President of our society was Sir Donald Smith, Lord Strathcona, Mount Royal, famously photographed in the Rockies driving the last spike in the Canadian Pacific Railway line. Our non-profit organization's mandate is to preserve and promote Scottish culture and heritage in Manitoba. I would like to add that we are not the only organization with such a mandate. Rather, we are among the many integrated groups of the greater Scottish community across the City and the Province.

I'll begin by thanking you for the opportunity to speak before you with regard to the Fort Douglas development proposal. Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to this proposal. We are opposed for a variety of reasons which include: this is an historic site at both local and national significance; this is a publicly owned riverbank park; and that there has been a complete absence of public consultation with regard to this process.

You may have noticed the fact that I've referred to this proposal not as the Alexander Docks development but more accurately as the Fort Douglas development proposal.

Mr. Speaker, on February 28th, 1889, Charles N. Bell, a fellow of the Royal Geographical Society, and one of the founders of the Manitoba Historical Scientific Society, delivered the inaugural address to the officers and members as first President of that society. His address contained the following words: "There are certain historic spots in or near this City, such as the old Fort Garry gateway and the sites of Fort Douglas, and the fight between Governor Semple of the Hudson's Bay Company and the Bois Brules in 1816 on the main road at Inkster's Creek, which should be secured or marked in some way as pertaining to important epics in the history of the country."

Mr. Speaker, this development proposal is on the site of Fort Douglas. One of just three historic sites in Winnipeg specifically singled out by Dr. Bell in his 1889 inaugural address to the Manitoba Historical Society, in which he described them as sites of national historic significance.

Councillors may have noticed that there is an existing cairn monument on this parcel of land. This cairn marks the actual location of the southeast corner of Fort Douglas. In 1982, Mayor William Norrie along with Lord Selkirk dedicated this cairn to the citizens of the City of Winnipeg.

Councillors may also have noticed another monument on the neighbouring parcel of land, the Cairn of Tears, more commonly known as the Scots Monument was erected in 1995. This monument includes stones sent from each parish in Scotland and recognizes Lord Selkirk, his settlers and Chief Peguis, the Saulteaux Chief without whom the Scots would not have survived.

Mr. Speaker, this coming September 6th, Scots and those of Scottish descent, will be celebrating the dedication of another memorial, the Settlers Monument which now stands within the traffic circle at Bannatyne Avenue and Waterfront Drive. This monument of which there are only two in the world, commemorates the highland clearances and the human devastation that was a direct precursor to the Selkirk Settlers arrival. Lord and Lady Selkirk are traveling to Winnipeg this fall to help us make this dedication during our annual parade to the Scots monuments.

These various monuments gifted to the City in perpetuity have a value easily in excess of a million dollars. They have been bequeathed to the City for the enjoyment of all her citizens and visitors and to commemorate, celebrate the contribution of the Scots to the founding and building of this City. They are all located in an area of Winnipeg that is part of Lord Selkirk's original Red River Colony, the very beginning of the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker I'll refer specifically to the monument to be dedicated in September to inform Council today that the traffic circle site of the Settlers Monument was not in fact our first choice. The original intent was to erect the monument adjacent to the existing cairn directly on the site of Fort Douglas.

However, in discussion with the City of Winnipeg's own Property, Planning and Development department, not more than two years ago, we were informed that we could not place this monument on our preferred Fort Douglas site because of concerns about the stability of the riverbank and the fact that it would be considered an encroachment on designated natural habitat.

Imagine our dismay to be told just two years later that this designated natural habitat recently deemed so fragile as to be unsuitable for an inspirational bronze sculpture has now been recommended as the ideal location for socials. Adding insult to injury, the proposal even condemns the 1982 Fort Douglas Cairn to a distinguished location rising majestically between two stalls in a parking lot.

Over the past months much has been quite rightly written and spoken about the importance of Upper Fort Garry and its role in the development of Winnipeg. How many in this room Mr. Speaker realize that Fort Douglas was not only Lord Selkirk's Red River Colony fort, it was first Hudson's Bay Company fort at The Forks sites and the first residence of the Governor of Assiniboia.

Mr. Speaker our second objection is grounded in aesthetics and common sense. We believe the development of the east side of Waterfront Drive at the site of Fort Douglas is both unnecessary and unwarranted. To place a structure which obscures the view of the Red River from Waterfront Drive runs counter to what most cities with these natural amenities are doing.

Here in Winnipeg several previous generations of Councillors have worked to assemble downtown riverbank property as a public amenity. The result everyone agrees has been a dramatically enhanced downtown. In Edmonton, groups consisting of neighbouring municipalities are currently working to co-operate on a plan to preserve and enhance riverbank property. Not with bricks and mortar but with landscaping, paths and flowers. Now, you are being asked, not to build on the admirable and worthwhile efforts of your predecessors but to turn your back on an enlightened policy and lease this invaluable public amenity to a private purpose.

Mr. Speaker, a third objection relates to process. While the other arguments alone ought to be sufficient to raise severe concerns about this proposal, it is our belief that the underlying process has been profoundly flawed. We find it unimaginable that a long-term lease based on the redevelopment of a historic site, encompassing designated natural habitat can be brought before City Council for approval without any public consultation whatsoever. We ask that City Council not make a decision of this magnitude in a vacuum.

As this site is one of the fundamental foundations of the City of Winnipeg and a site with national significance, it appears clear to us that a more well-rounded review of this proposal would be advisable. A review that should take into account all of the very public stakeholders' interests instead of none of them.

As a result of this Mr. Speaker, Your Worship, Councillors, we strongly recommend that this City Council table this proposal until there has been an

opportunity for thorough and meaningful public consultations.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Ness. Any questions Councillors? Councillor Thomas followed by Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I am disappointed that I didn't know more about this then that the nature of my questions… Actually some of my ancestors were part of the people coming towards the Winnipeg settlement but my great-grandmother decided to stop. She had had enough traveling and decided to stay in Fort William and so they didn't continue on. So I kind of have a, even though we didn't get there and aren't one of the names up there, the Leeson's probably could be if my great-grandmother had chosen to make the rest of the trek.

And given that and given my personal history, you said some things about the monuments which I was surprised about, and I may have misunderstood you. Is it your contention that these monuments will have to be moved in order for there to be construction of this facility?

Vernon Ness: I cannot answer that. Based on the plans that were disclosed, it shows the Fort Douglas cairn between two stalls in a parking lot, is what that shows.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Yes, second question, no preamble to this. My second question is, with regard to the site itself, this is an existing heritage building, is my understanding. Are you saying that this building would be expanded and changed in some ways, as you talked about the site lines being blocked? Are they going to be blocked in any more significant way than they are now?

Vernon Ness: I think our main issue is that it is an historic site and that there has been little public consultation and that is our concern as we have no idea what will be built, or the size or of anything, if it will actually be built on top of the fort, will the cairn end up in a parking lot like at somewhere else on such an historic site? That is our concern and the public process.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillor?

Councillor Thomas: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves your first question.

Councillor Steeves: I had a very similar question.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, your first question.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, thanks for your presentation Mr. Ness. I believe yesterday, just a question or clarification, yesterday I think City Council had delegated to the Standing Committee, delegated to CentreVenture to organize the final report before us today with the public service, and Mr. Ross McGowan who is also involved with the, I understand the Selkirk Settler statue at the time and location, had spoken to either to yourself or some member of the organization, and had given you assurances yesterday I believe, correct me if I'm wrong, that the St. Andrews Society would be involved in a very consultative process with regards to any future concepts with regards to this site, specifically Parcel B which is the site that you've been referring to.

Vernon Ness: Parcel A.

Councillor Wyatt: Parcel A and Parcel B, Parcel B is the Alexander Dock site, pardon me Parcel A, Parcel B being the Harbourmaster site. So I believe he did talk to you yesterday or somebody from your organization.

Vernon Ness: It was, if I can comment Councillor? It was just actually to make sure that our opposition is formally recorded and I'm happy to hear that that is public, and there will be some public consultation.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor O'Shaughnessy your first question.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I was glad to hear your previous response shows that you have done your research and are aware to a great extent of what is going on there.

But just to clarify. Are you aware that there are indeed, two parcels that we are approving, or not approving? One parcel which will be a redevelopment of an existing building only, the old Harbourmaster, before that a pumping station for the Amy Street steam heating plant which has been torn down and that is what Council is approving. There is a second parcel which there is no approval for and would have to go to a public meeting to design a building on that which would also involve the location of the building and the parking lot stalls.

Are you aware of this and that what you're doing is making us more aware and warning us for the future, but not indeed as I understood from what you said, having sealed the future of this whole area, without consultation.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ness.

Vernon Ness: I was hoping to hear that Councillor. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor your first question.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think Councillor O'Shaughnessy just addressed the same issue; the difference between Parcels A and B and I think you are quite cognizant of that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Mr. Ness thank you very much.

The next two delegations are on the same item. First is Cathy Collins. She will get 10 minutes followed by Marion Willis, both will be addressing the, one gets 10 minutes the other one gets 5 minutes. Miss Collins you have 10 minutes to make your presentation.

Cathy Collins: Thank you very much Mr. Mayor and Councillors. I'm going to refer you to the EPC report dated July 9th, Item 4, page 1128, and the report on Property Planning and Development, Item 8, SP1/2008, page 5136. I'm appearing in regard to this report from EPC from July 9th, Item 4, page 1128, which is called "The Vision and Master Plan for the Health and Wellness Zone associated with the Health Sciences Complex" and it's an economic development grant request.

I'm appearing today on behalf of the West Alexander Residents Association Incorporated as its chair and as a member of the stakeholder group from the Centennial West Alexander Secondary Plan which the City completed, which is contained in a report from Property, Planning and development. That's the other item.

This master plan before you will permit the institutional expansion into land north of William, south of Logan, west of Sherbrook and east of Arlington. Suddenly this land has come to be called the Health and Wellness District by the Health Sciences Centre. Currently this land is home to nearly 400 residential buildings, Pinkham School, the City's own Fleet Management SAO, the Signals Branch of the Public Works yard and the Federal Lab and Canadian Blood Services.

I'm appearing in opposition to this for several reasons which I'll outline. The first is the missing stakeholders in this application. The only sponsor in this application is the Health Sciences Centre, and the Health Sciences Centre, Winnipeg Regional Health Authority is only one stakeholder from the secondary plan group.

The others include: McDermot/Sherbrook Residents Association, left out. The Centennial Community Improvement Association, left out. West Alexander Residents Association, left out. Elgin Avenue Residents Association, left out. The University of Manitoba, left out. The International Centre for Infectious Diseases, also left out. The Committee for the Canadian Centre for Animal and Human Health Research, left out. The National Microbiology Lab and the Public

Health Agency of Canada, left out. Red River College left out but not affected immediately. Myers Drugs and Riediger's, two small businesses that were part of the stakeholder group, also left out. Also missing, is Winnipeg School Division No. 1, well Winnipeg School Division, and the loss of housing in this area will impact severely on this, because Pinkham School will be closed and other schools in the inner city will be affected.

My second reason is in regards to these other parties which I have named. It is claimed that other stakeholders were consulted in this application but there are no letters of support. In fact there was disagreement among the institutions that I've listed above on the Secondary Plan Committee about the advancement into the expansion zone, how it would come about and how much intrusion was required and these institutions also want a voice.

The residents of West Alexander opposed the secondary plan at the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan hearing on May 26th because we felt the plan contained no mechanism to allow this expansion to occur fairly for the residents or in a way that would make the community safe in the interim.

This proposal before you, from EPC, says that Health Sciences will establish a subcommittee to retain a consultant. But this subcommittee will only have one representative, this subcommittee will have one representative from each institution, but which institutions? What about residents? Apparently, in the outlined plan, we are to be consulted or learn about things at public meetings.

But we have homes in this area, a lot of homes. All the stakeholders including the residents should be on the steering committee. The fact that so many people are left out will mean this defect will jeopardize the success of this proposal and if we are left out we will have to pursue other options, so this proposal is a no win proposal. Also, the City has land in this area. Is this land available for redevelopment?

The last reason I have is in terms of the proposal talks about a community development corporation. Health Sciences proposes to form a community development corporation for the expansion zone with a blue chip board of directors.

At present the government of Manitoba funds a community economic development corporation called the Central Neighbourhood Development Corporation that includes this area. The board of this corporation has a representative from Health Sciences Centre and one from Red River Community College. And this CEDC has been, has been but has been bypassed and it should not be bypassed.

Because of the concerns about the secondary plan, we know that we have to, we support the creation of a master plan but the fact is the details that are lacking which I've stated, need to be worked out. We actually like the proposed consultant in the application, but it is very important that the process be guided by all the stakeholders and not driven by one institution so residents must be involved.

Now, why, why hasn't this proposal appeared before Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Committee for discussion as it should be according to the City's procedures? There is an opportunity here and if we're going to do this right, this whole project correctly, we need to do it right. So please refer this item back so that all the stakeholders, including the residents, have a chance to provide meaningful input into this project.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Questions may be asked after Mr. Willis. You're on the same subject Mr. Willis?

Cathy Collins: Yeah he's with me.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead. Pardon? (Inaudible).

Cathy Collins: There is another one.

Mr. Speaker: Oh you two are together?

Cathy Collins: Yeah.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Miss Willis? We'll ask you, Cathy we will be asking questions after.

Mr. Speaker: Miss Willis you have five minutes.

Marion Willis: Good morning Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Mayor Sam Katz and City Council. My name is Marion Willis and I'm the Executive Director of the newly established Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation, managed by a board of directors of 15. We are responsible for community development in West Alexander, Central Park, and the Centennial neighbourhoods.

I'm here this morning to ask you to consider postponing decision on the matter before you, to allow for some further discussion between the department of Manitoba Inter-governmental Affairs, Neighbourhoods Alive, that funds our development corporation and the department of the Manitoba government that, that this proposal seeks to secure funding to support a new development corporation called the North William Development Corporation.

It seems to me that we would have overlapping mandates, and there would be duplicity in funding. And I can't imagine that, I can only think that the reason why… I can only imagine I guess, that the two departments of government are not aware of this proposal, because I can't imagine that the government of Manitoba would support funding two development corporations to do exactly the same thing.

I must say that the Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation supports the development. We are happy to see that you are moving forward with your vision. It's disappointing though, to note that there has been so little consultation with the relevant stakeholders.

I'm pleased that you will be engaging urban strategies. I think that urban strategies would likely echo what I would have to say to you about community development and that there is something that's a little bit different than community consultation that's called community engagement. And I think that one of the ways to mitigate some of the issues with the residents is to establish a process that engages the residents to become a little bit more involved in helping to reshape their futures, because it will require some reshaping.

I'm here to suggest to you clearly, that the Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation is the corporation that is best positioned to work with all of the stakeholders. We would be very pleased to work with a steering committee that is outlined in this report. And we see that the steering committee would have a very significant role. So we are not here to oppose.

We are here to let you know that perhaps that the developers of this proposal were not aware of the new Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation and the mandate that we've been given, which by the way is economic development, it is housing and land use planning, it is safety and justice, it is health and wellness, and education, training and employment.

So again, I ask you to postpone your decision-making on this until we've had some opportunity for the two government departments to get together so that we can discuss this further. I thank you for your time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. There will be some questions. Cathy Collins, Fred Currie. Would you please come? The first question is Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I'll just throw this open for whoever feels they have the best information to answer this question. We are about to approve the West Alexander Centennial Neighbourhood Plan. It would be helpful…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas, Councillor Thomas that one is a public hearing. We're dealing only with Item 4.

Councillor Thomas: It would be helpful if the process, because you're concerned about the process with regard to Item 4, it would be helpful if you could talk about how the process went and how you feel the differences are between that, since there was a reference made to a difference in the process of how that went forward.

Mr. Speaker: Who wants to answer that?

Councillor Thomas: What kind of consultation occurred?

Mr. Speaker: (Inaudible). Yes, yes, she asked any one from one of you three.

Cathy Collins: Fred can also speak to this. It was a long process, it was a difficult process, it was painful for residents because learning that a third of the people in your area may be gone because of the interests of expansion was very difficult and we, but we did have discussions, and we tried to be as candid as possible.

I don't want to discredit anyone on the committee but we had to reach consensus but the one issue that was difficult for us was that designated zone and that expansion into it, and ultimately, the concerns we expressed were that we needed to have similar to this a consultant come in and work on a strategy that would allow the expansion to occur in a way that was fair, to re-housing the people that were immediately impacted.

Mr. Speaker: Ms Collins, Ms Collins, please address Item 4 because the public hearing (Inaudible).

Cathy Collins: Okay, well that's why I wanted to know if I should answer that because… Okay, okay.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker just a Point of Order just perhaps to clarify for everybody.

Mr. Speaker: All right. What's your Point of Order?

Councillor Swandel: The West Alexander/Centennial Neighbourhoods area structure plan or secondary plan is something that we've closed public representation of which is on, and we haven't passed it yet which is why we need to stay focused on the item that's in front of us. Is that not correct?

Mr. Speaker: Item 4, only Item 4.

Councillor Thomas: That's why I was asking the question of process. I wanted to know what the process was for one because their concern is that the process is now different for Item 4. So…

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Thomas: I didn't want to know about the content I wanted to know about the process.

Mr. Speaker: Fred, Fred Currie, are you going to answer?

Fred Currie: Mr. Speaker, I will address some of the material from Item 4. In the key issues for Item 4, there is a brief with Item 4, and in the key issue it speaks of the consultation that took place during this process.

And our concern was you know, you're running on a tight budget when you're doing a plan. A lot of the people in the area that we're talking about are elderly. They could not come to the meetings. We asked for transportation there was no transportation available.

Many of them don't speak English. We also asked for translators and we didn't have translators. We couldn't go door to door and talk to people. My Portuguese is really bad. We needed somebody who spoke Portuguese. We need somebody who speaks Vietnamese. We need people who speak Chinese. We didn't have that. We couldn't contact people directly. We'd like to be able to do that. These people need to be talked about since they are liable to be driven out of their homes by the master plan. That's what the master plan is going to do. It's going to end people living in this area. Sorry, Councillor, it is.

Councillor Swandel: It's out of order.

Fred Currie: No it's not. It's right here. Read it.

Councillor Thomas: That's part of Item, Item 4.

Fred Currie: The stuff I'm talking about is in Item 4 and the key issue is…

Mr. Speaker: Questions, questions, questions, please. Councillor Thomas do you have a further question?

Councillor Thomas: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: What's your second question?

Councillor Thomas: My understanding in listening to what you're saying is that the plan that we will be approving on Property and Development, that some of the most contentious parts in it…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas, Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Is in item 4.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas. Councillor Thomas, Councillor Thomas I've shut your mic off. Councillor Thomas, please concentrate on Item 4 as Justin Swandel, Councillor Swandel had alluded to, it was a public hearing. The public hearings have been closed.

Councillor Thomas: Yes. Is it your concern that Item 4 represents contentious items that have not been resolved by the community that you feel need more consultation or less consultation?

Marion Willis: The answer to that is yes. And I guess that's why we're really pleased that there is a plan to engage urban strategies, because I think that they're experts in community development. They're very, very good at teaching all of us about how institutions and urban communities can all coexist together well. So I think that that's really very wise, and I think a lot of the issues will be addressed through this consulting group.

Again, I'm going to say to you that the appropriate way to engage the consulting group is through the Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation and to establish a committee as an arm of the Central Neighbourhoods Development Committee, or sorry, Corporation, and let's all work together to make this a positive and rewarding experience for everybody. And I think that can happen.

As I said before, the urban strategic planners will understand the difference between community consultation and community engagement, will look at all of the stakeholder roles and I think we'll be able to move forward in partnership. So again, I ask you to reserve decision-making on this until we've had an opportunity to discuss this further with all the stakeholders.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas that's your final question?

Councillor Thomas: Yes thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan your first question on Item 4.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to thank the delegations, Ms Collins, Mr. Currie and Mrs. Willis for coming down here today. I was pleased to hear that you're pleased with the consultant's urban strategies and that you're advocating for sort of a holistic community engagement process.

And so, you continue to say it that you wish as part of this recommendation going forward with the master plan, that the community be, that this committee going forward be comprised of residents, businesses, institutions, and headed by the Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation and not necessarily an arm of the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority or the Health Sciences Centre Foundation.

Marion Willis: And it actually wouldn't make sense to establish another development corporation that would be focused on a single issue. You need to know that Dana Erickson, who is the

Chief Administrative Officer of the Health Sciences Centre is on our board. You need to know that the Dean of Business Administration from Red River College is on our board. You need to also understand, or perhaps feel sorry for me that I have the proponents and the dissidents comprising my board, so I attend some very interesting board meetings.

But having said that, does that not create a tremendous opportunity for all of us, you know, to work together with this consulting group, to come up with a plan, you know, where everybody feels that they win. You know, what I'm hearing from the residents and I've only been around since May but what I hear from the residents is they are not so opposed to the development. They feel that there hasn't been consultation and again there is a misunderstanding between what constitutes what consultation is and what engagement is.

And, so again this is all going to be worked out through the urban strategic planners but I can't imagine that the three levels of government would be funding two development corporations to do the same thing. We are new, it's quite likely that that wasn't a known fact, so we need to have some further discussion around this. Otherwise we're all going to get ourselves into a lot of trouble here. And I'm here to move things forward in a good way so let's figure out how we work together on this and reserve decision-making for another time.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question, Councillor? No questions? Thank you ladies and gentleman, for appearing.

Colin Craig on behalf of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, in support of Item 5 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July 9th of 2008 regarding Winnipeg Parking Authority. Mr. Craig. You have 10 minutes.

Colin Craig: Okay, well good morning and thank you for the opportunity to speak here today. Someone mentioned yesterday that this is the final Council meeting before you have your August break and it's kind of like the last day of school so I will promise to keep my comments brief here.

On behalf of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation I would like to speak in favour of some of the recommendations in the Winnipeg Parking Authority's 2008 Business Plan.

First and foremost it is encouraging to see that the Parking Authority has recommended to sell the Winnipeg Square Parkade. It's the position of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation that municipal governments should not, should abstain wherever possible in engaging in activities that require them to compete head to head with the private sector. Simply put, the City of Winnipeg should not be in the parking business.

As you are all aware for the last 20 plus years the City has owned the facility and with it the air rights to developing above the parkade. Obviously during the same period, no significant development has taken place to take advantage of those air rights. Who knows what potential could be unleashed with the divestiture of that asset. The selling off of this asset will be a step towards possible development of that land and facility. On a similar note who knows what potential could be unleashed through the selling off of the City's two other parkades and surface parking lots.

On behalf of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation I encourage Council to examine selling those facilities as well. I understand that some concern has been raised.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Craig, Mr. Craig we're not talking about selling, we're talking about raising the fees.

Colin Craig: I indicated on the phone that I wanted to speak in favour of the report which recommends…

Mr. Speaker: Yeah but you alluded to the selling, selling. We are not selling.

Colin Craig: The report indicates that the Winnipeg Square Parkade would be, the

City would be looking at selling off that facility.

Mr. Speaker: Looking, not now, not here.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of Order Mr. Speaker. The report refers for information that there is an expression of interest being done, so perhaps that's appropriate.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead.

Colin Craig: That's, that is what we're in favour of is looking at selling the facility.

Councillor Steeves: Why is Gerbasi always sticking up for the Taxpayers Federation? (Laughter).

Councillor Swandel: Yeah what's this?

Councillor Steeves: Always in cahoots.

Councillor Swandel: Cahoots with the Taxpayers Federation that Councillor Gerbasi.

Mr. Speaker: Which means she is a member of it. Go ahead, Mr. Craig.

Colin Craig: I think Council is aware of the position of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation on this. Okay.

I hope it's clear what it is that we are in support of. I think it's a positive step that Council is looking at possible sale of this facility and I'm here to speak in favour of that.

And I do understand that some concerns have been raised about you know, looking at, even looking at selling this facility as some believe that the City has a role to play in the parking business in an attempt to keep the prices low. And I would note that on page 10 of the report, it indicates the City will be setting its rates in accordance with the ongoing market rate, so that dispels that myth.

On another note I would also like to voice support for recommendation 5a which allows the Parking Authority to tender out parking enforcement services. This is a positive step in opening up a City service to competition, and it's a fair step in allowing all Winnipeggers to put together a bid and provide these services.

While I do have concerns with the projected growth of the Parking Authority's debt for 2008 to grow from $8.2 to $9.1 million dollars, the Parking Authority is projecting to reduce its debt to $2.8 million dollars by 2010. And I hope that they meet that target.

So again, thank you for the opportunity to speak here today and finally there are some positive recommendations in this report, and I look forward to tracking their progress. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Colin. I believe there is a question. Councillor Fielding you have the first question?

Councillor Fielding: Yes, Mr. Craig if that is your name. Just wanted to, in terms of your point with the expression of interest, I think there have been some figures that have been bandied about whether it be $20 to $50 million that it might be worth. What would your organization feel that the money should go to towards in terms of if the City is able to bring in some assets or some money for the parkade?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Craig?

Colin Craig: I think first and foremost it should be used for retirement of any debt and second to that, it could be used for core City services such as building and repairing roads, as well as helping to maintain the property tax freeze, as well as the possibility of looking at the elimination of the business tax.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillor? Councillor Swandel your first question.

Councillor Swandel: Just a question for clarification here Colin. Just want to make sure that you're aware that what we're looking at here is an expression of interest to get an understanding of what this business does for the City to rationalize that in the best interest of taxpayers to see whether they should actually be marketed or not. And that those decisions that we will be making,

inside this special operating agency, will be business-based and be made in the best interest of taxpayers. Do you understand that?

Colin Craig: Yes, thank you.

Councillor Swandel: Good.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Mr. Colin, thank you Mr. Craig.

The final delegation is Mr. Tran. Mr. Tran, you have five minutes with no questions.

Ty Tran: Good morning Mr. Speaker, Mayor Sam Katz, Councillors. I apologize I didn't bring any prepared speeches but I would like to speak from my heart today. Today is a very big day for the City of Winnipeg and I understand there are growing concerns about accessibility. I have done many, many researches going on about indoor water parks around North America, and the current prices in Grand Forks Canad Inn offers for ages 6 years old and up of $15 and under age 5 is $7, which is very, very reasonable. The average standard rate for indoor world-class water parks like West Edmonton Mall, all the water parks in the Wisconsin Dell costs $29.95 per person.

What I'm here today to stand before you is, my major concern is, a tiny portion of my tax dollars goes to this park is that I would like this water park to be for all ages, not just from 2 to 12 years old. And another thing is that I want to make sure that this park has a lot of toys I'd call it, for all of us.

Such as a wave pool which is a must have, and even though some people might say it's outdated, but it's not, because to us it's brand new. For other cities, yes, it's old, they've been there done that but to us it's exciting so we need it, okay. A family hot tub is fine, flow rider, which is a surf rider, two inner tubes, a lazy river, one to a high speed slide which is my favourite. And one day if we have it here I would like to invite Councillor Smith to join me to jump down a 5 storey high. The reason why, because today…

Councillor Steeves: No Speedo. No Speedo. (Laughter).

Ty Tran: He's got to come in a Speedo. It's the second best thing to a theme park. (Laughter).

Councillor Steeves: No Speedo. Point of Order no Speedo. (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Tran Councillor Smith has accepted.

Ty Tran: Thank you. I would like to see your (inaudible) shorts, too. And, of course, a mind blaster which many people thought is a zip coaster is another known water coaster which is an unbelievable ride to have.

We are a city of opportunity, and Councillors, you all have the heart to make it happen today. And please don't make me wait for another 32 years because I can't afford to go. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Tran. Now to get down to business, Executive Policy Committee report of June 25th, 2008, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 25, 2008

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 6.

Mr. Speaker: Item 6 is stood down.

Councillor Thomas: There is a motion on 6.

Councillor Gerbasi: There is a motion on it.

Mr. Speaker: And a motion. So items 1 to 5.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 6, Mr. Clerk.

Item 6 - Development Proposals for Indoor Water Park - Economic Development Grant, File PR-2

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we all got the gist of Mr. Tran's excitement and exuberance. To my knowledge he has been at this for at least four years, collected somewhere between 17 and 20,000 signatures from Winnipeggers who want a water park.

It's rather obvious Mr. Speaker that the private sector didn't think this was the most wonderful money maker because as you can see we don't have a water park in our City, unlike other cities. And as a result of having some monies available for recreational facilities we have made $7 million dollars available.

Now, what are we getting back for this Mr. Speaker? That's what it's really all about. One, a world-class water park for the citizens of Winnipeg, in the City of Winnipeg, long overdue.

Number two, the private sector is investing over $44 million dollars. They will be paying approximately a million dollars in incremental tax which the City will get every year. In addition to that they're providing $700,000 dollars a year towards making sure that this is publicly accessible.

Mr. Speaker, if this isn't a win/win, I don't know what is. $700,000 dollars over 25 years, you can do the arithmetic. And I have heard concerns that have been raised this morning obviously in the paper, and I'm sure they will be repeated again today and I will address them later on. But the realities are this is a phenomenal opportunity. This pays for itself. The City is getting back a phenomenal return. I don't see how anybody could not see this as something good.

I know there are those who may have preferred a different location, whether it be St. Boniface, whether it be downtown, but the bottom line Mr. Speaker, we can only look at the proposals that are put around the table. This was one of them. This was the most successful. This group also has a fairly phenomenal track record with water parks as well.

So, I will now be waiting with anticipation to hear from Councillor Gerbasi and others who want to speak on this.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Pagtakhan you have a motion. Motion No. 3 would you like to introduce it?

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi

WHEREAS it is important for all citizens of Winnipeg to be able to afford the admission into the proposed Indoor Water Park;

AND WHEREAS the business plan, which will include admission rates, has not been made available for consideration by Council;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council lay over Report #6 of EPC dated June 25, 2008 until such time as the business plan has been made available.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I just want to say really quickly on the clause and on this project, I'm excited about having a water park, the prospects of having a water park in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada and I want to thank the proponent for submitting his proposal.

I do want to say though that I forwarded a motion here, I don't have all of the information that makes me feel comfortable to completely support this project here today on the floor of Council. I think it's proper business protocol and proper business practice to do our due diligence and to have all members of Council be apprised with a proper business plan. I know that when we have projects in our communities and we're providing funding to organizations we often ask first for a business plan and after that a grant is forthcoming. So that's the sort of the practice that I'm coming forth with here today.

And the motion is very simple. I think it's a very friendly motion. It's simply saying to lay this matter over until we receive some of the details, specifically, the details of the admission towards citizens for access to this water park.

I understand, I can do the math and I understand that you know, we'll recoup, this $700,000 dollars every year of a grant but if the admission is, if the admission is anything over $20 bucks or in that neighborhood Mr. Speaker, a $10 discount really won't do a lot.

So I'm just hoping that we can get the support of Council on this friendly motion to lay the matter over until we've seen a business plan with regards to the admission. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There is a motion on the floor to lay this Item 6 over. Are there any further speakers, on the lay over motion?

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: You can't speak to a motion for lay over. Sam can speak against it though.

Mr. Speaker: Okay Councillor, the Mayor, the Mayor, you have a right to speak against it. Please.

Councillor Vandal: Just the lay over.

Mr. Speaker: Just the lay over.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, the goal here is to have this built and complete and open for November of 2009. That's the objective here.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the admission price, I think it's unfortunate that some numbers were thrown out because there is nobody on the floor of Council right now that has any idea what admission prices are. You heard Mr. Tran quote and others, what the price is in Grand Forks, we know that to be real.

But I can assure you this Mr. Speaker that anyone who is investing $44 million dollars in a world-class, indoor water park is going to make sure that supply and demand come to meet. They are not going to charge too much because people won't come. They're not going to charge too little. They have to get a return.

The realities are they will charge a fair price. I think their track record has shown that. And on top of that Mr. Speaker, I have asked Councillors before, what do you think should be a reasonable discount? And you know what to date, no one has ever come up with a number other than yours truly.

The realities are, whatever the number is for the admission, whether it's $15, whether it's $18, whether it's $12, whether it's $22, this Council has the opportunity with $700,000 dollars available every year to make sure that it's affordable and accessible to those people who we want to make sure can access it.

And I can tell you Mr. Speaker, there are other projects in this City we've invested significantly more money and not one Councillor was concerned about can people access a concert? All of a sudden people have a concern. We're dealing with credible people. We have the final say. And we can certainly make sure it's accessible and affordable. I want to get this completed by November of '09. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote please.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote has been called for. On Motion No. 3, a motion by Councillor Pagtakhan. Motion moved by Councillor Pagtakhan, seconded by Councillor Gerbasi to lay this report over.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Thomas, Vandal.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Leipsic, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 4, Nays 12.

Mr. Speaker: It's Lost.

On the motion Councillor Gerbasi. On Item 6. Item 6.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Speaker. Winnipeg is a winter city and a world-class indoor water park is something that many citizens would love to enjoy year round, and however, unfortunately I am not able to support this current proposal to subsidize the Canad Inn hotel expansion and water park with recreational dollars from the City of Winnipeg.

In January of this year, Council decided to offer $7 million dollars for a water park, I was very clear if you check Hansard that my support for any given proposal came with very clear conditions. These conditions unfortunately have not been met.

To take $7 million dollars from a rapid transit project and then to take it from a recreational development in a north end park, and then to take it to a private water park development is a real stretch. But the only way it could possibly be justified as a use of public money would be if it were to be demonstrate achieving benefits to the public good in a couple of key areas.

Firstly, it should be built in or near the downtown or be part of a significant revitalization effort in a depressed area. This is not the case with this proposal. Now, it is my view that the request for proposals timeframe and this was something I spoke to EPC about when this came forward, that the request for proposal timeframe was too short and did not allow enough time to pull together a complex proposal in the downtown or in a declining area.

These types of developments are more complicated and also require leadership, patience, creativity and flexibility. To make a downtown renewal project happen the City would have had to been more proactive and determined to take the time and effort to make the proposal come together.

It's a lot easier to hand over money to someone who is in a thriving area with no infrastructure needs or relatively none, who are already expanding their facility. And the lack of spinoff revitalization from this project makes this harder to justify the investment of public funds.

Another key factor is whether or not spending public money on this project is justified is whether the park is affordable and accessible to all citizens. Now some of us have been asking questions about the affordability of the water park all along and it is fairly frustrating to get a sketchy information from a last minute email from the public service the day before Council. The public service is scrambling to explain what they can do to make the best of this difficult situation and I frankly feel sorry for them.

I have been advised by the public service, it isn't in my mind as Councillor O'Shaughnessy alluded to, it was actually in an email from the director, which said that he, the direct, it was from the administration and they said that the director believes that an admission to similar water parks in is a range of $20 to $35 per person depending on the amenities. Well I'm sorry that's all the information I have and that came from our administration.

We have also heard that Canad Inns is proposing 200 discounts per day of $10

each. And the public service is scrambling with some ideas about doubling up the discount or finding a way to make this affordable but we don't know if any of that will happen yet. Realistically how many $10 off coupons is one family going to be allowed to use? For a family of four with a price range of $20 to $35 this means a cost of $80 to $140 to get in the door. A $10 discount is not going to make this affordable or accessible to those of low income.

Councillors are being asked to vote for this right now and assume that these issues will be resolved later. Yet we have not been told enough detail such as the actual price of admission or exactly how the proposed discounts will work and we won't be until the final business plan is ready. And I strongly believe that a business plan that includes admission prices and more details of how the discounts will work should be required before Council proceeds any further. Unfortunately that motion was just defeated.

Councillors and Council will ultimately be responsible if it turns out that a lot of our citizens are not able to utilize this facility. The numbers we have right now are not very encouraging, to achieve the goal of a truly accessible facility that everybody can use. And we're not talking about concerts, we're talking about recreation. There is a difference.

I'd also like to allude to the fact that other water parks, yes, we don't have a water park right now, but we all know that one is being proposed in the Point Douglas area whether that's going to happen or not, but we understand that that is not being, expecting a public subsidy. So it's just a little confusing about why this public subsidy is required.

And it was also mentioned that there is $900,000 dollars in incremental taxes that we're going to get. And I would like to ask first of all, if that $900,000 dollars in incremental taxes per year, how much of that is from the hotel expansion and includes hotel tax and all of those things? Probably a lot of it I would guess but maybe that could be answered, is from the hotel expansion which is probably something that Canad Inns could probably do anyway if they wanted to expand a hundred new rooms that would probably bring in a fair bit of hotel tax. So I'm not really clear about how much benefit in terms of public money that's coming back to the City.

So in conclusion, the question and the only question we really need to answer today is, is this the best use of $7 million dollars of public money? This water park is not downtown. It's not in a depressed area. It will not contribute to community revitalization. We don't know the price of admission and there are strong doubts that it will affordable to all, particularly to struggling families which is how most people go to water parks, it's always a family. And I know as a middle class person I really hesitated about spending $100 and something bucks to go to the West Edmonton Mall because that's expensive for half an afternoon of swimming when you're raising young kids.

So I'm very disappointed. You know we're in a hurry to do things around here and I'm glad we're getting rid of red tape and I'm glad we are doing things quickly but we need to do things right and I don't think we're doing this right. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: There we are. Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm looking forward to this discussion I think it's an important one. I guess we can start with the premise that everyone on Council seems to be generally in favour of the prospect of us building a high, I guess a larger water park, a better water park for the citizens of this City. And I think we should start with that acknowledgement because I think it's a good place to start. This Council doesn't always have the luxury of beginning with everybody having that same mind set. So that's a positive, I think.

It would appear, as the Mayor has stated, that based on our history as a City, that nobody in the private sector is going to

come forward and do this of their own volition. Otherwise it's going, it would have happened already. I think we can all take that as a fact. I mean there has been some talk lately about something being attached to a potential football stadium that might occur in one part of the City, but really, really, if we look at the actual history of the private sector in this City, the opportunities have been numerous to do this but it has not been done.

So it would appear that if we do in fact agree this is a worthwhile thing for our City, we're going to have to get involved, to a certain extent we're going to have to get our hands a bit dirty and do some hard work on this. So, we instructed our public service to go out with an expression of interest and qualification which I think is an appropriate way to go about this and they did so on our behalf and everybody I think was in favour of doing that.

When it came back at the appropriate time we had a chance to compare the other bids and look at what made the most sense for the City of Winnipeg and not us, no Councillors sitting around this table came to the determination that this should be the bid. It was our public service, learned schooled people that they are knowing a little bit about these types of projects, that came to the determination that this project was the one that was most viable, and has the very best chance of succeeding. So we have that.

We have our public service telling us, Councillors, right across the board, in our opinion, this is the project that makes sense and that means something to me. Whenever you depart from that type of advice, the advice that we're paying for, the advice that the citizens are paying for, you better be careful about how you do it.

The chosen bid as you are aware, had a lot to do, I think, with an operator, a proponent who has a proven track record in such ventures and we're very lucky I think in Winnipeg to have a person who has this type of specific ability, proven ability, over and over and over again, to launch this type of venue and seemingly to make it very, very successful. I'm not saying that we have to listen to every single thing that this proponent has to say each and every time, but it does seem on its face, that this is a very credible partner with which we could become engaged. I think anyone would make that assessment.

I want to acknowledge the concern though that's been raised by Councillor Gerbasi and doubtless will be raised by other of our Council colleagues. No one on this Council wants to, at the end of the day wind up with a water park that citizens can't access. That is in nobody's interest, sitting around this table. It's not in my interest as a Councillor from St. Vital, the Councillor from St. Norbert and the Councillor from Daniel McIntyre. It doesn't make sense for anybody, for any of us, to wind up with a water park that people cannot access.

Now, there was an email that went out yesterday, I thought it was a bit unfortunate, and maybe premature, that did sort of list a range of pricing. Again, that is not a determination of pricing to get into this water park and let's be clear about that. If people want to debate different things we can do that but please do not put forward the premise that there has been a decision made with respect to admission price to this water park. Everybody here knows, all 16 of us, that decision has not been made. And that decision has yet to be made.

I'm going to read again, the final part of paragraph one which reads "and that grant in the amount of $7 million dollars to Canad Inns be approved subject to Canad Inns entering into satisfactory Public Access and Capital Funding Agreements. We have to figure this out and we have to do something that makes sense and good for us for having this debate and putting it on the table right now. Because we all know the Winnipeg market and the last thing again any of us want to do is wind up with a park that people can't access, that doesn't work socially and it probably doesn't work economically either.

We have to address this and look at it this way Mr. Speaker in my respectful opinion. We have to ensure that at the end of the

day the public use of this facility, is going to be a vital part of the business plan that will make this park successful. What we want to be very careful to avoid and all 16 of us have to be diligent and vigilant about this, we can never enter into a business plan that would allow this type of project to succeed without the public coming out in very large numbers to support it. If we did that then yes, it would be possible for an individual proponent to preclude members of the public by having such high prices that people couldn't access it.

So that is our task. And that is what we are going to collectively ask our public service to do on our behalf. Do not get us into an agreement that could ever possibly succeed without the citizens of the City of Winnipeg accessing this park. There is no way at the end of the day we want a deal on this park that would allow it to go ahead as an economic model by virtue of only hotel patrons patronizing this park. Personally I doubt that's possible.

I think we're a little bit fortunate Mr. Speaker that we can look just a little bit to the south in Grand Forks. I did about 45 seconds of research on pricing down there and for a half day pass it looks like it's around $11 bucks for an adult and $5 dollars for a child under 6 I believe.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Over 6.

Councillor Steeves: However that, over 6, and under 6, $11 and $5 dollars. I don't know if this is, if that's an apples to apples comparison but seemingly, these are not market prices that would preclude members by and large from the public, especially if you work in the concept of a voucher system.

Right now I would submit Mr. Speaker to you and to members of this Council and to members of the public, there is enough here to credibly move forward with this report to the next phase which is going to be working out "satisfactory public access". I'm going to be voting for this Mr. Speaker but make no mistake our work is not yet done on this file.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I hate to be the skunk at the garden party here because I like and my family likes water parks as much as the next person but I'm not going to be supporting this for one main reason and it's been alluded to.

I believe that we can build a water park with little public subsidy as part of a stadium redevelopment and I believe the Mayor believes that because he is negotiating quite seriously with Creswin, David Asper on the Point Douglas proposal. And we know that part of that Point Douglas proposal is a water park. And I believe that and Mr. Asper believes that.

And if you don't believe me I'm going to read you what is on his blue and gold web page. "Disney's creative genius would make a big splash in Manitoba, world's leading water park designer offers unforgettable and affordable downtown oasis for all. The world's leading water park designer and creator of Icons and Disney World, Niagara Falls, West Edmonton Mall would make a big splash in downtown Winnipeg as its design to historic Point Douglas moves forward". And it goes on to talk about community access, partnerships to allow people of lesser economic means to access this water park.

This is coming from David Asper who is a pretty credible fellow who is committed to doing something in Point Douglas and we know that the City is working with him. In fact we've signed a Memorandum of Understanding to make the Point Douglas development happen.

And if you don't believe or think that the Point Douglas proposal is real, then you should talk to Canad Inns and Leo Ledohowski about another stadium proposal which is in my ward, the Canada Packer's site where it was quite clear the expressions of interest that Canad Inns would build a hotel and they would build a water park as an addition to a new stadium. Now make no mistake about it, the new stadium, whether or not it ever gets built, involves some public subsidy.

But I believe there is a will. I believe there is a need to actually solve the stadium dilemma in the City of Winnipeg and I believe that through that process we could take that $7 million dollars that we're now subsidizing a water park on a one off, take that $7 million dollars and throw it in as part of the package to actually deliver a stadium, a hotel, a water park, a wider attraction amenity, public good for the City of Winnipeg and I don't know why we're not doing that.

We know that negotiations are ongoing. We know that we're already several months behind the 8-ball on this whole proposal and it makes some sense if there is the potential to take that $7 million dollars and invest it in the stadium redevelopment somewhere, which includes a water park. I don't know why we wouldn't do that. It's common sense to me.

Councillor Gerbasi has made some good points about access and I have those very same concerns and I think we all do. As Councillor Steeves said, nobody wants to build a water park that's not accessible for our citizens. And I'll quote the Mayor who clearly stated on the floor of this Council that "he doesn't know why people are concerned because nobody knows what the admission prices are going to be at this point."

Well when I hear the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg say that, then I get more concerned. Nobody knows what the admission prices are going to be. We know through an email that came out at about three o'clock yesterday afternoon there is $10 vouchers, we don't know what the price is. We don't know if we can take two of those $10 vouchers and make them one and bring families.

So I think there is a lot of information missing here. This is a very significant public investment into a water park and of course, I would love to go to a water park. Who wouldn't? I know Ty Tran, he's a constituent of mine, lives in St. Boniface and we've been friends for four years and we've had many conversations about water parks.

But I think now is the time to look at the big picture, look at what we're doing with the stadium. There is going to be some public investment there. There are some proposals there. The person we're giving $7 million dollars to has already said he would build the water park for no public subsidy if he could have a crack at a stadium.

So what are we doing? We're giving him $7 million dollars and saying go build this water park over here, we're going to negotiate with David Asper over here on a proposal that I don't know what it's going to end up costing and this is all going to come together in time for the next election.

Mr. Speaker I have those concerns. I think the solution to this issue is to keep your eyes on the stadium prize and negotiate prudently and then the water park will be delivered somewhere in the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Vandal. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. You know, this is an interesting debate. I think it's a win/win situation. I'm supporting the water park, and I'm doing it because it's going to provide us with a world-class facility, a wave pool, a lazy river, a family whirlpool, an adult whirlpool, a children's activity pool, inner tube slides, a water roller coaster, bow water slide. It sounds fabulous. You know, and we're putting $7 million in but we're going to get $700,000 dollars every year in reductions for making it accessible. It seems to me if you multiply that by 25, for 25 years, that's $17,500,000 we're going to be getting. So it seems to me that this is worthwhile.

I see that Councillor Gerbasi is a little puzzled by that but the fact is this is going to in effect provide a facility, it's going to provide what young people want, and everyone wants for a winter city. It seems to me this is a reasonable thing to do.

You know it's, it puzzles me why we have the opinion that we have the David Asper stadium proposal for Point Douglas but

that's iffy/iffy. You know like, we have this before us now. I've waited for something to happen in this direction for a long time, so I'm going to be very supportive. I want this to pass and I really would like it to be unanimous you know because quite truthfully it's going to benefit the residents of Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry, it's going to help us all in this City. It will make Winnipeg an up-to-date city with recreation. I support it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I thought this was a very positive recommendation that was coming here this morning and I was somewhat surprised when I got here today and found out about a) the motion, and some of the discomfort with this particular clause.

It's interesting. I certainly believe in democracy, both my father and my father-in-law fought for it for a number of years and I believe that everybody has the right to express their thoughts. And for the most part I accept that and I take the time to respect people's comments a) when you come to the podium and hear whether they're a delegation or whether it's one of my colleagues or any other member of the public frankly that calls.

But sometimes it gets a little frustrating Mr. Speaker that some people feel that just for the sake of being heard they have to be opposed to something, that nothing can ever go through here unanimously, even when it's one of the most exciting things that's come along in a long time, or not. Which this is. And I just don't understand it sometimes.

The clause is so simple if you read it. A proposal was created and people answered the proposal. Somebody has chosen and we have to move forward. And going beyond what Councillor Steeves said it says "that authority be delegated to the Chief Administrative Officer" after today "to finalize a schedule for the project delivery with Canad Inns that would be acceptable to the City of Winnipeg, finalize the terms, and conditions of the Public Access and Capital Funding Agreements."

Now it's really unfortunate that that email got sent yesterday, that somebody bothered to answer at all, because the attempt wound up creating a bigger problem than if they wouldn't have answered. That happens from time to time.

But you know I was in the room when this was created. We had $43 million dollars. We tried to do some good things with it. But we recognized that there were certain things we couldn't do. We didn't have enough money, Mr. Speaker.

And there are some very, very good things coming out of this $43 million dollars. There is a huge development taking place in Councillor Thomas' ward, that I drove by the other day. Another one in Councillor Smith's is nearing completion. Another one that I fought for personally in Councillor Pagtakhan's ward, in the north end where we're going to look at spending $6 to $7 million dollars on a new community centre adjacent to and inside of the Old Exhibition grounds. All of those initiatives are in older parts of the City, Mr. Speaker.

Some of us in the suburbs have had some money and by the way, the hundred thousand dollars that my ward got towards a skateboard park, we're thankful for. It wasn't a huge amount of money in comparison to some of these other projects but we were thankful to get it and we made the efforts to try and spread it around as best we could.

But we recognized that the problem that we were trying to solve was more related towards the inner city, except I hate using the word, because that's, we're all one city Mr. Speaker. I'm a City Councillor. I make decisions for the betterment of the City, not just to do with my ward even though that's where I get elected. And that's what this issue was.

We created an opportunity and we put forward $7 million dollars and an entrepreneur, a very well known entrepreneur in our City came forward

and accepted the opportunity and is as a result of that, looking at a major expansion.

And when you look at our $7 million dollars and what do we get for that? We get access for 25 years that's worth approximately $17-1/2 million dollar return. And it's not a matter that the City is not receiving the money. Somebody is going to benefit to the tune of that kind of money in reduced rates, whatever they're going to wind up being, to be able to use that facility.

Over and above that because I think of the size of the expansion and yes, there will be some extra hotel rooms because the gentleman involved isn't stupid. He understands that he's going to try and use this facility to make some money besides, that's what he is in business for. And we're going to get a spin off of a somewhere between $900,000 and million dollars a year forever. What a terrible deal, Mr. Speaker. I can't imagine why we could go for something like that.

And yet, is it ever, is it going to be unanimous? Not a chance that it will be unanimous Mr. Speaker. It's just not wonderful enough. This is Winnipeg we can't do anything that's exciting and pass anything unanimous. We've got to have somebody, all the time, come forward, there has always got to be a naysayer, there's always got to be somebody that's got a problem.

And by the way that website over there that talks about the Blue Bombers and their stadium, doesn't talk about who's going to pay for anything. And if you think something is going to happen over here, let me know where the $200 million is going to come from to start moving roads and doing all those other things and then talk to me about what's on the Bomber website. And by the way, we didn't choose who the opportunistic person was going to be to try and come forward with some kind of a stadium proposal. The Blue Bombers did and they still hold complete control over that initiative. It has got nothing to do with City Council.

This proposal Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned, is exciting for the young people in this City. It's something we haven't had. I've never understood why, that somebody hasn't brought forward something like this before, and put an opportunity together like this. I'm extremely happy that I was in the room when we actually created this idea, and the initiative, excuse me, came forward.

I think, I can tell you, I was skeptical at the time that a private entrepreneur might jump all over this, but I'm extremely pleased that they did. And I'm extremely pleased that it's going to be going in an area, while it's not exactly right downtown where some people think everything has to be, it's in a location that's pretty easy to get at for everybody and I think it's important that that's the case. And while it's not exactly, immediately downtown it's pretty close. And so I'm pretty happy about that.

Mr. Speaker, I'm, I know that by standing here and venting which is what I feel like I'm doing today because I didn't plan to even to speak to this, that I'm not under any illusions that when we have the call that 16 people are going to stand up because I know that some of them aren't. But I would like the opportunity to have my democratic right to tell them what I think about how they're going to vote today because I think it's a shame that something as exciting as this isn't going to be unanimous in this chamber Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Clement. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today to speak of my support of this initiative and you know I truly believe the City of Winnipeg needs to start looking at different models like this to deliver our services to our citizens. This is the number one priority of our citizens. In my opinion, the average citizen and I've said it before I don't think, it doesn't matter to them whether these types of services are delivered by a non-profit, profit organization or the City of Winnipeg. What they really want us to ensure is that this type of facility, a water park, is done

and they can use it with their families to enjoy.

So this proposal is very much a step in the right direction because it does four things. First of all it gets the water park built. It shortens, it gets the water park built so everyone can enjoy it. The City makes its money back, investment in a very short period of time. It's more efficient in terms of the way we deliver our services and there is a public access agreement that allows our citizens to go here at a reduced rate.

Well Mr. Speaker I think we all know the reasons why we've had to move in this general direction to have the private sector. It's the construction costs. We've talked about it before in this chamber. They've gone up anywhere from 25% to 30% in terms of projects and has put a lot of stress in terms of our capital projects.

Councillor Clement and others have talked about the $43 million dollars that we originally allocated for recreational facilities and to be quite frank, the money hasn't, we haven't been able to create what we wanted to and what was first imposed or suggested we wanted with the $43 million dollars. So the City of Winnipeg really needs to find ways to stretch our money and deliver our services in a more efficient manner.

Another reason, Mr. Speaker and I'm very pleased that this is something that we did talk about in the Economic Opportunity Commission in terms of some of the rec facilities that are there. We know that, I guess it's in 2007 numbers that our rec facilities run about a $10 million dollar deficit in and of itself right now. The Commission recommended using outside providers to run any new facilities that come on line. The rationale for this is of course the cost for the City, the City, how the City can provide it far exceeds what the private sector non-profits can deliver.

A good example of this of course is the YMCA as they run their facilities at budget or surplus compared to our facilities. Right in my backyard, the Centennial Pool, I think in 2007 numbers ran about a $800,000 deficit in terms of their operating. Right across the street at the YMCA they were able to deliver the service in the black or at least at a cost savings. What this tells me is we are not experts at running these types of facilities and we might, and if you look at the memberships, whether it be at the YMCA verses a City facility it's a lot less.

So when it comes down to service costs the same 19-year-old that's delivering service for the City of Winnipeg is going to make anywhere from $19 to $22 an hour, that same person that would work at a Canad Inns or a non-profit like the YMCA is going to make $9 an hour. So how can we compete with this model? That's why we need to move to different models like this.

Another item Mr. Speaker that's been brought up by some critics is in terms of why a water park? Why are we spending this money? So I would like to address this, express the concerns. The reality is, this is something that was identified by our public as a definite need for our citizens and that's why we're moving on this. So that's why the money was allocated, the $43 million dollars to move on a water park that's a definite need for the City of Winnipeg and our citizens because that's why we're delivering it.

Also, Mr. Speaker in terms of the taxation, I mean it has been addressed before but this is going to bring $900,000 dollars more of property taxes, business taxes and hotel taxes on line. So my rudimentary math tells me that in eight years this project is going to pay for itself. Sounds like a pretty good deal to me.

A partnership with the Canad Inns will also provide benefits in terms of a reduced rate for a number of years and the $56 million dollars, I think its $56 million dollars for the combined project, $43 for the water park is going to create jobs in our economy too as well.

The Public Access Agreement it has been talked about before and I won't go in too much details but the $700,000 dollars over the 25 years is roughly in equivalent of a subsidy to our citizens of around $17,500. We've looked at some of the

pricing and Ty Tran has brought it up and others, in terms of some of the costs that Canad Inns has been able to deliver in some of their facilities at that (inaudible). So I think the access agreement is something that will make it affordable for our citizens.

One of the last things I want to talk about is location. You know I think we did try to address the location of this, putting a facility downtown, we incorporated an expression of interest that was put out there and the reality is we got a number of proposals that came in and the Canad Inns was the best proposal. It's five minutes from downtown. I can guarantee you that. Five or ten minutes, it depends on, and it's great bus access so it is somewhere where there is a definite need in that area as well as close to downtown. So I think it makes a lot of sense as Councillor Clement said, I don't think every project needs to go downtown. There is other parts of the City, the suburbs, in around the Polo Park area makes a lot of sense I think for taxpayers.

So in conclusion, I'm very supportive and excited about the project. I think it gets the water park built number one. It provides us with a more efficient means to delivering these services. We're making our money back in eight years Mr. Speaker and I think that makes sense for the taxpayer. So I'm very supportive of this initiative and look forward to 2009 in November when I can take my children and our neighbour's children to a facility like this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Fielding. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of the motion and the proposal that is coming forward here today.

Long before running for public office I felt Winnipeg lacked indoor water facilities whether it was wave pools, water parks, we are vastly lacking a resource like this and it's something I would like to see. $7 million dollars is a bargain. We're getting a multi-million dollar water park in the City of Winnipeg and it's a great amenity for all the children in the area.

The reality is up until now the private sector didn't have the business case to do it. That's why we had to provide that $7 million dollar incentive and I'm glad to see that this is actually going to get it done.

When it comes to location everyone has their favourite spots. Councillor Vandal would have liked to have seen it in his ward at Canada Packers. Councillor Gerbasi would like to see it right downtown in her ward. I personally like the idea of the Harbourview Kilcona site that Creswin had proposed. I only read about it in the report that came out. I had no idea that was on the table.

The reality is, there was a criteria set, it needed to be accessible by public transport. It needed to have parking facilities. There were criteria that were set and the location that won was Canad Inns at Polo Park. That's what we are going with. It makes sense. You know, was it my first choice? No. Does it make sense? Absolutely.

I have people who when they heard in the media that downtown was being given extra consideration were very much opposed to it. The notion of it going into the Canada Post building downtown, they didn't feel safe sending their kids downtown on public transit to wander around downtown to get to the Canada Post facility for example, if that you know ever had any play and they didn't want to pay for parking, for Winnipeg. So there were concerns with those scenarios

When it comes to admission, there are many instances where Council here has decided that this is a public good. It may not make necessarily market sense but we're providing incentives to make it work. Whether it's tax breaks, whether it's direct cash contributions or ongoing operating costs. When it comes to the ballpark, MTS Centre, the Convention Centre, you name the particular venue, there have been public incentives provided.

But the reality is we don't decide that yesterday the price of the Akon concert is going to be this much or tonight the Kid Rock concert is this or this is what a hot dog at the ballpark costs. That's not for us to decide. It's the market that decides those things.

I'm curious as to how exactly the $700,000 dollar subsidy is going to be provided. I would have liked to have seen the number of admissions provided or discounted certain times of the day or something to that effect that would ensure that people who would otherwise not have access to the water park could have access to it. There could be particular days where particular neighbourhoods can bring their schools. You know, people from Daniel McIntyre ward are going to have certain times when they could bring people into the park.

I'm curious as to what this public access agreement is going to be and I encourage our public administration to think this through very carefully. This idea of $10 vouchers I'm not sure it's been totally thought through and I would like to see that still fine tuned before it comes forward.

In terms of the prices that have been floated around, yeah, I mean market prices if you look across Canada and the United States for full-blown water parks probably are in the $20 to $35 range, but again it's up to what makes sense for the operator of this park.

I had the opportunity in January to go down and I took a look at the Grand Forks property. I mean yeah there's different times, different rates, half day rates. They even have, the morning that I happened to be down there, most of the water park was closed however they have this lazy river facility that goes around the park and I believe that's an amenity that our park is supposed to have, only that lazy river was open. Seniors can walk in the lazy river against the current, apparently it's exceptionally therapeutic but I'm telling you they weren't paying $15 to be in there. The operator is going to want to do what ever is creative to make the most out of his particular investment in this property. So again, I don't see why we're trying to play, to play in this.

So again I'm very much looking forward to this coming forward next November. I think it's long overdue and I'm very excited. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Browaty. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This proposal is wrong, wrong and wrong. It's too premature, there is too little information and there's too many questions on the information that we do have available to us.

First I want to say that it was clear from my vote the last time that I really wasn't interested in providing dollars, public dollars to subsidize a private water park. I made it clear at that time that we had two existing water parks within the Winnipeg vicinity, one in the north and one in the south and that we are authorizing a subsidy to compete.

I think that the long track record of those other institutions has shown that business can do it by itself if they want to. The reason they haven't done it within the City of Winnipeg is that there's been shown no need. I mean some people said that, shown no need unless we give it a subsidy. But, that's a question. Should Winnipeg actually be subsidizing facilities that directly compete with the private sector that's already been adequately serviced? And I say no.

I want to suggest that one of the things we've been trying to do is have a regional strategy. We've been having meetings. I've been one of the few Councillors who have been attending those meetings on a capital regional strategy and it suggested that one of the things that we should have is a no competition clause.

Mordon / Winkler have declared themselves a region, along with the RM of MacDonald, and they quite recently and quite publicly, rejected a gift of a concert hall because one of the parts of their regional strategy already had a concert

hall, and they didn't want another facility similar competing it. They made an agreement if someone would have a concert hall the other one would have a swimming pool. They made sure that they stayed within the region. So I think there's a whole bunch of issues around competition.

Now the second issue is the value for money. The $10 subsidy and the 700,000 passes that will be issued over, the 70,000 passes that could be issued over the year are not going to be adequate unless some of the dollars are figured out. You could issue 700,000 passes and give every person within the City of Winnipeg an opportunity for a $10 pass but if the entry fee is somewhere between $20 and $35 which is the figure bandied about, even with the discount a lot of people are not going to be able to attend.

I am going to give you an example of two neighbourhoods that are negatively affected because their community centre was razed in my area, the Chalmers neighbourhood and the Glen Elm neighbourhood. Some Councillors suggested that there was a new facility going up in my area. It's not. That's in Councillor Browaty's area. My area was torn down and the funds are going to be used to subsidize his area which is another question that I think many Councillors were not really aware of that being an issue when the motion was passed on Council.

Now, in the Chalmers area, the average income is $25,000 dollars. If one parent and one child go to this water park and receives a subsidy, they would have a minimum of $20 that they would pay, plus they would have to get on the bus, and to get there and back, we're talking about another $6 plus. I'm rounding it down because it's $2 plus each way for the parent and $1 plus each way for the child so we're talking about another $6 just to get there and back. And by the way, parking isn't an issue in my area if it was downtown because most people in my ward take the bus anyway.

Now, if it went, the Glen Elm area which was also negatively affected by this, they are a little better off. Their average income is $37,000 a year, and one parent, one child would be a little easier for them to afford but it would still be hard. While the income is higher it's still much less than the average of the City of Winnipeg. And by the way the average for my ward, which is $47,000, so the ward as a whole, is much less than the City of Winnipeg.

But I'm sure that these families, while they're considered less, that none of them would qualify for the subsidy. Which would mean that even if it was $20 each, if one parent took one child on the bus, we're talking $40 minimum to get there by the information given in the emails that I've received from the administration, plus bus fare. And it's not very close. It may be five minutes from St. James but that's a three-quarter of an hour bus ride from Elmwood–East Kildonan.

And how accessible is this value for dollars? Councillor Browaty had many excellent suggestions that would actually make it more accessible and I applaud you for bringing those forward but they are not here, which is why I supported Councillor Pagtakhan's motion to lay this over because this is exactly the kind of thing that we have to ensure to make sure it's accessible. I don't see any guarantee that any of those things will be happening.

What is talked about here and what is in the clause is a $10 subsidy. A $10 subsidy on what? Who knows? And it's suggested that maybe we could put two of those subsidies together. I have received many coupons from many private businesses and I don't know any of them that allow you to use two coupons on one purchase. So if you were to come by yourself and give them two coupons and say that's the only way I can afford to get into this park, I don't know whether they would be allowed to do that. That's not said anywhere in this clause that they could do that. And someone said I don't know if this is an apples to apples comparison and the point is no one knows if it's an apple to apple comparison because we don't have the information.

And I was also disappointed by Councillor Clement's comments it's too bad the administration attempted to answer the questions because it lead to more questions.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal moves extension of two minutes.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Well of course it lead to more questions which is why you should of supported the motion to lay it over. It's too bad that people want to vote on something without getting the information. That's what's too bad here.

And finally these dollars are redirected from a public facility. Kildonan Park is in much in need of renovations. I went on a site visit just last week to look at what happened when $9 million dollars was taken away from Kildonan Park in order to do this. The equipment that is there is very tired, in poor condition, and some of it is just broken down.

Now, in addition to that, I had the sad opportunity to be on crutches awhile ago, and found that the washrooms are not accessible. You have to go outside of the pavilion and down a ramp which at that point in the late spring was icy because we had just had a snow storm. I was slipping on the ramp. I was assisted by someone from the facility who walked me down in case I fell and hurt my already sprained ankle again, so that I could get to the washroom and use the washroom. And I said well how do wheelchairs manage that? And she said to me, well yeah, sometimes the wheelchairs, the ramp is a little steep, sometimes the wheelchairs have gone off the ramp.

$3.5 million dollars was supposed to go for those upgrades and I already told you that before, some of you who are surprised by this information. I already asked those questions at the last Council meeting. It's not going to be there any more because that was part of the money that was redirected from Kildonan Park for this project and that, fellow Councillors, is a big reason why I have problems with this. If it was other money…

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor.

Councillor Thomas: from other places that would be a whole different thing but when we take money from public facilities…

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Thomas: to subsidize private facilities when public facilities are lacking basic accessibility, that is a serious, serious problem and we shouldn't do it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Thomas. Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Leo, wherever you are, I want you to know that you are subsidizing our public water park with your $44 million dollars. You have no say.

What nonsense we've just heard. I stopped writing after a point, but… It's premature. It's premature. For that Councillor Dan, David Asper is going to build one for free. David is probably having apoplexy. You know what? To the people out there, your sweet 10 and 11 year olds if you wait for David Asper's proposal, is going to be 15 or 16 by the time it could possibly open and won't want to go with you. People of my age, your unborn grandchildren ain't ever going to get in at the under 6 rate because they're going to be 8 by the time it opens. It's premature.

By the way $7 million dollars to subsidize this when David is going to do it for nothing, I've got a secret folks. The subsidy for the football stadium and the total redevelopment in that area is somewhere between $100 and $300 million dollars, okay. Not a free water park, I love it, and he ain't going to charge to get in either. No. He'll give everybody lunch.

This subsidy by the way amounts to a one time subsidy of $11 a head for Winnipeggers. Eleven dollars is what you are subsidizing, each of you, this water park by. And if you can't afford it, every time you visit we're going to give you $10

bucks of it back. And your kids, too. I don't know.

The price we've heard, read the Free Press today, $35 bucks a head. Well, how about if it's $15 and it's $5 if you're under 6. Oh, that's the only one within driving distance of Winnipeg. That's an actual for this market price. But who is doing, oh the same guy who is doing this one.

That would mean this $120 to take your family there. Mom and dad and four kids, are not well off and they're going to get the subsidy. So that means the two, mom and dad, instead of $15 are going to pay $5. Four kids, the two of them over 6 are going to have to pay $5 and the two under 6 are going to pay nothing. So this family of mom, dad and four kids, it's going to cost them $20 bucks. $20 bucks to go. Is that absolutely accurate? Heck of a lot more accurate than $120. And it may be totally accurate and it may not. You don't price something that isn't even been built, you don't even have construction drawings on yet. That's a little impossible. But let's wait. Let's wait.

It's in the wrong area. It's a terrible area. It's an area that is being stabilized and is slightly on the upswing. We could tear down 15 houses at Pritchard and McGregor, wherever, with parking 40 houses. No, no.

Just the total absurdity of what's going on. We're going to subsidize by $11 a head something that is going to bring us back a million dollars in taxes a year in perpetuity. Never mind the $700,000 a year in subsidies on top of that, we're getting 14% return on our money, in perpetuity right now.

And you know what? Those admission fees may go up but I'll tell you what, taxes will go up to cover it. We subsidize our own existing swimming pools by I think more than $7 million dollars a year now. This is a one time thing. And the million dollars a year in taxes goes on forever.

But the one thing I really rose to say because I couldn't understand the rhetoric, it's the dumping of garbage on Winnipeggers who dare to do something, who dare to succeed. Mr. Ledohowski has paid us tens of millions of dollars in taxes and will continue. He has created thousands of jobs. He has done good things for our City. He goes beyond it to Portage and Brandon and Grand Forks and now Bismarck, he's building in. He answered our call and he is being crapped on. Look out David, you're next.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was rereading the clause, recommendation no. 1 that the $7 million dollars to the Canad Inns be approved subject to the Canad Inn entering into a satisfactory Public Access and Capital Funding Agreements. I want to thank my Councillor colleague, Councillor Steeves, for that reminder during his remarks and I want to say that I'm also heartened to know that in speaking with our CAO that he is also open to having a Council seminar relative to that as we are delegating authority to the CAO to finalize the terms of the Public Access Agreement in this recommendation.

It's quite simple for me Mr. Speaker on this thing. Many Winnipeggers across this City should be applauding this project. It's a great one. But I want to make sure that families and individuals who cannot afford to go and that desire to go to this water park will not be turned away. I would like to hear that when the Mayor sums up Mr. Speaker in his closing remarks, to ensure that in this Public Access Agreement that no families, no families or individuals who wish to go will be turned away in support this project. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll tell you this Mr. Speaker, no families in Winnipeg will ever get the opportunity to find out whether or not they'll be turned away if we don't build this bloody thing. Time to get it in the ground. Time to do something for Winnipeg. Time to create some opportunity. If you don't create the opportunity for people to walk through the door they'll never get through the door and that's why we should all be

standing here today unanimously supporting this.

You know the idea of where the line should be drawn, on what incentives should be where, that's a work in progress, that's part of an ongoing negotiation between the CAO and the other players in this deal as it goes forward. Ultimately you know as Councillor Pagtakhan said I'm sure that there will be proper transfer of information between the parties, from those parties down to the Councillors and we'll know that what we have is what we're looking for and that we will have done everything we can to provide as great public access as possible within the parameters of the understanding that we started with.

And even with that, only that understanding on the table there are many other opportunities for people to access facilities like this. Even today, whether it's The Boys and Girls Club, the different school programs, private facilities are often accessed at no cost for individuals through group outings and programs. And some of us who perhaps choose to work on the social agenda with action as well as with words may even go out and buy tickets for this venture and donate them perhaps to Harvest Food Bank who knows that they have families with children and through programs like that other opportunities can be provided.

You know, I mentioned The Boys and Girls Club, the United Way in Winnipeg does a great deal of work with many, many organizations in the City who I'm sure will see the opportunities here and get many, many people to this wonderful facility. And again you know, and I say it again without building this we don't know, none of the individuals, whether they be from the inner city or even middle class families, will have the opportunity to attend a facility in their own city of this splendor.

I'm just going to close quickly just by you know telling you, Mr. Speaker if you want a good chuckle, I want you to go and search in Hansard and look back on the debate over the True North Centre and look at the questions that were being asked at that time and look at what was being bandied about. And it is really hilarious to read some of the members of EPC at that time.

For example, Councillor Gerbasi extolling the virtues of this wonderful private/public partnership. Councillor Vandal explaining the process, you know how this is a process and it's going on. Kind of like what we're doing here today. Councillor Thomas, you know, strongly supporting it and advocating, applauding the actions, the dogged determination of the private sector partner that was coming forward and doing this for our City.

So you know the shoe is on the other foot today because there is whether you believe it or not a bit of unofficial opposition here. But if you really want a good chuckle you know, get into Hansard, find those meetings and read the lengthy diatribes that I'm sure will floor you with laughter Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, we had a very public expression of interest process with regards to this water park development. We have as has been rightly pointed out already a $7 million dollar investment of public money that's leveraging, leveraging $43-1/2 million dollars of private money coming into a development with including the hotel as a total.

Mr. Speaker, $900,000 a year in taxes, coming back to the City. We have a 25 year commitment of a $700,000 subsidy for public access. The, as has been noted there will be further dialogue with regards to what that public access means, Mr. Speaker. It's very clear that that decision has not been made yet, that that will still be something that Councillors can have input into.

And the fact of the matter is, I haven't had really, other than maybe Councillor Browaty and a couple others, the Councillors who seem to be most adamant against this, I haven't heard any motions or any strong suggestions coming forward on what sort of access that they see as being amenable. Is it free

days like we have at the zoo or what is the scenario that would work?

Mr. Speaker none of that has come forward. If there was a sincere concern with public access that would have been great but I guess I think it should also be stated that you know there are certain things that we as a society agree are necessities, that we subsidize and not only subsidize, we fund. We sometimes will fund housing, housing for the poor. We have a social assistance system for social assistance, for welfare, for clothing, for food, for shelter. We have a universal health care system in this country Mr. Speaker, these are things that we as a society have agreed as part of the social contract to enter into.

I don't see us as a society turning around and saying we're going to have a universal water park system in this country. It's just absurd. It just doesn't make any sense. It's at a point Mr. Speaker where we've become a society which is clearly arrogant and obviously too affluent if we can have a universal water park system. We will have a water park in the City Mr. Speaker that will be a positive amenity.

Let us also remember Councillors that it may not, if we don't act today it may not always be built in the City of Winnipeg. We have a growing Capital Region surrounding the City. The City of Selkirk already has a beautiful indoor water facility if anybody wants to go have a look at it that would match any of the ones we have today in this City if not go beyond what we have today. There is nothing preventing, Mr. Speaker, another municipality in the Capital Region coming forward and building a water park within the next 10 years. It's conceivable. It's real. I think we as a City our position of dominance that we've taken for granted is no longer going to be there.

This is a positive step for our City and we have an entrepreneur, Mr. Speaker, who is coming to the table, who has a proven track record in delivering hospitality and entertainment facilities to this City, employing local people, based out of Winnipeg, head-office here in our City and growing and who's come to the table to build a fine facility and what happens? We automatically as a group that decides to dump on this entrepreneur and to criticize somebody who comes to the table in a big way.

I think Mr. Speaker we should be thanking him for making this investment, for leveraging private sector dollars the way that we are leveraging today and we're making a facility happen that conceivably we would not be in a position to build through the public sector on a hundred percent dollars. This is a tremendous development for our City.

I would encourage all Councillors who have spoken against this to rethink their position, to vote in favour of this because we know very well Mr. Speaker that we have other challenges with regards to infrastructure. $900,000, close to a million dollars of taxes does a lot Mr. Speaker when it comes to also financing and investing in the infrastructure of existing public facilities across the City. It gives us new tax revenues that we're in desperate need of Mr. Speaker to do just that.

So I would encourage all Councillors to support this today. It's been a long process, a very public process. An open process that has allowed others to come forward to bid on this and we have ensured and protected the public with regards to the public investment of $7 million dollars for the return, for those who, who are the working poor afford to have access to this facility Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. No further speakers? Mr. Mayor, in closing.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as Mayor, you are regularly called upon to make a decision. And you hope you always make the right decision. And there are days you go home and before you go to bed you start asking yourself, did you make the right decision.

There are two decisions here that I will share with you. One was LRT verses BRT. Another is what we're talking about

right now, a water park. Mr. Speaker, there aren't that many days when Sam Katz, Mayor of Winnipeg, and Nick Ternette agree 100%. When we do that, I think that's an alliance that tells you something. Something very good and very special is happening.

We have a model here that is actually getting the best bang for their buck. Who is subsidizing who? Is the City subsidizing the private sector or is the private sector subsidizing the City? Many Councillors have said the numbers - $36 million, $7 million dollars.

Ty Tran, 17,000 people. 17,000 people signed a petition they wanted a water park. Coincidentally at that particular point in time it was at the old Winnipeg Arena site. Little did they realize that because of an agreement that was signed prior to that, that was never going to happen, but they wanted a water park. They wanted a city of opportunity. They wanted one great city. They wanted this City to be exciting and vibrant.

So I sit here today telling you that I truly believe that this would be a unanimous decision. It's obviously apparent that some feel differently so let me tell you a few things. Some facts and information on indoor water park world-class. You have half day rates for 5 and under. You have half day rates for children 6 to 16. You have half day adult rates. You have half day family rates. You have day passes for 5 and under. You have day passes for 6 to 18. You have adult day passes. You have senior's day passes. You have physically challenged day passes. You have family day passes. You have peak day passes. You have off-peak day passes and God knows how many more Mr. Speaker. There's all sorts of admissions to these types of facilities. Nobody should be quoting any prices till we know what they are.

But Mr. Speaker, when I hear people talk about Point Douglas and a water slide, I'm the one who said to Councillor Gerbasi maybe we could have two water parks in the City. Why not? But if Councillor Vandal believes it's not going to be subsidized, you're dreaming and anybody who believes that is absolutely dreaming.

And the key issue here, Mr. Speaker is accessibility and affordability. And I know what has become called as the public opposition to yours truly meets on a regular basis. I would have hoped they would have just sat down at one of those meetings and Councillor Vandal and Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Thomas could have addressed the key issue. People what is affordable? What do we define as easy access? Is the number free? Is the number $5? Is the number $8? What is that number? And maybe we could work towards a goal. And as Councillor Pagtakhan just pointed out, the clause specifically covers entering into a satisfactory Public Access and Capital Funding Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, in four years being here, as the Mayor of this City, I have never met someone so talented and so intelligent as our existing CAO. I have the utmost confidence that we will have the public access protected. And you know you talk about $10. You talk about, the number isn't important. What we have to determine and what will be determined is what is affordable. If the number is $5 and the cost is $25 then guess what? We'll have to come up with a $20 subsidy. So be it.

We have a situation, $17.5 million dollars is coming back to us. Thank you, Councillor Smith for pointing that out. $17.5 million dollars. We can play with that the way we want. We can make this a truly wonderful facility, truly accessible. We have the ability to do so.

And Mr. Speaker I could give you a list of projects that this City has pumped money into as well as all sorts of festivals. So you know what? I'll give you one for example because I know Councillor Gerbasi is a big fan of the Folk Festival which just happened. I know she knows we subsidize them every year. Just for the record, a youth pass, daily youth pass $51.25. Now Mr. Speaker no one has ever said that people can't afford to go there, Mr. Speaker.

The bottom line is an event a facility will determine what the marketplace will pay. It's called supply and demand. And whenever Canad Inns comes out with what their numbers are based on supply and demand, our CAO will determine what is necessary for a subsidy. But for crying out loud I would have loved to see somebody come forward and say if you truly want public access they can't pay more than $7, $5, $9. Not once, not once has anybody come up with anything and that's what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, this should be supported unanimously. How can anybody not vote against it? How can anybody not vote for it I should say? I mean this is a no-brainer, an absolutely no-brainer.

Now here is the sad part and maybe, just maybe Councillor Swandel pointed it out. The three Councillors that appear are going to vote against this, when it came to another project, they were on the exact opposite end of it. Give them whatever they want, don't worry about the public. Here is why we're doing it. Historical building? It's okay. Maybe because as Mayor I am leading this one maybe they are against it. It's time for that to stop.

What's good is good. What's bad is bad. This is good. Let's get on with it, make something happen, and make sure everybody, the grandparents, the children, the grandchildren, we all get to enjoy something very special and maybe once in a while, thank the private sector for coming forward with $34 million dollars and taking a risk.

Because there are some people who don't think this was such a good investment. Maybe it's time to acknowledge the fact that we can get things done in this City because I know a lot of Councillors have been here for a long time there is no water park. Let's get it done. Let's make Winnipeg a first-class city with a world-class water park indoors. That's all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. A recorded vote has been called for.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Leipsic, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Thomas, Vandal.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 3.

Mr. Speaker: It's Carried.

Mr. Mayor, report of July the 2nd of 2008.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 2, 2008**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

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

Report of July the 9th of 2008, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 9, 2008**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 7.

Councillor Gerbasi: Item 5.

Mr. Speaker: No. 5. Councillor Pagtakhan what number do you want?

Councillor Pagtakhan: 4.

Mr. Speaker: Pardon?

Councillor Pagtakhan: 4.

Mr. Speaker: 4. And, well let's just get the, so on the, from 1 to 7, except 4 and 5.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

So Item No. 5 and No. 4 has been, is being put for discussion. No. 5.

Clerk: Item No. 4.

Mr. Speaker: Oh No. 4 first?

Item 4 - Vision and Master Plan for the "Health and Wellness Zone" associated with the Health Sciences Centre Complex - Economic Development Grant, File G-8

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I think we all are aware of what this motion is all about. We've heard delegations. At this point in time I would very much like to hear comments from Councillor Pagtakhan and then I will respond.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not opposed to the grant that's being provided to the entity, the proponent here. What's at issue though is that this original proponent, the HSC Foundation, which is a great organization, originally asked in their funding request that they would be receiving a grant on behalf of a community development corporation and then they switched it later on to be the HSC Foundation.

There is perhaps unbeknownst to the HSC Foundation a brand new development corporation, a brand new community development corporation called the Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation which is headed up by a board of directors with the executive director who appeared here today, Marion Willis.

And, Mr. Speaker I would like to refer this back to Executive Policy Committee and to our CAO, to ensure that we can include the community, the Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation in this because it's important that we have the stakeholders which are already part of the CNDC, to be part of this process with residents, businesses, institutions. So that's what I'm basically asking for.

Mr. Speaker: The vote. All in favour of Councillor Pagtakhan's motion to refer?

Councillor Swandel: Wait, wait, wait here, we're debating the clause here. There's no motion.

Councillor Thomas: Yes there is.

Mr. Speaker: Yes his motion was to refer.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: He didn't say "I move".

Mr. Speaker: No.

Councillor Steeves: There is no debate though right?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Councillor Swandel: The Mayor introduced the clause.

Councillor Thomas: And then he moved a motion to refer which is in order.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors, (inaudible) who is voting in favour of referral? Mr. Mayor, Mayor… Mr. Mayor do you want to rebut this?

Mayor Katz: Well I would very much would appreciate that opportunity over the next few minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, go ahead.

Mayor Katz: First of all Mr. Speaker I very much appreciate Councillor Pagtakhan's concerns that's number one. I know that the parties are wanting to move forward. I don't know how time sensitive this issue is. That would be one of my concerns.

I know that one of the delegations made mention about the other levels of government, if they're aware of it. Well the other levels of government are already committed to funding this as I'm sure

Councillor Pagtakhan knows, but the key thing is you don't want to see duplication in committees and when one of the delegations did mention that there was representation from the Health Sciences, I mean from the Health Sciences, et cetera, there may be a scenario where maybe they weren't aware of that other committee, and maybe this is something we should consider.

Although I will say to you, I am concerned about how time sensitive this is, because I know the proponents very much wanted us to move forward. So I'm a little at a loss on that one cause they're not here but otherwise I would have no problem with that motion.

And because of the fact we're moving to prorogue, it is two months, so maybe if Councillor Pagtakhan has any other information on that I would very much appreciate if he would share it with us.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan, you already have moved your motion to refer. We're ready to call the question.

All in favour of referring? Councillor Pagtakhan's motion. Those opposed? It's Lost.

Item 4. Any speakers for Item 4? Councillors Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Just when the Mayor closes, just for clarification and for Councillor Pagtakhan's edification, I guess he doesn't have a chance to speak again, I kind of wish he did if he did. If he did I would ask him his thoughts on page 1137 of the report.

As I read this, and I don't know if I'm wrong about this, but it looks as though, Councillor Smith says probably, it looks as though, it looks like a five-phase process where phase 1 is reconnaissance, deliverables, there's a vision workshop, power point, there's comprehensive power point presentation and poster display.

Phase 2 deliverables, there's a public open house, supporting materials, a vision statement document.

Phase 3 the master plan. The deliverable there, the development framework and guidelines, infrastructure and development phasing strategy, another public open house, supporting materials and final master plan. There is a planning approval phase and an RP phase. It looks fairly open already.

And that was the part that I wasn't clear on in the delegations and perhaps I should have asked them about that. I don't know if anybody here has any information about this process but if Councillor Pagtakhan is concerned that people are somehow going to be blocked out of the process, I would just, looking at the face of the report it looks fairly open to me, maybe exhaustingly so. So if someone is concerned about being locked out of the process, unless someone around this table can say that this is just not what's going to happen here, I think we're covered on this one Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, you know if you read through this report in detail you'll see that there is as Councillor Steeves correctly points out, that the consultation process is exhaustive. It talks about taking 12 to 18 months. But more importantly this project has the support of all three levels of government.

And you know, I remind my colleagues that the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority is part of the, under the umbrella of the Provincial government. As I believe the Provincial government is the funder of the economic development agency that was here this morning. So there are close connections here between funders and the stakeholders.

The Federal government, we all know, is involved with the Virology Lab and the infectious disease folks over there. So you know there are those connections are there. They are strong. So the players that are involved in the funding of getting this master plan going are insisting that, as did the process through the other planning, the secondary plan insisted that

there be strong public consultation. I think it's clearly outlined in the document here.

So I don't know if there is a problem here with one particular entity having ownership of the process because it's coming from the Health Sciences Centre Foundation so that creates a little bit of fear but when you look at the lay of the land as to who is funding this process I think, I'm quite comfortable knowing that those ties to these different organizations are there and that the stakeholders are going to be, including residents, are going to be strongly represented in this process.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors, Councillor Pagtakhan has asked that he wants to speak and if there is no other speakers we might be able to finish this because before we go for lunch. Councillor Pagtakhan introduced a motion to referral. It was lost. Councillor Pagtakhan, briefly.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Okay, thanks Mr. Speaker. Yeah, I just wanted to basically say with regards to Councillor Steeve's questions it's about the proponent here. The Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation ought to be the proponent working on this master plan and visioning process and not the HSC Foundation.

The Central Neighbourhoods Development, Mr. Speaker we just did an exercise, a secondary planning process with the West Alexander Centennial Neighbourhoods Plan. That was a, that was a City lead initiative. This type of thing for this neighbourhood, for the potential health and wellness district, for a bio-med city concept, ought to be done by a community group not just one group which is deemed basically to be a stakeholder which is the Health Sciences Centre.

It should be led by a community development corporation which is composed of residents, businesses, institutions including the Health Sciences Centre, the Foundation, the Virology Lab, The Infectious Diseases Centre and the like, and this is basically what I'm talking about. If we could have referred that back then I think we could have resolved that. And I'm hoping that on a go-forward basis that this could still be resolved, perhaps with the Mayor and with the CAO on a go-forward basis.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers? Mr. Mayor, do you want to close?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker as has been mentioned earlier, all three levels of government, what we're basically doing here is approving a grant. That's what this is about.

And I must confess that I am not pleased by the information that came forward today and maybe there is some duplication. I wish myself and Councillor Pagtakhan had the opportunity to converse earlier and maybe we could have addressed this. I'm just not sure, the motion is here and I guess at this stage of the game we either have to vote for it or against it.

And I understand the concern, and maybe with the public consultation that will be coming down the road, you know, maybe we can work it out, massage it, maybe we could have some dialogue with the other stakeholders as well. But at this particular point in time, you know I believe we have to move forward with the situation and that's what I'm going to be doing as far as my vote will be concerned.

But I do understand where Councillor Pagtakhan is coming from. If I had another alternative, I would gladly suggest it but I don't know if I do at this particular point in time Mr. Speaker.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, Point of Order.

Mr. Speaker: What's your Point of Order?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Can I just say that…

Mr. Speaker: What's your Point of Order?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Before the motion was called earlier the Mayor had said that he was open to the idea, open to the idea of a lay over and is there an opportunity for this Council to...

Mr. Speaker: No, no, no. Councillor Pagtakhan, Councillor Pagtakhan that's not a Point of Order.

Okay, for the question Item 4.

All in favour?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Record me in opposition Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan is...

Councillor Thomas: Record me in opposition as well.

Mr. Speaker: And Councillor Thomas in opposition.

It's, Councillors, it's getting on to about three minutes after twelve. We still have to do Item 5 has been stood down.

Councillor Steeves: Record Councillor Smith in opposition as well please.

Mr. Speaker: Go for lunch? Councillor Smith moves okay we'll adjourn until 1:30. And Item 5, Item 5 we'll start dealing with it.

Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of July 16, 2008 at 1:35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Get to your seats and we will continue. We'll commence with Item 5. Councillors, those in the back, get to the front. Get to the front of the bus. Item 5, Mr. Clerk.

Item 5 - Winnipeg Parking Authority Special Operating Agency - 2008 Business Plan (Selection Report) - By-law Amendments - Multi-year Contract for Purchase of Parking Pay Stations and Parking Enforcement Contract, File GL-5.6.1

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe if my memory serves me well, prior to the lunch break that Councillor Gerbasi had this...

Mr. Speaker: Yes she stood it down.

Mayor Katz: I would love to hear Councillor Gerbasi's comments and hopefully we can address them.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, thank you Mr. Speaker. I am not rising in opposition to the report but I just wanted to comment, put some comments on the record regarding the decision outlined in the report by the Alternative Service Delivery Committee to seek expressions of interest for the sale of the City-owned parkade at Winnipeg Square. I really have some concerns about what will become of our public Parking Authority if its assets are sold off one by one.

The question has been raised during the discussions and I attended most of the meetings, followed this report through, as to whether the City should be in the parking business at all and I would like to remind Council about why the special operating agency for parking was set up in the first place.

The Winnipeg Parking Authority became a special operating agency in order to be run like a business and at the same time provide parking services in a way that served the public interest. The Parking Authority was set up so that the City would have some capacity and ability to do a better job of providing parking options and to play a role in downtown revitalization.

Yet Council continues to undermine the Winnipeg Parking Authority's bottom line by taking off profits into general revenue which was done when the Parking Authority was set up I agree, but unfortunately that's continued.

Furthermore, the City is examining selling off the Winnipeg Parking Authority's most valuable parking assets. Not only the most profitable parkade potentially but most of the surface lots that make money for the Winnipeg Parking Authority are also being considered for sale to the private sector.

Winnipeg has some major issues and problems, particularly in the downtown

that relate to parking. And if you ask the downtown agencies that work there, they will tell you that the private sector system is not working by itself. We have acres of surface parking lots, essentially run as a private monopoly. It's pretty much one company that owns them all. No one is investing in building new parkades and if we are ever to reduce the sea of ugly surface parking lots we need the capacity to stimulate this kind of development through public policy initiatives. With only the private sector as a player in downtown parking public policy goals will not be met because the driving factor is simply the bottom line.

Generally speaking in private lots, the minimum is being done in terms of beautification and improvement. There are less requirements and less being done to create parking spots for people with disabilities, for example. The City has a universal design policy and guidelines that result in accessible parking for people with disabilities in our parking lots. The private sector does not have those same standards.

In the Winnipeg Parking Authority's presentation to Councillors last week at the I believe it was the ASD Committee, they stated that one role they play is to ensure a supply of public daily, hourly parking in preference to monthly parking. This short-term supply of parking is needed for downtown businesses to attract customers. This is something the private parking providers are not willing to do as they respond only to market forces.

There is no motivation or incentives built in for the private sector to do any of these desirable improvements or meet higher standards. It seems that this desire to sell off assets of the parking authority comes from a simplistic ideology that says that everything is better done by the private sector. And I put to you that leaving the Parking Authority without assets and without the ability to affect downtown parking issues is a serious mistake and it has not been justified.

At the Alternative Service Delivery meeting last week, Councillor Swandel referred to the fact that there is already been a lot of analysis done about the Portage and Main parkade and that there is an actual report that has not been made public about the issue. I expect that Councillor Swandel and perhaps others, I have no idea, have seen this report since they seem to be aware of its existence.

However, all of Council must vote today to either proceed or not with this preliminary marketing of the parkade although I guess we're not really voting on it today, we're just voting on the SOA report. So I'm not really, I guess that's not really fair to say but you know we're discussing it today and we don't have the same information that all Councillors have, and I really don't think that's fair.

So I would really, I would like to call on the Mayor to have this report that must exist since it's been referred to by Councillor Swandel. That there is preliminary work that's been done in looking at this parkade, we should be having a right to see it before an expression of interest is going out to the private sector and I'm very concerned that we don't have that information. And there is a lot of other information we should be gathering, in my opinion, before we set out on that course as well but this is stuff we supposedly already have.

The Winnipeg Parking Authority works in co-operation with key stakeholder groups to enhance the downtown and other urban areas in a variety of ways. One thing a public parking authority can do that has assets and the capacity to do so is that they could work to develop more parkades in conjunction with downtown development. This should be a part of an overall downtown vision to promote more attractive and sustainable development.

The currency of surface parking lots is a huge drain on the vibrancy and health of our downtown. Many community stakeholders including downtown advocates have a lot of concern about where we're going with our Parking Authority and I really think Council needs to be aware of this. This is not just me talking. This is not to get votes. This is our downtown and the health of our downtown as many of you have said over

the years, affects the health of the whole City. This is not self-serving grandstanding as I'm accused of every time I stand up here by some people.

Financial sustainability of our City is at stake here as well. With continued freezes on property taxes and proposed cuts to business taxes, how can we justify eliminating an ongoing revenue stream which is what we get from this parkade and other Parking Authority assets. There is also a strong likelihood that the value of parking lots will increase over time as society shifts to policies that promote alternatives to the automobile to reduce congestion and deal with environmental concerns as we see the price of the parking going up higher and higher in other cities.

If there is a financial case for selling off these profitable assets which has not been made at all at this point publicly, if anywhere, I would expect that those promoting that should be giving us the information before they expect this issue to be moved forward in any way. And I think that's a very reasonable request and I'm very disappointed that we are having this discussion without some report somewhere that someone has written and none of us except perhaps Councillor Swandel has seen it.

And another really important question that I would really like Council to consider because a lot of times these parking lots come up one at a time when we're looking at selling them off. We're not looking at the big picture. And where, the question I would like to have answered is where will the profits go if these assets are sold off? If the money goes to feed general revenue or tax cuts and freezes in the future, we're in big trouble. I believe that if it ever is justified that these assets get sold off that the revenue should go back into creating downtown parking policies that help create a vibrant downtown.

In conclusion I urge the Mayor to ensure that all the reports and information about the Parking Authority be made available to Councillors and members of the public in the most transparent and timely way possible. And I also urge all of Council to look at the big picture and the long-term future of our downtown and our City before we start going in this direction. The last time I looked we still have a downtown first policy, and if that's no longer the case, someone should tell us, the rest of us.

And before we start to…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas moves extension of two minutes.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: Before we start fishing for offers for our gold mine at the corner of Portage and Main we need to consider potential public policy impacts on our City and particularly our downtown. Public policy on parking and the capacity to make change in this area is invaluable and I hope that this opportunity we have to address the parking problems in our downtown, the surface parking lots, the lack of parkades, and the short-term parking in a way that makes sense for downtown revitalization, I hope that this opportunity won't be lost in a shortsighted search for new cash. We have to look at the big picture. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just want to say that I feel most of the same concerns that Councillor Gerbasi has in regards to downtown and the parking issue. But again, I don't see why this asset needs to be publicly held.

The Parking Authority runs a special operating agency like a business. I don't see why they would want to if there is a demand for hourly parking, daily parking, it's more profitable than a monthly pass. A monthly pass assuming that the new rates are adopted today it would be $195 per month per a non-reserved stall, $245 per a reserved stall. If you use it 20, 25 days a month I mean it's less than $10 a day. For 3 hours of parking in that we're getting $12, assuming that the new rates are passed. That would be the minimum. Sometimes these spots will flip over a couple of times a day. Hourly parking is

far more lucrative so that will support downtown businesses and it will support the downtown economy for casual parkers.

My dentist is in Winnipeg Square. I always used to go downtown and my three hour or two hour visit would be quite expensive to stay, to park there but again that's for a publicly run organization. The private sector can do that equally well.

It's been suggested that, by a major developer in town that elevated parking structures and such only make sense when monthly parking gets up closer to the $250, $300 a month range, some of the numbers I've heard bandied around. The public, the private sector isn't going to be building new parking structures today based on that model. We have a role I think as the City here, to take that money from the very valuable asset we have at Portage and Main and reinvest in downtown.

It's been discussed that perhaps the Canadian Museum for Human Rights needs a parking structure because of the set up at The Forks. Perhaps that's where it should go. We need to have those discussions. And again right now we're only looking at an expression of interest. We're not selling it. If the price isn't right, the market isn't right, if the commissions aren't there we're not going to do it. It doesn't make sense. I know Councillor Vandal supported this motion. All we are doing now is looking at it. We're not saying, we're not selling it to the highest bidder. We're not… This isn't a guarantee that we're going to sell it tomorrow. So I think it makes a ton of sense.

In regards to the operation of the public, the Parking Authority as a special operating agency, if it was a private enterprise they would be paying property taxes, business taxes. Shareholders would expect a return. That's exactly the mandate of the Parking Authority. That's what it is today.

Again, there is also the public good component. When it comes to parking lots whether they be parking in three parkades or surface lots they compete against the private sector. However on-street parking is a natural monopoly. I think that's the business that the City should be in. Does it have to be publicly administered? Not necessarily but it works fine as it is today but that's a natural monopoly.

So again, what exactly is the role of the Parking Authority? We need to have these discussions. We need to look to see what assets like Winnipeg Square and our other parkades are worth. But again it is not a commitment today that we're going to sell these off. And you know we need to look at some of the concerns that Councillor Gerbasi has raised I think in terms of you know making sure hourly and daily parking is accessible to the downtown businesses.

I mean I saw the communication from the Downtown BIZ in regards to this. I think, I don't agree with necessarily all the concerns but we need to have those discussions with groups like that. This is just the start of this thing not the end. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just let me start by saying that I don't think Councillor Gerbasi is up politically grandstanding, I just think she is a little misinformed.

Since I've taken over as chair of the Alternate Service Delivery Committee we've worked very hard to get a new dividend and policy so that we didn't repeat the mistakes of the previous Mayor and his Executive Policy Committee where they would raid the special operating agencies, taking dividends that were totally inappropriate, running these things into debt and then trying to rationalize it in the consolidated statements of the City of Winnipeg at the end of the year.

So be very clear, Mr. Speaker, good business practices are being followed here. The Parking Authority does make money every year, returns it, too much to the City but we actually I believe in 2009 we will no longer be making dividends back to the City of Winnipeg where profits

within the organization would dictate that we don't. So, you know, considering the fact that we do have this asset at Portage and Main that we all know is a very valuable asset, you know, it's just a good business practice. Councillor Gerbasi is correct, that we are trying to run this like a business. It's a good business practice.

We've have had an evaluation done on it. The confidence in the valuation is because it contains some specific numbers that while we're going through this process we don't want it out there in the public so we have a good idea of what the asset is worth. I publicly stated somewhere between $20 and $50 million dollars. That's a very broad range. At the end of the day we need to see what expressions of interest bring to the table, and then we will look at that and we'll from our business perspective as a special operating agency and the Alternate Service Delivery Committee we'll make some decisions.

And first and foremost I would hope that we would clean up the long-term debt and the on-running deficits that have been incurred as part of the previously bad practices, and I believe in 2009 we'll be on track to really be doing a good job of that. But, you know getting the long-term debt out of the road would certainly be good.

You know Councillor Gerbasi also referred to this as a gold mine. We also have a couple of money pits in front of us. I don't know you pull into the parkade here across the street, there's chunks of concrete falling out, falling down, we know it needs millions of dollars of deferred maintenance done on it. Similarly at the Millennium Library they need huge investments there also. Those money pits are part of the special operating agency and we'll certainly have to look at how we spend these dollars relative to those pending deferred maintenance issues that we have coming at us very quickly.

The public policy or parking policy has to be about public good. I think we would all agree that when we went into the parking business at the corner of Portage and Main, the issue around the Trizec Building and that development, we stepped in there where nobody else would. We put the parking in there, got the thing going and we've got it to the point now where it's making a great deal of money. But at the time we needed to be there. That parking lot wasn't running at full occupancy. It was there to serve a new development and so it was the right place for us to be.

Likewise I agree today that we've made investments in parking, like for example even though it wasn't done by the Parking Authority, 104 King Street we've put some money forward there to start dealing with some of the parking issues in the Exchange District. The economics of it don't work so the public sector steps in when the private sector can't deliver. We create the opportunity to improve the parking and from a public policy perspective it's the right thing to do.

And as was the case when we did it at the Trizec Building now we are at the point where we have an operation that is run by a contract manager, it is making profits, it's running in excess of capacity. And part of the reason for those profits just to clarify another point is any good operator of a parking authority will make sure that they have daily or hourly rates as well as daily rates, usually they are about a 60/40 split is about the best business practice for these operations. You want that because your hourly rates allow you to sell the same lot about 115% I believe is the equation. So, it's good business practices that you would keep hourly rate parking within these places. So I don't see that there is even an argument there as well.

And you know, back to the public good piece, I have a document in my office somewhere that was written by CUPE and I don't have the exact quote in front of me but even CUPE in their document talked about where the public sector should be engaged in different businesses or providing different services and the gist of it was that the public sector needs to be there but the private sector either cannot or will not provide a service, a required service at a reasonable cost.

And in this case, you know, we know, I don't know what the numbers are going to say at the end of the day but we know that this business model could probably be run privately. We don't need to be doing it publicly and for the most part it is being run privately now by a contract manager.

I guess the final pieces are the proceeds. Well you know as I said before, we will look at the proceeds if we do decide to go ahead. Number one, what we'll look at is what we get from the expression of interest. We'll make some sound business decisions based on those responses. If we see that it's in the best interest of the taxpayer to market we would market. If we see that it's in the best interest of the taxpayer to maintain the asset and that the, that it's better to take the net present value of that revenue stream today, then we would do that.

And the proceeds, you know if we deal with the long-term debt and there is some parking issues that we need to look at and improvements certainly is something that could come forward. I don't see the money going into the black hole. You know it's similar to what we did when we marketed Glacial Sand and Gravel. We still have the $10 million dollars set aside, trying to make some responsible decisions with that money rather than just using it to back-fill.

You know, unfortunately we're also at a point where we need to have some strong discussions with the Province around budgeting and new revenue sources and when you have these piles of money, you know, when you go cap in hand to the Province they always point to our reserves or these other piles of money that we have. So I'm a little reluctant it keep the money. It's almost better to spend it because it gives us a better argument on Broadway to get some new revenue streams working for the City of Winnipeg. Because I think we would all agree we're far too reliant on property taxes and we need some assistance legislatively from our colleagues on Broadway. Those are my comments, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. The argument goes round and round and I'm not sure whether it's a dog trying to catch its tail or what's happening here.

The agency is making a profit so we should take off the most profitable part of that agency and sell it off. And then the agency won't be making a profit and then there is a problem with that.

Well, give the special operating agency the mandate to do what it needs to do. Don't say oh you can't raise your rates when they recommend that the rates be raised from 2007 and that's part of the clause here and no, no, you don't need that money. And then surprise, surprise when the profit level is down, use that as a rationale to sell off assets that are actually making money.

Those arguments are not consistent and they don't make sense and as much as I hear the gobbledygook and the circular arguments, they don't make sense and anybody with two brain cells to rub together knows that.

The Winnipeg Parking Authority special operating agency was separated so that it could run like a business. And there has been political interference in the running of it like a business when you work at not allowing it to have the proper rates that it needs in order to operate properly; when you look at selling off its assets that make it a profitable business. That's two big problems. I can't support that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. No further speakers? Mr. Mayor, do you want to close?

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I very much appreciate some of the comments that were made. Just to address a couple points. Number one, I think what Councillor Gerbasi said was extremely important and vital. I think we have a responsibility to provide parking where it would help revitalization, rejuvenation and development of our downtown, and quite often that means providing parking where the private sector won't do it. I think that is our responsibility

and I agree 100% that's how you stimulate development.

By the same token, from what I understand here, they're looking at a scenario whereby they're going to explore the opportunity to see what this asset may be worth. As Councillor Browaty talked about in the private sector, you pay property taxes, you pay business taxes. Councillor Gerbasi referred to an entity that has the exclusivity of most of the parking. I believe we probably all know the entity she is referring to, and it may come as a surprise to her that it's that same entity that is managing our parking lot.

You would think, when I first learned of that, I was shocked and surprised that if we are in the parking business then why aren't we managing our own assets as opposed to farming it out just like anybody can do. I could never understand that. I still don't understand it today.

The fact that the committee has decided to move forward and explore if there might be some options, let's not forget there is significant deferred maintenance in these facilities that you have to address sooner or later, whether it's the parking right across the street from City Hall at the Public Safety Building, whether it's the Millennium Library, we do have expenses that we've been deferring. And I think what is extremely important, I love it when people start talking about if it's sold, you know where the money is going.

I think that Council Swandel made it very clear, you know the stop sign, the red light is up. Okay, the money is not going anywhere until we make a decision. In the meantime, the money sits there. I think that's the important thing. There is no money going into any black hole of any kind. If and when that were to ever happen which no one is saying it is, but I think what we should do is have an overall plan for what we think should be going on with downtown parking.

The City has a role to play, okay. Our role is basically when is there a void, to fill it. If there is a void in parking we should fill it. If the private sector is prepared to do it at fair market value or higher and maybe even develop a hotel on those air rights, maybe it's a good thing for the City. We don't know that but right now all I see is exploring it.

And number two, when it comes to parking rates, Mr. Speaker, supply and demand. That's what it's all about with parking rates. And I think even Councillor Gerbasi would love to see less people driving their vehicles downtown and taking transit. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Ready for the question?

All in favour of Item 5? Those opposed?

Councillor Thomas: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: One opposed.

Councillor Thomas: Record me in opposition please.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas is recorded in opposition.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Lazarenko,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,

WHEREAS the price of gasoline has risen to $1.40 per litre in Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the high price of gasoline hurts the operations of the City of Winnipeg, in particular the operations of the Police Service, the Fire Department and Winnipeg Transit;

AND WHEREAS high gasoline prices create hardship for all Manitoba motorists, especially in winter when a vehicle is often essential;

AND WHEREAS the Public Utilities Board has the ability and section 107 of the Public Utilities Board Act states in part:

The board may perform duties assigned to it

(a) by Act or resolution of the Legislature;

(b) by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council ask the Provincial Government to direct the Public Utilities Board to investigate and report on the cause of the high price of gasoline, its effect on Manitobans and the desirability of price regulation for the protection of consumers.

Mr. Speaker: EPC Motions, we have two. There is Motion No. 1, which is a Notice of Motion that will go to September meeting.

And Motion No. 2, Councillor Vandal I understand that the Community Committee wants to meet during the prorogue period. Enlighten us a bit on this before we vote.

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

WHEREAS Council on October 24, 2007, established its 2007 Schedule of Meetings identifying a prorogue period from July 18 to September 1, 2008, mutually inclusive;

AND WHEREAS Corbett Cibinel Architects, on behalf of Le Cercle Moliere, has submitted Rezoning, Variance and Conditional Use applications to permit the construction of a new theatre by expanding the existing Centre Culturel Franco-Manitobain (CCFM) at 340 Provencher Boulevard, but did not meet the deadline to consider these applications at the July 14, 2008 meeting of the Riel Community Committee;

AND WHEREAS the next scheduled meeting of the Riel Community Committee is not until September 15, 2008;

AND WHEREAS delaying the start of construction will have serious financial repercussions for the project as the tender has already been awarded with a 60 day expiry period;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Riel Community Committee convene a special meeting to consider the above-referenced applications during the prorogue period on a date to be determined by the Chair, in consultation with Committee Members and the Winnipeg Public Service.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker I would ask that we suspend the rules to deal with this today because essentially, if you've read this motion, it's pretty clear, there is a, you don't need to suspend the rules?

Mr. Speaker: No, no you don't need a suspension.

Councillor Vandal: It's pretty clear that a proposal has come forward to the construction of Le Cercle Moliere Theatre in St. Boniface. They've missed our Community Committee deadline. If we don't have a special meeting say on August 5th and I think the clerks are working on this, then it's going to get pushed back to September. Their, their tenders who have price freezes for 60 days will have expired, things will get more expensive. So I would ask Council's support for this and we can have a very short meeting called on this.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, I'll call the question.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

EPC Consideration of By-laws. Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws No. 123/2008 and 125/2008.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 123/2008 and 125/2008.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that By-laws No. 123/2008 and 125/2008 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 123/2008 and 125/2008.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 123/2008 and 125/2008 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Question Period. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the Mayor. Would the Mayor please give Council an update on the latest status of negotiations on the rapid transit proposal? I've heard through the media that there will be an announcement before the end of the month of some sort or some sort of decision about the Federal money and I'm wondering if there is any information at all that the Mayor could update Council as to how that's going.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Gerbasi. First of all number one, I think I have given the impression that I was hoping that something would be in place prior to the end of July. In the interim I can tell you that we are doing our due diligence, which I think everybody understands we need to do, as far as what if any land assembly, what the costs would be. Also, building a business case, so that this investment makes sense. That is an ongoing process right now between the City and the Province, and I am still hoping that something may be taking place in the very near future Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi your second question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Through you to the Mayor, would you also give us an update regarding the hybrid articulated buses, the 20 buses that were ordered and there was some testing and we haven't yet heard what is happening with that in terms of purchasing hybrid buses.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I believe I read in the media that the hybrid buses were not meeting the expectations. It appears right now the technology that we require doesn't seem to be there. I know right now that the department is communicating with the suppliers to see if maybe they can find it to service our needs and they're still exploring it but right now there are definitely some challenges and some obstacles to having the articulated hybrid buses running in our City. Which I can tell you right now, was a big disappointment to me.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: So are we then if we're not going with the articulated buses, are we going with some other form of environmentally friendly buses that are being investigated? What are we looking at doing with that funding?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, the reality is we need buses. We were hoping to go with articulated buses for many reasons, the hybrid articulated buses. Environmentally friendly, they are larger, we could order fewer of them.

If that is not the case, we will definitely have to explore an alternative of other types of buses, no question about that and I will wait for the department to report back on that.

Mayor Katz: Councillor Vandal your first question.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker to the Mayor, can you explain to me and to this Council how a stadium proposal can go from $150 million at Polo Park to potentially $400 million stadium redevelopment at Point Douglas, and yet

the ask of the Federal government has reduced by $25 million and the ask of the Provincial government has reduced by $15 million?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I can certainly try Mr. Speaker. First of all Mr. Speaker just to put the facts on the table, when Creswin came forward to the Winnipeg Football Club as a proposal to build a new stadium, it was a $120 million dollar deal, and they had asked $40 million dollars from the Federal government, $40 million dollars from the Provincial government, and the private sector was investing $40 million dollars.

They also were looking for land from the City of Winnipeg, concessions on property tax as well as business tax, and they were looking to purchase land at fair market value to build some retail to subsidize the football stadium.

The facts are quite simply, simple in that the City was ready to move forward on Polo Park and still is. After 18 months of due diligence and negotiation, our team from the City have concluded a deal with Creswin to move forward on the original site. The realities are, the other two levels have not basically agreed to what Creswin, without the opinion they require to make this deal happen. That's number one.

Number two, I believe Creswin has already come forward with the scenario that the $120 million dollars they were talking about 18 months ago, is significantly more, at least $150 million dollars.

Now, when Councillor Vandal referred to the number of $400 million, I'm not sure where that comes from. I can only assume what's taking place is that $150 million, which is a ballpark cost for the stadium, for the football stadium right now, and then if you add in projected costs for land acquisition, then you add in infrastructure, and for those who have basically listened to the media, they've seen the fact that Higgins will have to be moved, Louise Bridge, Disraeli. You add all those costs, in my humble opinion, you're probably looking at somewhere north of $300 million dollars. But we don't have an exact number, and I hope that clarifies what Councillor Vandal wanted to know.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: My second question has to do with the fact that less money is being proposed for, from the Federal government, less money from the Provincial government. How does all of the extra expenses parlay into less money from the Federal and the Provincial governments?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I think the simple answer is it doesn't. The realities are the deal that was proposed by Creswin was $15 million dollars. The new deal, and Councillor Vandal is referring to the proposed deal of Point Douglas so we all know what we're talking about, was $15 million dollars from the Federal government, $25 million dollars from the Provincial government. I think anybody on the floor of Council would agree that $15 million is a much easier pill to swallow than $40 million and so is $25, so probably much easier to get buy-in from the other two levels of government.

And I have made it very clear that I believe the Mayor and Council's job is to protect the taxpayers of Winnipeg. We know exactly what we were committed to at the Polo Park deal and we're prepared to go forward on a status quo. But if the private sector is going to end up putting in more money, which I think someone is going to have to fill the void, don't expect the City of Winnipeg to come to the table with more money when other levels of government are coming with significantly less.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Okay, having said all of that, this is clearly a deal that is not, the financial assumptions are way off. My question to the Mayor is it's been reported

that you have signed a Memorandum of Understanding. Why would you sign a Memorandum of Understanding under those conditions and if you have, when will we get a chance to actually see what it is you've signed?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I have signed a Memorandum of Understanding for the site at Polo Park. Ready to move on that.

When it appeared that deal was going nowhere they wanted to explore opportunities, other opportunities. Creswin demanded that the Province and the City sign a Memorandum of Understanding because they want to make sure that people were being sincere and genuine. They'd spent 18 months and approximately $1-1/2 to $2 million dollars doing their due diligence. And I can tell you that any Memorandum of Understanding that I have signed has most definitely protected the interests of the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg, which I believe is my responsibility.

Now, if no one else has signed that Memorandum of Understanding and just so we all know, a MOU is anything but a deal. It's the fact that we intend to go forward, explore the opportunities, do our due diligence and determine if this is realistic or not. And that's all we're doing right now and it's still continuing on right now but no Memorandum of Understanding, to my knowledge, has been signed by the other parties at this particular point in time.

Mr. Speaker: Second time around. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Your first question.

Councillor Gerbasi: My first question is also to do with the stadium. It's been explained that the Bombers are dealing with Mr. Asper at Polo Park so that they are still dealing with him I guess at Point Douglas.

I guess I'm wondering if it's a different site with different costs and different issues, shouldn't it be, with significant government money from all three levels, shouldn't this open it up again to different proponents? Like I realize we keep being told you know it's only a deal with one person but now it's a different proposal. So shouldn't that open that up for a more open, fair process for other bidders on it? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker I thank Councillor Gerbasi for that question. Contrary to what was reported in the newspaper yesterday, the City of Winnipeg has no directors on the Winnipeg Football Club. We have appointed three individuals to the Stakeholders but their existence hasn't been acknowledged. The City of Winnipeg really has very little, if any involvement.

What I can tell you is the Winnipeg Football Club put out an Expression of Interest. They received responses. They made a decision to go with Creswin. It's my understanding Mr. Speaker that they've given Creswin an extension, to determine whether Creswin can get a deal together.

So at this stage of the game, we are spectators to what the Winnipeg Football Club has decided. They've decided they're working with Creswin. That's who the City of Winnipeg is still communicating with and dialoguing with and trying to determine whether or not it is realistic to do something at Point Douglas.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Will the Mayor share the contents of the MOU with other members of Council? Since it's something that is, it's not just one person, it's all of Council that would be agreeing to go in a certain direction and I'm just wondering is it possible for that to be something that Councillors can see confidentially or whatever?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm kind of disappointed that this is the first time anybody has ever asked me but if Councillor Gerbasi wants to come into my office, I'd buy her a drink or a juice, I'd be happy to show her any MOU that I've signed. It would be my pleasure Mr. Speaker. And that of course, and I would not play favourites, of course I would do that with any Councillor who is genuinely interested, be my pleasure.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Have you received, do you have any sense of, like have the Premier and the other players also seen the MOU? Because we haven't heard anything about this and in fact when it first came out I thought I heard the Premier say he hadn't seen it yet. So I'm just wondering if that, are the negotiations going well?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I would assume that when the Premier says he hasn't seen it he is telling the truth. I can also guarantee you that his staff have most definitely seen it. They are in possession of it. The same as Creswin, of course they have a copy.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor…, there's no others? Councillor Vandal your second time. Your first question.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Mayor is thinking that he is the president, acting as the president of the Winnipeg Goldeyes. If there is a Memorandum of Understanding that's been signed it should have been at Executive Committee and it should have been at this Council today.

So I'll ask the same questions I just asked. When can we actually see this Memorandum of Understanding for discussion and a debate and a decision?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker…

Councillor Vandal: Not your own.

Mayor Katz: I believe Councillor Vandal is mistaken. Anything that the Mayor does whether it's by dialogue or a Memorandum of Understanding, I've said 100 times and I'll say it 101 for the sake of Councillor Vandal, it's all subject to the approval of Council. I do not make any decisions on my own. Everything comes to the floor of Council. Everything is subject to Council's approval. I'd like to believe that after 12 years Councillor Vandal would know that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: My question Mr. Speaker is how can Council approve anything when we can't see it? If the Mayor has signed a Memorandum of Understanding, could I ask my question? I understand he has signed two Memorandum of Understandings, the last one was over two weeks ago. There has been ample opportunity to bring this to the floor of this Council for discussion and yet it's in his office. I would love to go in his office and discuss a whole bunch of issues but when you're making, you're signing a contract on how you're going to go forward on an initiative that's going to cost hundreds of millions of dollars, this Council should have the privilege of seeing it.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I understand that Councillor Vandal probably doesn't understand how business in the real world works. I'll try and give him an introductory lesson.

The only thing that I have done Mr. Speaker is agreed to work with the Province and Creswin to see whether or not it's realistic to do a brand new football stadium in whatever location you want. That's the only commitment there is. There is no commitment for anything else at this particular point in time. And until the other parties agree to it, there is nothing for us to approve. This is nothing more than dialogue.

I would like to think that every Councillor, including the Mayor, has dialogued and makes commitments on a regular basis but unless all parties come to the table there is nothing further to discuss. If and when that happens, I can assure you that I will be glad to come to the floor of Council or through whatever proper channels there are, to let you know that we are entering into an agreement to explore the possibilities, to see whether a new football stadium is feasible on whatever site may be chosen Mr. Speaker. It would be my extreme pleasure. I hope that day will come shortly.

Mr. Speaker: Your third and final question Mr., Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Okay. The Mayor previously stated that he knows and Executive Committee knows exactly what was committed to Polo Park and there was a Memorandum of Understanding signed. Can you share with this Council exactly what was committed for Polo Park?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I will not only share with Council, I've already shared with the media, told them exactly the case. Number one, it's the status quo. One with the new football stadium at Polo Park we maintain the status quo of no property taxes. Saying we're not winning, we're not losing.

Number two, we would sell them some land at fair market value. They would pay property taxes and business taxes just like everybody else. And if there is another piece of property that has to be sold, they would also pay fair market value and pay property taxes. This has been reported in every media outlet that exists. This isn't news. This is old. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Let's continue on the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, report of June 27, 2008, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED JUNE 27, 2008

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the agenda of June 27th and I'll move Items 1 to 4 as Consent.

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

No Motions. No By-laws, and no questions. Oops, Councillor Vandal your first question.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Vandal: My question to Councillor Clement is do you have any indication of what the infrastructure improvements will cost for Point Douglas if it were to move forward? Do you have any indication to what the infrastructure improvements for Point Douglas will cost on the stadium redevelopment in Point Douglas?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Clement: No, I don't. I haven't had any involvement with any proposals, phantom or otherwise, and until somebody comes up with a proposal that says this is what we would like to build and this is how we would like to build it, it's pretty hard to be clairvoyant and know what you have to expect.

But the drawing that I saw in the paper clearly showed that there was a realignment of Higgins Avenue. I clearly understand that there would have to be a fairly significant land exchange, and it sounded like in the article that I read that somebody thought that the City should do that, and I'm not sure where somebody thought that the City was going to get the money to do all that because I've never been in any meeting that committed us to do any of those things.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel your first question.

Councillor Swandel: Just quickly. Are you aware of any other assessment or analysis that the Public Works is doing on the costs of phantom infrastructure where there is not even as much as a Memorandum of Understanding between parties to explore anything?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I believe that there are long-term plans Councillor Swandel on a number of fronts that deal with infrastructure, phantom and otherwise, and that they sometimes put numbers on some of them as well. But I haven't, the question was specific about a particular area and I'm not aware of any analysis of the costs associated with that site.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Standing Policy Committee on Finance. No report. No Motions. No By-laws. Question Period. None.

Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development of June 23rd of 2008, no report. Report of July the 8th of 2008, Councillor Wyatt, please introduce it.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JULY 8, 2008

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah I'm pleased to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2 Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'd like to stand down No. 2.

Mr. Speaker: No. 2.

All in favour of No. 1? Carried.

Item 2, Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 - Lease - Alexander Dock/ Harbourmaster Sites - The Gatehouse Development Company LLP File FI-2.1

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I'd be pleased first to hear from Councillor Pagtakhan.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan you have the floor.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just want to applaud the developer and Councillor Wyatt for their hard work on this and all the various proponents that worked on this.

Just for the public record, I was hard of hearing this morning, if Councillor Wyatt could reiterate the level of consultation that's going to take place and involvement with regards to the St. Andrews Society that would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I guess I'm summing debate Mr. Speaker at the same time?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you are.

Councillor Wyatt: All right. Absolutely I welcome the St. Andrews Society's presentation this morning, and give the assurance that they will definitely be consulted.

The report before us today speaks to two parcels, Parcels A and B, specifically a plan for Parcel B and calls for a concept plan to be developed with Parcel A. Gatehouse has signed that agreement and that a concept plan would be coming back to the Standing Committee and to the director for approval prior to any agreement and that indeed the St. Andrews Society will be consulted as part of the process.

As a matter of fact, I can tell this chamber that yesterday Ross McGowan of CentreVenture already had a conversation with one of the leaders of the St. Andrews Society and indicated to them that they would be part of the

process. I believe Mr. McGowan himself was also involved with the Selkirk Settlers statute that is now in the roundabout with having that erected in that location.

And as somebody Mr. Speaker of proud Scottish decent myself, going back to the Baxter clan and even further back traced to royalty of the lowland Scots, I can assure this chamber that I'll be more than proud to ensure that, that my ancestors rightful place in the foundation of this City and indeed this country, is always upheld and celebrated Mr. Speaker. So thank you very much for the question.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors. We shall celebrate Councillor Wyatt.

All in favour of Item 2? Contrary? It's Carried.

DD Motions, none. DD Consideration of By-laws, Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker I would like to move that By-law No. 120/2008 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 120/2008.

Councillor Wyatt: I'd like to move Mr. Speaker that By-law No. 120/2008 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 120/2008.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker I would like to move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 120/2008 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Question Period. None. Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, report of June 24/2008, Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JUNE 24, 2008

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me start by thanking the members of the Property and Development Committee. As you can see, we have 31 items in front of us today so we know who was carrying the workload around here through the months of June and part of July. One, two items, one By-law, no items, two items. Thirty-one items Mr. Speaker, that's not mentioning what, oh four for Councillor, thank you very much, Councillor Clement.

So, I'm pleased to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 through 31, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'd like to stand down Item No. 5 please.

Mr. Speaker: No. 5. And from…

Councillor Swandel: Item No. 5…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor hang on, Councillor just hang on. From 1 to 31 excluding 5, All…

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: 6.

Mr. Speaker: Oh you want 6. 5 and 6 have been stood down. Any more?

And the rest, Mr. Clerk.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

So Items 5 and 6 have been stood down. The rest have been passed.

Item 5 - Rezoning - Southeast corner of Templeton Avenue and McGregor Street - DAZ 209/2008

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Item No. 5, okay. It's pretty straight forward. There was a change here, a change in the recommendation from Community Committee where the Community Committee had recommended the cost of pavements previously installed not be charged to this.

Through Property and Development and Executive Policy Committee we both agreed that because this was publicly marketed as unserviced land we had to stay true to the principles of fairness in the marketing process. If the proponents choose not to move forward that would be a shame. We'll have to go back and remarket the property but I'll listen to what Councillor Pagtakhan has to say.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan you have the floor.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This particular property, the southeast corner of McGregor and Templeton is a real special case and I just want to put some facts for the rest of Council to consider.

From the time that I've been a Councillor, this piece of land has been pretty much undevelopable throughout the last six years. The reason why is because it is a remnant when McGregor was put in. It's a triangular piece of land as you can see, from your report, screen 14 of 22 on your screen on DMIS, and basically as a result of it being a remnant it's got a high ratio of frontage relative to the rear lots.

So if homes were to be built on McGregor or Templeton some lots would have very, very short rear yards and some of them would have wildly larger yards. Mr. Speaker that's extremely important because it is very difficult to create a solution to satisfy this triangular piece of land which is like I say a remnant.

In the past we have had, we've considered an application for a very dense development, and that was turned down by the Community Committee. That wasn't supported by the community or all of the Councillors on the Committee.

So, I have to applaud the developer here, the 3-Y Group Incorporated. They found the perfect balance Mr. Speaker, on this triangular piece of land. Instead of fronting onto McGregor and Templeton and with restrictions on the rail line, they have made a development of 38 town homes, affordable town homes I might add, that face inwards. And they are, Mr. Speaker they are prepared to pay $800,000 of servicing, sewer and a road into the development, to make this project happen.

Incidentally, and very important here, this development is very well accepted in the community. The proponents got a lot of support from the community. They got support of the Councillor, the local Councillor, and support of the members of the Community Committee. And so that's, this is a unique situation that requires a unique solution and I think we need to think outside of the box here, Mr. Speaker.

I'm asking that we give this application a second thought, and I would like to refer it back to Executive Policy Committee. I've spoken with the developer. They have no problem with it going back for a second review in favour of allowing the waiver of the fees for servicing along McGregor and Templeton and for us to consider favourably their application here today.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor I wish you said that from the first that you're moving a motion to refer because you spoke and now you are moving a referral. But it will be up to the will of Council, what Council wants to… Should have done it first, Councillor Pagtakhan. Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Speaker I would be pleased to move referral of this item for the reasons given by Councillor Pagtakhan.

Mr. Speaker: Okay thank you Councillor. A motion to refer.

Councillor Swandel. Can we speak to the motion?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel. You have a right to speak.

Councillor Swandel: We have been through a public hearing process. It's troubling me that Councillor Pagtakhan has in fact spoken to the proponent. I believe we've had a clean process up till now, and I believe that we need to proceed with our process. We have matters that are in front of us. There are matters of fairness in marketing. I don't know, we don't have legal representation here right now but I don't know what we're opening ourselves up to. I would suggest that the appropriate thing to do would be to have the matter proceed and let the cards fall where they may.

Mr. Speaker: Okay on the motion to refer. All in favour?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote has been called for on the motion to refer.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Thomas, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Gerbasi, Leipsic, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt.

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

Mr. Speaker: The motion to refer was Lost.

On the, on Item 5.

All in favour? Opposed? Councillor Pagtakhan in opposition.

Item 6.

Item 6 - Subdivision and Rezoning - Southwest corner of Templeton Avenue and McGregor Street - DASZ 9/2008

Councillor Swandel: I believe this is probably the same argument on Item No. 6. And I just want to add one more comment on this that we've done a great deal of work with Property and Development and through the Red Tape Commission and trying to have a consistency in the application of development agreement parameters and I think this is just proving out that we are being consistent as well.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'm not going to make up a motion, this is the same, this is a piece, a remnant of land on the other side of McGregor, even longer and narrower, that we sold for I believe $375,000 dollars.

Then at the hearing the proponent, the person buying our land was told you can't have access off of your 1,000 feet on McGregor. You can only have one driveway. You must service your 33 single family lots by a service road which you must build off this one driveway, onto McGregor, oh and something we didn't tell you but we sold you the land for $375,000, we want another $400,000 dollars for the pavement we installed 15 years ago on McGregor Street.

Community Committee thought that was totally unfair. The land is this deep and this long and we're going to charge you for this length even though it's our own land and you can't have more than one driveway off it, but you'll pay us, something we didn't tell you about. At this meeting, the property representative was asked by me, then chair, did you sell this land acknowledging that there is a road there? Well of course. All of a sudden, no,

it was sold as unserviced land and they have to pay for the road we built 15 years ago, even though they can't have access to it. The whole thing is idiotic and bogus. However, I guess it is what it is because we can't be seen to do anything for a developer.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I want to be a little bit careful of this one Mr. Speaker. I recognize the comments of my friend from Old Kildonan. My probably gross oversimplification of this is that this land, and I think I could probably group both sides of the road to the same category, was marketed by our Property and Development department. There was a closure date.

None or most of us, to my knowledge, weren't that close to the process so I'm going to make the assumption that it was a wide open process. There may or may not have been multiple players who were interested in this property and for whatever reason, the proponents in question here wound up being, I don't know if successful is the right term, but the principal people that went forward with this particular land.

Now, where it gets difficult of course is that when Councillor O'Shaughnessy says well they were then told this or they were then told that. Well, I don't really know exactly how all of those pieces unfolded. So my concern is this. If we suddenly start changing and sort of adjusting the obligations of any developer kind of midstream, what are we opening ourselves up to? That would be my question.

Was there other people who knew about some of these obligations, for whatever reason, and wrote them in and didn't make the same offer or the same proposal or whatever and now suddenly, if, sort of 75% of the way through the process the rules are changed what happens then? It's a little daunting and maybe even a little bit scary to consider that.

So I guess we could do this, we could run this issue through the process as is. We could vote on this report and it goes ahead and I suppose the developer is going to have to make a choice, whether or not this actually works for them. And if it doesn't, then I guess we go back to square one, which is bad for the developer and, of course, we genuinely don't feel great about that, but at least what it does do is it opens up everything wide open again and then everybody can then exactly be on the same level playing field and we can put forward that land in whatever form that we deem appropriate.

If it turns out that what these developers are saying is exactly correct, that this land is not developable, if we're putting on some of these conditions, well then the marketplace is going to tell us that and we can tell all of the, we'll be able to tell by the reaction of all the players out there in the marketplace that what we're asking for is too much.

I just, I don't know Mr. Speaker, the prospect of putting something out there with a cut off date and then we go with one person and kind of, we make these changes, pretty big changes kind of after the fact, that's not, that wouldn't be the perfect way to go. I don't think there is any real risk to us in just sort of closing out this process, let the applicant make up their mind at the end of the process. Will this work for them or not? And if not they can back out and then we could start again.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel would you like to close?

Councillor Swandel: Strictly to close. These are conditional sales, both of these pieces as I understand it. They are conditional on successful, the rezoning to the purchaser's satisfaction. These ultimately will be business decisions at the end of the day. I don't disagree that there is an argument to be made here that perhaps the entire cost of that piece of road should not be applied to this piece of land but we would have to market it like that in that case.

If you look just to the west, the one that's on the west side there is a large amount of residential that came to within this 100

feet or 200 feet of this roadway. Normally the cost of this roadway would have been, if that land was included with the other houses the cost would have been spread out over those other lots.

So you know I don't disagree that there is an argument here. The reason why we are here today doing what we're doing is because procedurally and I believe legally, it is the correct thing to do. And I think it's unfortunate that people have had to do the work they've had to do but I think we're probably obligated to take the path that we are taking.

Mr. Speaker: Ready for the question? All in favour of Item 6? Opposed? Three, me myself too, four of us, Councillor O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Thomas and myself, and Councillor Nordman is five.

Councillor Swandel: Anybody else while we are at it Mr. Speaker or can we move on to the…?

Mr. Speaker: We're through with that so Motions, if any. None. Consideration of By-laws. This is only for the second and third reading. Councillor Swandel.

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

Councillor Swandel: I will move that the following By-laws be read a second time, By-law No. 215/2006 as amended and 64/2008 as amended.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 215/2006 as amended and By-law No. 64/2008 as amended.

Councillor Swandel: I will move that By-law No. 215/2006 as amended, and By-law No. 64 /2008 as amended, 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 Swandel: Mr. Speaker I will move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws No. 121/2008, 122/2008, 124/2008, 126/2008.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 121/2008, 122/2008, 124/2008 and 126/2008.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I will move that By-laws No. 121/2008, 122/2008, 124/2008, and 126/2008, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 121/2008, 122/2008, 124/2008 and 126/2008.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 121/2008, 122/2008, 124/2008 and 126/2008, be read a third time, and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Question Period. Councillor O'Shaughnessy your first question.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: To the chair of the Standing Policy Committee Councillor Swandel. Would you be willing to request, as you have no authority to direct anything, as Councillors have no authority around here, would you be willing to request that your real estate people be instruct, or inform people offering to buy City land in the future of any fixed cost that will be added to, such as LI rates on streets that the property happens to be situated on and any other fixed costs that they will incur such as the $1,200 for gross subdivision, so that people aren't buying under one set of circumstances and then finding they have to develop under another because everybody is not a Qualico or a Genstar or a Ladco?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Certainly I can ask for that information and make sure that that information is put forward when we do that. I think we already do for the most part. Not everybody is a sophisticated developer and is aware of the development agreement parameters that we operate under and certainly we end up in some problems when we're marketing City land and then we're getting into a Committee process where we've had multiple players on a piece of land.

And I think its unfortunate we've had to through this process here today, but as I stated before I believe it is the correct thing to do. But we'll certainly bring that to the attention of the Director and the Manager of Real Estate at the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you. Does the chairman know if the proponents, since we've, the clauses we've just passed, 5 and 6 will be, if they should decide that it's untenable with these charges they didn't know about when they made offers on the property, will they get a refund of their down payment, and this is the sarcastic part, will they get back the $40 to $60,000 dollars each one of them has put into these development proposals before they were told they had to pay $400,000 for pre-existing pavements?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: You know, I guess I would have to take it at face value that people were not aware. I think in one particular case, I know one of the developers is quite sophisticated and would have asked, done a great deal of due diligence before even making an offer, so I think they would have known the transportation situation, and probably the requirements on the roadway. Short answer, no.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: They won't get their deposit back?

Councillor Swandel: Well hopefully they'll get their deposit back, the other one no.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions?

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: No.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, report of July 4, 2008.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JULY 4, 2008

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker regarding our Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services meeting of July 4, 2008, I'll say first, did you know that on the four person committee two of the members are born in the United States, which was on July 4th. It was quite a celebration at Committee Mr. Speaker.

I will move as Consent Items, Items 1, 3 and 4, Mr. Speaker. We have to have a little talk about No. 2.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal what number? What number are you asking for?

Councillor Steeves: No I've set aside No. 2.

Mr. Speaker: No. 2. Okay so 1, 3 and 4 and number 2 has been stood down. Would you like to introduce it?

Councillor Steeves: Just call the question on 1, 3 and 4.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, sorry, sorry. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 2, Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 - Community Incentive Grant - Entreprises Riel Inc., File PR-2.6(35)

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor, Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I was obligated to do that by the rules because it comes forward without recommendation. I'm not going to make a speech on it. It is the, it is one of those I guess CIGs doesn't meet criteria and as per my usual practice I'm not going to try to influence the Council in any certain way. You will vote your own conscience.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Yes this is something that came out of the Riel Community Committee. It's a $25,000 dollar grant from my Community Incentive money to Entreprises Riel, which are, who are a non-profit organization who promote economic development in the Riel district.

Essentially, the money is to be used for the purchase of cabins or kiosks, which are going to be part of a Christmas craft initiative event over a few weekends in November and December, on City land, on boulevard Provencher. And when they are not there they're going to be publicly owned, they're going to be used by the Festival du Voyageur. They are going to be used for the river trail which occurs after Christmas, and there is going to be much community use for these cabins over the course of the year.

It's a non-profit organization. The funds are coming from St. Boniface CIGs. So I would urge all Councillors to vote against the Protection recommendation and we'll see what happens. Thank you.

Councillor Steeves: A quick Point of Order Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: What's your Point of Order?

Councillor Steeves: Just so we're a hundred percent clear, given it came forward without recommendation from EPC the clerk has informed that it does stand on Council floor as a negative recommendation, a recommendation against the, against the CIG going ahead. That's the status as of right now.

Councillor Swandel: So that's a simple majority.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, a simple majority. Let's go to Council. Councillor Thomas, Councillor O'Shaughnessy. Do you want to speak?

Councillor Thomas: I actually had a question that I hope gets addressed when it's closing. I heard Councillor Vandal say that Festival du Voyageur is going to be using these kiosks as well as a number of other recreational groups and given that I don't understand why it doesn't meet criteria because it is a recreational organization and those are recreational activities. So I don't understand why it doesn't meet criteria in the first place so I would appreciate that being explained upon closing.

Mr. Speaker: They will, they will. Councillor O'Shaughnessy you're next to speak.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: As this came forward without recommendation I assume that means it was a 2-2 vote. I would just like to know in your summing up, who voted for it the Americans or the Canadians? (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, you know, perhaps as I speak the clerk could be making some notes here because I kind of think we need some clarification on exactly what we're doing here.

As I understand the process Mr. Speaker, we are, we need a simple majority to have the clause stand because the negative recommendation means that we're not going against criteria. I'm assuming then that there is no motion on the floor to have a positive recommendation. A vote supporting the negative recommendation does not mean an automatic support of not meeting the criteria.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Yes it does.

Councillor Swandel: Okay. So by simple majority then, this thing can proceed in the positive. No.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Yes it can. We've done it hundreds of times.

Councillor Swandel: Okay. So do we, perhaps I'll make that as a Point of Order and we get some further explanation and then I will stand up and speak Mr. Speaker.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Yeah, special rules in this category. We made that change. Now I remember.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors, Councillors, Mr. Clerk, can you take that microphone and explain to Council exactly where we're at and what No. 2 means.

City Clerk: In accordance with the By-law that you passed, any Community Incentive Grant that doesn't comply with the terms in the Community Incentive Grant policy requires approval of two-thirds of the members present. However, the recommendation that you not be approved is not in non-compliance so it needs a simple majority.

So when you're voting on it as Justin said, you're voting on the Protection recommendation that's before you today, that you not approve a grant to Entreprises Riel. If that is not supported, someone could ask for suspension of the rule and look for support for Entreprises Riel and giving the grant that that would require a two-thirds vote.

Mr. Speaker: Right. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I'm sure, and I hope that Councillor Vandal will stand and make that motion if this is defeated.

You know, it's very difficult as someone who tries to make everybody stick to the rules and to stand up and support something like this. You know it's my colleague from the Riel Community Committee so some of it is out of that camaraderie or common support that we sometimes bring out of Community Committee.

But I also believe that in this particular area, there is so much going on, whether it be Le Cercle Moliere which we dealt with earlier today, the jardin de sculptures at the City Hall and a number of capital projects and initiatives along Provencher, that it would be quite easy to find capital dollars that would meet CIG and that there could be a bunch of juggling that happened here to make this work and we would just be basically making these organizations jump through a bunch of hoops that they don't necessarily have to jump through.

You know, ultimately at the end of the day. If we look at this as some structures that are temporary in nature that are going to be put out at Christmas time as part of arts and crafts and walking through this Promenade on Provencher, that it could be certainly considered recreational and for the community good. It will happen on City property. It's organizations that we are strongly supportive of.

And you know while I'm reluctant to do it, I'm certainly willing to support Councillor Vandal here today in just getting this $25,000 moving towards what I think we're going to do at the end of the day. He will find a way to do this and we'll juggle some money somewhere, and I've already had some preliminary discussions with Councillor Vandal how to do that. I don't know that it's necessary for us to force people to go through that.

So I would ask that we get some support for Councillor Vandal here to defeat what's in front of us today as a recommendation from Protection, and also that we can get a unanimous support to move forward and have the money flow as I had suggested it should.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just want to say I can only speak for myself for this. I sit on Protection and Community Services. I appreciate the explanation from

Councillor Vandal. I didn't realize, I thought it was for operating for this particular function. Now that I know that it's for kiosks and for recreational and festive use, I have no problem supporting this application.

Mr. Speaker: Are you ready for the vote?

Councillor Steeves: Do you want me to sum up or…?

Mr. Speaker: The clerk… Councillor Steeves do you want to sum up before the vote?

Councillor Steeves: I thought there was a couple of questions. Very briefly. Councillor O'Shaughnessy asked about the split at PCS. It was, I was the only person in favour of this particular one. I think I lost 3 to 1 on that so both Americans and one Canadian voted. I'm just joking. They're all Canadian. They're all, yeah. They're all Canadian. Exactly right.

To answer Councillor Thomas' question about why it didn't meet criteria I'm only reading from the CIG application of valuation. It doesn't meet criteria according to the person who filled out the form, it doesn't meet criteria 1b, which is the organization is a non-profit community organization offering sport or recreation services or is a non-profit community organization that contributes to the health and well being of the community but not through the development of a sport or recreation project. That's X-ed out as a no.

And number 2 also indicated that in terms of making a significant contribution and long-term benefit to the community-at-large through improved facilities. These are the criteria that have been, I guess, denoted as not being met. And take that for what it's worth Mr. Speaker, that's the determination of one person or whoever is in charge of making those types of determination. It is what it is Mr. Speaker.

I will be supporting, as I supported it at Community Committee and at the Protection and Community Services Committee. I think it's close enough and even though maybe there are some possible areas of debate with respect to the type of service it provides. At the end of the day, if, if the Councillor in the area feels this is an appropriate use for his or her allotment within the area, unless it is something that is I guess way outside of the policy, my inclination is support it. I say that not in attempt to try to convince you but only to tell you my position. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, ready for the question? Explain the question. Voting on the recommendations of the Standing Committee.

All in favour of the recommendation as coming from the Standing Committee that it not be proceeded with. Just a simple 51% of the vote. That it not be proceeded with.

All in favour of that recommendation from the Standing Committee that it not be proceeded with.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Clement, Gerbasi, Leipsic, Wyatt.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

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

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal do you want to move a positive motion now?

Councillor Vandal: Could I move a positive motion, the same motion from the Riel Community Committee?

Councillor Swandel: I'll second that.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Vandal: Seconded by Councillor Swandel.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. You need two-thirds of the vote. All in favour of Councillor Vandal's motion please rise or just recorded vote. Two-thirds, we need two-thirds of the vote Councillors.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Clement, Gerbasi, Leipsic.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 4. The motion is passed.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is passed. Congratulations Councillor Vandal. You got it.

Okay. The Motions, None. Consideration of By-laws, Councillor Steeves.

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

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll move that By-law No. 127/2008 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 127/2008.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-law No. 127/2008, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 127/2008.

I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 127/2008 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Question Period. None.

Alternate Service Delivery Committee, Councillor Swandel report of July 8th of 2008.

REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE DATED JULY 8, 2008

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank Councillor Vandal who not only sat through all of those items in Property and Development with me but also at Alternative Service Delivery Committee. It was a great deal of work that we had to do this month, and I appreciate the efforts.

And with that I'm pleased to introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Item No. 1.

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

Before we move into adjournment, Councillors this is our prorogue season now, we won't be back here until September, so to each and every one of you, to your family, have a joyous and a safe holiday throughout the summer.

And also I would like to invite the listening or the people who have been watching us on cable, Shaw and MTS, that if they have any comments, I hope you enjoyed this session of this Council meeting, the final one for this summer. Please, let us know.

Councillor Swandel moves adjournment.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Gerbasi, Leipsic, Nordman, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel, Thomas, Vandal, and Wyatt.

Council adjourned at 2:57 p.m.