COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, September 30, 2009

The Council met at 9:33 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 Browaty.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We have two pages. I would like to introduce them. It's Kayla Ruiz of Kelvin High School who resides in the Daniel McIntyre Ward and Nick Bruneau of Garden City Collegiate who resides in Mynarski ward. Welcome. We have three condolences motion…sorry. Mr. Mayor, you have an announcement? Followed by Councillor Pagtakhan.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. As most of you are aware in the wake of tropical storm Ketsana, many regions in the Philippines are experiencing the worst flooding the country has ever seen in the last 40 years and remains in a state of emergency, including Winnipeg's sister city, the city of Manila.

And on behalf of all Winnipeggers, I wish to extend our thoughts and prayers to the citizens of Manila and every municipality in the flood-affected region. In the face of tragedy, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the affected Filipino communities, provinces and regions will find strength to rebuild and persevere throughout this very trying time.

Mr. Speaker, Winnipeg has been known for its generosity and giving nature whenever or wherever tragedy strikes. I wish to encourage all Winnipeggers wanting to assist those affected by flooding in and around our sister city, by way of a donation or volunteer resources to please contact the Philippine Canadian Centre of Manitoba located at 737 Keewatin Street. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Pagtakhan

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to thank Mayor Sam Katz for those comments and the Encouragement of our citizens to help out as much as possible with those affected back home in the Philippines.

Winnipeg has a large Filipino population and I just wanted to read into the record a little bit about what has happened back home for many of the Filipinos, they have a lot of loved ones back home and it's…this tragedy, this typhoon, the tropical storm Ketsana or popularly known as tropical storm Ondoy amongst Filipinos, has really ravaged a great deal of craziness in the Philippines. So basically, this storm lasted for almost 9 hours last Saturday, September 29th…sorry, Saturday, September 26th, 2009.

The typhoon has mainly hit the island of Luzon with winds of 85 kilometers gusting to over a hundred kilometres. At the height of the heavy down pour, flash floods and land slides occurred. Waters rose so fast that people living in low lying areas were caught unaware. They were forced to stay on the roofs of their houses to avoid being swept away by the flood. Collapse of walls weakened by the flood water caused more damage, coupled with the raging waters.

The statistics from national disaster coordinated Council in the Philippines, the death toll has reached over 300, Mr. Speaker, 37 confirmed missing, and as of last count of The National Disasters Coordination Council the total number of population affected is over 1.8 million individuals, or over 319,000 families. At present, rescue operations are still on going and some areas have not been reached. Some areas are still submerging water. In areas where water has submerged…sorry has subsided, water

and power supply are cut off because water and power systems and generators were damaged by the flood water as well. Communication in disasters stricken areas is difficult. Most of those stranded cannot call for help because the batteries of their mobile phones are dead and they are not able to charge because of the cut off power supply.

Urge all Winnipeggers and members of Council that they can to provide some cash and or in kind donation to the Philippine Canadian Centre located at 737 Keewatin and there is also another group of Filipinos who are doing various multi prominent approaches with this disaster relief. There is an organization here called The National Council of Filipino Canadian Associations representing over a hundred associations in the city, and they're going to be coursing donations through The National Council of Churches in the Philippines who are already mobilized with their member churches and it's an ecumenical organization with many volunteers, and if anyone would like to make a cash donation to The National…to The National Council of Filipino Canadian Association, just contact my office. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor, to you Mr. Mayor and Councillor Pagtakhan. Thanks. Thank you for these. And we have three condolences motions. Would the Clerk please read all three of them and then we'll stand.

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Lazarenko,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former City Clerk, William (Bill) Quayle, which occurred on July 29, 2009.

This Council extends to his daughter Leslie-Ann and her family, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Moved by Councillor Lazarenko,
Seconded by Councillor Steeves,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former City Clerk, Herbert (Herb) Sanger, which occurred on August 18, 2009.

This Council extends to his wife Mary, son John and daughter Peggy, and their families, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Moved by Councillor Lazarenko,
Seconded by Councillor Nordman,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Councillor Warren Steen, which occurred on August 19, 2009.

This Council extends to his daughter Laura and her family, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. I'd just like to say briefly that the three condolences motions that have been read out here today, the only ones that were present at that time in the 70s when they worked as the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk and in Council was Councillor O'Shaughnessy and myself, and I'm sure you know members of Council, we, at that time, it was a little bit different. We used to have communal cities. It was not the same as it is now but we had fine people and those fine people are gone and so we just re-lived on our memory. Would everyone in the gallery and the chamber, please rise for a moment of silence.

(Moment of silence)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We have now a motion, motion number one. Would the Clerk please read the motion out?

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Browty,
Seconded by Councillor Steeves,

WHEREAS Section 67(1) of The City of Winnipeg Charter states that Council

must appoint a Councillor to be the Deputy Presiding Officer;

AND WHEREAS Section 67(1) of The City of Winnipeg Charter also states that the Councillor appointed as Deputy Presiding Officer must not be a member of the Executive Policy Committee;

AND WHEREAS the current Deputy Presiding Officer, Councillor Mike O'Shaughnessy, was appointed to Executive Policy Committee as Secretary of Strategic Infrastructure Renewal on September 8, 2009;

AND WHEREAS Councillor Grant Nordman has expressed interest in acting as Deputy Presiding Officer;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Councillor Grant Nordman be appointed by Council as its Deputy Presiding Officer.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further nominations? No further nominations for the last final call, no further nominations?

All in favour of the motion? Contrary? Carried. Congratulations, Councillor Nordman. The adoption of minutes,

MINUTES

Councillor Nordman moves that the minutes of the meeting held on July 22nd, 2009 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? - Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Delegations. We have one delegation. Emily Ternette, you have 10 minutes, Emily. And that's in respect item one of report of the Standing Policy Committee of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated September 15th.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, if I may…

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mayor Katz: Just before Emily, forgive me. I know you mentioned one delegation. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, we Executive Policy Committee dealt with the matter on the agenda today regarding Infrastructure and Public Works. It's been brought to my attention that there is a delegation here that would like to speak, and I'm hoping that we can move to accept the report to allow the delegation to speak after Emily speaks.

Mr. Speaker: Could you give me the name?

Mayor Katz: I don't know.

Mr. Speaker: What's the name of the delegation?

Mr. Speaker: Dan…Dan Nolin? Okay, Councillors (Inaudible) all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Emily.

Emily Ternette: Thank you. I'm actually giving this presentation this morning on behalf of Nick. It's…so you'll just have to imagine that Nick is giving this presentation, not me. So I don't sound at all like him, but, I'm here today to speak to you regarding the Administrative Report, Future Transit Fares and Low Income Transit Passes. I would like to clarify some matters and ask some questions about this report.

As you know, in November 2008, the original motion was moved by Mayor Katz and seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan, to take the issue of bus fare increases away from City Council, and that Council directed the public service to review these fees regularly. At that time in my presentation to you, I recommended that the Public Utilities Board of the provincial government, an independent board, be given authority to hold public meetings concerning bus fare increases, then the PUB could increase or decrease bus fares depending on transit's needs. I am shocked to see that on December 17th, 2008, a motion was recommended that a By-law be passed that would delegate authority to the Chief Financial Officer to increase transit fees and charges up to the rate of inflation.

As a result of the adoption of this policy, Transit will no longer require City Council's approval for any transit fare adjustments. This is completely unacceptable. By using a By-law from December 2008, you are leaving out public participation and Council participation. In fact, this By-law was never meant to be applied to transit and might just be illegal, according to the City of Winnipeg Act. Are you aware of which part of the Act allows such a By-law to be passed? In fact, according to the City of Winnipeg Act, under a section called delegation, restriction on delegation by Council, section 53(1) and I quote, "Council must not delegate its authority to enact a By-law or to exercise or perform any power, duty or function that by this or any other act it is required to exercise or perform by By-law. While I recognize that Council has difficulty in dealing with fare increases every year, the Public Utilities Board could instead take over this role and allow public input during fare increase considerations. But what if transit increases are needed above the rate of inflation because of other cost increases? Who will make the final decision then? The CFO or would it go back to Council?

Low income bus passes. I am pleased to note that the City of Winnipeg staff has been in touch with the Province's staff at Family Services and Housing's Disability Programs and Employment Net Income Assistance Program to discuss how a low income bus pass would be implemented and what impact the Province's involvement would have on their staff complement. I also understand that the EIA program provides bus passes for some recipients. However, I am not talking about welfare recipients, I am talking about the sector of citizens who are low income, working yet living below the poverty line which is about 22,000 dollars a year, having to go to food banks to get by. So why can we not implement the low income bus pass for this group of citizens as we are not talking about people who are on welfare, who already receive bus passes. The suggestion that a low income bus pass program would decrease transit revenue in the range of $850,000 to $2 million is simply not accurate because of the increased ridership that these passes would bring. Principally immigrants who don't go on income assistance work at low-paying jobs and take public transit.

Off peak bus passes. This concept would provide low income cut off bus passes at more affordable prices during off peak hours. The suggestion that this be considered after Transit's Fare Collection System Update Project is completed is like putting the cart before the horse. I was involved in the Fare Collection System Update Community Consultation and fully support the recommendation that the fare collection hardware and processes replace transit's current fare collection system by the end of 2009. During the consultation, I asked whether it would be difficult for the smart card to incorporate off-peak passes as well, and I was told absolutely not. All kinds of transit fare discounts can be incorporated if City Council approves. So if you favour off-peak passes then implement them immediately. The technology for the fare collection system is already built in with the smart card. Off-peak passes will increase ridership significantly to the point where bus fare increases will not be needed for a number of years to come. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Ms. Ternette. Are there some questions? Councillor Gerbasi, your first question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I think I'm sure I speak on behalf of all members of Council when we send our best wishes to Nick in his recovery as many have already, but of course we're always thinking about him at this time and as many Winnipeggers are. So I just wanted to mention that but I also…just also wanted to ask if you were aware that a number of Councillors did vote in opposition to the new fees and poli…fees and charges policy that was passed in December. Councillor Smith, Vandal and myself voted against that policy for some of the reasons you outlined. I just wanted to know if you were aware of that. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? If not, thanks, Emily. Give our regards to Nick. The second delegation, Dan Nolin.

Mr. Nolin before you start, I just want to indicate the procedural By-law section 51(12), delegations appearing before Council with regard to recommendations for an award of contract shall only address Council on the basis of the criteria set out in the invitation to tender and not on any other issue. Section 51(13), also, any questions by members of Council of delegations appearing before under rule 51(12), shall be directed to the criteria set out in the invitation to tender and not on any other issue: (Inaudible) You know that's what I read and that's what you have on the procedural By-law. So address the issue that you're here for.

Dan Nolin: Thank you. I would like to say good morning to everybody. I've never done this before so…totally nervous. It's about a trash issue in the cart. I went on the internet and basically, things are going in the wrong direction with waste management reduction.

For the last five years I've been doing my part. I…I'm down to about not even a 100 litre garbage can at home. I fill up recycle bins and basically I wheel them out to the front street, one trip, not a problem. With the issue of these big garbage cans, they're humongous. We're up to 240 litres. I noticed on…for these microchips it's not about finding my garbage can, it seems to be…or seemed to be working towards a pay for weigh trash removal, because if anybody would go on the internet they can see that the chip was actually designed and meant for recycling bins of that nature. And what it would do is give people incentives to recycle more. It would give them coupons, business things, and they would register on a data base this information, and you would receive coupons or…as it was on the internet they say in Philadelphia, the family got 15 dollars the first week and received 35 dollars the following week.

So, that then, if you filled up a container that size that you have out there, if that was full, I probably would have no use for 240 litre trash can, because there just doesn't seem…you would be recycling. So that chip, actually, if anything, should be on the recycle. So then you would have less waste if you had less waste you wouldn't need the trucks and if you wouldn't need the trucks you wouldn't need these bins either and somebody wouldn't be asking you for $3 million right now.

I invented a cart myself that just takes the trash right out to the front street. It doesn't cost anybody anything. Nobody is asking from nobody for money. Nobody is asking for funds. If people want to do it that way, it's fine. They've been doing it that way. They have no problem. Our trash as far as I recall, I've never had anybody steal my garbage can in my life and I've lived here for 50 years. I never knew there was a problem with trash. I've lived in Windsor Park all my life. I've never had a problem with my trash. The odd day, yes. They don't show up, maybe because a truck broke down. I'll look down the street. If everybody is not picked up, I would assume…whatever, malfunction in the truck, something happened. If, for whatever reason, I need…if I didn't have that service, I wouldn't need a chip to tell you that nobody picked up my garbage. I can just pick up the telephone and I would phone and say "hey, nobody's picked up my garbage today. Why is that happening?" Like…it's like any other service. If you don't receive it, people will just pick up the telephone and phone. You don't need a microchip to tell them. I think more or less what the microchip is for is, and if the City is going with a big large waste container, it's…we're stepping into pay as you weigh because that's what the thing does. It basically gives you an account for these people that were getting their discounts for recycling and set up an account for you and basically, all you have to do with this system is click in Dan Nolin's cart and Dan Nolin threw 20 pounds of garbage out today, which Dan Nolin never throws out basically more than 100 litres. Some people in my neighbourhood have a little bag. It seems nobody wants to pick up anything any more. They want a machine to do it.

So, I don't think it's at all about this plan is not about waste reduction at all. It's totally opposite. It's actually…it actually makes just no sense. And then for a company to come and ask for millions of dollars for

me to start my business and my venture, I had to do…like I guess most people do for businesses, you put a business plan together, you go to the financial institutions, you seek investors, and then you ask them. And they'll look and study the issue and they say "hey, is there money to be made at this?" and if there is money to be made at, guess what, they'll jump on it. They'll invest. They will give you the money. If it's not a money-making adventure it seems, let's come and ask the taxpayer for the money because if it sinks, oh well. I'm stuck with the bill. We're all stuck with the bill. I don't want to be stuck with a bill. I want waste reduction.

A microchip isn't going to help me find my garbage can. I bet you if you asked the officer that got hit by a car he would sooner have that microchips sitting in that car that were used for chasing that was stolen so at least send the City of Winnipeg and say, you know what there is where that car is going down the highway. It's got a microchip in it. I would sooner have a microchip in a vehicle rather than a garbage can. To me, it's just absolutely makes no sense. It's a total waste of money. It's totally all…all not for waste reduction what so ever. It's about basically dumping more trash.

I've gone to Brady Road. They've got three lanes now. Before they used to have one. Three lanes now to pump the cars in there. Let's get the garbage in, let's make some money. Somebody wants to make money and dump more. So, it's obvious there, so as far as I'm concerned, if the City is at on a can that size, it should be a chip on a recycle bin, okay, then you can see how much the people are dumping, you can award them for it and then you are going to have less and you won't need that black one there so you'll save money. You won't need people to lift it, you won't…hopefully you won't have any of it. You'll be down to a garbage can this big. One would hope, in a perfect world and sooner or later I hope we get that way. But until then I think wasting millions of dollars just to wind up giving everybody a big can so at the end we can give them a bill for weigh is the wrong direction. I think a bill for weigh for recycling would be the way to go. That's about all I have to say, and I want to…you know…thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. Like I said, I've never been here before, never done this before and I wish you all have a great day today, okay.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Nolin. Just, just hold it. There may be some questions. Any questions of the delegation? Councillor Orlikow. He has a question for you.

Councillor Orlikow: Yes, thank you for coming today. I know this process was quite rushed, and it's unfortunate. And I've been gathering information as well as quick as I can. And one piece of information just relates to your presentation is that when we're awarding this contract, the actual size of the container will come out at a later date. This is what I've been told through the department. So, were you aware of that?

Dan Nolin: The size? Of what container?

Councillor Orlikow: (Inaudible) The container for waste removal. The actual size being proposed right now may not be the actual size in the end.

Dan Nolin: But what is the size though?

Councillor Orlikow: That will come out at later debate. Were you aware of that?

Dan Nolin: No. Like…basically it's in the paper. It's 240 litres.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Any further questions, Councillors? Mr. Nolin, thank you, thank you for appearing. Thank you. Executive Policy Committee Report of September the 9th, 2009. Mayor Katz please.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2009**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And just for point of clarification, I think our learned friend was referring to the recycle bin that we're still looking at, not the garbage bin. I think that's established at 240. But nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the report and

move adoption of consent agenda items 1 to 4 on September the 9th.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Report of September the 16th of 2009. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 16, 2009

Mayor Katz: 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 September the 23rd of 2009.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 23, 2009

Mayor Katz: Three times lucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I believe there's…there is a motion. Councillor Gerbasi, motions No. 2.

Councillor Gerbasi: And Councillor Thomas looks like she has something to pull out.

Mr. Speaker: Which…you want No. 2?

Councillor Thomas: Yeah.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Number 2. So items 1 to 3 as consent, all in favour? Contr…oh pardon me. Is it No. 3? Oh just item 3. On item No. 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay so now there is…Mr. Mayor, introduce number 1.

Item No. 1 - Corporate and Community-wide Climate Change Action plans to reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Winnipeg
eFile E

Mayor Katz: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would be happy to. Mr. Speaker again…in January of 2008, at my State of the City Address, I made a promise that we would seek a further reduction of 20% for greenhouse gas emissions. As you know in the past, Mr. Speaker, we had set a goal of 20%. And the claim was that we had accomplished it. I guess you could have that debate but the reality, Mr. Speaker, we accomplished it by selling off Winnipeg Hydro to Manitoba Hydro in the year 2002, prior to my being here. And the truth was that we accomplished half our goal because that accounted to approximately 10%. So obviously because I know that everybody on the floor of Council and all citizens are very concerned about greenhouse gas emissions, I think that we should further make a pledge of 20%. We should work with MIAC, we should work with…stakeholders, members of the public, Councillors as well, to basically fulfill this reduction of 20% and now I would love to hear from the Councillor, please.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow

WHEREAS the Province has enacted, with the Climate Change and Emissions Reductions Act in June of 2008, a target for Manitoba of 6% reduction in Green House Gas emissions by 2012 compared to 1990 levels;

AND WHEREAS the Climate Change Action Plan (Attachment 3 of Item 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 23, 2009) refers to a 6% amount, but does not include a deadline to achieve reductions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Recommendation 3 of Item 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 23, 2009 be amended to include a change to Climate Change Action Plan, specifically setting a target that is consistent with the provincial Climate Change and Emissions Reductions Act target of 6%compared to1990 levels by 2012.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to…I'm moving a small amendment to the report in front of us and I wanted to explain what I'm…what I'm talking about. I appreciate what the Mayor has just said and what he said in terms of…he's spoken mostly the 20% he is speaking to are the corporate emissions which is what the City is doing itself in terms of our own services and our own…the size of the City Government's footprint. And I appreciate that we've made some progress in that.

But I just wanted to go back a little bit to explain that Winnipeg joined partners for climate change…it's now 11 years ago and there was…there was two goals that cities are supposed to complete in that process within the ten years. The first goal is reducing corporate emissions and I think we're working on that and the Mayor has definitely shown a commitment to that and I appreciate that 20%. I'd like to bring to your attention though, that only 2% of all emissions in the City of Winnipeg of greenhouse gas emissions actually are…come from corporate emissions alone.

So that's why the next step in the FCM process that we signed on to, now 11 years ago, is to do a community-wide climate change action plan. And in the report in front of us, attachment 3, outlines an approach to begin doing that community climate change action plan. This amendment is not about the corporate emissions alone, it's about not the 2% but the 100% looking at all of that and it's saying that we need to set a clearer target. We're already 11 years into this process and we haven't started really getting a plan in place. This…what's in front of us is setting out a process to begin to do that plan, and so…and if you look at what other cities are doing…well I'll get into that after. First, I'll explain exactly what this amendment is saying. I wanted you to know in case you don't, that the Province passed legislation in 2008, the Climate Change and Emissions Reduction Act in June of 2008, which targeted Manitoba for a 6% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2012 compared to 1990 levels. And this is not…this is the kind of target that the city of Toronto has, many, many other cities across Canada have a target specified like that and they have a plan in place.

The Climate Change Action Plan outlined in the report in front of us that we're supposed to be endorsing today. I know there is a lot of trash talk and things flying around today and we're kind of missing some of these other really important issues that we're dealing with today, but we're deciding that this is the course we're taking in addressing greenhouse gases and a lot of people probably haven't even had time to read it. But I would like to point out that we're endorsing an approach that does not have a target. It has…it says 6% but it does not include a deadline to achieve those reductions.

So what the motion is saying is that let's include a deadline of 6% compared to 1990 levels by 2012 which is exactly what is specified in the legislation from the Province of Manitoba. It's right in here that the goal at the front of the legislation, if you look it up on the internet, the Climate Change and Emission Reductions Act, it clearly says to reduce community wide greenhouse gas emissions by 6% over 1998 levels. As for the…oh no. That's the wrong thing, sorry. I've got too many papers here. Here is the…here's that's…that's what we're saying. We're saying we're going to do 6% but we're not saying a date. This is what it says in the Provincial. It says the initial emissions reduction target is to reduce Manitoba emissions by December 31 of 2012 to an amount of at least 6% the Manitoba's 1990 emissions.

So basically what I'm trying to do to simplify this is…what I'm trying to say is we should have a target, we should have a goal that actually means something. I mean, just to say we're going to try to reduce it but we're not going to say by when we are going to try to reduce it, I don't really think that's the kind of leadership or the political message and the direction in fact we want to give our administration on an issue like this. I think

we want to say to them that this is a high priority. I mean I've heard that from the Mayor that this is a high priority. So yes, we're doing some work on our 2% of emissions that are caused by corporate stuff and I know there's people out in the community already working on some of these community climate change issues to deal with the broader issue, but even before we finalize what our plan is going to be and we have a plan, we can set a goal and that's what the legislation and the Province does. It sets a goal and that's what we should be doing when we're saying that we're endorsing our administration to go off and do an approach to set up a plan for our city. Well we should have a target that they should be reaching and I think we have to give them a little more guidance than just to say, you know, reduce it by 6% whenever. I mean, that doesn't really mean anything. And if you look at what other cities are doing, I think you would…you would see that.

I've done a little bit of research in the last few days and from my previous experience as chair of MIAC last year, Toronto has a community wide climate change plan. So they're not just talking about corporate emissions which is a smaller piece of the pie. They're talking about their land use and transportation planning and all of the issues that are part of a community-wide plan and as well as working in partnership with business, you know, the decisions that are made in partnership with business affect the greenhouse gases overall. And in Toronto, their plan is a target of 6% greenhouse gas reduction to 1990 levels by 2012. Same with New York City, actually, has 7% reduction to 1990 levels by 2012. And if you look at the nine major cities in Canada we're the last one that doesn't have their plan in place and doesn't have a clear target.

So I mean I think we've done well on the corporate emissions but when it comes to our larger emissions issue, we really are trailing the rest of the country and maybe it's not for lack of trying. I think some of the problems are that we don't have this adequately resourced in terms of staffing. We really…you know we really don't have a full-time environmental coordinator who's…We're doing a city plan, but if you look at what other cities are investing in terms of staff and resources to having that sustainability piece part of their plan, you know, I know our staff are struggling to do that with the resources we have and I'm really not trying to criticize them, I'm just saying that we as a Council can make a commitment to setting a clearer target.

And it makes sense to me that what I'm doing is asking Council to amend the section attachment 3, which says here, it outlines…you may have seen it, it's the last three pages of the report and there is a quote that says we are going to begin to develop this community-wide climate change action plan. And it seems to me that if we're going to say we're going to reduce it by 6% through this plan, then let's…let's say by when we want to achieve that and that's what this motion says. And I…I really think we need to think about that, you know. If it's just another report saying we should do this at some point when we get around to it, you know, how long are we going to wait? It's already been 11 years since we made the commitment to do it within ten years by signing on to partners for climate change. And…and I really would like to see us be a leader, you know, rather than a follower on this issue.

So, I hope you'll consider making this amendment that sets a very clear and specific target. You know…we've all been thinking about a whole a lot of other things. I would point out that Winnipeg makes up approximately 80% of the Province of Manitoba. So if we want to help out our province achieve their goals, we're going to have to work a little bit harder. If the Province of Manitoba is going to achieve what they've set out in their legislation we might want to work in partnership with them to try to align our strategies because, you know, I think it's not just about this Council, it's about this planet that all of us are trying to do our part to reduce our emissions. And you know, I really think it's not a great message to send out that we're approving a plan without even setting a target. You might notice there is only $20,000 set aside to work on this Community Climate

Change Action Plan at this point. If you read through the report you'll see that. That's because other money hasn't yet been obtained. So, I mean we're really working with very, very little resources to…to do what other cities are doing. Toronto, London, Edmonton…and I'm talking London, Ontario, Vancouver, Calgary, Halifax. If you look at all of those cities that are major cities like Winnipeg that are in partners to climate change, they've already got their plans either implemented or ready, almost ready to go.

So I'm not trying to point fingers about why this hasn't happened but it should be happening and it should be happening faster and this motion simply tells…and I talked to our administration, You know I haven't just winged this without discussing it with some of our administration or working on these things but I mean really, we as politicians have a role in pushing them to do…to know that we're serious about this and I think that's what this motion says it's a guideline and target saying let's have a target. Let's try to do more, faster and then I don't have the answers as to how and I'll wait…I can sum up on this after, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. First, I would like to thank EPC for their motion with regard to Corporate and Community-wide Climate Change Action Plan, and I'll be supporting both the clause and the amendment because I believe that not including a time line for the Community-wide Action Plan was an oversight, and that can be fixed by amendment. And a target really isn't a target if it doesn't have a deadline, so, 6% is good but if you don't have a deadline it could be 6% in the year 3,000. Just wanted to point out the same as Councillor Gerbasi that Manitoba has already defined a deadline at the end of 2012, so it would be fairly simple for us to…to co-ordinate if we were on the same page as the Province with regard to this, so it would make co-ordination of action plans a lot easier. I'm looking forward to…to seeing an action plan very quickly so that we can move on it with a little bit more detail than what we have here. I think this is exciting. I am concerned about the minimum resources that we have put in, but I'm hoping that this is the beginning, not an end and if we feel that we need more resources in order to achieve our goals, that we're willing to do that, and I see this as an initial step to get behind something that we had started in 1998 and that we should have been putting the necessary resources in at that time, so I'm thankful that we're moving forward on it. There is a lot of things that…that I could say should've been done going backwards, but we're moving forward. I just see this as a…as a friendly amendment to the motion, and I'm encouraged by that and thank Executive Policy Committee for moving forward on this item.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've got to admit that I wasn't all that prepared to speak on this. I saw this report as 100% positive and I was surprised to see that there was a motion here to try to amend it and change it because if you read the report, what we're doing is we're exceeding what we're doing. We're actually leaders in this country, we're not behind the rest. Yes, we might not have a specific date on a target but you know you get back into the original… this originally emanated from, it was a FCM, partners of climate piece that got us started in this direction and at that time, Council in 1998 passed a resolution signing on to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities Partners for Climate Change Protection Program and committed to reducing its corporate greenhouse gas emissions by 20%, and the city-wide community greenhouse gases by 6% over the baseline year of 1998.

So when we start using provincial statistics of baseline year of 1990, then we're probably not going…I don't know that we're going in the right direction or the wrong direction if we are to do this amendment. I think that's sort of where I'm at here is that when you look at the total recommendations here, the second Recommendation is that we get a status update on our 6% target that we already

have as a Council policy. So certainly we know that that status update will tell us whether we're still leaders in this area or if we are, you know back…behind and need to amend this policy which we always…always have the ability to do, to set a better target, a stronger target and I think that we would, given…if our information our true data got back to us saying that we weren't out there keeping up with the rest of the world or keeping up with the previous targets. The target of 20% was a ten year target that on our corporate, we exceeded that. We're moving forward to do another 20%, although it doesn't say ten years, you know, you could infer ten years and we could certainly measure that. We know that there is room for us to do more, we know we continually strive. We've got a Green Fleet Policy coming forward in other areas where we'll see significant reductions in the city's greenhouse gas emissions.

There's one piece that always troubles me when I look at the capital budget and its relationship to greenhouse gas emissions, I continually see in our building services side an annual commitment to energy efficiency in buildings. But yet those monies are not spent on an annual basis. I forget if it's $200,000 or $250,000 every year that we have available in this city to spend on energy efficiency and I think there's three years of money that is unspent. So you know we're not perfect in this area but we certainly are on the right track and I know that there is room to make improvement and I see us making that improvement. So, because of the ability to deal with the intent of the motion at a future date I don't think it's necessary to deal with it today because I think we need more information. Like a status update on our 6% target we set back in 1998 and even at that time there would be no…no…I think there would be no problem with the department just communicating with us, what the further 20% reduction time line would be. I think it's inferred that it's ten years but I would like to hear that and perhaps the Mayor can clarify that when he closes on this matter as well.

So I'll be supporting the clause but I think that the motion well intended doesn't…doesn't really assist us in being leaders in this area.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Councillor Swandel hit on what I was going to bring up and did it much more eloquently, but just to point out that the City of Winnipeg led in Manitoba, led the Province of Manitoba. The 6% that the Province is now come up with is what we came up with 11 years ago. They've taken it as their job to do it. Anything we do will both assist them and surpass their goals. I think what we're doing is the right thing, and we weren't last, we were first, and I think in this continuing plan of action and this commitment to go beyond what the Province's goals are, I think is something that should be applauded and not tinkered with for whatever political purpose might suit someone today.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. On the amendment to the motion, I'll take it as well intended, and for clarification, I guess based on her summing up I'll ask Councillor Gerbasi just to be clear the last line reads "end emission reductions at targeted at 6% compared to 1990 levels by 2012." What I take that to mean is 6% below 1990 levels in the Province of Manitoba. What's that?

(Inaudible speaking in the background).

Right. But I'm talking about the Provincial Climate Change and Emission Reductions Act. So, I take it theirs…and these are questions I'll just leave open for Councillor Gerbasi to address on her summing up. But I take it what's being said here is that the goal for the Province of Manitoba is to reduce provincial emissions overall, community wide, by 6% below 1990 levels. The 1990 baseline, I believe, if I'm not mistaken is pretty close to where the Kyoto Protocol baselines were set if not the exact same year. I believe that the Province of

Manitoba was one of the provinces that endorsed the Kyoto Protocol and I guess as such is…I guess…committed to those targets. I'll remind Council, it hasn't been mentioned as yet, but I think our Council as well endorsed the Kyoto Protocol and the targets set by that. Interesting how we're having a discussion on climate change and we've gone through several speakers and no one has mentioned the Kyoto Protocol which of course is the grand daddy of the whole thing. But there is a lesson there, Mr. Speaker. Part of the challenge with the Kyoto Protocol is, again, it will always be remembered I think as the first big step this world took towards addressing climate change, as well it should be, a momentous occasion for the world and I don't think that's not too grandiose to even say but part of the challenge was I think as a planet we bit off a little more than we could chew in terms of an emission target and that's part of the concern that I have with the amendment.

Boy, 2012 is not far away, Mr. Speaker. And if we're talking about 6% below 1990 levels, wow, that may be a significant community-wide percentage drop from where we are today. My impression is that on a community-wide basis, we are significantly above 1990 levels in this province. I don't point the finger at anyone for that. And if I am pointing the finger at anyone, I'll point it at myself as much as anybody else. But I just want to make sure that we're not getting ourselves into a short-term ball game here that we have no hope of winning. I don't know if Councillor Gerbasi is going to have any comments on where we're at as a province, vis-à-vis getting to 6% below 1990 levels. But, I can tell you, in order for me to support it, I hope I hear from her that we're well on our way to addressing this and it looks as though we're going to get there as a province and as a community. Because if we don't, all these things do, in my respectful opinion, is serve to demoralize the movement.

I think back to the Federal Government under Paul Martin, I don't recall which Party and that's not important, but…choked for members of Council. (laughter) But the commitment then made by the Federal Government was laudable, and it hooked us in as a country to the Kyoto Protocol. What was lacking and what is admitted across the Board today by everybody, including members of the Liberal Party and members of the Federal House of Commons who still exist in the House of Commons and did at that time, was that there was nothing backing up the plan. And if anybody would have really, at that time, sat down and said do we have a realistic chance of getting to those goals, I think anybody, objectively and comprehensively apprised of the facts of the day could've come to no other conclusion that the goal was probably unattainable and that's my concern here, especially in such a short time frame. Those are my comments. I don't criticize the amendment. I know it comes from a person who cares deeply about the issues and is well intentioned. I just don't want to set us up for a goal that perhaps we have no chance of achieving.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This amendment is reasonable. I don't understand why people…some people are opposed to it. I mean, if you have a plan you should have a deadline. You should be able to measure what your successes are. You know, without a deadline, without any dates to achieve something it's not really a plan. I mean, I…the people who have spoken to date have talked about our successes to date and I think they're good. But, they haven't given me a solid reason why not to support this amendment. Without this amendment, the plan is almost meaningless. So, I'm supporting the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The report before us today goes through a whole process that we're going to go through to identify to involve the public and do all the right things to figure out what is appropriate in terms of greenhouse gas emissions. Everyone understands we've got to do things differently and the whole revision right now to Our Winnipeg and the whole

Speak up of Winnipeg Process, the kickoff of the event, Sustainable Winnipeg, was all about doing things differently. We can't just impose a random date on everybody without understanding the ramifications are.

This report through…goes through a very detailed process through August of next year where we can have public consultation, public buy-in and a full understanding of what these reductions are going to be. We've gone from talking about 1998 of 6% reduction of that, Councillor Gerbasi talking 6% of 1990. Perhaps these are right or maybe they are not. We need to have that conversation. The province has a plan and they've gone through the process but that involves more than the City of Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg of course has to play a major part in that. What about the industrial sectors outside of City of Winnipeg that are major, major polluters? Again, I won't be supporting the amendment. I do support a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and I do support the process that this report goes through, through August of next year to determine when that 6% reduction is appropriate. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers? Councillor Gerbasi, you want to close in your motion?

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much. Thank you everybody for your comments and I think it was a really good discussion today. I think it's important that we think about something as important as this and I recognize that we all think it's important and we all want to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and nobody is questioning that, but I think it's a matter of how we do it and I think we have to be clear, we have to show our commitment to it in a stronger way.

I just want to try to answer a couple of questions, yes, I am talking about 1990 levels and I realize that when we…and I want to clarify first of all, we are talking…there is a difference between the corporate emissions which are 2% of Winnipeg's total emissions only, and the overall emissions of the city, and I think there is some confusion about that. So aim talking about the overall emissions. I think we've done well on the 2% corporate emissions, we've done very well, but that's 2%, okay and that's where we talk about reducing them by 20%. We're talking 20% of 2%. So, there is a bigger issue with community-wide emissions and I under…and so that was one point I wanted to make.

In terms of being a leader or being a follower, if you look on the FCM web site and you look at the stage we are at with corporate emissions, we're right up there with Calgary, Edmonton, Halifax, Ottawa. We've done well with that 2%. But when you look at the Community Plan, we are just at step 1 and almost all of those other cities are at step 4 or 5…3 to 5, meaning they're implementing it and they are already monitoring it. These cities I mentioned, Calgary, Edmonton, Halifax, Ottawa, London, Toronto, Vancouver, all on the FCM web site, are all already evaluating or implementing or developed… or have developed a local plan. And I'm just saying of the large cities in Canada we are not being a leader. And so what I'm saying is we…we can inspire and encourage this to happen faster. I think Councillor Browaty made an important point. We don't want to supersede the Plan Winnipeg Process, I'm certainly not suggesting that. I'm very supportive of hearing from our citizens and having them have input into this process. But this plan, if you look at the guidelines here, will not even be going out for full public consultation and Council vote until after Plan Winnipeg has been sent over to the Province and complete.

So you know maybe there is something in that process where there is input going in, you know they are trying to explain all this to everybody in a way we can understand. But what it comes down to is that if we really want to achieve this, we have to be bold and that's what the Province has done and maybe they won't…maybe they won't succeed but they have the guts which very few provinces have done to actually put this into legislation. This isn't just a statement. They actually put in their legislation and yes, 1990 levels are what Kyoto said,

1990 levels are what Toronto has in their plan and Vancouver and most Canadian cities, 1990 levels, which are lower than 1998 levels. It's a more ambitious thing to try to achieve 1990. That is what over 900 American cities have committed to. So it's not like a leadership, a really out there thing, to make a commitment to reach 1990 levels, okay. It's actually very ordinary and in fact, we're kind of behind the pack when it comes to the community-wide emissions. The corporate emissions, the 2% you know we've taken those baby steps and that's important. I mean that's something we can control and we can do and…and I've always spoken positively about that.

But, I think we have to start resourcing this properly, we have to start setting lofty goals and I'm not saying to ignore the public process, I'm not saying to…I'm not even telling you how exactly. I don't have all the answers of how we achieve that goal. That will come out of the public process but at least let's set a goal, let's start with saying we want to get somewhere that actually means something to people. Because if you just say we'll reduce them by 6%, when do you mean that? You mean that by 2050? You know, do you mean that by 3,000? Like, when are we going to get on this? I mean that's why we have things like Kyoto and why we've had…and you know, unfortunately our Federal Government, Councillor Steeves points out, you know hasn't really done the best job especially now where they're looking at 2006 levels which is an international embarrassment. But, I don't really think we want to follow if we truly are saying that we are concerned about this greenhouse gas and climate change issue. I don't think we really want to follow the 2006 lead of Stephen Harper. I mean if that's what this Council is saying, you know that's why you can vote how you like. I'm saying that we should be following the lead of progressive cities across the United States and across Canada which are most of our major large cities in Canada and with those progressive cities across Canada, 9 of them bigger than us are saying, is that you know we need to really try to achieve Kyoto targets. And…and I think you know, unfortunately our federal leadership isn't…quite is…has dropped the ball on this issue but you know that's unfortunate. I think as a City Council you know we often talk about ourselves as a level of government. This is a policy for the City. This isn't…this is saying here is what we're going to do, and I'm just trying to say, let's make it make sense with what our province is doing which is trying to be more progressive on this issue and trying to be a green province, trying to be a leader, and let's try to be leaders ourselves and we have been in some ways of course. But…but I just say we can do better and we can guide our administration. If our administration hears from us, look, we're committed to this, we're going to give you the support you need to do this, I think we're more likely to see it happening. So that's really what I'm saying is let's show that leadership and support to our administration and let's get the message out. You know I'm your representative on the FCM Board and so I talk to these people from all these cities and believe me, I'd like to be able to brag and I brag about whatever I can about Winnipeg to them but I'd like to be able to brag even more, so I encourage you to support this motion, you know to move us forward at an even faster rate than we're going. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor, closing.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Mr. Speaker, just to address the motion that came forward from the EPC, specifically, it was for a further 20% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and included transit emissions which were never previously included. Methane gas recapture at the Brady landfill, replace of existing traffic lights to LED, and completion of green vehicle plan for consideration of Council, as well as annual progress reports on our city web site. That was part of it. As well as the approval of the process for development of a community plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, led by MIAC, one of the co-chairs sitting here, Councillor Wyatt augmented by members of Council, public service, stakeholders and to be done within ten months. I think everybody agrees this is the right thing to do and I think we all want to be leaders,

regardless of what level of government we represent.
To address Councillor Gerbasi's, Mr. Speaker, very frank with you, we may be on the same page. I don't have a problem with 6% but to quote Councillor Gerbasi, "say by when, and think about it." I'm quoting exactly what was said. I think, Mr. Speaker, it's the reverse. "Think about it and then say by when." We all know what's happened in the past. Lovely announcements, media gatherings, here is what our target is, we're wonderful, we are terrific. We all know where that resulted. I think what we should do is do our homework, and hopefully maybe that 6% is something realistic and set the time frame, whatever it would be, but I think we should do our due diligence first. I have no problem with the 6% and maybe we can find out that's not as an ambitious goal. Maybe it should be 8%. No problem with that but let's do our due diligence first and I have no problem letting Councillor Gerbasi know that's something that I would be happy to move on as quick as possible. But let's not just throw out a date not knowing what's realistic and then look foolish. Let's do our homework right away, come up with a date and move forward. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Recorded votes have been called for on item…on item 1. All in favour?...on the amend…on motion number 1, the amendment.

All in favour of Councillor Gerbasi's motion, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith. Vandal, Wyatt and Thomas.

Nays

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

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 6, Nays 10.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is lost. On item 1, all in favour of item 1? It's carried. Walk on report of…pardon me. (Inaudible) Motion item number 2, Councillor Thomas…Mr. Mayor, can you open?

Item No. 2 - Disraeli Bridge and Overpass Facility - External City Borrowing
eFile SB - 3

Mayor Katz: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The issue is the Disraeli Bridge and the motion is that we have the ability to borrow up to 75 million in external borrowing and obviously this has to do with value for money which is the whole procedure. I've heard many Councillors here talk about interest rates and what should we do and I think this is actually following what most Councilors have said, I'll be happy to hear what Councillor Thomas has to say and then I'll respond to that particular point in time.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thanks. It's now clear that it's going to cost the City less money to do external borrowing as it is entailed in the clause. My concern is that we're continuing to go with The Design Build Finance and maintain model also known as the P3 model. And it's really not being proven to be any more economic. And, I do not understand why we're still heading down that road if now we're going to be responsible for borrowing at least 50% of the project funds. So that's the concern I have, is part 2 continuing with the Design Build and Finance model. There is nothing here with regard to what the bridge is going to look like and that continues to be a concern for me.

We've had three, four plans now that have come up without the community consultation, when the Provencher Bridge was done and now when the bridge is being done going to the Fort Garry area, committees were formed, you had monthly newsletters that came out from

these committees, there was a sort of committee forum that met in secret, our residence advisory group asked for them to come to a public forum and were told no. There was…we as Councillors were invited to look at what supposedly the final bridge was going to look like, a half hour before it was open to the public to see the final thing. And now that's not the final thing. I don't know who is continuing to meet. Don't have any upgrades. This is not being done like any other project and I continue to register my concerns with regard to how it's being handled. I've heard that it's not going to be closed now for 16 months but this is rumour and innuendo. I don't have the documentation like we've had on any other bridge that is being built and I continue to be disappointed in that. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this is generally positive, but I have a few questions. Number one, since it's been…there is evidence that it's financially more favourable for a government to borrow money than the private sector why are we only borrowing for part of the capital cost and not all of the capital costs? We know there is…that's one question, and number two. We know there is lots of negotiations on Disraeli with the Provincial Government. Why would we not wait on a final model…negotiations to complete to see what it's all going to cost before we actually lock into 75 million? And, last question, is if it's financially favourable for government to borrow over private industry, is this being considered for the Waste Water Treatment Plants, the Public Works yard in Councillor Wyatt's Ward and other triple Ps, Chief Peguis Trail out there, as an alternative? Are we doing the analysis on that and are we going to undo other P3s for more traditional forms of borrowing? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Basically no one knows what the end product will look like because we're in a closed, confidential process and we're trying to…the innovation of the industry, the private sector and the engineering consultants out there, bring us something forward. We expect, given our desired option but we've also encouraged other options in that process and its growing system we'll deal with those as options we go through it.

I think you're right, Councillor Vandal, we did approve an option to put it out there for tender. We also encouraged the RFP process, other options that might include not having to shut the bridge down. That's also partially what's happening in the process. It's unfortunate that there's people out there that are solely responsible as to talk about what they think may be happening in the future. We are in a closed process. I remind my colleagues of that because some of the options in that process may be for one thing and others may be for another so if you invest hundreds or thousands of dollars or millions of dollars I would believe in some cases in one particular venue and then you've got this…this public conversation going on, along like somebody knows that there's some particular vein that somebody is going down, and that is completely irresponsible. And…and you know I saw Mr. Malloway in the paper the other day spouting as a Federal politician that he had knowledge of something somewhere that was…I considered it to be completely irresponsible. There is no knowledge of what exactly this will look like until the recommendations come forward out of that closed and confidential process.

Now, to get to the crux of the matter, I think Councillor Vandal hit the hammer…or the nail on the head when…when he said that this is a good thing and it is a good thing. What it is that you're…we're not talking about borrowing versus borrowing here. We're talking about borrowing on both sides of the private partner…private public partnership here to ensure that you maintain value for money. We all know that since 2008 when this process started, that the ability for the private sector to access capital has changed drastically and for the City, we have a very strong bond rating for us. The ability to access capital, the conditions on it and the interest rate are more favourable. So by doing a hybrid,

we're…we're you know, if that's what we can do to maintain the value for money that a P3 will bring to us, and that's my understanding is that by doing this we will maintain the value for money level close to what we saw it being when we entered into this process, we will deliver that value for money for taxpayers.

The motion, I think, is pretty vague in the amount of money because it says up to 75 million. We're not saying 75 million. We won't know the exact amount of money until we see what comes out of this process. Where what amount we need to put in there in order to ensure that we're getting the value for money that we have but yet the private sector still has enough skin in the game so that they're sharing in the risk which is where a lot of the value for money that you get in P3 processes comes from. So you know, I could see those that oppose P3s in general jumping on this and…and you know suggesting that because it is using City borrowing that therefore all P3s should be gone, that the City borrowing is the way to go. Well City borrowing in a P3s is just another way of adding to that contract, that commitment, that partnership to ensure that value for money is maintained for taxpayers and that you're getting the product or the end that you set out to achieve and you're doing it in a way that's respectful of taxpayers and as it's going through what I consider to be a fairly…it was a good process up until people started meddling and throwing ideas out there like they knew what these private and confidential matters were that were being dealt with in this process. Those are my comments. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I mean this is a pretty challenging…this is a pretty major decision we're making here today, 75 million dollars of borrowing is a lot of money and I realize some of us didn't support doing that privately and now some of it's public and some of it's still private. It's a short report in front of us and I understand what Councillor Swandel is saying is that the process isn't a public process because it's dealing with the private partner. I guess that does emphasize some of the problems with these private partner deals, the down side is the lack of transparency because we can't just talk about…we can't really get all the information because we're told it's with a private business partner rather than a public…some of the obviously we still have tender processes that…that have to be behind closed doors but I mean we've all been reading in the paper that the Mayor and the Premier are discussing a totally different bridge option that none of us have even been consulted about. So I think it's pretty ludicrous to expect members of Council who have expressed concerns about lack of transparency who've expressed concerns about accountability which is a legitimate role for Councillors who represent our citizens to be doing by the way, we've expressed these concerns and how on earth do you expect us to have the comfort level to just go "okay, you know, great, whatever you say, $75 million, you know, you can explain it to us later."

I mean we have accountability to those who have elected us. We don't even know what bridge we're building at this point, let alone whether it's… how much of it's public and how much of it's private and you just expect "yes, sir." Well I'm sorry that's not what I or many of my colleagues were elected to you. You need to do a better job, EPC, Administration or whoever it is needs to do a better job of…of getting support from members of Council who have concerns by maybe talking to us and by maybe working with us a little better. It's not always us who are supposed to figure it all out…you know, like jigsaw puzzles in Sherlock Homes. I mean it's your job to…to convince us to support what new initiative you're bringing forward. I supported redoing the Disraeli Bridge. I realize that's a priority. What I'm talking about is how we're doing it and I think the public has a right to know what they're borrowing money for, how much, who's borrowing and how much public control and how much accountability we have in this deal. We know that there have been situations across Canada where cities have lost a lot of money getting into private partnerships where they haven't worked.

Perhaps they worked sometimes and sometimes they haven't. And I don't know that we're making an informed decision here today and I think it's up to our Administration and our Mayor and EPC to convince us that that's what we're doing and I don't think that they've done an excellent job here. Maybe that's because somebody ran to the paper and let the cat out of the bag that we might be building a different bridge. But you know if we are building a different bridge, I think we should all know that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor…as there's no further speakers. Can you close?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well this is the first time on this topic I haven't heard someone say this isn't about ideology but everything I heard today except for Councillor Swandel is all about ideology. It's a fact there are some Councillors who don't like P3s. I accept that. That's okay. We're not going to agree on everything, but Mr. Speaker, let's put a few facts on the table. This is totally open and transparent. We all voted on exactly what we're going to do. I was the one many years ago, swinging underneath that bridge and saw what was going on and said something had to be done. It wasn't any…wasn't Councillor Gerbasi, wasn't Councillor Thomas, it was yours truly. And when I saw what I saw, I said my god if people saw this, would they even have considered driving over the bridge. We had to address our crumbling infrastructure and fortunately we haven't had what happened in other catastrophic scenarios in other cities such as in Minneapolis and the Province of Quebec and we don't want to see that. So we are moving forward and taking actions. Mr. Speaker what we're doing here very quickly okay, this is all about value for money, all right? Value for money was originally estimated by our corporate people at 16%. It's dropped 8% due to the credit crisis and the inability to obtain long term financing, referring to more than ten years. So what we're doing basically is by doing the external borrowing, Mr. Speaker, we can get that back up to 14%.

To address Councillor Vandal's question, a good question, why are we still looking at a P3? Because if Councillor Vandal, if I went to Councillor Vandal and said "I'm opening up a restaurant, I want you to invest half a million dollars of your hard earned money, he may make that investment. I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, he would be more prone to make that investment if I put in $200,000 of my money. You want skin in the game. You want to know that there is risk for the other people. That's the answer to the question.

And, Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on what Mr. Malloway or Mr. Ashton say. What I can tell you is Council to…in the past has approved spending $140 million. We all know the plan. I can also tell you that Councillor Browaty has expressed a concern about a 16 month delay. It was a fair concern and we also went back to the Administration and said listen, we want you to explore the ways of addressing that 16 month delay. And I can tell you they have done that. And there are options available. And yes, I have spoken to the Premier, okay. And actually, I've spoken to Mr. Blaikie. The first person to raise that concern and the only person on this floor of Council was Council Browaty when we were addressing it. The sad part is I wish with all the concerns that Councillor Thomas had, she would once phone me or raise the issue with me because you know what, Councillor Gerbasi, I could address your concerns and maybe I could give you the information. But if you don't communicate with me, it makes it very, very difficult. Councillor Browaty has. Councillor Wyatt has as well. We've had these conversations.

So the realities are, Mr. Speaker, we're here to address a problem. For those people who are against P3s, fine, I accept that. Nothing I can do about it. I understand the ideology behind it. But, Mr. Speaker, this is all about value for money and getting the biggest bang for the buck and making sure that anybody from the private sector who is involved has skin in the game and if they don't do their job, they will lose their money. That's what this is all about, Mr. Speaker. And it

does work and in Winnipeg it's worked every time we've done it so far. Every time. Two locations It's been successful. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The vote on item 2, recorded vote has been called for. (inaudible) What is it?

Councillor Thomas: There have been statements made that I have not looked at the underside of the bridge and I would like to correct that. I have. I didn't do it with the press hanging all around, but I've done that on several occasions, and members of the Administration can vouch for having done that. And if…if the Mayor does not want to remember personal conversations that we had about this, that's fine. But I am on the public records of expressing my concerns with regard to the closure of the bridge and these…these are in previous Councillor Hansard and so…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas...

Councillor Thomas: These are…so I'm rising on those.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Mayor Katz: That's not all what I said and I'd be happy to repeat it but that's not all what I said.

Mr. Speaker: No, let's…let's forget it. Thank you for your information, Councillor Thomas. On the vote, recorded vote has been called for. On vote item 2, all in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas, Wyatt.

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

Mr. Speaker: Matter is carried. Walk on report of September the 30th, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would move that the rule be suspended and that the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 30th, 2009, be considered.

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

(Inaudible)

Councillor Thomas: 10 (1) and 10 (2), I'm calling notice on this item. (Inaudible)

Councillor Gerbasi: Councillor Thomas thought this was the issue of the contracts for residential garbage would be my guess why she is doing that…

Mr. Speaker: I'm just…

Councillor Gerbasi: Just to help you along.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Thomas: I'm not calling notice on the street closing.

Mr. Speaker: Are you sure? Okay. Councillor, report of the September 30th. The closing.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

We had…we've had too long a holiday. Notice of motion. Moved by Councillor Swandel and Browaty. Mr. Clerk would you like to read that introduction.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Swandel,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

WHEREAS Winnipeg is described as a River City with two main rivers and a variety of lesser tributaries;

AND WHEREAS the City owns land along these waterways that is under-utilized;

AND WHEREAS the Premier has recently expressed interest in the Province participating in a project to make some river lands more accessible to the public;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada has recently declared the Red River a Heritage river;

AND WHEREAS all citizens should have access to our rivers;

AND WHEREAS enhancing our rivers, and growing the number of people enjoying our rivers would be of economic benefit to the City and add to the quality of life of citizens;

AND WHEREAS greater access to our rivers would create a greater appreciation for their environmental importance;

AND WHEREAS the City has an existing capital budget commitment to enhancing our rivers;

AND WHEREAS partnerships like the Forks North Portage, Centre Venture and the Core Area Initiative have brought great value to the City of Winnipeg;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Public Service be directed to explore with the other levels of government a Tri-level Partnership to create a stand alone agency to enhance our rivers, create economic opportunities along our rivers, and grow the number of people that experience our rivers;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a financial analysis be provided to value the City's current work on the rivers, provide a general cost analysis on future works, and provide an estimate of required funding from each partner;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the mayor designate a member of EPC as the project lead on this initiative.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This…this motion came to me as a result of listening to quite a number of complaints from citizens over the summer especially in the south end of the city, when it came to accessing in this case, the Red River from docks and boat ramps at both St. Vital park and Maple Grove Park. For most of the summer either due to high water levels and then when they subsided leaving the dirt on the ramps which we neglected to clean up as the City. The ramps were unusable and…and for a great deal of the time the docks were not put in at both St. Vital and Maple Grove. I think to…to date the docks still were not put in for this summer season. Apparently Councillor Steeves tells me that the ones at St. Vital as much as three or four weeks ago, they were not in at St. Vital. And I believe they're still not in at Maple Grove Park.

So we started with those couple of issues. I started talking to people about our waterways and people on our waterways. I think it's one of our great untapped jewels in the City of Winnipeg and there is a great deal that can be gained from both and citizens and visitors to our city by creating better access and taking…doing a better job of looking after our rivers. When I started talking to other people, other items came along and people started talking about some of the positive things like the skating trail that was put in by the folks at the Forks North Portage Development and another…the Pond Hockey Tournament that's happened on the river during the winter time, rowing…some of the rowing stuff that happens during the summer, both the Dragon Boat Races but also just the recreational and competitive rowing that goes on our river, and…and I also just you know, people relayed on numerous occasions stories of being able to boat to

somewhere like the Pony Corral Pier 7 out on Pembina Hwy when it was a warm you know summer afternoon, being able to park your boat, go in and have something to eat or drink and get on and continue…back in your boat and continue. They really enjoyed that but it was difficult for them on the negative side to get their boats into the water and be able to do that.

So…and then there was the negative side, there was lots of talk about erosion and lots of talk about cleanups needing to be done along our water ways and lots of talk about debris in the river. People that boat in the river will tell you that…with our…these water levels that we have going up and down, there is constantly debris being lapped into the river whether it's…whether it's environmentally friendly debris like trees or other debris you know from time to time you see stolen cars dumped into the river and you see bits and pieces of those floating down the river, shopping carts on the banks, bicycles…stolen bicycles.

So in general, people knew that there was…we could do much, much more with our rivers. And…and that got me thinking about how we addressed this problem in the past and in other areas. What are some of the best practices that we've used out there when you had something of this magnitude, how do you find a quick remedy and start to really bring about change? I started to think about non government organizations and in particular, I thought about the Forks North Portage Development Corporation which is funded by three levels of government, It's gone out there, it's done wonderful work in…not only in developing the Forks and helping with…with the North Portage issues that we had back in the 70s, 80s I guess but also it's done a great deal for bringing people to the river when you look at what they've built there as far as docking facilities and some of the commercial entities that go along with that. They've certainly done wonderful work.

So, what would a non governmental organization look like that…that might help us in bringing more people to the river? Well you know, it could just start as something as simple as a small group of folks, professionals that come from some different areas with a director or CFO or CAO, and start to map out what do we need to do in the rivers to make them better? Do…should we have better docks? Should we have easier to install docks? Should we have better equipment for cleaning off boat ramps? Should we have boat ramps? Can we find private sponsorship for some of our docks and ways to access the river? I believe that we can. When you talk to…I've had a couple of conversations with people especially those…the folks from Pony Corral who gain business from people being on the river, they would be more than happy to provide some sort of sponsorship dollars to ensure that we had some descent boat ramps and docks to get in there. When that small group of professionals that are there, you know our full time staff can be supported by a seasonal staff as well. You know in the summer time when you can get out there, we can have seasonal staff out there doing stuff. But these staff whether they're full time staff or seasonal staff could also be supported by large bands of volunteers. I can tell you of somebody who has a boat and likes to be on the river on the odd occasion that...I would love to spend a bit of my time helping to clean off the boat ramp or helping to put a dock in or just participating in the cleanup of getting that debris off of the river.

So this non government organization while it's not clearly defined in the motion and I think what the motion sort of doesn't say is we need the Administration to go out there and sort of get a handle on what we can do on our rivers and what the cost might be, you know they talk…the motion talks about a baseline figure on how much money we actually put into our rivers right now and how that money is spent. But we really need to look at what can…what should we be doing, what can we be doing and what are we already spending and how…do we need to spend more or do we need to find greater value through an organization through a non government organization. I'll sit down and listen if anybody else has comments on the matter but I think at the end of the day

what we have here is something that is inviting more people to access our rivers. It talks about cleaning up our rivers and our waterways because this isn't just the Red River or the Assiniboine River. This…I'm talking about you know working with group like Save Our Seine and other organizations, volunteer organizations that are already out there, but giving it a hub, giving it a centre that people can relate to and it is not just people too that they can access, maybe it's equipment. You see in other places like the Thames in England you know, they've bought equipment for keeping the river clean, for sucking debris out of it because…you know picking it up was…was sort of a giant pitch fork because winds blow, debris hits the river, you know, people are deliberately thrown into the river on occasion. So, by being able to have the right equipment to better steward our rivers or help to steward our rivers, is also an important component of this. At the end of the day, I believe what we will have is a better, cleaner system of waterways in our city that's more inviting for our citizens but more than that, it's a place that invites people from other cities. Our waterways are…will be unique. They will be celebrated throughout North America and maybe throughout the world because we have a very unique situation in our city with the amount of waterways we have flowing in and through our city. And I think that we need to harness that uniqueness and we need to do it for our people, and those who might choose to come to our city to…to see that…to see the wonders of what our waterways really are and we need to do it in four seasons as well. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Mr. Speaker, because this motion appears to have some merit, and because we already have a committee under whose jurisdiction all of these matters fall, I would move that this be referred to the Riverbank Management Committee without instructions.

Mr. Speaker: You're moving that this be referred to the Riverbank Management? Good. All in favour? Contrary? It's carried. Referred to the Riverbank Management. Thank you. Motions? Mr. Speaker, none. By-laws. First By-laws, first time…first reading only, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that By-law No. 120/2009 be read a first time.

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

(Inaudible Speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt wants to be recorded in opposition.

Clerk: By-law No. 120/2009.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law 111/2009 and By-law112/2009.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 111/2009 and 112/2009.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I move that By-laws numbered 111/2009 and 112/2009 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 111/2009 and 112/2009.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 111/2009 and 112/2009 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.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal, Smith. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor, I'm wondering if the Mayor can give us an update on the negotiations between the City of Winnipeg and the R.M. of Rosser.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: It'd be my honour, Mr. Speaker. I think as everybody is aware that CentrePort is a project that all levels of government have been working on. In the very first discussion that took place, there were three pillars in order for CentrePort to move forward. One was that it would have to be a private driven initiative. Number Two, that there would be a single authority. For example at the airport you have the Winnipeg Airport Authority. There'd be a single authority and they do have a board that has representatives from different areas. And lastly, that there would be one jurisdiction. I can tell you Mr. Speaker that I met with the Reeve in my office a long time ago Mr. Speaker. Could be close to a year ago. In that category maybe ten months. And we actually agreed on how this would go forward. Unfortunately after that there was a change of heart. Since then there has been a letter sent to the Reeve of the position as well as even a…I guess you'd call it a sweeter deal than the first time and we are still waiting. I can assure you the Province is very much aware of this as well, and I know the Province hopes that we can work it out amongst ourselves so they won't have to be part of the solution.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor?

Councillor Vandal: I'm assuming there's been some analysis on the infrastructure liability should we acquire the property. Could you share that potential infrastructure liability with us this morning?

Mayor Katz: Well, to date, there was an announcement many months ago. Approximately $200 million was being put into CentrePort. Those funds came from the Province and the Feds. I am still of the opinion that somehow that had a negative impact on the City of Winnipeg and I know they are looking at infrastructure dollars and cents. I have not seen any reports with specific amounts of money that had to be spent, but I certainly know that the major source of revenue for the City of Winnipeg would obviously be property tax, so that is something that's very important. You can't spend money unless you have revenue, and I don't have any of those numbers, but when I do see any numbers in black and white I would be happy to share them with Councillor Vandal.

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

Councillor Smith: Mr. Mayor. I've asked you in the past about the Public Safety Building. What the hell's happening with it? Are we getting a new Public Safety Building? Where are we at in making the sale of the existing structure? What's happening? All I see is the boards around the building and the cladding has stopped over a year ago. What's happening? Tell us.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I don't know if that four-letter word is appropriate, but I would be happy to address the question to the Councillor, which I've told him on many other occasions. Right now as we sit here before you Mr. Speaker, we have an understanding with the Federal Government, but in that understanding it also gave us the opportunity to do our due diligence, and I believe at the end of this month, which is actually today, that a recommendation will be coming forward for Council, all of Council, to basically make a decision whether we move forward or not, so I think Councillor Smith's days of waiting are over. I believe we're at the point right now where the due diligence has been completed by the departments and I certainly hope that when you look at a project of that, Councillor Smith is aware that you want to make sure you do your homework and have all your ducks in order, and I believe

that's exactly what we're doing, so I'm sure before next Council meeting, Councillor Smith will see what the recommendation is, and it will be coming to the floor of Council.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor? Councillor Gerbasi, your first question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. There was a Federal announcement recently regarding the Waverley West Arterial Road Extension of Kenaston and it says that the City of Winnipeg…the Federal Government has announced, what is it 50 something million, and that the City of Winnipeg is going to be responsible for 21 million. I'm just wondering is that money that's budgeted for in the Capital Budget and if so, in what year and when or are we going to have to come up with an additional 21 million in the short term to be eligible for the Federal announcement, because I think those announcements are for projects that are suppose to be our top priorities.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, there was an announcement that was made. It was suppose to have been hopefully one-third, one-third, one-third. The Province, unfortunately, fell a little bit short but I think there might be a way of working that out. And to address Councillor Gerbasi is, we do have the majority of that money but there is a small shortfall that we will be trying to identify and right now we do have Corporate Services looking at that situation as we speak.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: I guess I'm wondering is, Mr. Mayor, if you view that building this road first over, for example, the second phase of Rapid Transit or other priorities that citizens might have, is this our priority as a City or yours as the Mayor? Or is this just simply reacting to the latest Federal decision or announcement of their priorities?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz? Mr. Speaker there is no reaction here. We are pro-active. It was at the last Council meeting where Councillor Vandal asked me what are my priorities, and I specifically stated Water and Waste and Rapid Transit. And I'm sure everybody remembers that. This Mr. Speaker, we're talking about Building Canada funds, we're talking about stimulus monies and the realities are, this was on the table and this is one of the projects that all three levels of government are supportive of. I think Councillor Gerbasi knows that unless you bring all three levels to the table, nothing moves forward.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. As we're heading into the Capital Budget, if it is going to be passed in December as it was last year, are Councillors going to have the opportunity to have a Council seminar very early in the process so that we can have, participate in these kind of priority setting exercises about decisions as to…because we can't really afford to do every priority we have obviously. We're going to have to make those decisions. Are we going to have an opportunity, all members of Council, to be part of that decision making process early on or are we just going to have the same process we had last year?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly endeavour to have a Council seminar as early as possible to accommodate all members of Council. In addition to that Mr. Speaker, I'm quite cognizant of the fact, and I'm sure everybody is here, that one, with all the priorities that we have facing us, I think we've all discussed our infrastructure deficit on many occasions, Councillor Gerbasi knows that we can't address every single one of the priorities. So basically when you're sitting at the table with the other levels of government, when you have a list of your priorities and if there's one or two of them you can move forward with consensus, you certainly

grasp that opportunity. I know Councillor Gerbasi is aware of that and that's exactly what takes place.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, your first question.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. Well, it's now come to pretty well the end of my first year. Six months in, but it's been quite a ride, I'll say, in the first bit, and I believe a lot of the angst and problems that I have seen so far are not anything of a reflection on the people who are trying to do excellent work. I have met many of our staff and I must say, I'm quite impressed about where they're going and where they're trying to take this City. I've actually had the opportunity to meet most of the Councillors and actually ask a lot of advice from most of the Councillors, and it has been very rewarding and very open about their advice, and I do appreciate that. But I have had the other side of the coin where it seems that the process is broken in regards to how we communicate out there. We have Our Winnipeg on one side, and I've been to many of their round tables. I must say it's been quite enjoyable. Connecting with the people like that, different ideas...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, Councillor Orlikow, your question.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Orlikow. I don't think I've had my two minutes, so I'll just wait for my time. So I have enjoyed those opportunities, however, I've dealt with the Parker issue, the land swap issue there. I've dealt with Kenaston extension that we weren't talking about. That came running through. Ikea came running through. A lot of these really significant issues that are out there for our communities are coming through at an incredibly rapid rate. And I'm not saying we slow down the process, but I do believe that something is broken. I'm not sure what is exactly broken, but I gotta tell you that the way that I feel this is being done hasn't worked out, and therefore my questions are in that spirit. They're in the spirit of trying to do my homework, to be that learned person, that can communicate to those people that are feeling that they have to react as they trust Councillor Orlikow, what's going on. I really hate telling them I don't know. No one's told me, I just read it in the paper yesterday too. Or I'm not sure what they exactly do mean. So I look forward to using this opportunity to help clarify that. And I'm going to be asking my first question on clarification, and it's not about ideology, it's not about hating a past decision or liking a past decision. It's about clarity. So we recently have received the tender for the strategic partner for our Utility. Okay. So we received that, we got the document we all…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor. Councillor Orlikow. Please this is question period. This is question period.

Councillor Orlikow: So, you will be getting the question from me in two minutes.

Mr. Speaker: No. No. No you don't. You have…this is question period.

Councillor Orlikow: My question therefore…thank you Mr. Speaker, I'll get right to the point. On the utility matter, what is the issue…what is, when we say 100% publicly owned. To me what that means if you own the corporation owns things. They own not only the asset but they also own the shares in the company, because the shares are what dictate the decision making process. So again, in that proposal, there's an opportunity for those two waste treatment plants which are an integral part of the system to be shares to be given to this third party. So I'm not sure…I'd like to get some clarification of what we mean by 100% publicly owned.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I will get to the point. 100% publicly owned is exactly what the Councillor said. We own all of the assets. That's always been the way it's been put forward. That's still the way it is today. And owning 100% of all the assets doesn't mean you can own a retail clothing store, for example, Councillor Orlikow could. That doesn't mean he

couldn't have a manager who manages it, does a really good job and gets 10%. Councillor Orlikow still owns 100% of the asset.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow. Your next question.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. Thank you very much. So again my question is, we are in ownership still. If that same manager has shares in that company, it's given 49% of shares of that building or that infrastructure of who can hire, is that still 100% owned?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I don't think you or anybody else heard me say shares of any kind. You can have management agreements whereby someone is doing the right job they get rewarded, and if they don't they don't. It's that simple. We own 100% of the utility, end of story.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: My final question is that it isn't the end of the story. My final question is related to again, what we're talking about is I understand the assets. That they're going to remain with it, but again that proposal says shares will be transferred to the third party. Shares are in a corporate model, part of ownership, so again I can't put them together. 100% publicly owned but not these…these shares don't count. Shares are a part of ownership in my opinion. If I'm wrong then that's fine. Then I can voice that out to people and say shares don't count for part of ownership in a corporate model, which they actually do because they give you voting rights, however, assets do count, and I'm okay with that, but if we are selling shares, I don't think it's proper to say we're 100% publicly owned.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, for Councillor Orlikow's benefit and everybody else's, it's my understanding Mr. Speaker we're not dealing with shares of any kind. There are no shares. We own the shares. And whatever else may be said, I'm telling you right now that there are no shares. We own all the shares.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas. Your first question.

Councillor Thomas: Yes Mr. Speaker. In the last meeting before our summer proroguement, I asked the question with regard to two drop-in centres in my area since the Mayor had made a commitment that there would be no front-line service cuts, and two programs run by the City, one out of Chalmers Community Centre and one out of Salisbury Morse Place have been cut, and no replacement programs had been offered anywhere in the districts, and the Mayor made a commitment to get back to me and I have not heard from anyone in the Mayor's office as to what has been done to replace those two programs. I'm reminding the Mayor of his commitment and re-iterating my question.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I very much recall the question and I had thought that Councillor Thomas had received an email which I'm sure I have seen. If she hasn't received that I'll make sure she gets it A.S.A.P., but there was an email addressing that and I'll make sure that she gets it Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. That's it Councillor?

Councillor Thomas: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi. Pardon me. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, question to the Mayor. Thank you Mr. Speaker. We've had now I think 12 or 13 years…it's been so many years of tax freezes or tax cuts in the City. With the upcoming Capital Budget and the implications for the Operating Budget, and the need to re-invest in Civic services, can we expect from EPC to receive a budget that does have a property tax increase with regards to the Operating Budget?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, we're not at that particular point at this stage of the game. I think the Councillor would know that when you're looking at any budget you explore revenues and you explore expenses, and of course you always want to increase revenues. I also think Councillor Wyatt's very much aware of the fact, Mr. Speaker, what one percent of P.S.T. or G.S.T. would equate to verses a one, two or ten percent of property taxes Mr. Speaker. There is no comparison and I know that Councillor Wyatt very much knows that, and I think he also is very much aware of the fact that we are looking to capture that from hopefully the Province and other levels of government. So there are many options we're looking at, but, no I cannot give a definitive yeah or nay to that question right now.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Councillor Wyatt? Okay.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Alright. Are there budget meetings taking place, or have been taking place with regards to EPC and with the Administration discussing the budgets to come?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I believe that's a rhetorical question. The answer is yes and Councillor Wyatt has been in many of those meetings.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question.

Councillor Wyatt: For the record. And is there an assumption that has been made in those meetings that the goal is to either have a property tax increase or a property tax freeze with regards to direction given to the Administration.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. Number one, this is a process where the departments basically come forward and share with us the information. We have to make decisions. Decisions aren't always easy. Sometimes they're very difficult. At the same time we're looking at all sorts of other sources of revenue, and I'll make the point so that everybody understands it. Mr. Speaker, a one percent property tax increase would get you approximately $4 million. I'm sure Councillor Wyatt can tell you how many miles or kilometers of road we can pave with that. Next to nothing. Whereas, a one percent of either G.S.T. or P.S.T., which we've talked about and lobbied for, is 25 to 30 times that amount. So we know exactly the difference and where we should be addressing our energies, and what we'd be working on is to get a share of that, and I know Councillor Wyatt is leading that parade, and I certainly hope someone who has the ear of Mr. Ashton, that will become a reality in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We're going second time. Councillors. Councillors. Councillors. Councillor Steeves you're next.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your first question.

Councillor Steeves: As you know, the N.D.P. leadership campaign is going on. People are vying to become the next premier of the Province of Manitoba. Obviously of huge interest to the City of Winnipeg. I'm wondering as I was looking at one of the media outlets who published again a re-iteration of their position, which mirrors our position, that being that the Province of Manitoba should by colour of right eliminate the obligation of the City of Winnipeg to go through a process that eliminates nitrogen as a removal category for its waste water upgrades. Has the Mayor heard from any of the leadership candidates wherein they have indicated positively that if elected Premier of this Province, that they will remove the obligation of the City of Winnipeg to do those unnecessary upgrades that will cost the citizens of this City hundreds of millions of dollars?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, it's approximately $350 million we're talking about, and scientists all over, the vast majority, have said this is an absolute waste of money. And I know that it was actually discussed last week during question period at the Leg where Jon Gerrard brought it up, and I'm hoping that they will go back and take a look at this. I can tell you that what I am doing, I am dealing with the existing government and I will be writing a letter, one in process, to Minister Stan Struthers to address this issue because I think this is very serious, and I think someone has made an honest mistake and I think it should be corrected before we flush millions and million of dollars down the toilet. Specifically speaking, no I have not communicated directly with Mr. Ashton or Mr. Selinger on this topic. I have had the opportunity during the election process to have a few words with Mr. Ashton when he was here at City Hall, but it wasn't on that topic, and I am hoping to get both on the record and before judgment day comes Mr. Speaker, so at least we know where everybody stands.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Your second question Councillor?

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. On a lighter vein, I wonder if the Mayor, perhaps Councillor Clement, would be so kind as to convey my thanks on behalf of the people of St. Vital for the project and the work that was done on the Fort Garry Bridge that connects Fort Garry and St. Vital. This was a two-year project that was brought in on time, on budget. Of course we're talking about some serious time-lines because it's a primary bridge for University traffic. Construction started the two-year window after school let out, and they were off the bridge before school came back in both years. We hear a lot about projects that don't go very well. I think the Mayor, on behalf of Council, should thank our Public Works Department for a job very, very well done.

Mr. Speaker: And your question is?

Councillor Steeves: If he would convey my thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Councillor Clement, and Councillor Steeves, and all the Councillors and all the citizens, I think we should thank them for doing a great job and I'm glad that the citizens in your area are very pleased. It was a very difficult task and it was a great job, and it's nice to hear some positive feedback because quite often what you usually hear is the negative. So this is a good story and give him a round of applause.

Mr. Speaker: That's your questions Councillor? Councillor Clement your first question.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's along the same lines of the last discussion and my question is more…I'm going to be more direct. Will you have a conversation with the two candidates for Premier about the sewer initiative, and it's not $350 million with all due respect. It's $350 million worth of capital to do that work, but if you read the report, when this thing rolls out, to operate what gets built is going to cost $30 million a year. Not one year, $30 million a year forever is going to be the cost of operating that plant as a result of the stubbornness of whoever the Deputy Minister is that keeps advising them that they should be doing this. And I think it's inappropriate and I think that the time to ask the question is now because the only place that $30 million is going to come from is sewer and water rates, and they're already getting outrageous as a result of the earlier part of that program. So my question is, will you talk to the two leaders so that we can find out where they're at on this very expensive project considering the fact that they get elected because most of their seats are in the City of Winnipeg Mr. Mayor?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Clement. I'm aware of the capital and the operating cost, and what Councillor Clement has said is totally accurate. As Councillor Clement knows, we did go back a second time, and

unfortunately we got the same response from the CEC. I think this would be an opportunity for me to address both candidates, would be I think the right term for the leadership, and maybe the media will ask that same question as well, but yes it would be my privilege to do so.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor?

Councillor Clement: Yes, Mr. Mayor, notwithstanding that the Provincial Government hides behind the CEC on this issue, if you read the original CEC report, it did not dictate that these initiatives be done. There was discussion in the document about it, but the document, once the Clean Environment Commission document got there, which we all know was suppose to be shared a third, a third and a third, which of course didn't come out of there, that the licensing changed at the Province of Manitoba directed to us. And licensing changes were done by the Environment Minister, not the Clean Environment Commission. Well no, it's accurate Jenny. I can…you're sure it's a preamble because it's time people realized what's going on over there. The bottom line Mr. Mayor is are you going to continue to let the Premier-elect hide behind the Clean Environment Commission when in fact it's the Province that are making the changes, not the Clean Environment Commission?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, to try and address the question is that it's not my intention to let either of the candidates to be our next Premier hide behind anything. It is my, I think, duty as well as everybody on the floor of Council, to make sure that what is done is the right thing. I think that from the world of science, it's obvious what the right thing is. It's not to move forward with this. It's a waste of $350 million in capital. It's a waste of $30 million a year. And Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I am more than prepared to fight for what is right on behalf of all the citizens of Winnipeg, because in the end, they are the ones who are stuck with paying the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor. You had yours. You've had yours.

Mayor Katz: Is there something they're putting in the water today. I'm just wondering.

Mr. Speaker: Not at all. I'm just wondering if, Mr. Mayor, you're not communicating with your EPC members. Councillor Swandel, first question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Kind of interesting that we want to talk about this issue today so much when we just had a wonderful opportunity to do something for our rivers, but we kind of sachet'd that off to a Committee and a stalling process rather than action, but you know, but if you're here to talk about action, what I'd like to know from the Mayor is, if he is aware that, I believe this to be true, that one of the largest contributors to nutrient loading in our rivers is agricultural practices outside the City, far greater than anything that we do in the City of Winnipeg. In other jurisdictions what they've done, and it was considered, I believe, to be best practices, that they tried to acquire some of the lands in the repairing zones along the rivers so that they can green them and make them act as buffers for the run-off that comes off the agricultural fields, so by having a couple of hundred feet, or a couple hundred metres of good vegetation, of unpolluted vegetation, that you could actually filter a lot of what goes into the river out of it. I'm wondering if you have any idea how many miles of waterways that you could create a 200 metre buffer on, or 200 foot buffer, I don't know which is appropriate, but that $350 million worth of taxpayers or ratepayers money would purchase?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I think Councillor Swandel is asking me if I know the arithmetic of what $350 million a year would equate and how many miles of land we could protect with the buffer zone, which I am available because we've discussed this in the past. The answer is no Mr. Speaker, I have not done the arithmetic not knowing

one, how much the value of the land is, so that would be very difficult but I understand what he's saying and I know this is something that has been very successful in other jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Would it surprise you to learn that it would be in the hundreds of thousands of miles that you could purchase along our waterways if you were using a 200 foot buffer as the example?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, after being Mayor for five years, nothing surprises me Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question Councillor.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Could you just let us know if you recall, I'm not sure you do recall and my memory isn't that great, but who was the Minister that was responsible for setting these levels in the license when they came forward to the City of Winnipeg. The Clean Environment Commission recommendation was quite different than what the Minister put on the City of Winnipeg. Do you recall who that Minister was that implemented this injustice?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor. Mr. Mayor. Answer.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I feel like I've been grilled by Perry Mason here and I should have sworn I solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, but if memory serves me it was Minister Ashton.

Councillor Swandel: What?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor, you've been put on the hot seat here in your question period. Fifty percent of them are from your caucus.

Mayor Katz: Everybody should ask questions (inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Exactly, exactly. Okay question period is finished.

Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development Report of September 8, 2009. Councillor Fielding.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 8, 2009

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda 1 through 15.

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

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

Councillor Fielding: I'd like to move that the By-laws 105/2009 be read a first time.

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

Councillor Fielding: I would like to move that By-law No. 35/2009 be amended and read a second time.

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

Councillor Fielding: I'd like to move that the By-law No. 35/2009 be amended and read a third time and at the same time passed, ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Councillor Fielding: I'd like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 103/2009, 104/2009, 113/2009, 114/2009, 115/2009, 117/2009 and 118/2009 and 119/2009.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 103/2009, 104/2009, 113/2009, 114/2009, 115/2009, 117/2009, 118/2009, and 119/2009.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that the By-laws numbered 103/2009, 104, 113 to 115/2009 both inclusive and 117/2009 to 119/2009 both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered103/2009, 104/2009, 113/2009 to 115/2009 both inclusive and 117/2009 to 119/2009 both inclusive.

Councillor Fielding: Okay, and I'd like to move the rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 103, 104 and 113 to 115/2009 both inclusive and 117/2009 to 119/2009 both inclusive be read a third time and at the same time passed, ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. None.

Standing Policy Committee Protection and Community Services. Councillor Steeves report of September 14, 2009.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 2009

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.(Inaudible) Report of September 14, 09. I'll introduce the report and move adoption of consent items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. By-laws.

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

Councillor Steeves: I move that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 107, 108, 109, 110/09.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 107, 108, 109 and 110/2009.

Councillor Steeves: I move that the By-laws numbered 107 to 110 of 09 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 107 to 110/2009 both inclusive.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that the rules be suspended, By-laws numbered 107/2009 to 110/2009 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. Councillor Smith, your first question.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith, your first question.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Councillor Steeves, can you give us an update on the progress towards having a police helicopter for the City of Winnipeg. Where are we at?

Councillor Steeves: My understanding is that our Police administration is looking at the item and preparing a report. I haven't been involved in the preparation of the report Mr. Speaker. I don't exactly know when it's going to be coming forward. I can tell you this. When it comes forward I'll be looking at it very, very closely because I think it's a two-sided issue that we're going to have to have a very, very close peak at.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillor? No further questions?

Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, report of September 15, 2009. Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED SEPTEMBER 15, 2009

Councillor Clement: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the report of September the 15th and I'll move items 1 to 3 as consent.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Walk on report?

Councillor Clement: Yes, the walk on report. I will move that the rule be suspended and that the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works be considered.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Clement: I believe we had a quote on the suspension of the rules. It's not on the table to be called notice until we have suspension.

Mr. Speaker: The rules have to be suspended and this is where the motion ends. They won't be suspended, Councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: My point…my point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think we just want to be sure that is…what is the point maybe we can have an explanation from the Clerk of what is being said because we want to be sure that the intention of everybody is being met. I'm not sure. I'd like the speaker to explain the two different procedures we're going through here.

Mr. Speaker: Right here now we're dealing with…there is a challenge from Councillor Thomas…

Councillor Gerbasi: (Inaudible) maybe the Clerk could explain it in terms of what Councillor Thomas asked for notice verses suspending the rules to hear it.

Mr. Speaker: Fine, go ahead.

Clerk: I believe that Councillor Thomas is asking for the same suspension that Bill is already…Councillor Clement has already moved, basically section 10 (1) of the procedural By-law calls for every item to be on the agenda and section 10.(2) says any matter which are not provided on the agenda should not be considered at a Council meeting. And as such Councillor Clement has noted to move suspension of that rule to hear this item. (Inaudible) item today.

Mr. Speaker: And that's what's before us now.

Councillor Gerbasi: (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement you moved a motion that the rules be suspended subject to 10 (2) of the procedural By-law on the report dated September the 30th, Councillor. (Inaudible in the background) September the 30th. A recorded vote has been called for. All in favour? Please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith, Thomas, Vandal, and Wyatt.

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 6. It does not achieve the two-thirds suspension.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Clement, you have the floor.

Councillor Clement: I have the floor, okay. It's Bylaws I guess, eh?
(inaudible speaking in the background).
(laughter).

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Councillor Clement: Mr. Speaker I'll move that the following By-laws be read a first time By-laws 106 and 116/09

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

Clerk: By-laws106 and 116/2009.

Councillor Clement: I move that By-laws numbered 106 and 116 of one…109…116/09 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 106 and 116/2009.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 106 and 116/09 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 Finance. Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE
ON FINANCE
DATED SEPTEMBER 17, 2009**

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker I'm pleased to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda item No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Wyatt wants to be recorded in opposition. Motions none. By-laws none. Question period. Any?

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE
ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD**

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Yes, to the Chair, Councillor Swandel, through the Chair of course. You've been championing the potential borrowing of half a billion dollars for capital improvements across the City of Winnipeg. I'm wondering if you could tell this Council if that is being seriously considered at Executive Committee to the upcoming Capital Budget.

Councillor Swandel: I think a number of issues are being considered in the Capital Budget. My championing of borrowing is not specific to a number of half a billion dollars. I threw that out there as an example when I talk about the use of borrowing and what it might mean relative to a specific amount of money. The Capital Budget process is ongoing right now with the Administration and in closed door process with Executive Policy Committee, so it'd be inappropriate for me to comment on whether or not that is part of that process at this time. But I certainly am bringing it forward in that process, but I can't tell you where it's going in that process.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Vandal: The other side of the coin to borrowing that amount of money is the ability to service the interest that would be created. Would you also consider a property tax increase as part of the…on the operating side as part of the solution to service the extra interesting?

Councillor Swandel: Property tax increase is certainly one place that you could look at for revenue. I think as the Mayor alluded to earlier on today, property tax increase does not get us into the realm of solving our problems that we have in infrastructure or even servicing the interest on debt. If you look at interest on half a billion dollars going out thirty years is probably running, or the cost of servicing half a billion dollars in principal land interest going out thirty years is probably running in the 40 to 50 million dollar range which would equate to a 10 percent tax increase. When we're talking about Capital Budgets and our infrastructure deficit, we know that property taxes is not the solution. Maybe part of the solution, but more on the side of maintaining what we've built, and

ensuring that we do proper life cycle management and have a proper asset management strategy in front of us. And it certainly is something that can come into that equation, but the problems that we have in front of us are of the magnitude that will require serious help from the other levels of government, and we have other issues that we're wrestling with right now in the operating side of the budget. As you are aware, the pension issue has been one that has hit us very hard over the last couple of years and it's going to take a number of years to deal with the financial implications of that and you'll see some of that coming back.

But I should also make Council aware that when you look at, during the 80's and into the 90's, the City of Winnipeg did do quite a bit of borrowing, actually even before that in the 70's. There was a lot of borrowing that happened in the City of Winnipeg. Some of it was poor borrowing that wasn't allocated out over a finite amount of time with a finite amount of interest. The benefit that we have today is that our borrowing that we look at today we can look at it over the life cycle of some of the stuff that we build. For example we now have thirty-year interest rates available to us in the Public Sector, which is a great benefit. The other piece there too relative to what went on before is most of that old debt, if not all of it, drops off in the years 2013 to 2017, so we realize the gain on that in the years 2014 to 2018. So there is some new monies, you know, the access to those Capital dollars in those years. When I talk about borrowing, I'm sort of trying to deal with that time between today and when that old debt starts to drop off and how we use that to both manage our Capital and our Operating Budget.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor. Your third and final question. That's it? Councillor Steeves your first question.

Councillor Steeves: One of my colleagues from Charleswood-Tuxedo had mentioned the operating…sorry and Whyte Ridge…it doesn't say so on your little plastic tab though, I should say…had mentioned an operating cost on the new waste water upgrades of $30 million. His numbers not mine. I don't know if those are correct or not, but assuming they are, I'll ask the Chairperson of Finance through you Mr. Speaker, while I recognize that in all likelihood that operating funding would come through the Utility, water bills, waste water bills, and the like, as a comparative, on a year-to-year basis, what percentage tax increase would that $30 million additional operating cost represent?

Councillor Swandel: I think if you realize it in property tax, one percent of property taxes or revenue brings you about $4 million, you'd be just under 8% to somewhere in the realm of 7.8, 7.7 and a half percent, somewhere in that realm as a tax increase. So somebody who had say a $2,000 tax bill, they'd be looking at $150 tax increase on an annual basis to deal with that. When you put that into water rates that's a pretty scary number.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question? Is that it for questions?

Standing Policy Committee Downtown and Development. No report. No motions. Considering By-laws, none. Question period. Question period none. Moved by Councillor Nordman that Council do now adjourn and roll call, Mr. Clerk.

Councillor Nordman moves adjournment. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 11:54 a.m.