REPORT OF THE

COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, PARKS AND CULTURE

DATED SEPTEMBER 2, 1993

On motion of Councillor O'Shaughnessy, the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993, was considered clause by clause.

Moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,

That the Consent Agenda items, Clauses 1,2,3 and 4 be adopted.

Councillor Clement requested that Clause 1 be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

Councillor Thomas requested that Clause 4 be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

The motion to adopt the Consent Agenda, Clauses 2 and 3, was put and declared carried.

Her Worship the Mayor and Councillors:

Amendments to Alarm By-Law No. 4676/87 File GF-2 (Vol. 40)

913 - 1. Council on March 24, 1993, passed By-law No. 6155/93, amending By-law No. 4676/87, being a by-law of the City of Winnipeg to regulate and control burglary and robbery alarm systems and to require permits therefor. The amendment provides for an annual permit fee for an alarm system (residential - $20.00; commercial - $30.00; suspension renewal - residential $20.00; suspension renewal - commercial $30.00).

Council at its meeting held on July 22, 1993, referred back Clause 4 of the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated July 5, 1993, in connection with the proposed amendments to Alarm By-law No. 4676/87 (Exhibit "A") and further delayed the implementation of the registration fee for all alarm systems for 60 days.

In 1987 the City of Winnipeg enacted the Alarm By-law to reduce the growing number of false alarms. The Police Department established an Alarm Co-ordinator, assisted by a Clerk, who are responsible for the issuance of Alarm Permits and enforcement of the By-law. These permits are issued at no cost to the subscriber. Since the inception of the program the number of false alarms has declined from 23,832 in 1986 to 16,895 in 1992.

Although the Alarm By-law has been successful in reducing the number of false alarms it is anticipated that there will soon be a levelling of false alarms at approximately 16,000 per annum. As the number of new alarm installations continue to grow this will inevitably result in an increase in false alarms, no matter how vigorously the Alarm By-law is enforced. The monetary value associated with police response to these alarms, as well as the administrative costs associated with the by-law, are totally absorbed by the City of Winnipeg.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture has been advised that members of the Manitoba Burglar and Fire Alarm Association have met with the Police Department to consider different proposals and have reached an agreement. The Manitoba Burglar and Fire Alarm Association is in support of an annual permit fee for all alarms to maintain the Police Department's alarm permit data base and to generate revenue for the Department's costs in responding to alarms, as outlined in Exhibit "B".

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture has been advised that the following fee structure as suggested by the Manitoba Burglar and Fire Alarm Association and the Police Department, would significantly offset Department costs as follows:

All Local Alarm Permits	-	$30.00
Monitored Commercial Alarm Permits	-	$20.00
Monitored Residential Alarm Permits	-	$10.00

Reinstatement fee for Suspensions for excessive false alarms as follows:

All Local Alarm Permits	-	$30.00
Monitored Commercial Alarm Permits	-	$20.00
Monitored Residential Alarm Permits	-	$10.00

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993

Your Committee has been advised that the recommended permit fees are in the same proportion as costs incurred by the City due to false alarms. Local alarms are the most costly for the Department to maintain, as they require keyholder information to be maintained in Police computers and the Police Department Communications Centre is responsible for contacting the appropriate keyholder to attend an alarm. Monitored alarms are monitored by a monitoring agency which maintains a list of keyholders and calls the Department when Police assistance is required. Residential alarms occur only half as frequently as commercial alarms and therefore it is recommended that they be charged a lesser amount than commercial alarms.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture has been advised that all Alarm Permits would have to be renewed annually, by original issuance date. Prior to that date a renewal notice would be mailed to the subscriber with instructions for payment, and the final date for renewal. Should the Alarm Permit not be renewed by the due date, the Permit would be suspended and the subscriber so advised.

This initiative would validate all data in the Police computer system and it is estimated that the user fees would generate in excess of $500,000.00 per annum.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture therefore recommends:

I. That the City of Winnipeg Alarm By-law No. 4676/87 be amended to establish an annual fee schedule for all existing alarm permits as well as new alarm permits issued, as follows:

All Local Alarm Permits	-	$30.00
Monitored Commercial Alarm Permits	-	$20.00
Monitored Residential Alarm Permits	-	$10.00

Suspension renewal fee as follows:

All Local Alarm Permits	-	$30.00
Monitored Commercial Alarm Permits	-	$20.00
Monitored Residential Alarm Permits	-	$10.00

II. That the above changes to By-law No. 4676/87 will take effect on October 1, 1993.

III. That any previously approved direction adopted by Council be amended accordingly.

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

Moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,
Adoption of the clause.

Moved by Councillor Clement,
That the clause be referred back to the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture.

The motion to refer was put.

The Speaker called for the yeas and nays, which were as follows:-

Yea: Councillors Reese, Golden, Lazarenko, Prystanski, Silva, Clement and Angus. 7

Nay: Councillors Boychuk, Duguid, Eadie, Fraser, Hyman, Murray, O'Shaughnessy, Thomas and Mayor Thompson. 9

and the motion to refer the clause was declared lost.

In amendment,

Moved by Councillor Clement,
Seconded by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,
THAT the clause be amended as follows:

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993

1. That all local alarm permits be charged a $30.00 one time only fee to allow a proper updating of data required so that the Police Department can more appropriately do their job, and that a letter be sent explaining the problem.

2. That each year a letter be sent out to all registered alarm owners asking for any changes to their required data. Should they require a change, a fee of $15.00 be charged.

3. That in the event of a second false alarm, the permit be automatically cancelled and may be renewed, subject to subsection 4(10) (e) of the by-law on payment of a $50.00 fee.

Council recessed at 12:03 p.m. and reconvened at 1:37 p.m., same members present.

Councillors Duguid, Murray, Silva and Her Worship Mayor Thompson entered the meeting after Council had reconvened.

The Speaker called the Deputy Speaker, Councillor Reese, to the Chair in order to participate in the debate, and after speaking, resumed the Chair.

The amendment was put.

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

Yea: Councillors Boychuk, Eadie, Silva, Clement and Angus. 5

Nay: Councillors Reese, Duguid, Fraser, Golden, Hyman, Lazarenko, Murray, O'Shaughnessy, Prystanski, Thomas and Mayor Thompson. 11

and the amendment was declared lost.

The motion for the adoption of the clause was put.

The Speaker called for the yeas and nays, which were as follows:-

Yea: Councillors Duguid, Eadie, Fraser, Hyman, Murray, O'Shaughnessy, Thomas and Mayor Thompson. 8

Nay: Councillors Reese, Boychuk, Golden, Lazarenko, Prystanski, Silva, Clement and Angus. 8

and the motion for the adoption of the clause was declared lost in accordance with Rule 58.

(Note:See Minute No. 917 for attachment)

Request for Program Change in the 1987 Capital Estimates - Crescentwood Community Centre.
Files PR-2 (Vol. 76) & FC(1987)

914 - 2. In 1987, a Capital Project was approved to replace the heating and cooling unit for the Crescentwood Community Centre gymnasium at a total cost of $20,000.00.

There was some discussion whether one heating unit was required or two based on the additional exhaust system capacity (to reduce smoke accumulation during bingo). It was decided to install one unit initially and keep the project open, and after operating for a season (or more), if another unit was needed, the funds were available. There was no requirement to install another unit, and the account has remained open to date with a balance of $13,391.90.

The Community Centre has now begun to plan an expansion/renovation to their facility and has requested to redirect the remaining funds to the renovation, which they have estimated at $600,000.00. City funding of $31,000.00, to assist with improvements to Crescentwood Community Centre, is identified in the 1992 Capital Program "to remodel and expand interior walls of ... storage room, washroom, kitchen/canteen and common room." The Community

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993

Centre executive have applied for a number of other grants and are prepared to apply for a loan to make up any shortfall. This change in capital funding - making a total of $44,391.90 available - will help them in reducing the amount that they may require from the bank. They are also considering phasing in the project as another way to address any funding deficiency.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture recommends:

I. That funds in the amount of $13,391.90 remaining in the 1987 Capital Program to replace the heating and cooling unit for the Crescentwood Community Centre gymnasium (03-118XXX-5487570604) be transferred to the 1992 Capital Program - Improvements at Crescentwood Community Centre (03-118XXX-5492560602).

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

Adopted by consent.

Priorization of Development for a City-wide Riverbank Parkway System
Files PR-4.1 (Vol. 6) & E-5.1 (Vol. 2)

915 - 3. There is considerable current public interest, as expressed by various Ward Councillors and confirmed by the Winnipeg Leisure Study, towards the development of the City's riverbanks for lineal parkway purposes as well as the establishment of bicycle/pedestrian pathway routes. Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture believes it would be timely at this point to identify development priorities for the various sections of riverbanks in the City as guidelines for short and long term riverbank parkway development. The current economic situation of civic spending for the foreseeable future suggests that riverbank parkway development should not occur as haphazard, piece-meal development representative of primarily local interest. Concentration of civic resources and funding towards development of specific sections of riverbank parkway would appear to be the more prudent, cost beneficial approach for addressing broader City-wide public interests for increased access and leisure use of the City's riverbank system.

In order that a broader systematic approach towards riverbank development may occur, it is essential that two fundamental activities take place:

1) The definition of a list of "objective" criteria from which priorities for development can be determined for various sections of riverbanks; and

2) The identification of a listing of sections of riverbanks, which, in themselves, form complete units of activity (i.e. logical "beginning" and "end" points) of general public use, while at the same time, furthering the long-term goal of a continuous, City-wide Riverbank Parkway System.

Five criteria, four of which could be weighted on a scale of relative importance, have been identified pertinent to an objective assessment of sections of riverbank for development purposes. This criteria includes:

1. Linkage Potential:

This would evaluate the importance of sections of riverbank for linking major points of interest or leisure activity situated along the rivers, (examples - The Forks to Assiniboine Park, The Forks to Kildonan Park) or, the relative importance of a section of riverbank in connecting two other existing sections of riverbank parkway (example - the section of riverbank between the Louise Bridge and the mouth of the Seine River Parkway as a means of connecting the "Kildonan Parkway" (Peguis Trail Bridge to Ernie O'Dowda Park) with the "St. Boniface Parkway" (Whittier Park to Guay Park).

2. Ownership:

This would evaluate the proportion of the length of a section of riverbank which is currently either publicly owned or lies adjacent to quiet residential streets which can be utilized for purposes of linkage continuity. The existence of such streets (examples - Wellington Crescent, Wolseley Avenue, Scotia Avenue, Kildonan Drive) would negate the need for riverbank acquisition for parkway purposes. This criteria would also evaluate whether existing breaks in continuity of a given section of riverbank could be readily resolved through property acquisitions, easement agreements or design adjustments to street thoroughfares.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993

3. Public Benefit:

This would evaluate the relative benefits to be derived by the public from the establishment of a given section of riverbank parkway, not only on a City-wide basis, but as well, from the perspective of local residential access (example - some sections of riverbank traverse densely populated residential areas, whereas other sections of riverbank traverse areas of either low residential population or include obstacles which restrict or limit direct public access).

4 .Costs:

This would evaluate the relative costs to be incurred in the establishment of a section of riverbank parkway, and, would include consideration of site development factors, property acquisitions, as well as situations of obvious riverbank instability. For the purpose of ranking priority of development, "costs" are only of a comparative nature between the various sections of riverbank. More comprehensive cost estimates for budgetary purposes would be prepared at later dates relative to specific sections of riverbank in accordance with priorized rankings for development purposes.

5. Other Factors:

This would include consideration of various other currently known factors which would have influence upon the ranking of development of specific sections of riverbank; and, which could have either positive or negative impacts; accelerating or retarding the potential rate of parkway development of a given section of riverbank. As such factors would not be common to all sections of riverbank, they cannot be "weighted" as with the aforementioned four criteria. However, these "site specific" factors may be of significant enough influence to effect the overall ranking of priority for development (example - if two sections of riverbank have otherwise identical ranked priorities, but one section is subject to an alternative source of funding, i.e. Core Area Initiative Program, ARC, Development Agreements, etc., or, a long standing expressed interest and support by adjacent residents, then it will assume a higher priority rating for implementation.)

It is proposed that the first four criteria be rated on a scale of 1 to 5 for each section of riverbank evaluated, where 5 is considered as "most significant or important" and 1 is considered as "least significant or important". As such, sections of riverbank with a rating of 20 would be of high priority for early implementation as parkways, whereas sections with a rating of 5 would be of low priority at this time. As situations change or new conditions arise, the priority ranking of a specific section of riverbank could alter significantly. For this reason, the review and adjustment of development priorities must be an ongoing process in order to ensure accurate representation of current conditions and should occur at least once every five years.

The City's riverbanks along the Red and Assiniboine Rivers have been characterized as 16 sections of riverbanks. Each section or "unit" of riverbank could be developed separately and function independently from the other sections of riverbank as a "self-contained" riverbank parkway. This would ensure that, as each section of parkway becomes fully operational, the public could derive recreational leisure benefits during the interim period of perhaps two to three decades (given current economic conditions) that the complete City-wide riverbank parkway is evolving. The 16 sections of riverbank, so defined, are outlined in Exhibit "A".

Implementation within the current economic climate must invariably require a prolonged period of time to fully achieve and will be subject to a variety of unforeseen factors (i.e. new sources of funding, local public interest, availability of properties, etc.); therefore only the first six sections of parkway have been ranked with respect to priority for development. The six sections of parkway should be termed as the "First Phase" of the City-wide riverbank parkway system.

In consideration of the aforementioned criteria and the definition of 16 sections of riverbanks along the Red and Assiniboine Rivers, the following six sections (First Phase) of riverbanks have been rated as having "relatively" high priority for development of riverbank parkway:

1. The North Winnipeg Parkway - (Exhibit "B")

2. The Assiniboine Parkway - (Exhibit "C")

3. The Fort Rouge Parkway - (Exhibit "D")

4. The St. Boniface Parkway - (Exhibit "E")

5. The Kildonan Parkway - (Exhibit "F")

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993

6. The Churchill Parkway - (Exhibit "G")

A detailed analysis of the above sections is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Although ten sections of riverbanks have not been specifically rated at this time, it is readily apparent that these sections currently experience significant deficiencies in accordance with the criteria for ranking development priority, and as such, would have a "weighted" rating of less than fifteen. A brief explanation as to why the remaining 10 sections of riverbank are not considered for the First Phase of development is on file in the office of the City Clerk. As conditions and circumstances change, and as sections of riverbank within the First Phase are implemented, certain sections of riverbanks will warrant priority rating for development within the Second Phase of the City's Riverbank Parkway.

The Riverbank Management Committee has considered this matter, invited input from the Community Committees and concurred in the recommendations as outlined below.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture concurs with the Riverbank Management Committee and recommends:

I. That the Criteria, as outlined above, be approved as a means for establishing development priority of the various sections of riverbanks along the Red and Assiniboine Rivers towards the long term establishment of a City-wide Riverbank Parkway System.

II. That sixteen sections of riverbank as outlined in Exhibit "A" comprise the City-wide Riverbank Parkway System.

III. That the North Winnipeg Parkway, the Assiniboine Parkway, the Fort Rouge Parkway, the St. Boniface Parkway, the Kildonan Parkway and the Churchill Parkway, be approved in principle for development priorization as the First Phase of the City-wide Riverbank Parkway System.

IV. That the priorization of sections of riverbank for development purposes be reviewed and reassessed annually and at least once every five years in order to reaffirm or adjust development priorities for the sections of riverbank in accordance with changing conditions and circumstances.

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

Adopted by consent.

(Note:Exhibits "A" to "G" referred to in the above clause are on file in the office of the City Clerk)

Proposed Amendment to the Policy on Purchasing Procedures regarding Landscape Contractors
Files PB (Vol. 1) & GL-9 (Vol. 4)

916 - 4. Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture on April 8, 1993, considered administrative report dated January 13, 1993, concerning the evaluation of private sector contracting on City of Winnipeg boulevards. The Committee referred the following motion to the Administration for comment:

"That the sod evaluation system be upgraded to allow the City to bar a contractor that has shown poor past performance, from competing on future projects, so that contractors who have not satisfactorily met their obligations will be barred from bidding after a first negative evaluation for a five-year period and a lifetime ban after a second negative evaluation."

The Policy on Purchasing Procedures and the Disposal of Surplus Materials was approved by City Council on February 10, 1988.

Clause 10 of the "Policy" clearly states the means and circumstances under which a contractor or subcontractor can be debarred from performing work for or on behalf of the City of Winnipeg.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993

Clause 10 (a) (i) states that:

"if there is sufficient cause, debar a person for a period not exceeding three years from participating in a solicitation, acting as a contractor, or a subcontractor or supplier to any person who is awarded a contract"

Clause 10 (a) (ii) goes on to state in part that:

"if there is probable cause to believe that a person has engaged in any activity which might reasonably lead to debarment, suspend that person for a period not exceeding six months from participating in a solicitation, and acting as a contractor or a subcontractor or supplier to any person who is awarded a contract."

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture proposes to amend the Policy so that the period of debarment for landscaping contractors under the jurisdiction of the Parks and Recreation Department only, be increased to five (5) years from the present three (3) year period.

The administration believes that the existing debarment and suspension provisions in the Policy are adequate and as such should not be changed solely for landscaping contractors. There are a number of issues that lead the Department to this conclusion, which are outlined as follows:

1) Consistency in the City Purchasing Policy

Landscaping contractors should be treated in the same manner as any other contractors doing business either directly under contract with the City or through a Developer. Landscaping contractors do not default any more frequently or with any greater severity than any other contractor.

2) Existing Purchasing Policy Penalties

The present debarment and suspension provisions in the Purchasing Policy are adequate, but not utilized very frequently.

3)Enforcement

The existing suspension and debarment provisions in the Policy must be utilized by the City in order to send a clear message to bad contractors that their poor performance will not be tolerated. As indicated in point # 2 above, debarment has been utilized in very few cases to date.

Increasing the debarment or suspension periods will not encourage the Departments to recommend that a contractor be debarred or suspended. Further it may not keep undesirable landscaping contractors from bidding for City work as it may encourage them to devise a more creative method to subvert the Policy.

4) .Invitation to Tender

In addition to the remedies of debarment and suspension set out in the Policy, the Tender Documents also permit the City to reject a bid submitted by a Contractor who has not performed satisfactorily on past projects.

Acting on the above advice, the Administration recommended to your Committee:

"That the Debarment and Suspension provisions of the Policy on Purchasing Procedures and The Disposal of Surplus Materials (the "Policy") be enforced by the City rather than be revised as per the motion of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture at its meeting on April 8, 1993."

However, your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture does not concur in the above recommendation and recommends as follows:

I. That Clause 10(a)(i) of the Policy on Purchasing Procedures and the Disposal of Surplus Materials be amended to state that a period of debarment for Landscape Contractors under the jurisdiction of the Parks and Recreation Department be increased to 5 years from the present 3 year period.

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

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993

Your Executive Policy Committee does not concur in Recommendation I. above and recommends that the existing 3 year period of debarment be maintained and strictly enforced.

Moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,
Adoption of the clause.

The motion for the adoption of the clause was put.

The Speaker called for the yeas and nays, which were as follows:-

Yea: Councillors Boychuk, Duguid, Hyman, Silva and Thomas. 5

Nay: Councillors Reese, Eadie, Fraser, Golden, Lazarenko, Murray, O'Shaughnessy, Prystanski and Angus. 9

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

917 - Exhibit "A" referred to in Clause 1 of the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993

Amendments to Alarm By-Law No. 4676/87 File GF-2 (Vol. 40)

4. Council on March 24, 1993, passed By-law No. 6155/93, amending By-law No. 4676/87, being a by-law of the City of Winnipeg to regulate and control burglary and robbery alarm systems and to require permits therefor. The amendment provides for an annual permit fee for an alarm system (residential - $20.00; commercial - $30.00; suspension renewal - residential $20.00; suspension renewal - commercial $30.00).

Council on May 26, 1993 ruled automatic referral of the following motion to the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture:

"Whereas the City of Winnipeg enacted an alarm by-law to encourage property owners to install alarms to protect their property;

And Whereas thousands of Winnipeggers have done so, and in doing so have received a reduction in their insurance policy premiums and also a saving to the taxpayers of Winnipeg by providing a deterrent that means less involvement by the Police Department;

And Whereas Council enacted an annual fee structure of $20.00 per resident that installs an alarm system whether they are connected to the Police Department or not;

And Whereas this hidden form of tax is a penalty on a home owner's decision to protect their property;

Therefore Be It Resolved that Council request the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture to revisit the issue with a view to proposing a fee structure that will encourage people to protect their property, and report back to Council."

On June 23, 1993, Council adopted Clause 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated June 16, 1993, recommending that By-law No. 4676/87 be further amended to require the implementation date for alarm permit fees to become effective one month later on August 1, 1993, to enable the matter to be resolved prior to the implementation date of August 1, 1993.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture has considered five alternatives, including the implementation of an annual permit fee.

The five alternatives were examined by the Police Department against the following "system requirements":

1. There must be some monetary return to the City of Winnipeg. A small percentage of property owners (less than 10%) are receiving extraordinary service from the Winnipeg Police Department. In direct costs this service is valued at $500,000.00 (Alarm Permit Administration Fees - $85,000.00, and officer response costs - 8 person years @ $50,000.00). Metro Toronto Police determined it costs $80.00 to answer every alarm. Using this estimate, false alarms cost the City of Winnipeg $1,222,000.00 per annum.

2. Assurance of accuracy of the data in the Police Computer System. The Alarm Permit System requires that permit holders identify two keyholders who may be contacted in the event of an alarm. At the present time the data concerning the 30,000 permit holders is "suspect" at best, and at worst is totally inaccurate. Permit holders have moved, taking their alarm system with them, or have left it with the new occupant. Keyholders have died or moved and in the majority of cases the police have not been notified of the any of these change. In May of 1992 lists of Permit Holders were sent to monitoring firms for validation. A random sample revealed a twelve month delay in response, and in excess of 20% of the records were inaccurate. It should be noted that these are the "best" records.

3. That it not significantly increase the administrative work load of the City of Winnipeg, including any requirement for Court attendance or dramatically increased Suspension Appeals before the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture.

4. All citizens, including those owning alarm systems, should be assured of prompt, effective police response. Sanctions for false alarms should not be so onerous as to make any citizen hesitant in tripping an alarm system to immediately summon the police.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993

The following alternatives were considered by your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture:

Exhibit "A" referred to in Clause 1 of the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993 (continued)

1. $30.00 fee for new alarm permits
   No suspensions
   $25.00 fine for third to fifth false alarm in a six month period

   This alternative (proposed by the Alarm Association) does not meet the system requirements. The one time registration fee would generate $90,000.00 per annum - slightly more than the cost to administer the program. The monies realized from fines after three false alarms in six months would be minimal. This system would do nothing to ensure data accuracy. This system has police issuing offence notices to keyholders (not the resident) which would result in officers appearing in court for every not guilty plea. Finally, the association suggests that if no keyholder is available, the police would have the option of not attending. The liabilities of this inaction are immeasurable and the proposal was not deemed acceptable to the Police Department.

2. Minimum Fine of $100.00 for every false alarm

   This alternative would recover all costs associated with attending false alarms, however it would not ensure accuracy of data. The administrative implications of this system would be horrendous. Police officers would have to find the Permit Holder to serve the offence notice and then would have to appear in court for all not guilty pleas. With a fine of $100.00 it is the Police Department's belief there would be a high percentage of not guilty pleas. The most troubling aspect of this system is that it may encourage false crime reports and may cost some citizen their life. Facing a fine of $100.00, a home owner may simply report a crime - for example he could break a $10.00 window or simply state that the unlocked rear window was opened setting off the alarm and scaring away a non-existent culprit. This of course would result in police reports, investigation and costs. Even more distressing is the possibility that a clerk in a convenience store or an elderly person in their home may hesitate before pressing an alarm button. This hesitation, because of a $100.00 fine, may cost some person their life. This was not an acceptable proposal to the Police Department.

3. Alarm Companies assessed a fee based on the percentage of false alarms generated by their clients. Police costs could be set at a nominal one million dollars and the fee would bebased on the previous year's experience

   ]
   This alternative would recover all costs associated with false alarms and would encourage a further reduction in false alarms. The minimal fee for local alarms (not monitored) would ensure data accuracy for that group but all other data would continue to be suspect. Administrative costs would be unchanged and the citizens of Winnipeg would continue to receive service at the present level. This proposal would receive considerable opposition from the alarm industry and in the long run would result in an increase in monitoring fees to Alarm Permit Holders in excess of the original proposal. This was an acceptable but not a recommended alternative of the Police Department.

4. Form a City of Winnipeg Alarm Monitor Section

   This alternative would take considerable research before implementation could be considered. However, with an average alarm monitoring fee of $200.00 this system could generate $6,000,000.00 per annum, enough to pay for all associated costs and produce an income for the City of Winnipeg. The yearly fee would ensure accurate data and although administrative costs would be higher they would be stable and easily recouped. This alternative may increase service to the citizens of Winnipeg, however would meet with considerable opposition from the alarm industry. This was an acceptable but not a recommended alternative of the Police Department.

5. Annual Permit Fee for an Alarm System

   This alternative does meet all four requirements. It would recover approximately $600,000.00 per annum with the minimal charge to the residential permit holder of $1.67 a month. It would ensure that all computer data is validated on a yearly basis. There would be few administrative changes required to enact this system. Finally, the system would not discourage anyone from using their alarm system in time of real or perceived crisis. This alternative was recommended by the Police Department.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture after considering all aspects of this matter, recommends the following:

I. That the City of Winnipeg Alarm By-law be amended as follows:

Exhibit "A" referred to in Clause 1 of the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture dated September 2, 1993 (continued)

a)to require a one-time registration fee in the amount of $30.00 to be charged for all security alarm permits issued in the City of Winnipeg;

b)to require a $15.00 fee to be charged to update all changes to alarm permits;

c)to establish a $50.00 fine for all false alarms on summary conviction notice to the owner of the premises.

II. That any previously approved direction adopted by Council be amended accordingly.

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

Your Executive Policy Committee recommends:

1) That recommendation I. a) be amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"and further, that Administration be directed to include with the invoice billing, a letter of explanation outlining reasons for the amendments to the City of Winnipeg Alarm By-law."

2) That recommendation I. c) be deleted and substituted with the following:

"(c)to provide that in the event of a false alarm the permit will be automatically cancelled and may be renewed, subject to subsection 4 (10) (e) of the by-law, on payment of a $50.00 fee."

COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, PARKS AND CULTURE

QUESTION PERIOD

918 - Councillor Golden requested an update on the impacts of the zoo entrance fees to date.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy noted that attendance was down 73 percent in March, 43 percent in April, 37 percent in May, 2 percent in June, 6 percent in July, but reversed in August with a 7 percent increase, which continued into September with a 61 percent increase. Councillor O'Shaughnessy further stated that the attendance was notable given the inclement weather conditions of summer. In addition, he drew attention to the fact that the "Down Under" exhibit had raised sufficient revenues to offset all guarantees made, and stated that the final accounting for the exhibit would be forthcoming. He further noted that the "Free Tuesdays" were popular, attracting 100,000 of the 431,886 visitors and that the "family pass" was also a popular item, with 1,800 sold. To date, 640 free admissions had been given to individuals where their income level proved to be an obstacle for zoo entrance.

Councillor Hyman requested an update on the success of Rainbow Stage and questioned the status of Rainbow Stage roof expenditures approved by Council.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy stated that to date he had not received Rainbow Stage reporting, but noted that he was cognizant of the rumour of a $70,000 profit. He further noted that Rainbow Stage would be reporting to the Committee and that the roof issue would be considered after such report, with the work being scheduled for completion prior to the commencement of the 1994 season.

Councillor Thomas questioned whether Councillor O'Shaughnessy had been informed of the recent meeting between administrative personnel and another level of government, and whether he had been invited to attend.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy replied that he had not been formally made aware of the meeting.