COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

The Council met at 9:55 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 Wyatt.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We have with us, Kayla Ruiz of Kelvin High School, resides in Daniel McIntyre Ward and Nick Bruneau of Garden City Collegiate, resides in Mynarski Ward. Both of you, welcome.

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Condolences Motions, Madam Clerk.

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Nordman,
Seconded by Councillor Fielding,

That Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Councillor Pat Phillips, which occurred on April 1, 2010.

Mrs. Phillips served the citizens of Winnipeg as Councillor for the St. Charles Ward from 1995 to 1998.

This Council extends to her children Chris, Lori, Gord, and their families, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: Would everybody in the Chambers and Galleries please rise for a Moment of Silence.

(Moment of Silence)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

MINUTES

Councillor Swandel moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on March 23rd of and 24th of 2010 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mr. Speaker: We have a Motion on the desks here. Moved by Mayor Katz, seconded by Councillor Steeves, and Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker it was always the intentions of yours truly, and EPC to have Council to have the opportunity to discuss and debate this issue. It's also my understanding that there are some delegations here and I would certainly love to have the opportunity for all of us to hear what they have to say, so I'm hoping that we can have this on the Agenda. And I know that it will take two thirds vote for Council. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi, do you want to move that as a…

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I support hearing the motion and debating it today and placing on the Agenda. And I just have; would like to ask if Mr. Ken Klassen has requested the ten minute spot for a Motion to speak to the clause and I'm wondering if that's (inaudible)…

Mr. Speaker: Okay, good. Mr. Klassen will be put on the Agenda as a delegation to this clause.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Delegations. Thomas Novak, Co-chair and Lucas Redekop on behalf of Winnipeg Rapid Transit Coalition, in opposition to Item 2, the Report of Executive Policy Committee dated April 21 of 2010. Mr. Novak and Mr. Redekop, and you have 10 minutes to make your presentation.

Thomas Novak: Just checking. Your Worship, Members of City Council, thank you for allowing me to speak today. First I would like to note that the BRT systems are not a thing of the past or something that can't be implemented, but is an important tool in meeting the transportation needs of active citizens. BRT systems are currently being implemented around the world. It's misleading to suggest that BRT does not use new technology or does not provide exceptional service to riders. Currently a BRT system in Brazil serves 1.3 million riders daily. The BRT system being developed right now in Winnipeg has pre-board tickets, elevated platforms, meaning the bus is parallel to the platform, important if you're in a wheelchair, enhanced stations and dedicated transit ways.

In the 2005 Rapid Transit Meeting Winnipeg Report states the difference between Winnipeg dedicated line, BRT system and LRT are public; the differences are public perception and costs of BRT being cheaper. Speed and ridership are almost identical, therefore continually opening debate between LRT, BRT exaggerates the one difference between the two which is put simply public perception. Another study is now needed especially when the only barriers to a BRT system in Winnipeg is kind of a lack of cheer leading, hence I would encourage Council and Your Worship, the Mayor, to put your support behind a BRT system which has multiple benefits for Winnipeg Transit and future transit users. When we ask Winnipeg citizens where they want transit to improve they said more frequent service and improved transit stations. Both are fundamental to Winnipeg's BRT system and are identical to what an LRT system would provide. Therefore, BRT is not only adequate for Winnipeg but provides the exceptional service that Winnipeggers are asking for.

However, without providing funds for this excellent project through the Canada Building Fund, instead redirecting these funds to major road building near the Perimeter , we not only lose Rapid Transit but also urban intensification and the real savings that go with it. Here are the real savings I'm talking about. The 2005 Rapid Transit Report states that the southwest BRT system resulted in operating surplus of $481,000 on page 29 of that Report. In Winnipeg Transit would save almost half a million a year, simply by finishing the BRT system. This figure did not account for a new stadium at U of M, which I would guess it would move the surplus even higher. Therefore a question why Councillors ask for more money to build new roadways on Chief Peguis, Plessis, expand others Kenaston without knowing any specific costs or their operating costs while at the same time, shelving a plan when that completion will save the City money in operating cost. I think we have a choice between funding roads which are mainly on the outskirts of the City and the increasing cost or you can support transit oriented development within older neighbourhoods where many City services are already in place in an effort to reduce operating cost, all the while making the City denser more vibrant, healthier, more accessible or more green. However, if Council continues lay the second phase of transit towards the U of M in favour of new road construction; the City will not see the real benefits and savings of modern transportation system. Thank you, and I've left a Report of each right here. Thank you.

Lucas Redekop: Your Worship, Members of Council, since 1959 success with City Council's been ordering, studies of potential Rapid Transit systems and for 51 years, the launch of a new study is always meant two things. First, do nothing about Rapid Transit and second, build new roads. And we are not talking about fixing the crumbling roads we have, but building new infrastructure usually at the fringes of the City. The one miraculous exception to this pattern was the study that you, yourselves commissioned in 2004. The study that set out the current plan, Rapid Transit Corridor to the University of Manitoba followed by a northeast corridor to East Kildonan and Transcona. Over the last few months, the completion of the southwest corridor has gone from necessary to urgent. We're building a stadium with potential seating for 40,000 people but without any effective way to move people to it. We are perhaps the only City in North America to build a new facility of this size without a connection to Rapid Transit. Your Worship, if you are arguing that you are not cancelling Rapid Transit, you're only looking for a better system. No one would be happier than this Coalition when you will announce that work will start immediately on completing the corridor be it with buses, trains or with a system of teleportation. Be mass to the University Bill Menzies, but the reality that has been hidden under the proposal for yet another study is that the Rapid Transit Corridor is about to undergo an amputation. It will become a transit way to nowhere, waiting for some future City Council like Snow White's Prince, to kiss it back to life. Innovated entrepreneurs

are already creating housing projects adjacent to the corridor stations that will make the corridor success and will generate the tax revenue that will eventually help the corridor pay for itself. But what entrepreneur would want to do business with a City that announces a project one week and cancels it the next in an endless series of let's do it and let's study it. Let's do it, let's study it again. We are not opposed to (inaudible) project along. We would love to see the last study that you commissioned last year on converting BRT to a light rail.

We are however leery of studies that turn out to be smoke screens disguising a defect or cancellation of Phase 2 of the corridor and diversion of Building Canada Fund monies from Rapid Transit to the building of new roads, some of which are not part of the City's transportation plans and many of which will further exacerbate the City's problem of uncontrolled sprawl. The Federal Government is publicly committed to the corridor. The Province is promised to match Federal funding and in its climate change legislation has promised a contribution of at least 50 cents of every dollar the City spends on the Transit Way. The Government of Canada's packed up the car. The Province is ready to turn the key in the ignition and now with everything ready for the trip of a life time; the City is looking at brochures for new swimming pool instead. Last week EPC drew up a new list of priorities for the Building Canada Fund. No where is there even a mention of Rapid Transit. The City's best detectives can find nary a trace of Phase 2 in the City's Capital Budget and there appears to be no clear plan for a link between an amputated transit way and the new stadium. Your Worship, if the study is not just a new smoke screen, then why not announce today that you are going to phone the Premier and Vic Toes and accept the cash they are practically throwing at us to finish the corridor. There is still a lot of work to be done before either tracks or pavement are laid. There is land to assemble. There are drain issues to address. Overpasses and stations to construct and the road bed to be solidified. We can do all this work even if Council chooses to take one more look at bus or rail. We could keep our options open and get to work on Phase 2, or as the Agenda that is before us today would suggest, we can simply fold our hand on Rapid Transit and ask for new roads instead. Mr. Mayor, in September 2008, you promised the City of Winnipeg that construction of a complete untruncated corridor to the University of Manitoba. Keep your promise, finish what you started. Let's complete the corridor. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Pressing the wrong button here. Gentlemen, you just stay here. Mr. Klassen, Ken Klassen will be speaking to the same subject. He is an opposition also for the Item and then all three of you, standing here. There will be some questions no doubt by Council. Mr. Klassen. Mr. Klassen you have five minutes.

Ken Klassen: Thank you. The Building Canada Fund will total $8.8 billion dollars over seven years. The funding is going to be allocated to the Province's based on the 2006 census. If you extrapolate that that would mean Winnipeg has about two percent of the national population. We probably are looking at about $175 million in total, over $25 million for a year. Now I know the City of Winnipeg has its own list of priorities as proposed at the meeting today in a Motion. My concern that I want to speak to here is that you're ignoring your own policies and plans and I want to propose that I'm going to submit my own submission to the Building Canada Fund and what my submission will do is it will offer critique of your submission.

The first thing that I'm going to tell the Federal Government and Building Canada Fund and their Provincial partner, the Manitoba Canada Infrastructure Secretariat is that you're ignoring your own City Auditor. You received the Capital Project Management Audit Fund Report November 2008. Michael Ruta, your Chief Financial Officer said, "I'm in a strong agreement with the Audit's key findings." The Mayor in EPC was too. The Mayor in EPC concurred in the recommendations in February 2010, recommended to Council, the Administration quote. "Do all things necessary to implement the recommendations of the Report." But what did the Report say? Well, the Report said you should seek public input at the beginning of the process for Capital Projects not after decisions have been made. I would ask you, what public input or opportunity has been made in this list? Was there any solicitation, any public meetings, on line polls anything like that at all? The canvassed citizens of Winnipeg like the auditor recommended, get the input before you make these recommendations and come forward with these lists. You heard me speak about this before too but that's also in Plan Winnipeg Policy 2A-01 that it requires the City of Winnipeg to commit to Citizen engagement, political decision making process actively soliciting assist input into policy from relation applicable decision making through meaningful public input. Was there any public input into this list apart from today? I don't think so.

Three people speaking as delegation doesn't what I call meaningful public input. Perhaps one of the most important recommendations of the Auditor's Report, there's 29 in total, was that you are selecting Capital Projects with no objective criteria or cost benefit analysis. You heard me speak about that before. The City already has an existing policy. You're supposed to do cost benefit analysis through the cert, independent review of Capital Projects. So really what we have here is we have the proposed Motion, double standard on Transit compared to the expansion of Regional Street System. You have in your list, numerous expansions of Regional Street Systems. How many of them have a cost benefit analysis? Do any? Where is the objective criteria? I haven't seen anything as a tax payer. How do I know which project, not just has a merit because I think they all have some merit but which projects have the most merit? I don't know.

Now it's interesting to note too, that the Building Canada Fund priorities they include the Core National Highway System, drinking water, public transit, green energy. Ten of eleven proposed priorities in your Motion before you deal with transportation not one of them deals with transit. More than half of your proposed priorities, six of your eleven priorities are for the expansion of capacity regional street system. Council, you spent a million dollars on those of taxpayers' money in three years to the transplant process to find out what are the priorities for Winnipeggers. Here is what they told you. They felt that it was; they felt most strongly by almost three to one ratio that "is more important to develop a Rapid Transit system in Winnipeg than to develop more streets for automobiles. Among the funny priorities emerge in public consultations of funding for Transit improvements should increase with priority of immediate. Does this list reflect that? I don't think so.

This also has implications for your climate change goal. You made a commitment 11 years ago, more than 11 years ago; that you would facilitate development community wide plan to reduce emissions by six percent. There's five steps in that process. You're still in the first step after 11 years, no plan, no action. How is expanding the Capacity Regional Street System going to help? We know in Plan Winnipeg by law through the City of Winnipeg Charter, you are legally not allowed to spend money on projects that aren't in Plan Winnipeg, Major Capital Projects. For the six priorities listed before you today, are not in Plan Winnipeg. So, why are you doing this? Why are you not waiting for your $1.4 million Transportation Plan that's going to form part of the Our Winnipeg Process? I have more comments but I'm out of time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Just stay here. Councillors, any questions of the…Councillor Vandal you had the first question.

Councillor Vandal: Question to Ken Klassen is I understand you've done an analysis of the Capital Cost between Bus Rapid Transit in Winnipeg and LRT in other cities. Five Canadian cities, I understand. Can you share what those results are with us?

Ken Klassen: Well, I'll be appearing in delegation I guess because that it's just going to come up again and I'll talk specifically to that issue if Councillor is agreeable, yeah for the LRT issue, right? Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The last delegation is… Are there any further questions, Councillors? Delegations? If not, gentlemen, thank you.

Ken Klassen: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The last delegation is Kaj Hasselriis in support of Notice of Motion, proposed by Councillor Gerbasi and His Worship Mayor Norrie. Is Kaj here?

Kaj Hasselriis: I'm here.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, you want to come to the here? You've got ten minutes.

Listen, can I…pardon? This thing is not…

Kaj Hasselriis: Hi there. My name is Kaj Hasselriis. Thanks very much for giving me the opportunity to speak this morning. I want to speak on a resolution regarding Uganda. The reason is that Uganda, as you probably know, is a country in Central Africa and right now, in Uganda, a Bill is being debated in the Ugandan Parliament that would, if passed, bring the death penalty upon gays and lesbians. It's actually even more draconian than that because it calls for anyone who knows a gay or lesbian person and who doesn't report them to the Police are to be arrested in jail within 24 hours and it also calls for any organization that is supporting gays and lesbians to be shut down. This Bill has been; is in the process of being debated in Uganda over the last few months. There's much concern about it in the gay and lesbian community here in Winnipeg, as there is concern about it elsewhere.

Recently, I was in my Doctor's office. I'm a patient of Dr. Dick Smith who runs the Gay Men's Health Clinic in West Broadway here in Winnipeg and he was mentioning to me that Kampala, the capital city of Uganda is actually involved in Municipal Partnership Agreements with Winnipeg, and that actually, as a doctor, he had met with some doctors from Kampala just a couple of years ago who were here to discuss H.I.V., AIDS issues and that actually, Dr. Smith had raised the issue of homosexuality with them and they didn't want to talk about it, so at that point I thought hey, if we're involved in Municipal Partnership Agreements with Kampala, we definitely should feel like we have the opportunity and the obligation to say something about a Law that is not good, that's being debated. So I brought it up with my City Councillor, Jenny Gerbasi and she agreed to put forward a Motion here to Winnipeg City Council to; to calling on the Ugandan Government to not pass this Law and she talked about it with Mayor Sam Katz and he agreed to second the Motion which I think is great, and so it's being debated here today.

And I just want to add a couple more comments, just to say that in the meantime since I was in my Doctor's office I went to Uganda. I was in Kampala for a total of seven weeks this spring. In fact, I just came back from Africa last night. I went as a journalist to find out for myself what was going on there. How the gay and lesbian community is doing and I found that in Kampala just like any City in the world, there is a gay and lesbian community but it's extremely underground. People there are very afraid to that; they're very afraid to tell people that they are gay because they fear losing their jobs, they fear being kicked out of their homes, and they fear losing the respect and support of family members. And so, within Uganda it's a very; it's quite a; it's quite a right wing, Christian country and most people there, and I talked to a lot of people there as a journalist, feel very strongly that homosexuality is evil, that actually the general opinion on the streets is that actually, we're pedophiles, we're out to get their kids to recruit them and worse. And so there is a lot of support, actually, for that Law there. In fact, so much support that no Government MP in Uganda has actually spoken out against the Bill and yet within Uganda, the gay and lesbian community, for them to speak out against it, is extremely difficult, because of all the fears they have. So really, there is almost no opposition to this Bill coming from within Uganda. So, the best way to oppose it and for us to hopefully cause it to be defeated is international pressure. And actually, our Prime Minister, Stephen Harper, was pretty much the first world leader to speak out against it at the Commonwealth Conference last fall. Since then other world leaders, including Barack Obama has spoken out against it and I think it's good to add to their voices. And so that's why I'm here today to encourage you to do that. And if it is passed, I will get in touch with two friends that I made while I was in Uganda. One of them, Rodney Muhumza as a great reporter for the daily newspaper there called the Daily Nation, and hopefully he'll give some publicity to the fact that the City of Winnipeg, which is involved in partnership agreements, has spoken out against the Bill. And also I'll pass it along to Sylvia Tamale who's a great law professor at the Makerere University which is the main university in Kampala. She is one of the leaders of the Civil Society Coalition, which is a coalition mostly of straight allies who are trying their best even though they are small, to speak out against this bill.

And the one last thing I'll say about this is that I'll just tell you a little story. One of my other friends I made while I was in Kampala is a 21 year old university student named Blessed Busingye who is one of the few people in Kampala who's actually spoken out against this Bill and as a result, his picture and his name was in the newspaper. So, he became a bit of a figure and a few days later he was shopping in his grocery store and while he was there just minding his own business buying eggs or whatever. The supermarket manager came up to him and said excuse me sir, how are you. Blessed said, "I'm doing just fine. Is there a problem?" and the manager said I'm sorry sir, but I have to ask you to leave and Blessed said, "How come?" He said "Because your sexual orientation is making the other customers uncomfortable" and so Blessed left the grocery store. And it's; there are worse things that are happening to gays and lesbians in Uganda and actually in many other countries in the world but to me, that's a good story to tell because it shows that this is; it's not the first time that minority groups have been persecuted in the world and often persecution starts in very small ways like that but it can grow and develop and become much worse and so I hope that by passing this City Hall Motion today we can do our little bit to make sure that it doesn't become worse for gay and lesbian people in the country of Uganda. Thanks again to Councillor Gerbasi and to Mayor Katz for supporting the Motion and I hope the rest of you do, too. Have a good day.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillors, I have no sound system so I have to talk a little bit louder. Do you have a question? Councillor Gerbasi, your first question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's not really a question. I just wanted to thank; thank you Kaj for your personal courage in going to Uganda as a journalist and speaking up about these things and the work you're doing on this very important human rights issue. So I just want to personally thank you for your courage.

Mr. Speaker: You heard her.

Kaj Hasselriis: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves, your first question.

Councillor Steeves: Is it being contemplated that Uganda is going to be suspended from the Commonwealth as a result of these actions?

Kaj Hasselriis: It's not something that anyone has I think formally threatened. I think right now the hope is that if World Leaders like Stephen Harper and Obama and Hillary Clinton and Gordon Brown all whom I've spoken out against or spoken to directly to the President of Uganda, Yoweri Museveni about it, that if they can get through that way and cause the Bill not to be passed, then that will be that. I think that that's the next step, maybe people will definitely look into. I was going to say, I was interviewed about this issue on Information Radio a couple mornings ago by Terry McLeod and he asked me, "Do you really think this could happen? Do you really think that the death penalty would be passed for

gays and lesbians in Uganda?" and I said, "Yes. I fear it would" and the reason why is because I think there is opposition to it within Parliament, but the problem is that politicians there are very afraid to speak out against the Bill because it makes it look like they support gays and lesbians which is not a popular thing to be supporting. So, even if there is quiet support, I don't think it will actually translate into votes when it comes time to have a vote. And the problem is that there is a; it's an election year in Uganda and so the pressure that's coming on Museveni, the President by the World Leaders is basically kind of an implied, you know don't pass this Bill, and if you do, then we might think twice about sending you foreign aid because Uganda counts on a lot of foreign aid from countries including Canada. But being an election year, Museveni doesn't really want to take a stand against the Bill either. So there's a lot of rock in hard place situations going on here that could turn into a perfect storm that could actually cause the Bill to be passed and it is a Government MP who is putting it forward as a resolution.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions Councillors?

Kaj Hasselriis: Thank you again.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Thank you for coming. We have Ken Klassen is here for Motion No. 1 that's before us here today. Ken Klassen. Go ahead. They will distribute. You can proceed with your presentation.

Ken Klassen: Déjà vu all over again. I'm speaking to the proposal on the LRT business case analysis. I think that this analysis quite frankly is a needless delay in expenditure of money. There is ample independent confirmation by highly reputable source as cross North America and elsewhere in the world about the cost and benefits of LRT. Rapid Transit in Winnipeg has been studied believe it or not no less than four times in the past decade, twice internally, twice externally, January 2007 Direction to the Future, Guide to Better Transit for Winnipeg, January 23, 2002, case study, Cost Benefit Framework and Model for the Evaluation of Transit and Highway Investments, Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor was a future case study in a Federal document. September 3rd, 2004 the most comprehensive cost benefit analysis of the transportation project in Winnipeg's history. It was done by MKI. September 2005. Made in Winnipeg Rapid Transit Solution Final Report by Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Gerbasi and others.

The reality is that this Motion that's been submitted by the Mayor and approved by EPC is a classic case of paralysis by analysis. Do we really need a fifth Report on Rapid Transit in Winnipeg in ten years? Are we trying to get into the Guinness Book of world records for studying Rapid Transit? You have in this Motion before you six different objectives. Your first objective and perhaps the most important to trigger this was an analysis that compared cost per kilometer for Bus Rapid Transit and Light Rail Transit, citing unnamed industrial sources the Mayor has claimed that because of drastic reduction in cost for LRT, Winnipeg should re-examine its commitment to Bus Rapid Transit. I would agree with that Mr. Mayor if it indeed was true. I've requested from your office the name and the contact each of sources but haven't received a reply. Now you've suggested based on these unnamed industry sources that electricity is actually only margin more expensive than BRT. The figure that was used was $50 million per kilometer for three level LRT versus $38 million for the first phase of the BRT here in Winnipeg. Well, you know what? I did my own independent review. I found the complete opposite, Mr. Mayor. I found there has been a massive increase in the cost of LRT over the past decade and there is not a single major LRT project in Canada that comes anywhere close to matching the costs that you cited that triggered this Motion. If we go back and we look at perhaps one of the more important Reports on LRT, came on September 2001 by the U.S. General County Office. They looked at 13 different cities that implemented BRT and LRT. They found that LRT projects at that time, 34.8 million U.S. dollars per miles, 31.4 million Canadian per kilometre in $2,000. Let's fast forward a decade. Doing a review of the five cities I've found that the average LRT project in Canada. These are real projects, real budgets, real numbers currently $106 million per kilometre. There is no evidence of drastic reduction in construction costs. If we look at Winnipeg Free Press last week, the first thing you need is engineering services when you're building LRT system.

Here is a quote from an article in the Free Press, "It's a good time to be an engineering consultant." The last five years has been as busy as ever from the President of their Association. This year is shaping to be just as busy, so no break on engineering services. Construction wages, you're an engineer you've got to build it. Index of construction wages in Winnipeg, It's at a record high, Council. It's up 11 and a half percent in the last two years, so no break on your construction wages. Materials a consulted reconstruction data large supplier of construction data to the industry in North America. Prices of materials to build the LRT system. They skyrocketed. They rebounded since our lowest during the recession for ten key commodities, steel aluminum copper and so on, 79 percent from the low point and light rail vehicles, consulted by a large garage supplier in Canada of light rail vehicles, one of the largest in the world supplied more than 100 cities in 20 countries, their quote, demand for transit lingered vehicles has never been greater. Your second objective, analysis that compared advantages of Bus Rapid Transit and Light Rail Transit completely redundant. This analysis was already conducted by the Rapid Transit Task Force and results provided in the Report. I really question what this analysis would uncover that the U.S. Transportation Research Board much more in depth analysis in 2003 sponsored by the U.S. Federal Transit Administration, uncovered. What are we going to learn that they didn't? The

TRB's Report during the experiments of 26, no less than 26 urban areas in North America, South America, Europe and Australia. Their conclusion quote, "Case studies summarized here 26 studies including Canadian cities demonstrate that BRT does work. It can attract new riders and induce Transit oriented development. It can be more cost effective in part greater operating flexibility in rail transit." It's ridiculous to suggest BRT isn't good enough for Winnipeg. Every one of the five Canadian cities in the review that I've passed out, they not only have Rapid Bus Transit Systems. They are making major expansions of them. They are not just doing LRT. Dozens of leading cities across the world who've invested in BRT. Paris, Melbourne Beijing, the list goes on and on. Good enough for Paris? I think BRT is good enough for Winnipeg and I think Councillor Wyatt, I would be really upset over the implications for New Flyer. If we build a BRT, high probability that New Flyer would be supplier of the vehicles. We build a LRT, Vancouver's LRT, where are the vehicles come from? South Korea, Hyundai. Similar situations with other cities. Low probability of Canadian content. Maybe Bombardier if you're lucky.

Objective No. 3 in your Motion, prioritize officers for Light Rail Transit routes, again completely redundant. Councillor Wyatt, Councillor Gerbasi in the Report identified several corridors for BRT. I don't see that a BRT and an LRT corridor would differ.

Objective No. 4. Recommend (inaudible) for the type or types of light rail technology may be appropriate for Winnipeg. Complete waste of time, Councillors. In January of 2009, only 10 months ago there was a meeting in Ottawa. It wasn't a meeting, it was a forum. It's called the Light Rail Technology Forum that brought together manufacturers, operators, transit experts from across North America to discuss various types light rail transit systems, best practices and lessons learned. Series of eight background documents, audio recordings, copies of the presentations and a Report has been published and they are freely available so why are we hiring a consultant to reinvent the wheel?

Objective number five in your Motion you want to compare and quantify anticipated benefits of Light Rapid Transit versus or Light Rail Rapid Transit versus Bus Rapid Transit including incremental taxes, ridership increases reduction green gas emissions. Well again, the U.S. Transportation Research Board has done this for us, 26 cities. They've got; I've got a whole long list of the impacts of ridership. What are they going to tell us through your consultants are going to hire through this new Report that we don't already know from the U.S. Transportation Research Board, or General Accounting Office and I could go on and on and on. I'll give you a good example of the impact of BRT. Ottawa has the most extensive BRT system in North America. They also have the highest ridership per capita in Canada of anywhere or not Canada actually North America of any city of comparable size and their ridership on their BRT system has increased 30 percent at a time when the population only increased 18 percent so it works.

The last objective is the funding options. You're asking your consultants as part of the study to find funding options including strategy for pursuing intergovernmental funding. Well let's look. Is the Federal Government got all sorts of loose change in its pocket right now? We know the Federal Government has a $50 billion plus deficit. Will take years to dig its way out. We know that there is former Deputy Ministers of Finance and others and who have said that the Federal Government has a structural deficit. Provincial Government, $545 million deficit half a decade before they aren't going to be able to balance the books if everything goes right. So are they going to have all sorts of additional money for the City of Winnipeg to build a much more extensive LRT than the BRT system? But here is a real kicker, Council. I think I'm going to make people realize this is that gasoline tax revenues are set for a long, long decline. Canada and the United States are implementing new much tougher fuel economy standards. So what's going to happen is that there's going to be less federal gas tax revenue, less provincial gas tax revenue. Provincial gas tax revenue real turn is that already declined two or three percent per year because it's fixed just around 11 cents per litre. Now can you imagine when you're starting to get more fuel efficient vehicles and hybrid vehicles and so on, it's going to go down, down, down, down. So less money from the Feds, the Feds don't have all sort of extra money. The Province doesn't have extra money, and they'll both going to take a kicking from more stringent fuel economy status so they have less gas tax money to hopefully float to you as a city.

So when I look at all of this, I really think why? Why do we need five studies? You know, this was triggered by a claim by maybe; I don't know. I think maybe you got some really bad advice, Mr. Mayor by an overzealous salesman who wants to sell you an LRT. They aren't cheaper. The costs have tripled, $31 million at the beginning of the decade according to the General Accounting Office in the U.S. Real systems in Canada either completed within the last year now under construction or in the functional design stage, real projects in Canada averaging $160 million, complete opposite of what triggered the study. So if these things cost way more, they're not cheaper, they're way more expensive, what's the point?

Mr. Speaker: There are some questions. Councillor Vandal, you had the first question.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Klassen, have you ever watched the Simpsons? Seriously, how much did it cost you; how much did it cost you to actually get this information.

Ken Klassen: You know I'm a self-employed engineering consultant and I specialize in sustainable buildings in communities and you know I mean the cost to me was I lost a couple of billable days. I probably spent, I would say maybe two, two and a half billable days. So it didn't cost me anything out of pocket, but I was surprised how easy it was to gather this information and I really don't understand why my tax dollars, a hundred thousand dollars has to be spent doing this type of study when somebody can make a few phone calls to a few cities, hop on the internet, read a few reports, and find out what's obvious.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Ken this is an "Are you aware" question. Are you aware this would not be the second or even the third study but that this issue has been studied on a regular basis since I joined Council in 1989, and we've had no less than 6 Reports on this issue, and each one of them has said that we should go BRT and that that would be cheaper, that would be the most efficient and the most effective way to go.

Ken Klassen: I am aware; you know I've only counted five studies since 2000. I'm aware that there's various studies. I have copies of studies from the 1950s that talk about Winnipeg should do subways or you know, which was a current form of Rapid Transit. So I mean this is just an endless debate. I think it's a futile debate and I just don't understand why we need to study this endlessly why we just don't get on with the job. And I've seen no other city in North America benefits more from investments in transit than Winnipeg. Why? We have the largest supplier in North America of heavy duty transit buses. How many buses in Winnipeg aren't supplied by New Flyer? So in terms of economic input, I think if you go to light rail it's going to be a kick in the teeth for the men and the women who work for New Flyer. They are suppliers and all those companies that they support.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Thomas: He actually answered my second question in his first question and it was with regard to supporting of our local industries. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, your first question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Ken. You alluded to a large; I'm not sure if it was like a summit or meeting in Ottawa where they looked at the compared it all the different technologies and transit and so on. Could you say a little bit more about that in terms of how it relates to the situation here?

Ken Klassen: Well, you know, I think what's really important, if you want to select a light rail technology you have to pick one that works in a cold northern climate and they are going to build a light rail system in Ottawa. They are also going to expand their BRT system but they're very concerned about making the right choice and felt that there's a lot of lessons to be learned so they had people for examining from Toronto Transit Commission from the City of Calgary, from Allegany County in the United States and others. They have free the largest suppliers of light rail vehicles in the world in their presentations. They held an open public forum where the public could get involved and ask questions. I think it was an extraordinary event. I don't know if there's anybody from Winnipeg who happened to attend from Winnipeg Transit, but you know, it was a major, major event. It's the event in Canada and they've deposited all that information not just power point presentation but audio recordings of the presentations. They have a final report. Well, Winnipeg is not exactly Ottawa. Our climate's very similar and a lot of the things that apply in Ottawa on performance of the light rail vehicles in cold climates apply to Winnipeg and one of the things, here's a couple of key lessons I learned from reviewing. I reviewed every audio recording. I reviewed every presentation and some of the conclusions that I received is that there is no magical. There is no new magic technology that's radically reducing the cost of LRT systems. They are things like, they have rather than having electrified rails or overhead wires, they have inductive things that can pick up power. Costs more not less, okay you choose it because of esthetics and safety and a lot of the new technologies from Transit Commission will tell you in spades, Calgary will tell you in spades that these new leading edge technologies are bleeding edge technologies. They are very risky in a cold northern climate like Winnipeg. New Flyer makes buses that work here. Hyundai; you know, I've been to Seoul, South Korea twice in the last year. I can tell you it doesn't get very cold in Seoul so when Hyundai sends a light rail vehicle to Winnipeg, it might work in Vancouver but I don't know if it's going to work here. So I think that a lot of what they've learned in Ottawa is directly transferrable to Winnipeg and I like their process. They did what the City Auditor said, involve the public early in the selection process. But that doesn't seem to happen here.

Councillor Gerbasi: And I assume you're also aware that as part of the Our Winnipeg process, we're spending one and a quarter million on a transportation plan which is supposed to also look at modalities of LRT, BRT, whatever transit, as well as roadways and all that. Do you think that study is; should be covering off the; whatever this study is that we're looking at today is being asked to do?

Ken Klassen: Well, I think what the Our Winnipeg Transportation Study or plan should do it; should build upon previous studies, not duplicate them. And if there are corridors identified in the new transportation plan that may actually have merit without having us volume to be converted to LRT at some distance point in the future. Let's learn the lessons from the City of Calgary: This is what they told people at the forum. Calgary has arguably the most cost effective LRT system in North America, and they've got actually a good power point presentation on the website, let's say Ottawa. What was Calgary's keys to success to having the lowest costing LRT system in North America? Strategic LRT planning reserved corridors, reserved corridors. When they built their first systems in the 1980s, they came out like $18 million per kilometer. The most recent system is between $80- $90 million per kilometer. You know the presenter said? We goofed we didn't preserve the corridor. They had to take out for the west LRT line. You have to take out like 50 or 60 houses. Anybody think and see a no point subdivision in River Heights? You know, you're willing for the widening of Kenaston to take out about 60 houses, slivers a property from another 40 or whatever. Hundred properties you'll affect, there's 18 vacant condos and a project that's completely flopped. Buy that corridor. Preserve the corridor, learn the lesson from Calgary. Number one lesson. Preserve the corridor. You or some future Mayor in Council can have a debate whether it should be BRT or LRT. The BRT or LRT line down Assiniboine subdivision can handle the equivalent traffic of 8 or 10 lanes of traffic. Two additional lanes on Kenaston only handles 1200 cars per lane per direction. That's not a lot so if you really believe Winnipeg is going to grow by leaps and bounds, you have a Duff Roblin moment here, not a Mr. Dithers moment. Preserve the corridor.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Mr. Klassen, thank you for appearing here today. That is for the delegations. We have a Motion.

MOTIONS

Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz,
Seconded by Councillor Swandel,

That Councillor Clement be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to a personal family matter.

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

Let's get down to business. Executive Policy Committee Report of December 9 of 2009, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED DECEMBER 9, 2009

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the Report and move Adoption of Consent Agenda Item 2.

Mr. Speaker: Contrary? Carried. Go ahead, Mr. Mayor. Report of April 7th, 2010.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 7, 2010

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce the Report and move Adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Report of April 14th of 2010

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 14, 2010

Mayor Katz: I would like to introduce the Report and move Adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: Okay Councillor Gerbasi, what number?

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: What number?

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, so one.

Mr. Speaker: Item 1 and on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 1, Madame Clerk.

Item 1 - Comprehensive Review of City of Winnipeg Housing Programs

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think at this time I would like to hear from Councillor Gerbasi (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appeared on this Clause at Executive Policy Committee and I was; I'm still…had a number of questions about this Report and I have not received any answers to those questions so I'm going to put the comments again on the record and perhaps some of those concerns can be answered here today. My concerns come from discussions that I've had directly with people involved in working in our inner city neighbourhoods. And the housing programs I'm referring to are the WHHI, the Winnipeg Housing Home Initiative Programs are targeted housing improvement zone areas in our inner city which includes in my ward, the West Broadway area and many other areas in the city's; in the inner city. The recommendations of the Report leave me with concerns about where these very successful programs that are headed.

First of all, there is very little mention of the very basis of the housing policy these programs are founded on which is based, that these programs support neighbourhood housing plans. These plans are developed from the ground up and reflect the concerns, values and views of those at the grass roots level working in neighbourhoods. The Report is very unclear as to whether this approach is going to be continued in the future and whether it is valued as it's not even mentioned. There isn't a cookie cutter solution that can be applied everywhere. Some neighbourhoods have large numbers of apartments and rental housing and have a huge; have a wide range of income levels and needs. When the policy was created in 2000 the whole idea was that it would be driven by the community. I would hate to see us move to a top down approach. As politicians we often think we have brilliant ideas but the best ideas always seem to be better when they have some connection with the people who live and work there. The recommendation of doing in the Report it recommends that we move to doing focused improvements in different smaller multi block areas. Well, this isn't very clear about what this means. Is that creating smaller housing improvement zones? Is it within the context of neighbourhood plans? Are we talking about tax increment financing for this? The Report and recommendations are far too vague for comfort. I'm also wondering, what is the rationale for consolidating five of the six programs? It may well make sense to change the way some of these programs are delivered however the case has not been made in the Report about why they should be changed or what they are being changed to. It is really worrying as I think everyone agrees that these programs have been very effective. Obviously if there was more money, even more could be done. In any case, previous evaluations have shown huge success for these programs. The Report vaguely indicates that these programs are working but isn't really specific about the results as previous Reports were. I may be missing something. But will somebody please explain what is driving the consolidation of these programs and how this will make them better.

I'm concerned that there will be a lack of financial commitment needed to back up new investments in our inner city, simply pulling money out of one successful program and moving it to a different one will not cut the mustard. All along the issue has been that more investment is needed to do more. That is why we have only been able to get involved in five housing improvement zones when there are 14 areas identified that need help. The Report is clear that more can only be done as more is invested, yet every year council continues to freeze the investment at $1 million in spite of efforts from some members of Council. I hope that the Report does also mention that pulling support from areas already established as housing improvement zones is very problematic and destructive so I hope that's not the intention.

Another issue is that the downtown housing is a huge area of potential investment and that program is being lumped in with the other five programs. I think if the long awaited downtown housing plan were to ever arrive this might be clear. But we are still waiting for that I'm not clear what the intention here is. I realize there may be a need to separate and have a specific strategy for the downtown area, based on the housing plan which has been in the wings for years. By the way, as a Councillor who represents a large part of the downtown and a Member of the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, I've not been briefed or consulted on any Report about a downtown housing strategy. This seems both short sighted and not very transparent considering the large number of people that I represent. The original data that was done by the Community Services Department back in 2000 identified 14 areas of severe need. This data needs to be updated and I'm wondering where that process is at as well. We should be making informed decisions base on the need. I understand that there's supposed to be some sort of process brought forward that's vaguely referred to in

the Report that will decide about the creation of new his zones and it has something to do with Our Winnipeg. A clearer explanation of this is needed.

The situation with housing in our City was recently described this way at a community meeting I attended in the inner city about affordable housing. It is no longer a housing crisis. Crisis has come and go. It is a chronic housing shortage at a critical level. I'm not talking about the need for more $300,000 condominiums, but places that low income people can live safely and with dignity. On the topic of housing, I was disappointed that the Property and Development Committee decided to do nothing about the severe problem of rental apartments being lost to condominium conversions. Many other cities can and do take action on this and the situation here is getting worse and worse. I hope that the Mayor and EPC will do something on this issue and not be swayed by lobbyists on this matter. At the very least look at the issue and the options and I've moved a Motion today that will be automatically referred back to the Property Committee and maybe they can rethink their lack of action on a serious problem that has a lot of our constituents wondering where the heck they're going to live and particularly in the Corydon and Osborne area, there's a lot of media coverages about this lately. And I'm hearing from my constituents that they are getting kicked out of their affordable rental apartments as they become condo-ized. This problem affects many areas of our City.

In conclusion, I don't have a problem with modifying our existing housing programs if that is clear that these changes will make the programs more effective. This Report does not adequately explain the reasons for changing the programs and it does not confirm that more money and it does confirm that more money is needed to do more, something this Council has not been prepared to invest in. It's clear that a bigger investment is needed to address the chronic shortage of affordable housing. Housing is one of the most important factors that make neighbourhoods safe along with recreation community places and policing. We have had a successful program that has made a difference over the last ten years after a previous decade of inaction and decline and I hope this Council shows the leadership needed to invest more in our inner city neighbourhoods as we consider this housing issue going forward in the future. That investment will pay off in fiscally and socially sustainable ways. It benefits all of Winnipeggers if the core of our City is on the mend. And I would like to acknowledge the tax increment financing program that we're doing in partnership with the Province in the downtown. It certainly a positive; I'd like to thank the Province for coming to the table on that. I was at the CentreVenture AGM and they were quite excited about some things that we were going to be able to do in the downtown that would be doubling our efforts with the support of the Province. But we mustn't forget our inner city neighbourhoods. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. First of all I want to say that; I want to thank the previous Mayor in Council back in the day in 1999, 2000 that established this program and the three levels of government that participate in creating the Winnipeg Housing & Homelessness Initiatives. This particular Report, Mr. Speaker, really sort of celebrates the success of Winnipeg in terms of its commitment. This City's commitment to affordable housing, its housing renewal in the Province and across this country. It's Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, is a poster child when it comes to tri-level agreements across Canada in all the Capital cities across Canada. And I want to say that this Report really goes a long way with respect to adjusting, Mr. Speaker, to the changing environmental conditions and market conditions within the City of Winnipeg with respect to housing. No longer Mr. Speaker, can you buy a house for a dollar in west Broadway or $24,000 in West Broadway, Spence, Centennial, North Point Douglas or William Whyte. Why, Mr. Speaker? because this particular program, Winnipeg's participation within this program has been immense. It has been in 2006, Mr. Speaker, the Mayor, myself and others on EPC; we ensure that we put a million dollars into the housing rehabilitation investment reserve on ongoing basis as a line item in the operating budget, Mr. Speaker, year in and year out. That is huge. Mr. Speaker, this is talking about taking a measurable approach to documenting where there are derelict buildings in core neighbourhoods and other parts of the city. This Report also, this Public Service will actually undertake a study, Mr. Speaker, of how we can now assist other neighbourhoods that are now required renewal. There are neighbourhoods in St. Vital, St. Boniface, Elmwood, St. Charles and parts of the North End that are crying out for assistance, Mr. Speaker, but now currently our housing program can't address those areas because we're locked into some housing improvement zones. And this is not to say that we're not going to be participating and I repeat. This City will continue to help areas of West Broadway, Spence and all the other neighbourhoods that do need help but there are areas Mr. Speaker, for instance let me give you an example of my area, West Alexander.

The Public Service is now taking a strategic approach where they're saying listen, you know what there is now a neighbourhood organization called the Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation which looks after Central Park, West Alexander and the Centennial Neighbourhood. Currently, the Centennial Neighbourhood is designated as a housing improvement zone, but the City is now working with potential neighbourhoods development corporation to assist areas within West Alexander which is not currently designated as a housing improvement zone, to work at addressing housing stock within that particular neighbourhood. By Burton Cummings Centre, the houses, Mr. Speaker, are immaculate. They are selling for over $200,000 but yet in other parts of West Alexander you can still purchase a house

for maybe 89, 90,000, a derelict home and fix it up so those areas are the areas within a particular neighbourhood that sill need help, not the entire whole neighbourhood of West Alexander. It's helped us certain areas. And this is what this Report is going to do, Mr. Speaker, and any Councillor here, Mr. Speaker, be it Councillor Gerbasi or anyone else can go and talk to the people who wrote this Report on any day and ask clarification.

So, I just want to say that this Report really is; will take us into the next step, Mr. Speaker, with respect to housing. It also talks about how we're going to be investigating other methods of best practices municipally in terms of creating affordable housing by exploring the creation of a policy that looks at creating; what do they call that? Secondary suites or granny suites. So we're looking at that and others and we're continuing to push the Public Service, Mr. Speaker to look at better ways, new innovative ways in terms of affordable housing and this Report steers us in that direction. So this really is sort of a celebration I think of the past work that this Council has done. If anything it's certainly not damming Report. And it was the Public Service worked hard at consulting yourself, myself, Councillor Smith, Councillor Gerbasi and others with respect to some of the conditions and some of the concerns and some of the; our ideas in terms of where we would like to see affordable housing and our focus on housing with respect to the City. And those thoughts and sentiments are incorporated into this Report. So with that Mr. Speaker, I just really want to thank the Public Service for the hard work that they've done and I hope that Council supports the recommendations outlined in this Report. Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't sure anyone else was going to speak but I thank Councillor Pagtakhan for his words. Fair questions from Councillor Gerbasi but I'm hoping at the end of this discussion she'll see her way clear to supporting this Report as well the balance of Council because I think this is crucial that our Administration review what we've been doing in housing. Historically, not just Winnipeg, over the course of the last 10 years, all cities have seen massive changes in housing, the cost of housing, the availability of housing. That's not just Winnipeg. That's pretty much every city in North America and arguably a lot of cities around the world that you've seen gentrification has been happening in all parts of the City, particularly in parts of downtown. I can remember historically whatever amount of years it was ago, 8, 9, 10 years ago when it was first discussed that the City of Winnipeg would become financially involved in housing at that time and then when we moved it on to a permanent budget line as Councillor Pagtakhan has said, 6 or 7 or whatever years it was ago, we weren't part of the solution, financially at that time. I mean what people have to remember is it's a bit of an odd duck here in Manitoba in that Winnipeg is not part of the formal, regulatory structure that has to do with housing. Much different than Vancouver, much different than Toronto, much different than most cities where the municipal government itself is charged with the main responsibility for housing.

That is not the black letter law case here in Manitoba and that's always been a bit of a difference here. The responsibility at least from the statutory perspective rests with the Province of Manitoba. Everything that we are trying to do, I think have tried to do over the years has been an attempt to buttress and support, the Provincial Government in their statutory obligations and efforts to do exactly that. If you needed any more graphic example of the need to evolve these programs, you need only have attended at the Property and Development meetings during the course of the budget consultations. There we entertained delegations from I think all of our HIZs we have in Winnipeg currently and you can see what's happened. They are separated in terms of wants and needs in this City particularly in the shoulder neighbourhood surrounding downtown. We were hearing particularly from West Broadway and we were hearing to a large extent from the Spence Neighborhood, Mr. Speaker, that their issue now as they see it, is a subtle form of gentrification where they feel that people within their HIZ are being displaced or forced to move out because, essentially, they, we, us, the Province, have been a victim of our own success.

Let's be perfectly clear here. Seven, 10 years ago when we first talked about these zones and improving the housing, the idea of gentrification or misplaced people was not even at play .We were at that stage desperately clawing for the idea that we would simply, simply improve the ratios of ownership in the neighbourhood, try to improve the housing stock as it existed. Any new board, any new nail, any new window was welcome. Bring it on, anything to make these areas bigger. Well, as the market has evolved over the course of the last ten years, it's not surprising that based on the success of the program, based on the pressures of the marketplace, suddenly people are walking into neighbourhoods like West Broadway. People are walking in neighbourhoods like Spence, and without even consulting or discussing or knowing what programs exist, electing to voluntarily buy these homes and live their lives, raise their families, all of these sorts of things.

What does that do in the context of a naked marketplace? It brings up the value of the neighbourhood. Most of us, I think would consider that a bald, uncategoric success. Everybody would agree, but there is as Councillor Gerbasi raises, sometimes some problems. There are some people who are displaced and these things have to be dealt with. You have the other side of equation, the William Whyte, the Point Douglas where representatives came forward and said wait a second we are nowhere near that. We are nowhere near where West Broadway is. We're not near where Spence is.

We're still kind of where West Broadway and Spence was ten years ago. So it became pretty clear to me that potentially the exact same program is not going to work, particularly in these four neighbourhoods exactly. So if we're looking for a cookie cutter approach and just slap programs on to these existing neighbourhoods, that's bad, I think. And if you talk to the representatives in the HIZ themselves they'll probably tell you the same thing. The reps from West Broadway will tell you yes, we want to continue improving our neighbourhood. We do actually want to bring the current percentage of ownership sort of from the 90 percent or the 85 percent that the rent; the tenancy, want to bring that down and still work towards a higher percentage of ownership but let's start to be careful about what we're doing in our neighbourhood. William Whyte is just saying let's bring in the boards, bring in the nails, bring in the windows and let's fix things up to make it as good as we can possibly get. We'd love to get to the state where West Broadway is right now. At the end of the day, we all had to acknowledge, I think that the 10,000 million pound elephant in the room is often times the $287 that the most dispossessed people in our society get to buy housing and that is from the Provincial Government through the Social Assistance System. I'm here to tell you again categorically, there is no way that this Council can be expected to evolve a responsible and good housing policy on the basis that someone is going to pay $287 a month for housing. That just is not going to work. If that's what is going to be put into the marketplace then I can assure you that probably, these unfortunate people are going to be forced to live in less than desirable conditions and the neighbourhoods that they occupy are going to be filled with places that represent this marketplace reality. This is not a problem that we've created but if what somebody is saying on the other side of the equation, that City of Winnipeg, you have to do this and you have to do that, you have to bring the housing stock up to a certain grade, the other side of the coin that has to instantly be acknowledged, Mr. Speaker, is that is not enough money to expect us to develop a responsible housing policy in this City. It will never work mathematically. I think we all understand that.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers? Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Let me tell you, there is a part in this Report that I want to focus in on. You know, it says, "Recommends from the Housing Committee, the accurate and regular tracking of derelict buildings in vacant lots in core neighbourhoods be established." Years have gone by. What have we been doing? We haven't tackled the issue. Councillor Steeves wants to speak again. I think he speaks too much. But the fact is, you know, if we have derelict houses restored to a proper level. You know, that would help the neighbourhood more and I think that we talk about affordable housing; we should also talk about more money for housing, period. You know, this Report looks at going out to other neighbourhoods. Look it, it also very clearly establishes that the present HIZ zones are fragile. They are recovering and they need more resources. So you know, let's take some action that means something. Thank you.

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

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to try not to be redundant and repeat what's already been said but first of all I will remind everyone that it was this Mayor and this Council who got serious about this issue and made money available as a line item budget, real money in our budget, that's number one. We are the ones who took that action. Number two, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just; to address one of Councillor Gerbasi's concerns, is that the Downtown Housing Plan is coming forward as part of Our Winnipeg, and Councillor Gerbasi and any other Councillors as well as citizens will certainly have the opportunity for input. I think that's extremely important. As was mentioned earlier Mr. Speaker, as there is a new Downtown TIF that was announced not long ago and the Province was thanked and I think they should be thanked. But I also want to mention and I believe Councillor Wyatt will verify this, three years ago we came up with this idea, took us three years to get to where we are today, to get the TIFF done. Could have started many, many years ago, Mr. Speaker. It took awhile but you know what? Better now than never and I guess the important thing, Mr. Speaker, is I know as mentioned, that Councillors have ideas they may think are good ideas, may not be the case obviously but this Report, Mr. Speaker, comes from the Public Service. They've done their due diligence and I think they're trying to act in the best interest of all citizens and I think as was stated earlier by Councillor Steeves, I certainly could not more eloquently talk about the fact that you can't get housing for $267. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, the marketplace is changing and we need to adapt with it and I believe that's what the Public Service is trying to do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Vote on Item 1. All in favour? Okay, we'll wait. Councillor Gerbasi. (inaudible) The vote on No. 1. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Smith and Gerbasi. It's Carried.

Report of April 21, 2010 Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED APRIL 21, 2010**

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, just as so as not to cause any confusion trying to make it simple with your blessings what I would like to do is start with one to nine and then add 10 on at the end which is the LRT. So with that in mind I would like to introduce the Report and Move Adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 9.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors, you have heard that Motion. Councillor Vandal; No. 2. No. 8. So No. 2.

Mayor Katz: Thanks for reminding me.

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute. No 2 and 8 have been stood down on numbers 1, 2, 3, 4…pardon me. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 2 - City of Winnipeg Infrastructure Priorities - Building Canada Fund

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, a brief introduction. As we know, Building Canada Funds basically are funded by all three levels of government. On a one-third, one-third, one-third basis and we are still in discussion with both levels of government and obviously, the whole purpose of this is to basically help our infrastructure deficit. We don't have to talk about the billions of dollars that we have in infrastructure deficits. So what's happened, Mr. Speaker, is several suggestions have been made to the other levels of governments and if they are looking for others we've already asked the department to prepare more as well and hopefully we'll come to a conclusion on this in the very near future and from that I would love to hear what the other Councillors have to say, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, on Motion No. 2, on your Motion, would you want to introduce it?

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

WHEREAS Rapid Transit is a high priority for infrastructure investment;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 2 of the Report of the Executive Policy dated April 21, 2010 be amended to include the southwest Rapid Transit Corridor between Jubilee at Pembina and the University of Manitoba under the list of projects endorsed by council as City of Winnipeg infrastructure priorities for intergovernmental funding from the government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba through the Building Canada Fund.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes, I'm pleased to introduce this Motion which is a…this amendment which is very simple and straightforward. The Motion says

As recently as the Council meeting in February, the Mayor indicated in question period that Stage 2 of the southwest Rapid Transit corridor at a cost of 220 million was submitted as one of 11 infrastructure projects for the Building Canada Fund. Yet now a Motion is before us for official Council endorsement that does not include any sort of Rapid Transit. This sends a very dangerous message to our funding partners at the other levels of government. It says clearly to them that Rapid Transit is not a priority for this Council. Rather, the priority was to undertake a massive expansion of the regional street system. The cost of the roadway expansions on this list are hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. I also wonder where this list came from in the first place. There was never any transparent public process or even a discussion with all members of Council about this list. This is no way to run a City.

There was no Rapid Transit money beyond Phase 1 of the BRT in this year's Capital Budget either. And the Five Year Capital forecast. The Capital Budget is Council's Actual Plan and shows what our intentions are as Capital Investment. Yet, the Mayor refused to include any further Rapid Transit in that document despite efforts of some members of Council to amend the document. Underlying all of the discussions here today is the need for a vision for our City and the leadership to make long term and hard choices that will alter and improve the course of our City. Our City is a 10 billion in the hole with an infrastructure deficit like many other cities, yet our City continues building new roads which it will not be able to maintain. This is very clear. The truth is we can't have it both ways. Through leadership and vision City Councils make choices that determine the kind of City they will become. Successful cities such as Vancouver, Portland and Ottawa have chosen to make huge investments in public transit rather than spending a fortune on massive

unsustainable expansions of their roadway systems. Cities like Los Angeles, Phoenix, Dallas and Atlanta have chosen sprawl and are suffering economically as a result. It seems like this Winnipeg Council wants to avoid making any choice and simply please everyone by not really being clear about our priorities at all. This approach will not lead us out of the dark ages as our Mayor likes to say.

Not too long ago, as part of Our Winnipeg of the Our Winnipeg process, the City hosted a sustainability summit. I did not hear too many people there demanding a massive expansion of our regional street system for hundreds of millions of dollars. What I heard them say was invest in Public Transit and Rapid Transit and fix our existing roads and sidewalks. Yet the list of infrastructure priorities we are being asked to approve here does just the opposite. Many of the priorities on this list are questionable in terms of cost benefits, sustainability and justification of any kind. Having said that, if we are going to submit a list of priorities to the other levels of government, we should be at the very least, letting them know that we want funding for the second stage of our Rapid Transit Corridor, included in that list.

The City is undertaking a $1.15 million transportation study as part of the Our Winnipeg Process. That is the appropriate way to determine what we should do for future investment in Rapid Transit, roads, active transportation, the whole thing. But shovels are in the ground now. It is not the time to start second guessing, stalling and changing our minds. The Our Winnipeg Process is the proper venue to determine our transportation and land use needs and plans for the next 25 years. There's been a lot of confusion caused by the Mayor's lack of support for his own BRT project. The confusion is worse and by numbers being tossed around without identifying where they come from or who cited them. However, if the Mayor is convinced we should build BRT; LRT instead of BRT on this corridor, then why does; why not put it on the infrastructure list? Support the amendment here and you're making a commitment to finish the southwest corridor to the University of Manitoba. You can work out the details later just like the other projects on the list.

What we have now is a list with no Rapid Transit on it whatsoever. Winnipeg needs to get on with it and like other successful cities are doing by the choices they have made. Edmonton, Ottawa, Toronto, Calgary, Montréal, most of these cities started out by building Rapid Transit when there was not a great demand for 30 and 40 years ago. The availability of the transit options started changing the way people thought. Their culture and their habitual approach to day to day transportation began to change and today these cities are now trying to keep up with the demand and building more transit of all varieties. Transit friendly and more sustainable cities in Canada are building a variety of technologies. They are building BRT. They are building LRT. They're putting in street cars. Depending on what works and what is best in a particular corridor. Vancouver is looking at everything from BRT to LRT to sky train in its new corridor with significant public input in the whole process by the way, something we might consider trying. But this situation right now is very simple. We made a wise decision to move forward on our first rapid transit line. Let's finish it. Let's tell the other levels of government that we accept their money and that Rapid Transit is a priority.

Back in September of 2008, the Phase 1 of the Rapid Transit Corridor to the U of M was announced. At the time, the Mayor pledged in a press release to jointly seek one third federal contribution to the second stage of the southwest Transit Corridor. Obviously the intention was to finish this to the U of M. As we speak, a tunnel is being constructed through the Fort Rouge Yards. Well received public open houses have been held showcasing the details design from modern and impressive Rapid Transit stations. A high density infill housing project has been approved on Donald Street with a transit oriented development approach. Just this week it was reported that the developer of the Fort Rouge Yards just hoping to begin another significant housing infill project along the transit way in the next year or so. Furthermore we are about to prove a 33,000 seat stadium at the U of M, the terminus of the second stage of the Rapid Transit line. Both the Province and the Federal Government have indicated support for completion of Phase 2 of the Rapid Transit Corridor. Things seem to be going pretty well. And most people seem to be on board with finishing what we started. All except one thing, our Mayor doesn't seem to be willing to support our own project or take action to complete what is looking to be a huge success. I urge you to support adding Rapid Transit back on our list of priorities. Send a positive message to our funding partners and send a positive message to our citizens. Thank you.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is an old saying and I know we've all heard it that when you have more than one priority you have no priorities. That's why I was particularly surprised when the Executive Committee offered up a list of not one priority, not two priorities, not three, but 11 priorities a hodgepodge of projects which to quote the Report are in no particular order. We have 11 priorities in no particular order and we're going to allow other governments, the Federal and Provincial Governments to dictate how they spend their money, our money, and ultimately taxpayer money on things that frankly I don't think are priorities. What we should be doing is picking one issue, two, no more than three. Be disciplined, be visionary, articulate why they're important to the City, and actually get them done. Mr. Speaker, we need to be focused, we need to be disciplined and we need to set no more than two or three priorities to get things done. Now add to that; add to that mix that the most important infrastructure project of all, Phase 2 of Bus Rapid Transit is not even included on the list. So in a time when we need to get serious about getting people out of their cars and into transit, in a time of billion dollars infrastructure deficits that are caused because we can't even afford to maintain the streets and the roads that we have, in a time of building a $100 million stadium at the University of

Manitoba finally, in a time of attracting hundreds if not thousands of cars to the University of Manitoba on a regular basis in a few years. We could, Councillors, we could theoretically end up paying for Chief Peguis Trail west of Main all the way to McPhillips and wouldn't that be a shame. And it's not to say that Chief Peguis Trail west of Main is a bad project. It has its merits although with the boondoggles with Chief Peguis Trail east of Henderson Highway I don't know why we so readily try to build the other phase but that's another story. In a time where we need to be putting the puck in the net to quote Gary Doer on Rapid Transit we could potentially be building Chief Peguis Trail and I ask you, what's; what will give us the bigger bang for the buck in the City Of Winnipeg?

Mr. Speaker, the sad part of all of this is that had we kept the momentum we had going in 2004 we wouldn't be having the southwest Transit Corridor Bus Rapid Transit debate because that would be complete. We were ready to go into the ground in 2004. That would've been complete by 2007, by 2010 we would have been in the University of Manitoba. The sad part is the momentum that we lost in 2004 and this is also a kick in the teeth to New Flyer, our bus; we are the bus manufacturing capital of North America. Those are real jobs for real people that live in our City that shop in our stores that go to our community centres, that go to the MTS Centre and we're telling them that your buses are not good enough for the City of Winnipeg. We used to have a home grown strategy here in the City of Winnipeg pre-2004. I'm not sure what happened to We supported local businesses especially when they were exporting outside of Canada which New Flyer does and we're telling them that's not good enough for the City of Winnipeg. We're going to go out. We're going to look at Rapid Transit that works in Europe and moderate climates but you're not good enough for Winnipeg, and that's sad. Mr. Speaker, the only way I'm going to be supporting the infrastructure priorities, if you can call them that, all 11 of them is if the Amendment by Councillor Gerbasi is moved and adopted. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith to the Amendment on Item for 2.

Councillor Smith: Let me tell you this. When I look over this list and I see all that's being done for cars and Rapid Transit is not given in the list whatsoever. It seems to me we're establishing our priorities and our priorities are not Rapid Transit. That's obvious to me. You know, building more roads and more roads and more roads, when we can't maintain our existing roads, you know, is futile, you know, this is a mad house, this Council and its addiction to cars. I mean, you know there's no…there's no thought. There's just plowing ahead with doing the same old thing over and over again and creating a greater problem for us because we cannot maintain what we have. You know, Rapid Transit is going to be good for Winnipeg. It's going to, it's going to, in effect, get people out of their cars, at least some of the people out of their cars. Why don't we embark on this? We started something, why don't we finish it? This is just crazy. Please, support this Amendment and I'll support it and that's the only way I'll support this list.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be supporting the Amendment, but I have a great deal problems with the other 11 items on the list. My first problem is the lack of consultation. In the past, when we've had significant Items, we've had discussions as a Council. We used to have priority setting sessions where we met as a whole Council and decided what our priorities were. We did that on two occasions and we; we've also done it when there were Items of specific import. This list seems to have been coming from someone's head. It has nothing to do with any of the stated priorities that we've had over the past few years and some of them are goofy and I feel like Alice in Blunder land at this moment. Why is Chief Peguis extension from Main to McPhillips being contemplated when we have an Item in our line budget for the last number of years to put an extension from Henderson Highway through to Lagimodiere Boulevard? And that has been diddled with and dawdled with and dumbed with for the longest time and we do not have a single thing being done on that extension. And we need to analyze the traffic patterns after we do that extension, to find out when we can priorize Item 5, the extension of Chief Peguis Trail, west from Main to McPhillips. But we haven't even done the first part of that. I just; I can't imagine all these twinning projects are there and it has been pointed out to this Council and to Executive Policy Committee on more than several occasions, that we have one designated regional street in this city, which has two lanes. It is Concordia Avenue. You have been asked on numerous times to increase it to four lanes. You've received letters from a man whose wife was hampered from getting to the hospital because there were two buses parked on either side and he could not go through. Thankfully his wife lived. I cannot believe that some roads that are on the edge of the City are being stated for expansion when we have a dangerous situation in the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee that you have been asked on several; this is not funny, Mr. Mayor. It's not funny at all. I cannot believe that Panet Road is not being considered for expansion in these priorities when it has been in the budget for six years, summarily yanked out of the budget. We have huge number of traffic. Traffic that exceeds what it occurs on other regional streets. It should be redesignated a regional street but that's another issue. But here we have these priorities. Did we have a meeting? Did we have a seminar for Councillors in which to participate in creating this list? No we did not. Why is there one, one minor active transportation network from Jubilee to the University of Manitoba, so that people can take their bikes from Jubilee to the University of Manitoba? And that would be great but they need to get there. And there is no active transportation from any other parts of the City to get to this. This is just an absolutely goofy mélange of projects that in that just don't come anywhere near being a priority for the City. And this has

happened because we haven't been talked to about these issues. We haven't been invited into a consultation process and that is just a darn shame.

Mr. Speaker: There is no; oh, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm so happy that we've been able to have this debate today. You know, I; I used the phrase when we were talking about this the other day at EPC that there's a lot of folks here who are drunk with BRT and they can't stop and have some sober second thought and understand what it is that we're talking about here. For starters, BRT is on this list. There is not a need for a Motion to add BRT to this list. Mr. Klassen came up here and said one of the most important components of BRT are comfortable stations. Those were his words. The ability to get on and off the bus in comfortable stations, parallel loading I think was what he called it so it's even accessible to people who are handicapped. Item No. K on this list, Mr. Speaker, extension of the Pembina Highway Transportation Network from Jubilee Avenue to University of Manitoba with the transit hub at the University of Manitoba. By the way, Mr. Speaker, the buses that were going to go on the second phase of BRT, which I don't agree that that is actually the second phase of BRT, but the two strips of concrete that people keep referring to as the second phase of BRT, the only thing at the University that was part of that BRT was a transit hub. Those roads; those two ribbons of concrete, Mr. Speaker, they ended on the other side of Pembina Highway from the University. The buses were coming off and going onto Chancellor, Matheson into a new station. That was the design, Mr. Speaker, not two new ribbons of concrete that were going into the University. So BRT is in here. When I talk about sober second thought, Mr. Speaker, I talk about once you're past Jubilee Avenue or the Jubilee underpass and once you pass confusion corner, why would it be your priority to spend hundreds of millions of taxpayers dollars on the single item, to put concrete down, two ribbons of concrete down where buses currently move pretty quickly along Pembina Highway but parallel to it where only buses are going to run. Hundreds of millions of dollars, but when you look at the greenhouse gases that are created by the construction of that infrastructure, Mr. Speaker and then you compare that to the greenhouse gases that are eliminated by things like the widening of Kenaston, I think there is a twinning of Plessis in here. The other thing that's in here is that extension of that Active Transportation Corridor out to the University. That's sure to eliminate greenhouse gases, Mr. Speaker. Who knows it might even reduce the need to run our diesel fuel operated buses which spew greenhouse gases out into the atmosphere on a daily basis because students at the University are more likely to use their bicycles to get to the University than any other citizen in the City using their bicycles to get to and from work. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, it's something that they would do in the warm weather months for the most part but when you calculate and you factor that in, it's still as a huge benefit in the elimination of greenhouse gases and improving Winnipeg as a sustainable City.

You know, when you look at some of the other things that are on the list here that people conveniently leave out that they seem to be opposed to as priorities. One of them is community centres, Mr. Speaker, community centres. You know, we could constantly be struggling to find funding for our community centres. But you know, total disregard for the fact that some of us consider that a priority. Apparently the rest of us here consider only one thing a priority. You know, somebody mentioned why not have one, two or three priorities? I'd say why not have 11, 12 or 13 if you can get them done, Mr. Speaker. I think we can get these priorities done and I'm proud to see them coming forward before this Council today. You know, there's some other comments that were made today. Concordia Avenue, it's a clear failure by the local representative at the time to have the developers pay for; through development charges, that twinning of that roadway. Those fees were waived Mr. Speaker, for some reason and the onus was then shifted from the developer to the residents of that community. That's our process right now. That's how that road is supposed to be done by local improvement now because when the development opportunities were there to take the money for the twinning of the road, the area representatives did not do that, Mr. Speaker. So now it's left with the need to put it on the backs of the residents in that area as a local improvement. You know, if that's the way people want to argue what our priorities should be, I think in that case the priority should be to have the developer pay for those expenses like other developers do throughout the rest of the City like the twinning of Waverley as being funded through development, the extension of Kenaston being funded through development and on and on and on.

Just back to Active Transportation briefly Mr. Speaker, Active Transportation was clearly stated in our BRT strategy as a key element of our BRT strategy. We in that strategy we said that whenever we conduct BRT, we wanted to ensure that there are Active Transportation connections that were coming to and from the; any of the systems that we built whether they be BRT or other transit amenities and I guess in closing I want to remind everyone that again, that BRT is not just two ribbons of concrete, and once you have this BRT getting us past the Jubilee underpass you've taken most of the success that you're going to get out of speeding up transit operations in the south that Southwest Corridor. I don't have a problem with taking a second look at it, doing a proper cost benefit analysis, throwing the idea of how much greenhouse gases are saved by that versus some of the other things that are put forward in here. And that seems to be make sense to me. I love the idea of BRT where BRT makes sense. BRT certainly makes sense when you've got to deal with Confusion Corner. And we've got to deal with the Jubilee Underpass, makes perfect sense to do two ribbons of concrete. But many of us here have forgotten that the other components of BRT are things like transit priority signals,

using diamond lanes, comfortable stations, clean, convenient real time scheduling which we now see throughout large parts of our City. Those are also all components of BRT. So if you just want to hang your hat on 220, 230, $250 million worth of a concrete going into the ground, I think you know we've got to stop. And I will speak a little bit more to the value of LRT versus BRT when that item comes up but I think there's some arguments to be made there and there's certainly some of Mr. Klassen's comments will help to prove why we want to do that also. I'll leave you with that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's important to put this Motion before us into context. Why is this here today before us? This is here today before us because of the fact, Mr. Speaker that an unprecedented situation now exists that I can't recall in recent memory, whereby the Premier of the Province doesn't seem to want to address the issues that are coming forward from this Council, and indeed by the Mayor. That's why this resolution is here before us today. End of story. There's some folks in this room who'd like to paint it very black and white between BRT and roads and bridges. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, it's not as simple as that. Our infrastructure deficit is growing, and not only in terms of our existing infrastructure deficit but also new strategic infrastructure deficit. If you recall last summer, Mr. Speaker, as when I was involved with the file, two Reports came out. One involving our existing infrastructure deficit of $380 million a year or 3.8 billion over ten years and our existing infrastructure deficit estimated at 306 or sorry, new strategic infrastructure deficit estimated at $360 million a year over ten years, 3.6 billion. Councillor Gerbasi referred to it as $10 billion, I'm not too sure. But; but anyway, well came out billion but anyway, the reality is, Mr. Speaker, that there is not only an existing infrastructure deficit but there's also a new strategic infrastructure deficit which is building up, Mr. Speaker, large part because of the fact we have a successful City that's growing and that's prospering; and that is continuing to grow according to what the projections are from the Conference Board of Canada. So it's not just an issue, Mr. Speaker that we should be investing in BRT which I hope full heart, I support investing in Rapid Transit, period. Anything that we can do for Rapid Transit in my mind is a good thing. But Mr. Speaker, the reality is there are pent up projects across the City that need to be addressed. And I don't recall, Mr. Speaker, when was it now, before 2004, the previous Mayor fighting tooth and nail to prevent Kenaston from being twinned and the power centres from being built out of that end of town, yet it seems that that has faded completely from memory in terms of that infrastructure development, Mr. Speaker. That was decided by that previous Council, Mr. Speaker. These projects that have been identified involve not just exist new infrastructure but there is existing infrastructure that also has to be renewed. Community clubs are listed here. We're not building any new community clubs that I know of so I'm assuming it's existing community clubs that need to be invested in and the same goes with regional streets and rebuild regional street rehabilitation, Mr. Speaker. The very term rehabilitation implies the fact that we're having to rebuild or renew existing regional streets that we already have. So it's not as simple as saying that we should be doing BRT, Rapid Transit versus this. Unfortunately for whatever reason, that is what has occurred. And there's some who want to stir that pot and pound that war drum even though they know very well that it was just recently that we made a major commitment to build BRT in this City. And it's under construction right now as duly noted by Councillor Gerbasi. But, Mr. Speaker, at the same time, this Council encourages infill development, encourages growth within neighbourhood policy areas in Plan Winnipeg. Yet at the same time we don't want to build the roads that are going to service those actual neighbourhoods that we're encouraging that growth in; which everyone in this Council supports existing development in neighbourhood planned areas. I'll give you an example, Mr. Speaker; the Chief Peguis West extension from Main and McPhillips. We know that that end of the City is one of the fastest growing neighbourhoods in the City within a neighbourhood policy area and yet they have seen absolutely zero new infrastructure coming into their area. For years, Mr. Speaker and are dealing with their existing infrastructure and it's becoming more and more of a problem. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is we have been living on borrowed time when it comes to new strategic infrastructure in this City. We have benefited, Mr. Speaker from the decisions made in the past, back…going back even to metro, Mr. Speaker, pre-Unicity where decisions were made to invest in key underpasses, overpasses, bridges, roads that we are using still today. And those systems are getting taxed, Mr. Speaker whether we like it or not and even if you build BRT or LRT or whatever you want to build or a high speed rickshaw system, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whatever that Rapid Transit system is, the fact of the matter is this is not going to go away. This is not going to go away, Mr. Speaker. It's going to get worse and it has to be addressed and it's unfortunate though, Mr. Speaker, that the Mayor has to bring forward a Motion to the floor of Council and ask Council's support to take this issue before the Premier because the Premier should know full well the commitment this Council has shown in the past with regards to Rapid Transit and should know full well the state of our infrastructure, but obviously, the Premier is still AKA, Minister, not Premier of Manitoba, but Chair of the Finance Committee or he still thinks he is Chair of the Finance Committee, sorry Councillor Fielding, and can tell us how better; how we should be doing business here at the City in terms of the infrastructure challenges we're facing. I can tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, that I can see these projects here where you have traffic backing up; backing up on Pembina Highway because of the University, try?. Even with the Rapid Transit you're still going to have a problem with that Mr. Speaker, and the greenhouse gases as rightly pointed out by Councillor Swandel. You ask somebody who's sitting at a train for 20 minutes; they don't know how long that train is going to take, Mr. Speaker. They keep their car idling, twenty minutes, dozens and dozens and dozens of cars on a daily basis Mr.

Speaker, sitting at a CNR main line on Plessis Road waiting for their trains to get across. You know, we kind of accept it because we are a railway town, right? We came…the railway was there before the people. You know, that's part of it, you know what that's all about Mr. Speaker, a former railroader yourself. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker that these infrastructure projects, many of them are long overdue and it's unfortunate that the Premier has decided to make a political statement out of this, versus working together to find a way to make it work. And that is in terms of taking the Rapid Transit file, dealing with it separately and dealing with our existing infrastructure; it is not as black and white as some Councillors on this Council are attempting to paint it. The existing infrastructure and new strategic infrastructure that we need to build as a City is far more comprehensive, and this Council knew that last July when the Report came out and there was an addendum attached with many of the projects that are listed here, Mr. Speaker. These should not be a shock to this Council. Where did these projects come from? The Administration has been identifying these priorities Mr. Speaker, in terms of what we need to invest in. I didn't tell the Administration when the Report is coming, put this project in, don't put that one in I said what are the new strategic infrastructure projects that need to come forward, that need to be addressed as a City and they also put in Rapid Transit as well, Mr. Speaker. That's part of that $360 million, $3.6 billion over 10 year infrastructure deficit, Mr. Speaker, is there as well. So I think we need to calm down a bit. I think we need to relax and realize why this is here and make a concrete decision to support this so that we can support our Mayor no matter what our political persuasion may be to go to the Province and negotiate in good faith that these are the top priorities facing the City.

Mr. Speaker: (Inaudible) moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: I don't need an extension. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: (Inaudible) There we are. I'm done now. No. Seriously though, I do think that BRT should be back on this list. It should not be taken off for a number of reasons. One, it says here in a Motion, listed in no particular order. Well, I find quite unique that; well the Letter A is A. It's first. I think people who read this will see this as even if it's bracketed at top, no particular order I believe it is in a particular order and especially because it goes all streets and then at the bottom they kind of have some, you know, maybe we should put this in in case it looks too much like streets. Not saying that community centres aren't important, I'm not saying that many things in our City aren't very important, however it does list streets first, just what it says right here and then it has J and K and then we hear; but also they don't like these we have many more projects for you whoever wants to fund it. Again that also says how accurate this list is then why did we take BRT out if that's giving the Government options, to what maybe is in their funding portfolio, BRT may be something in enviro green plan that they really want to do. Again it provides our funders options. Right now we provide mostly the option is please give us more roads. Again, do we need roads? Yeah. We do need roads. It's not one or the other. However, this to me says it is one or the other by taking this off. Now what will BRT do for us? What areas could it address and why should it be here? Well, some people argue this and I've been more than happy to have that debate, however, we had no debate on this at all. This is the first opportunity that we've had to actually talk about this. The Kenaston widening, Taylor Avenue to Academy Road. That's one area I'd like to talk about. Pembina Highway underpass at Jubilee Avenue, okay? That's another one that we could talk about and K, the extension of Pembina Active Transportation. Well, these three projects in my opinion are directly related to BRT. We talk about greenhouse gas emissions. Well, the best way to deal with greenhouse gas emissions is get the cars off the roads. That is the best way. Second option is to make those cars move a little more effectively, okay? But the first option is you want to get the cars off the road. Kenaston Boulevard widening between Taylor and Academy Road, I can tell you this is quite a bit of concern in my neighbourhood. We're losing a number of houses and a number of residents are going to be directly impacted by this. We will be splitting a neighbourhoods up by putting a freeway right between two neighbourhoods. Again, that will happen. Now a lot of traffic we're expecting will come from Waverley West that's trying to get downtown. Well, I think in these car park area at the University of Manitoba or somewhere they are up where they could park their car, hop on a BRT system and whip downtown, will that alleviate the Kenaston Boulevard widening issue? Possibly. Do we have a cost benefit analysis on that? No, but that's what we have right now. What about the Jubilee underpass? Do we want to; it is a bottle neck right now. How do you solve bottle necks? Well, one way is get those cars off the road, provide people a better alternative. That's one way we can do it. Again we're actually re-abilitating Jubilee overpass this year. We're spending quite a bit of money on that. So again, would; is one option to widen it? Sure but maybe the first off should be because of the cost benefit analysis which I believe would show that BRT will have a positive effect both on the environment and for infill development and also the Pembina Avenue; the only BRT thing I see here is that sliver on K, but we're going to have to put there, Active Transportation Route with our BRT, so again we just pulled out the whole BRT part and put the Active Transportation network part which is vital. There's number of students right now that are riding down Pembina to get to the University and yes, those students do ride in the winter time and I can tell you it's terrifying and as a cyclist who's done that route, you put your head down, you stick close as the curb and not too much of a windrow there and you hope for the best. And that's how you do it because not all of us have cars, especially students so again BRT actually is an option because it does address other areas that are already in here. I'm not going

to speak to the other areas, you know D and B. They may be fine options, we do need to invest but again what this shows me and what this says to me, and I think it says to the public at large, is the City of Winnipeg is not committed to BRT. That's the perception that this list provides to me. Again, if we can just have a whole bunch of Items that go on here if the Province wants it or the Federal Government wants it. Let's make sure that we give them some choices, some options not just roads, let's actually add up a few things. Canadian; the Community Centre Investment Fund Contribution fantastic. We know that are community centres are aging. But we also know many of our street lights are aging, many things are aging so it isn't one or the other. It's having a balance between all these portions. So I would say that we; the BRT should be an option in there. I do agree with Councillor Vandal that we should priorize things. We should be able; this is what was done in other areas of government where you say based upon our review, our analysis, our consultation; these are the three items that we're looking at right now. To send out just a blanket statement of; give us an item. Now we're going to have exactly what happens before us where we have to chase after the Federal Government says this is what we want you to do and then we have to chase after it and try to figure out how to plug those holes. So what I would say is BRT is very relevant to allow these items and it should be back on the list. It sends a bad message. It shows that we are actually in the stone age and the stone age being streets. We need to be looking forward. We need to be saying, "How are we going to address our issues?" BRT, LRT, whatever it is, we need to find a way to provide a convenient, safe way for people to get out of their cars and to use transit and this is one step, the BRT is just one step. So again, I would recommend and hope that people will support the motion to put BRT back on the list.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The list of 11 items here is very significant to the City of Winnipeg going forward. That said $138 million has already been committed by this Council, I supported the Motion, to do Phase 1 of Bus Rapid Transit. This is something we haven't done in Winnipeg before. There isn't a lot of Bus Rapid Transit in North America. For $138 million we're getting through some of the worst bottle necks on one of the most travelled transit routes in the City getting from the downtown core through to the University of Manitoba. Is there a return there for the Second Phase at $220 million for that last stretch of; the last ribbon as Councillor Swandel refers to it? I'm not going to miss it at this point yet. Let's build Phase 1, see how it works. Let's look at the study there that we're proposing to do here today at looking at the business case for doing LRT or BRT. We need to see the; we need to see the numbers. If we don't ask for anything, however, if we don't look at the 11 priorities that are already here, if we don't put out there. These are things that are important to the City of Winnipeg. We're not going to get the funding from the other levels of government. We don't want to be sitting by while the City gets announcements and get funds. Well, we're not asking for something. We've got to be out there putting it out there. It's very rare that we'll get all these things, you know, we're not going to get all these things funded. I think we all are at that realization that tomorrow the Federal Government is going to come to the table of the Province and say hey, we got all 11 items here. I mean, it happened with our Active Transportation list of ideas but that's not likely to happen with these 11 items here because it's so much more substantial. So anyways, let's do; let's build Phase 1 as we are doing, let's look at doing the LRT, BRT business case scenario. Let's see the hard numbers. Let's see what makes sense going forward and let's actually go out there and ask for something. We don't have these 11 items out there and we are asking for something. We're not going to get anything. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. If there is no further speakers, I'll ask Councillor Gerbasi to close her Motion and then, Mr. Mayor you'll close on Item 2. Councillor Gerbasi, in closing.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting Councillor Swandel said we were drunk on BRT, I'm not sure what he means by that. I'm not sure what he is smoking because he represents the area where the stadium; where the BRT is going. It's really odd that he doesn't support it.

(Inaudible)

Councillor Gerbasi: Out of order? Okay, well he's kissed me…..

Mr. Speaker: Hold on, councillor, councillor.

Councillor Gerbasi: It's just a joke. I will withdraw if he is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Withdraw it.

Councillor Gerbasi: Sure.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, withdraw it.

Councillor Gerbasi: I don't know, I guess smoking verses drinking.

Mr. Speaker: Smoking is…

Councillor Gerbasi: All right.

Mr. Speaker: Not the right term to be using here. Okay, go ahead.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I have found those comments offensive. (inaudible)

Councillor Gerbasi: What?

Mr. Speaker: Okay, no, no. (inaudible). Proceed.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, Maybe…perhaps Councillor Swandel can drop that remark an then (inaudible) as well.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, proceed, proceed. You two can't seem to get along. Something is wrong here.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make my speech. I promise I'll behave myself if you let me proceed.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead. Your time is running.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, thank you Mr. Speaker. I; it surprises me in Councillor Swandel's comments that he's not supportive of clearly proceeding with the corridor within his own ward. I think his residents in the; who are getting a stadium of all the traffic that goes with it would probably appreciate some amelioration, the amount of car traffic that's going to be heading down there, but that's his call.

The idea that widening Kenaston and widening Roadways in general is the great method of reducing green house gas emissions is very, I think it's misinformed. I mean, obviously idling cars is an issue but as Councillor Orlikow pointed out, a much better way and much more efficient way in terms of quantity of reducing greenhouse gas emissions is by getting people to stop driving their cars, period, getting them on to buses. You know, for every bus full of people or train or whatever, you've got 40 or 50 cars off the road. That's going to make a difference to congestion. That's going to actually help people driving cars and that's going to help the environment. You know, cities across Canada are building BRT, they are building LRT and they're doing it because of greenhouse gas climate targens as well as congestion and quality of life. So I don't know what decade some members of Council are living in but Rapid Transit makes sense and if people aren't there yet, you know then that's pretty discouraging.

I also would mention this, the issue came up as a cycling path that was going to be part of the Phase 2 of the BRT Corridor is on the list, but BRT is not. You know, all of these things should be integrated. You know, some people will cycle in the summer. They won't in the winter. People will take transit all year round. If we continue, if we build the BRT Corridor, we'll also build the Active Transportation Corridor at the same time we're pouring the same concrete. It makes a lot of sense. That was always the plan so now we're going to leave it amputated, I believe was the word used by the Rapid Transit Coalition if we just stop there and we can have a bike path. You know, I guess transit riders will get on to Pembina Highway and go through the congestion. You know, it's a lot less attractive than a complete system.

The issue of bus technology keeps being mentioned, you know, buses you know like I said, every bus full of people is 40 or 50 less cars so there is your greenhouse gas effect right there even if we're still using some diesel buses now those that technology will change. I was with; at a meeting, the President of New Flyer at a Canadian Urban Transit Initiatives event recently. They are billion dollar company and he says in a couple of years, they're going to have better buses that we can even change the technology. It's changing. We just buy different buses which we buy every year, and so we can address. We can effectively reduce greenhouse gas emissions with BRT. It's not an accident that Vancouver, Ottawa, Edmonton, all those cities are building both BRT and LRT because they're all good systems. The issue is established the corridor, get the infill development, get the cars off the road. That's what we're talking about. I just wanted to clarify something Councillor Wyatt talked about the former Mayor building the Kenaston. What happened there was the former Mayor agreed to support both the Kenaston and underpass and the BRT project because it was the only way he'd get this car loving Council to support the BRT and it was a deal so we could get it done. Unfortunately it was later canceled then five years later we're building it now, thank goodness.

But I'm just saying that's why Glen Murray, you know, it was a compromise. Sometimes you do have to compromise, but we are compromising on this list of priorities. We're just simply building more roads and we're cancelling, we're telling. We're sending a message to the other levels of government that finishing this corridor is not a priority and I've heard that from Council Swandel. I've heard from Councillor Browaty. They are not convinced we should finish it. I'm not sure who else shares that opinion. It concerns me to think that many people think we should just stop right there that they are entitled to that opinion but I just think the public should know what is being decided here today. There is a Motion in front of you to complete the BRT Corridor to the new stadium to the U of M. Vote for it or don't but vote for it and you'll be on the public record and you can explain that to your constituents as we go into an election campaign. And that's where we're all here to do, but I can tell you that it's a very clear decision. We had a list a few months ago. It was sent in a letter to the other levels of government. It was mentioned in the February Council meeting in Question Period in Hansard. It was mentioned that we were asking the other levels of government to complete the Second Phase of BRT. Now we're not. Someone make that make sense in the current situation. What kind of a message are we sending? What kind of a message are we sending to the people who want to be enthusiastic about our City, who want to see us move forward, and who want to invest in the infill housing and so on along the corridor? I mean we're not sending a very positive message. The public is totally confused by all this, totally confused and we can still; we're doing a 25 year plan right now. We can look at other corridors. We can look at other technologies and that's totally appropriate. And like as Councillor Wyatt said, we're; I'm for Rapid Transit whether it's LRT, BRT, whatever works but we've established that we are building something. Let's finish it and that's what the Motion at least tells the other levels of government and by the way, the other levels of government have said publicly they would like to see us complete this project. The Premier has said it. In fact, I was at a breakfast with the Premier and I asked a question in the Question Period. There was 500 people there, real estate people, everyone, prominent people in Winnipeg, and he said you know, when you build Phase 1 that's something you should probably finish Phase 2 was his answer to my question. Generally, that's the idea and then he talked about how it made sense to complete this corridor and the money is there. Let's take it. Let's tell them we want it, let's get something finish and then we can look at future and we will continue to look at future expansions, I hope of our Rapid Transit system. But my biggest, one of my biggest concerns though is that we're blowing the bank on all these projects that have had no public consultation. They are not in Plan Winnipeg, many of them. They haven't had any cost benefit analysis. What a way to run the City. We've got to start doing things better, Mr. Speaker but in the meantime, what we've got right now I'm a practical person, we've got a list, it's going over to the Feds and the Province, put Rapid Transit back on it, please. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor, on Item 2, closing.

Mayor Katz: (Inaudible) First of all, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the; a few issues because sometimes it appears you have to remind people of the facts. And quite often on the floor of Council, you don't always hear the facts. So let's start off with some facts, Mr. Speaker. And let's go back a few years because it was discussed many times by Councillor Gerbasi how BRT started with the former Mayor. Mr. Speaker, I looked for the Motion for the BRT. I looked for the discussion through the Standing Policy Committees. I looked for the debate on the floor of Council, talked to the Clerk, couldn't find them, Mr. Speaker. Why? Because it doesn't exist, Okay? What basically happened which happens usually with Building Canada Funds, you've got three levels of government. You've got to find projects that all three levels of government are prepared to support. Sometimes they find quality projects. Sometimes they do a little horse trading. That particular year there was an underpass, there was a floodway and there was BRT. This Council never ever got to vote on BRT itself. It was all lumped together, we know that to be the fact, that's number one.

Number two, Councillor Gerbasi keeps on talking about we have the money. The money is not there, Mr. Speaker. Arithmetic might be very unique but the money isn't there period. That's a fact.

Number three, Mr. Speaker, I am disheartened to hear that for some members of Council, Polo Park is not a priority. Probably one of the areas that over the last ten years has become a major problem and we need to make some solutions. And if, and I say if, we move forward with that development, there will be even more problems but I guess some people here don't want to address it. Plessis Road twinning, not a priority? I think so. Our department says it's a priority. Some people here don't think it's a priority. Pembina Highway underpass to Jubilee. Not a priority? Our department says it's a priority. Community Centre Investment Fund, one of the best things that ever happened, Mr. Speaker is this Council made a commitment to invest money in our crumbling recreational infrastructure and as a result of that, we've got new community centres, we've got renovated ones, we have mergers and there is a lot more work to be done. If that isn't a priority for the rest of Council, Mr. Speaker, it's very much a priority for me. Our children, our families are very important, and I could go on, Mr. Speaker. There is a list of items here and what some people seem to forget, so I guess it's my job to remind them, Mr. Speaker. Councillor Wyatt actually you know, Councillor Wyatt was so good Mr. Speaker I think I was conflicted for the very first time being on Council.

As you know, I have stated, I intend to run for Mayor in the upcoming election. After that speech I'd like to run his campaign. You couldn't have said it any better and I thank you for that. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, when we announced

Stage 1 of BRT, there was no money from the Building Canada Fund, Mr. Speaker, because the Building Canada Fund is for our existing infrastructure. And whether the number is 10 billion or 4 billion, we got trouble right here in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada and if we don't start convincing everybody to start paying attention and addressing our problems, guess what Mr. Speaker, they'll get even worse. And that's exactly what we're doing. We're going to use Building Canada Funds for our infrastructure, and when it comes for Rapid Transit there's other pots of money that are available and that's the way we should be doing it. And if you want to quote Premiers, which the Councillor decided he wanted to do, well you know what I'll quote Gary Doer. "We're doing Stage 1 of Rapid Transit as BRT. After this, we go 50/50 on LRT and we go to the Federal Government for their one third share." There's a quote from Gary Doer, Mr. Speaker. But the most important thing is, Mr. Speaker, these are all priorities. And the realities are it's not; we need to address them through discussion, through our department. But when it comes to sitting down with the other levels of government, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to say, it's politics. It's politics at its worst and that's the way it is. So you know what, there are many projects here that could work as I mentioned earlier, there are more projects that could work. And once and for all, I want to put something to bed and hopefully we'll never hear it again. We're committed to Stage 1 of BRT. It's happening right now. And the only reason the public may be confused Mr. Speaker, is because there are Councillors on this floor telling the media that BRT is being shelved. Why don't you tell them the world is round, okay? They're both preposterous. All we're trying to do is make sure we do the right thing with the limited number of funds we have available, and we get the Province and the Feds on board and you know what, I've got another great quote from the Premier. "If the City wants to take another look at light; Light Rail, power to them. It never hurts to have a sober second thought on something." That was the Premier talking on CJOB, Mr. Speaker. We've got lots of projects here to choose from. Let's do the right thing. Let's move on. Let's address our crumbling infrastructure. Let's make sure we take the top issues of our citizens and we know what it is. We address that and let's make sure we get more money to do Rapid Transit, okay. And yes, I think we deserve LRT. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillors, thank you, Mr. Mayor. Motion No. 2 by Councillor Gerbasi, seconded by Councillor Vandal. Recorded vote has been called for by Councillor Gerbasi. All in favour of Motion No. 2 please rise. Are you standing or sitting down, Councillor Fielding? Sitting down. Proceed with the count.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith, Thomas and Vandal.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Nordman, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt and Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 5, Nays 9.

Mr. Speaker: It's Carried. Item 2 is Carried. I mean Item 2 is Carried. Sorry. The Clause to; Clause No. 2 is carried.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Yeah, the clause. All in favour, please rise.

Councillor Swandel: Recorded vote please, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded vote has been called for. Please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Nordman, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt, and Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith, Thomas and Vandal.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 5.

Mr. Speaker: It's Carried. Councillor Vandal moves we adjourn for lunch to 1:30 p.m. today. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We stand adjourned to 1:30.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
April 28, 2010, at 1:30 p.m.**

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor. Mr. Mayor, start, continue.

Item 8 - Economic Development Initiative for the re-development of the existing Stadium site and the new Stadium development at the University of Manitoba

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I will do as you say although I would hope that Councillor Thomas would've gone back. Anyways, as I was saying the best case scenario is that Creswin completed their project and they would pay back the $75 million plus any interest owing. The worst case scenario Mr. Speaker, is that Creswin would not get the tenants and it would not be able to proceed in that situation, what would've happened is the City of Winnipeg would put the land up for sale. I believe there would be several people interested in buying it. And then what would've happened from once it's developed, there would be proceeds base coming out of municipal taxes along with school taxes. The projections are from our department where there would be approximately $4.6 million dollars in school taxes and approximately; I'm just going to wait for Councillor Thomas. I know she wanted to hear this. They would be approximately $3.4 million in municipal taxes which was a profit; which was a $7 million and that money would be used to repay the $75 million. In addition to that, the City would also be benefiting from approximately $1.6 million in a business tax. In the worst case scenario, Mr. Speaker, what would've happened is the Province and the City would own the foot ball team because we are the stake holders and the University and the City would own the football stadium. In the best case scenario, the City and the University of Manitoba will own the football stadium and the Winnipeg Football Club would be a tenant. The realities are we need a football stadium. The Province has come up to fill the void they can now start construction and I think everybody has to keep in mind as we sit here right now neither the City or the Province collect one cent in municipal or school taxes, and with that I would be happy to hear from Councillor Wyatt, only (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: You stood this down. Do you want to speak to it?

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yeah, I did stand it down. I thank the Mayor for his comments. I think it's clear that you know, the Mayor is trying to make a best situation out of a very difficult situation. I think from what I've been able to hear and gather, that this initiative has been by and large been driven by the Province, working with assuming Crestwood and the football team, and he is trying to do his best in terms of the situation presented to him to try to deal with this. So the concerns that I have, Mr. Speaker, is just you know, not just a member of Council but as a Manitoban, you know, for the first time there is new to the agreement, new to the discussion when the announcement was made, tens of millions of dollars of public money being put up front to bring this initiative forward. And at the same time, the public is being asked to guarantee these funds, tens of millions from the Province. And, by and large, very little public discussion about that or opportunity to have a discussion in terms of the facility itself, the site, location, the type of facility because I think all of that really is back on the table now. And it's back on the table because of the fact that there is tens of millions of dollars of public money at stake. And I think that it's a reasonable case to make to say that now that the Province is coming forward and guaranteeing this money. And in the same breath, Mr. Speaker, it was announced that day that in the event of default it's actually the Motion right here, in the event of default from Creswin that there is a municipal and education taxes to fall back on. So, we know that this is going to be potentially, you know, a publicly owned facility at the end of the day, fully owned and fully operated by ourselves. I think therefore, it does require a greater discussion and maybe a greater vision. And that's really where I was taking the issue, Mr. Speaker. I think we do need a new facility. There's no doubt about it, the existing one is falling down. You know, I'm not against that. I think we have to keep the team in the City. I know the Aspers have done a heck of a lot of good work for the City and I appreciate it along with other Winnipeggers and I don't knock David Asper for one minute for what he's been doing and trying to achieve. It's difficult to deal with government, I can tell you that. But, Mr. Speaker, I think we need to have an opportunity to have that discussion on where we want to take the vision of this facility. And I offered a vision just the other day, you know, that I'll offer here on the floor that it's a different vision, but it is doable in terms of going to the public and asking you know, do we build this or do we do something more substantial? You know. Cities are often known for their stadiums, for their coliseums. Rome has the coliseum, Toronto has the sky dome. I mean, cities are often; the downtowns are often marked by these great facilities and we know it and identify it and we can see the benefit of what that can do for our City. And I'll be specific, a downtown of a City. And so the concept, we know, Mr. Speaker, we have to expand our Convention Centre. We know that. We know that if we don't expand in the next five years or so we're going to go from a Tier 2 Convention Centre City to a Tier 3, and that in my mind would be a negative. We know that.

And we also know that we have lands that are available there might have to be requirement for more land assembly than before but that's a technicality that we could overcome, Mr. Speaker. And we also know we have balanced budget legislation before us which I didn't write but maybe the Mayor's Chief of Staff could probably shed some light when she was there when Filmon passed it the Balanced Budget, Fiscal Management and the Taxpayer Accountability Act which specifically says that if you want to raise the PST by one point you've got to go to a referendum. End of story. So we have an opportunity we can put on the ballot this fall, do you or do you not support a new facility, part of an expanded Convention Centre. A stadium for the Bombers, retractable roof something that's really unique and we would probably pay for it in less than five years, Mr. Speaker at $130 million being collected in PST. It's an idea that I think the majority of Winnipeggers would support. I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, that we should be offering a greater vision for what we can do here in terms of the stadium. And I think we have to engage the public. The money is on the table. The Mayor referred to the 90 million and I think the Province was you know, obviously was desperate to pull this together. I don't know what the Premier was thinking to tell you the truth, in terms of this, you know. He was in a rush to make a deal. And he didn't consult with many folks, he didn't consult with the general public and I think that's a big mistake and I've got to give credit to the leader of the official opposition, Hugh McFadden who's set up in a house raised questions about this, in terms of public accountability and the public money going towards this, Mr. Speaker. He deserves credit for raising this which maybe you could argue is a sensitive issue but nevertheless deserves to be raised. Mr. Speaker, I would've loved to stand up and support this today but I really think that we need to look at a greater vision of what we can achieve here. Why are we doing this with public money to literally in some ways you could argue you have a NDP Government today, going to privatize a publicly owned football team. They thought the MTS privatization was bad, well now we're privatizing the football team, Mr. Speaker, and doing it with public money. I think, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to do something different is there. Clearly, we could have done that. There's been a lot of discussion over the last two years, three years, but this is really the first time we as a Council had a chance to come together and talk about it. The last time we really had a discussion before we were presented with a fait accompli was when we had a seminar down in the lower level and the Mayor presented the concept of going to Point Douglas and the Mayor was very excited about this concept of about rebuilding Point Douglas and putting the stadium there if you recall and he got others excited including myself. It was infectious, you know. It was a vision to do something really unique. And you know, I think we've lost that is what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker. I think we could do something different and something better. Having in the heart of the city, it's central you know, all modes of transportation whether we develop LRT or BRT whatever the case maybe, will be funneling into there. It would be the ideal site. We have the Convention Centre Challenge, Mr. Speaker, $200 million we've got to spend at least. The Convention Centre, Klaus Lahr just told me the other day that they're now having to do their 4th business plan for the Province. How many more business plans do they have to do before we actually build something, Mr. Speaker? (laughing). Well, Minister Steeves, I mean, Councillor Steeves correctly points out that you know, we have all these plans that seem to be coming forward in terms of the Convention Centre. When we could really be going forward and doing something there, Mr. Speaker and combining it and making it an amazing facility. We've got 12 games a year at best probably in the stadium. Mr. Speaker, having a convention centre tied to it makes all the sense in the world. So I can't support the Clause. I'd like to but I can't support it. One other thing I just want to add is that I don't know why we're letting the Province off the hook in terms of their provincial sales tax dollars and income taxes that they're going to be collecting during the course of construction, both for the stadium and for the Creswin development because they'll be pulling in millions, Mr. Speaker in new PST revenues and income tax revenues both personal and corporate from the construction of both these sites. That should be deducted off the top of that 90 million before they start deducting our municipal taxes, Mr. Speaker, because they're going to be pulling that in big time. Why was that not put on the table for us to consider today? Anyway, Mr. Speaker, those are my comments, thank you very much. And who wants the mike now?

Mr. Speaker: You're finished.

(Laughing)

Mr. Speaker: Next to speak is Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree 110 percent with the Mayor Sam Katz. We've been talking about replacing the stadium for over five years in and around this province now, and I used to be on Executive, not Executive but Winnipeg Enterprises, 10, 12 years ago and we were having those conversations then. And until today, until a couple of weeks ago, this is the only feasible proposal that's ever stepped forward. In principal we're taking one of the most valuable pieces of land in the City of Winnipeg and we are unleashing it. We are converting it into a piece of land that's going to be converted to its highest and best use. Creswin will be paying the City of Winnipeg fair market value. I'm not sure what that is but we're going to get appraisals. I'm pretty sure it's not $250 million though and then the mall will pay huge taxes forever. And at the same time, simultaneously, we're constructing a brand new stadium which is desperately needed on a University Campus which the land will never pay any taxes to the City forever because Universities don't pay municipal taxes. I for one happen to like the municipal; the University Campus for a new location. There would be all sorts of ancillary uses nearby and there will be challenges but none of which cannot be mitigated with

good planning. And if you add Rapid Transit to the mix from downtown to the U of M, this is a winner. And this is; will significantly transform to improve the very large segment of the City of Winnipeg. So I'm proud to support it and I hope it flies through this unanimously. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make a few brief comments. And the comments are coming from sort of three different hats that we all might wear here at any given time. One is responsibility to the City at large. The other is our individual responsibilities to the people that we locally represent, and then finally, sort of that perspective of there being only one taxpayer. So from the City perspective when you look at this deal, this is probably the best deal that the City will ever do when it comes to getting value for the City of Winnipeg. We are taking a land that currently could be generating huge quantities of property tax, but because of the relationship we have with the current facility, we're getting little or no property taxes off of that site. We're taking and removing the facility on to lands at the University as Councillor Vandal mentioned, will generate no taxes ever because that's what the law says. You just net present value that change in itself, when you look at the taxes that could come off that property, and we're well in excess of $100 million. It's a pretty straightforward equation. The other piece that I believe the Mayor mentioned this earlier on is the liability that we have sitting in front of us of - you can't pretend that the private sector is going to build a new stadium for the City or for that matter a new convention centre. We know that this is a place that we, as the leaders of the; not just this city but leaders of any city around North America, these are not venues that make money and require some sort of assistance from all levels of government, and you know when you look at the Convention Centre and you continue to provide operating assistance because we know there is a greater benefit that comes to our community from that. So, from the City perspective financially in particular, this works very well. The other piece from the City perspective is that the Province is taking all the risk here. Now, I; you know, we can throw stones at the Province all we want at a myriad of issues. They've stepped forward and said we will take the risk here. We recognize that we have to be at the table in a big way to; in order to ensure that this happens and this makes sense. It's just; it really, really makes sense now from an economic perspective. But they haven't downloaded that risk to the City. If those taxes take five or ten years to get up to the level where that 90 million or what will ultimately be about 75 million I think if I'm doing my math correctly, will service that debt, then it's the Province that has to make those bridge payments until those incremental taxes get to that level and come back in. It's not the City of Winnipeg. We don't have to come up with any extra money if that happens so purely from the City perspective we're very well protected and really it's a good deal for the City.

From the one taxpayer perspective, you know, there is; there is the issue of why is the Province doing that and what risk are they taking. The other piece that the Province has in the game, Councillor Wyatt mentioned the PST and payroll taxes and other things that might be generated off of the construction of this project, the Province is putting in a substantial capital investment at the front end as well. I believe it's in the neighbourhood of $15 million. It might be more but my recollection is $15 million. You know, so we're roughly; you know, it's more than 10 percent of the project funding is coming as a capital investment for the Province, not just the interim financing of the bridge financing. So from a single taxpayer perspective and knowing that that site is going to generate revenue, I'm very comfortable with this deal. The final issue for me is as the area local Councillor. You know, there's; when I go out and talk to people, the further away you get from the University, the happier people are about the stadium coming there. That's not to say that there aren't people living in close proximity to the University who aren't happy, but over all, there seems to be a general desire to see this happen. There are a couple of pockets, people that are very concerned about what traffic and parking and noise, how it might affect their quality of life. I know there is going to be a conditional use hearing tonight on the stadium where some of those issues might be talked about. I can tell you that after attending the open house at the University of Manitoba last week, I believe or just the week before, I talked with some of the residents that I committed without even talking to the folks at the City and since talking to them they've wholeheartedly and 100% agreed that we are going to have to come up with some strategies to mitigate some of the concerns. There's two areas, University Heights which is sort of a little pocket of housing that's just off of University Drive, where they're concerned about people parking on their streets and having access to their community. And we're going to sit down. We're going to have a meeting with those people, and the other folks on the other side of the University, there's sort of a pocket in Fort Richmond. It is; will be affected in the same way, and we're going to talk about how to mitigate their concerns. And the people who will be at the table in those community sessions are going to be the police, from the traffic perspective, public works from signage and now how that relates to parking or barricades, one of the ideas is to put up manned barricades at the two entrances into the one small area so that you can control who can come and go from there. And the other would be the Parking Authority because we need the Parking Authority to commit that anything we do to mitigate the concerns that area residents have around parking is going to be enforced aggressively because you know, while you can't say that this will have zero impact on residents in close proximity to the University, we could certainly do all we can to minimize the impact that it will have on the residents in close proximity to the University and to the stadium. And you know, I; the response that I received from everybody from Parking Authority, from the Police, from Public Works was a hundred percent yes we need to get out there and we need to do that work so sometime in June, probably right around the middle of June you will see that happen so there is a strong commitment from the City to look after the concerns of local

residents. So, you know, from the City perspective, from the single taxpayer perspective, and from the local perspective, I think this is something that has been; although a process that's kind of morphed from its initial beginnings into what it is today, it's something that I think is going to end up being of great benefit to all the citizens of Winnipeg and I think the local residents will come to realize that it's something that will add to the quality of their lives as opposed to detracting from it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you. It feels like open mic night here, doing shtick.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Fielding: I hear Karaoke. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and I will be supporting the deal before us, to be quite honest with you, I would have preferred the original deal which I think is still somewhat in place, with a lot of the private sector financing being a part of it. I am but I do think this is the best option for the City. I am very hopeful that David Asper will be able to accomplish the goals of building the Stadium, developing the Polo Park area site lands as well as meeting all the deadlines that are put forth in this deal. So for me, really what this boils down to, it provides the best option for the City of Winnipeg to get a new stadium while protecting taxpayers for further, unnecessary expenses at the current site. We all know the history of this facility, I think it's been open for a very long time, over 40 years. I've been there 38 years and I think Gord's 58, I think it's been around that period of time as well that it's been around. But overall it has been a landmark here in the City of Winnipeg for many years. And I remember hearing my dad talk about the first Bomber game where he snuck under a fence to get in the first game but it has seen a lot of changes over the years. You've seen expansions. You've seen improvements to it but really, it's come at a time where we need to make some changes to it. We need to move on.

The need for a new stadium has been brought up. We talked about the upgrades that are there, you know, I think the numbers are around $52 million that is there and I suggested the $52 million, I mean quite frankly that's a huge number to invest if we were to invest in the current stadium site and I already argued that investing any money, any sort of money into the existing building right now would be a bad investment of money. Even if the numbers let's say the numbers aren't 52 million. Let's say they're inflated to make the case. Even if it's 20, even it's $30 million, I would suggest that isn't a good investment in making; just putting a lip stick on a pig, I guess if you are with the existing stadium doesn't make a lot of sense from my point of view in terms of taxpayers spending more money more wisely.

Some will argue that we should've looked at some of the, you know some of the Reports with the Tower Report I think they talked about $8.9 million, three, four, five years ago well the reality is you know we are down the pipe with this. It's three or four years later. You are going to have to spend existing money and I think the $52 million that is there. It talks; it's a lot different money to get the building up to a workable level that you're going to maybe add a few seasons on to it. So it's a lot of money to spend for it so I think it does make sense. There's also talk in terms of the new tax revenues, and development that will be going on, which I think is a very important part of the equation. Right now as I think the Mayor indicated we're getting zero taxes on the current existing stadium site right now. You know, with the new development it will come on line and you're going to see anywhere between 7.1 and probably even higher in terms of some of the tax revenues that are going to come on. You'll get the Polo Park site land developed. You're also going to get some business taxes that are there. So it's a win for the City in respect to the getting the Polo Park site developed as well as you're getting a new stadium.

There's been a topic that we've talked about in terms of I think they're referring to it as the insurance policy and you know, I want to preference this. I think you know obviously this is a deal that of course the Premier put together and we were very much a part of it in respect of the TIF. I'd like to see the first option go ahead but if there is the TIF that does come on line, I think it's something that can get the money back. I guess the part that I'm more comfortable with is that the money wouldn't have been there to begin with so if we're going to do developing, it's not money that we're taking away from existing services and programs that's there the stuff that would come on line later on down the line and that money wouldn't have been there if we were not developing it. So with that, I do think it makes some sense with the TIF also has a schedule for repayment for taxpayers. As I mentioned you're going to get the benefit of a new stadium. You're going to get the development of the Polo Park sites as well as future tax base that can help the fund, services and programs from your; years ahead.

Sale of the land, the assessment, we all know how the deal works. You know, both sides are going to get the land assessed and we're going to come up with an independent number that will get the market value land for what it's worth. Both Crestwin and the City will come to a conclusion in terms of that but I think over all it's probably somewhere in the neighbourhood of 15 to 20, $25 million and what I think is important, I represent the Polo Park area, and I can tell that you there is major problems with traffic, there is major problems right now as it stands. If you do have a; you know, the

property that will come on line, there is going to be more traffic. I know Justin is dealing with it in his area with the new stadium but there is going to be some traffic updates you're going to have to do and I think there has been a commitment here from our level, when you do sell the land, the bulk of that money needs to go into the Polo Park area to ensure that it's a livable situation. I think that's going to be demanded just not from our elected officials but I think from the businesses because if you see a 18 to 20 percent increase in traffic you need to make it a livable situation. And for people that don't know, there will be developer pay back in terms of that, maybe using the wrong terminology but essentially, Crestwin would be required to pay for some of those updates above and beyond the sale of the land that would be there. The way the situation works, is you reapply what the traffic flows will come to or what an increase of traffic flows will be there and at that point a deal will be worked out in terms of what they would need to pay back for some of the upgrades to the area. So I think it's a win for the area in terms of the valuation of land in terms of the development of the area, and also, for the Polo Park region.

Another topic that has been talked a little bit about is the fact that we're going to get a fantastic new rec facility that's attached to the University area I think in the tune of $22.5 million that will be used by University and used by the general public that is there. It's an important asset I think is probably needed in that general direction. So that's a big part of it. And the final stage I think is really the fact that for a long period of time Councillor Wyatt alluded to it, we've been looking to develop a new stadium. You are going to get is you're going to get a state of the art facility that everyone can very much enjoy, and use for a long period of time. You know, when this debate started I had some unfinished questions. I actually called up David Asper and the Crestwin folks and I talked to them just in terms of the stadium in it. I'm absolutely convinced that there is a lot of passion to get this done. I think the stadium is going to be a fantastic addition to our facility. I don't think there's a; we're scrimping in any way. It's going to be a fantastic facility that Bomber fans are going to know and enjoy for many years to come. So with that, once again, I will conclude my comments. I will support it. I still hope that the first phasing of this, where it's a private sector driven deal will go ahead and we don't have to move into the TIF fund but I'm confident that those process will work and I think, you know, the deal that the Premier put together makes some sense and so I will be supporting that. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to repeat much of what you've already heard but I'll try to make it interesting. Firstly, I want to acknowledge the apparent death of the December/May romance between Russ Wyatt and the New Democratic Party. It would appear that although the flames of; the flames of passion burned quite brightly for a spell it would appear that the bloom is off the rose as it were, Mr. Speaker. I'm not exactly sure what happened there. Not exactly sure what the inside baseball on this thing is but I'll take it that nobody would second the Motion for a referendum on this issue as such there is no paper before us that I'm aware of. I do not support the idea of a referendum on this or on anything else. This referendum idea comes up periodically. I think it was on the table just a couple of months ago on the issue of the waste water utility. I recall being in Seattle at one point for a municipal election whereby their ballot was 23 pages long, Mr. Speaker, because they have referendum politics and people keep putting things on the Agenda. There was corresponding Motions calling for tax hikes and tax cuts both of which were passed by the populations and difficulties ensuing. The tough thing about this deal, Mr. Speaker, is that at the end of the day the stadium is our responsibility and I think sometimes we forget that. We think or perhaps people think that we can just leave things be with respect to the stadium and not deal with it. We, 16 here in this Chamber, understand only too clearly that this facility is and has always been our responsibility. And it will be into the future and God bless her but the old girl is getting pretty old and if we consider in the same light that the CFL, God bless her as well, is not necessarily except for maybe one city in the Union, a money making venture, we have to be sure that we're going to build ultimately is cost effective and does make sense. It's all very well and good to talk about retractable roofs and dome stadiums and this, that and the other thing. I don't know that that's possible and as a sports fan, I will make the observation, cities like Montréal, Vancouver, Minneapolis, Seattle, Detroit, going exactly the other way. Away from domed stadiums, back into the great outdoors. This is a little bit of a pedestrian comment Mr. Speaker, but the last place I would want to be on a hot July day, watching a Bomber game, is inside a dome, I can promise you that. The deal as has been put on the table already. It's…what's that? (Inaudible) Retractable roof, oh that sounds cheap, Councillor Wyatt. Thank you for that suggestion.

Well, I'll finish off the thought by remembering also, in this City, we have a peculiar point, and a specific point with respect to our arena. We all remember that any new facility that is built cannot compete with the MTS Centre in terms of what it attracts, in terms of the shows it brings in. So instantly the business model for an indoor stadium for seven months of the year, I would suggest is pretty much eliminated. The deal itself, the fair market value, all those sorts of things in my opinion, are thought through. It will be appraised at substantially less than what was reported on one radio station I think yesterday, and it will be done by 3 independent appraisers. One from us, one from the developer and, if necessary, if the appraisals are too far apart we'll bring in a third. And we do have the ability, I would suggest fairly easily to arrive at a fair market value for that land. We're remembering always, Mr. Speaker, that the Winnipeg Blue Bombers who are an important player in this process, did go through a process whereby they selected the proponent that they

wanted to work with, which is the proponent that we're working with. I'm not sure there necessarily be a long lineup in any event but for those reasons we are where we are and I think that it makes sense. I think the U of M is a perfect place for this new stadium. Many of us are alumni at the U of M. I'm one of those people that has always thought that this campus is under developed. Huge tracts of space, not enough spots, I would suggest where a community can gather. I'm not certain that it would've necessarily been a good thing for a student such as myself to have access to more restaurants and bars on campus, but, I do think overall, that it will be a shot in the arm for that campus. And for a campus, the size of the U of M, 20,000, 30,000 students, it's actually pretty remarkable if you compare it to other campuses of its size, that it doesn't have more of those types of venues on campus. This, I think, will be a boon to that campus.

At the end of the day, our worst case as was stated by the Mayor, I don't think is bad at all. I am not 100 percent certain that Mr. Asper will at the end of the day, be able to show up and complete the purchase of the team, et cetera. And if that doesn't happen, we all should remember the team will remain with the community as will the facility, obviously and all those sorts of things. But, we do hope that it happens, because I think it would be a wonderful step in this process. The nightmare scenario for us, Mr. Speaker, if I may suggest, is that we were to go through this process and at the end of the day we couldn't arrive at a consensus and we couldn't arrive at an idea, the Provincial Government went away, Mr. Asper went away, and then tomorrow morning we all woke up and things were as they were a year and a half, two years ago, and we were sitting here all by ourselves with a stadium that has attached to it, at least, at least a $30 million liability. People are throwing around numbers such as 50 and if experience in this Chamber has taught me a single thing over the last nine years, it's probably go with the higher number. I've learned that the hard way on too many occasions. That would be a bad thing and a poor outcome for this Council because within the year we would or whoever is sitting in these Chambers would be faced with the question, what are you going to do with that stadium? And how would we answer that question? What would our answer to that question be? I'd be willing to wager that a second attempt to go back to the Provincial Government would result in probably a fair enough comment back that "You had your chance to deal with us." I don't know if there would be another developer who would be willing to put this type of deal on the table. I suspect not but I'm certain Mr. Asper would be gone forever on this one. That's why, having thought it all the way through, considering as the Mayor said, our worst case scenario, this deal does make sense on behalf of the 660,000 souls we represent in this City, and I think we'll draw a few from outside of the Capital Region as well, Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As everyone here has mentioned and everyone here realizes, we have a liability with Canad Inns Stadium whether it's $8.9 million, whether it's 52 and a half million dollars or somewhere in the middle. We've got an asset that is deteriorated to the point we've got to spend some real money to make it to fix it and the football club under their current facility can't raise any additional money. I have had some constituents call me or spoken to me. They said to me, you know what maybe we shouldn't be in football at all but I don't think that's the majority opinion. I know that we need to go to a referendum to do that. I think what the proposal is here is fair and it's somewhat reasonable. Today we get no money in taxes from Canad Inn Stadium at Polo Park. And it's sitting on one of the most valuable pieces of commercial real estate out there. As vacant land, it's probably worth in the neighbourhood of $30 million as a fully developed property. That's a huge amount of tax revenues the City could be realizing in a future. If David Asper is successful, we'll see that money sooner than later if not we'll still be getting that money in the future to keep funding the civic services that aren't constituents all want and expect.

We get the assessed value, the appraised value of it regardless of who we sell it to, whether it's David Asper or if it goes to the private sector. The City of Winnipeg realizes that money when it's sold in 2011 or 2012. We get that money and in terms of you know, the type of facility we're getting an outdoor field is very desirable. I mean, some of the best facilities out there in the NFL especially are the ones outdoors. I mean look at the field there in Wisconsin that's absolutely one of the best from what I understand. Where I do have a small amount of questions and I haven't been; my fears haven't been completely eliminated is we know that it's a $115 million stadium but we don't know exactly what that bill of goods is. I do respect David Asper. I do believe he wants to build absolutely the best facility possible with that money. My question is, it's a little bit slippery in terms of what's there. We're talking 33,000 seats is what's often spoken about. If you look at the Report before us here today in terms and conditions and sale it says they require a stadium with a minimum 30,000 seats there's definitely a difference in the numbers. David Asper is supposedly responsible for the cost overruns. What's the exact bill of goods that we're getting? What's the level of finish? What's the size of the jumbotron? What' what are the…we…as Council here we don't see the exact plans of what we're getting. I don't think they exist yet. And what is the 1.15 based on? What level of detailed engineering is it based on? We don't have that yet. I hope that you know, our Administrators have the foresight to make sure we get positively all of that down, hard core, before the final deals are signed, but it does make me a little bit nervous. I mean, we've got to set sort of bases where, as where we're coming from on this. So again, we have a liability, I think the road we're going down is the right one. There's a couple of little loose ends I'd like to see cleaned up. I will be supporting this but again I do have a couple of small caveats on it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today as a Bomber fan. Nobody else has said that here today, so (laughing). My recollection of the current Canad Inn Stadium is back to 1957 when Ken Ploen and Jim Van Pelt were heading towards a grey cup contest. We didn't win that year but the following year we did and the club has had a long tradition and connection to this community that goes beyond most other institutions. The only other ones that I can think about that sort of draw the same connection to the community are possibly the Royal Winnipeg Ballet that goes back as far as the Bombers do, with great respect to the Goldeyes and the Jets. I really think that you know, this has been analyzed to death. And again with respect to my colleague Councillor Browaty, I don't know how much detail we need to know, how many pixels are on the screen. I really think we should just you know, get this project under way. As many of the other speakers have said, the City is protected in this. I think we have to be advocates of this project and along with some of the other outstanding opportunities we have with the new airport opening, Human Rights Museum, a potential new Convention Centre expansion, I just think this is one of many things that are great to be celebrated here in the City of Winnipeg in this Motion will have my support.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers? Then I'll ask the Mayor to close. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate all those comments. I believe as Mayor and Council, it's incumbent upon us to protect the citizens of Winnipeg, to protect the interests of the taxpayers. It's been said by many people that we have a significant liability today at Canad Inns Stadium. It can also be said that we have basically given away all of the revenues that we used to get, Mr. Speaker. We get zero revenue, everything, and I mean absolutely everything has been turned over to the Winnipeg Football Club and I think it goes without saying is that if this proposal were not to move forward and work was to be done on the existing facility, you can be guaranteed that the City of Winnipeg would be asked to come to the table with dollars and cents. In this situation, the City of Winnipeg is not putting any money up front, none that I know of. Basically what we're doing is we are there as insurance, and we are basically giving up approximately $1.1 million in permit fees, et cetera, which has become pretty standard, no different than what took place at the MTS Centre.

So, I do find the comment by Councillor Wyatt rather intriguing about the Provincial Sales Tax and the income tax and that's an accurate statement, but the reality is they are also putting in $15 million so, if you take, they'll get seven or eight million dollars back on their PST which is half the money and obviously, income tax would go on for a long point in time. It's; it's a good deal, Mr. Speaker. There is very little doubt in my mind. It's a good deal, but the key thing is just for some clarification, on the sale of land, regardless of what anybody says or hears, fair market value, outside appraisers, end of story and that's whoever buys it. No one's going to get a deal of a century and no one is going to steal it. End of story. Number two, the ownership of the football stadium will always be with the public whether Crestwin is in or Crestwin is out.

And the other thing and I will try and address some of Councillor Browaty's concerns when he talks about what level of construction. It is my understanding that the announcement that was originally made by Crestwin and all three levels of government is exactly the same. Nothing has changed except for some arches that really have no impact on the facility, will no longer be there. Other than that, it will be as described by Crestwin a first class facility and I'm actually going to follow up on the discrepancy between 33,000 and 30,000 because that is a very good comment. But I can tell you that yours truly along with department heads and the Administration and our Legal Department is making sure that we do our due diligence to protect the interests of the taxpayers. It's either pay me now, pay me later. It's time to move forward. Would I like to see this downtown? I love that idea, Mr. Speaker. I don't know of any land that exists downtown because we've looked and the only land that does exist, will be, God willing in the very near future, announced for an expansion of the Convention Centre which is very much needed. You just don't have the land so and it's been proven with at least two other cities that there are great synergies between a CFL franchise and University Campuses. I do hope that everyone supports this Motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillors we'll be voting on the Economic Development Initiative for the redevelopment of existing Stadium Site and new Stadium development at the University of Manitoba which is Item 8. Is there a Recorded vote called?

(Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Pardon? Okay, good. So all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Wyatt wants to be recorded or is reported in opposition.

Thank you, Councillors. Now we have Item No; we have the; we have here what we decided earlier and that is a Motion by Mayor Katz and seconded by Councillor Steeves, and this is dealing with the question of the what we dealt with here earlier. Mr. Mayor, would you like to introduce it?

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz,
Seconded by Councillor Steeves,

WHEREAS reducing greenhouse gas emissions is essential for the protection of human health and our environment;

AND WHEREAS Manitoba has enacted legislation that requires the province to meet its Kyoto commitment for 2012 and sets long-term goals for further reductions by 2020 and 2025 across all sectors of the Manitoba economy;

AND WHEREAS The Climate Change and Emissions Reduction Act enshrines in the 50/50 transit funding partnership to ensure the Province continues to pay one-half of Winnipeg transit's net operating costs, including rapid transit;

AND WHEREAS the Rapid Transit Task Force recommended one-third City/Provincial/ Federal cost-sharing of a rapid transit system;

AND WHEREAS as a first step in the development of a long term strategy for the development of a rapid transit system in Winnipeg, the City of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada have committed to funding for Stage 1 of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor, which is currently being constructed;

AND WHEREAS the expansion of rapid transit facilities in Winnipeg may help to increase transit ridership, reduce reliance on automobiles and achieve the Province's long-term greenhouse gas emission reduction goals;

AND WHEREAS rapid transit offers a potential stimulus for future development potential in terms of density and value, and light rail rapid transit may present an opportunity to increase development potential along rapid transit corridors;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg Public Service be directed to review the applicability of light rail rapid transit and report back to the Executive Policy Committee in 90 days with a business case that includes:

(i) an analysis of comparative costs per kilometre for bus rapid transit and light rail rapid transit;

(ii) an analysis of the comparative advantages of bus rapid transit and light rail rapid transit;

(iii) prioritized options for light rail rapid transit routes;

(iv) recommended options for the type or types of light rail technology that may be appropriate for use in Winnipeg;

(v) comparison and quantification of anticipated benefits of light rail rapid transit vs. bus rapid transit including: incremental taxes generated from development, ridership increases, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions; and

(vi) funding options, including a strategy for pursuing intergovernmental funding.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that funding to a maximum of $100,000.00 be approved for costs associated with undertaking such analysis, to be allocated from Transit Capital Account No. 442-181000-420755-4220000309 (Transportation Authority Study).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any consultant contracts awarded in association with the preparation of such business case that are estimated to exceed $100,000.00 must be tendered through a competitive RFP process.

Mayor Katz: Very much so. Yes, I would. I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe everyone has the Motion in front of them, Mr. Speaker and what this is all about is I've said in the past, we know that the construction for BRT is approximately $38 million per kilometre. As I have stated on many occasions to date, people in the industry that build light rail transit have said that construction of LRT at grade is $50 million, above grade, $70 million. Taking into consideration that things can change that basing on if you already have access to the land to build, that has an impact as well as if you have to

build tunnels or not. So, with that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's incumbent, as you can see it's not going to take very long, to number one, do the business case very quickly assess it, I believe it's 90 days, Mr. Speaker, and get back to Council and let them know that yes, we can build at those numbers or in this particular instance, no, we can't. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, right now, they are constructing Stage 2, Stage 1, I'm sorry of BRT. We have plenty of time to do this, verify the numbers are real and I'm hoping that if the numbers are proven to be accurate, Mr. Speaker, that LRT would be unanimously supported by all Members of Council and wouldn't that be nice, unanimously supported. With that I look forward to hearing from the balance of Council. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can't support this. This is a waste of money. This is an issue that's been studied to death and beginning in 04, after Mayor Katz and this Council cancelled Bus Rapid Transit. Mayor Katz formed the Rapid Transit Task Force, Councillor Wyatt was Chairperson. We spent $220,000 on this recommendation was that we build the very same bus way which the Council previously cancelled two years earlier. The Mayor's own office or somewhere in the Administration have recently funded a LRT conversion study 09, 10 for $53,000 to study the business case of Light Rail Transit. I've never seen the result of that. I don't think anyone on this Council has. We've got one over $1.1 million for the Our Winnipeg review that's occurring now that is solely looking at transportation issues. And I hope for $1.1 million that it can look at BRT once again to give us their best analysis. Somewhere in Winnipeg Transit's budget there is a transportation authority study that is; and again, over a million dollars for a transportation authority study. These numbers blow me away. I don't know why we need 1.125 for a transportation authority study. This money, Mr. Speaker, is wasted. This is something that one of our transportation experts could do with Google, calling up all these cities in Canada as Mr. Ken Klassen has done this morning. In fact, if you buy Ken Klassen a coffee and a doughnut I'm sure he could provide some excellent information as he has this morning. This has been studied to death. The results have always been the same. LRT is simply cost prohibitive for the City of Winnipeg. We started Phase 1. We've spent 90; we've actually borrowed $90 million to do Phase 1 of Bus Rapid Transit. We've gone in the ground. It is; it is foolish, it is a flip flop to consider severing Phase 1 and doing a $100,000 study, which is absolutely nothing but a waste of money. And it's some sort of; there is a wider political agenda here that's trying to make Mayor Katz and this Council and to look progressive, to reach for the stars but this work has been done. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, we've heard from the delegation, the work has been done a hundred thousand dollars is better spent somewhere else.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I can't support this. You know, the Mayor has some; talked to somebody and he's got some information, he doesn't tell who he talked to, who in effect suggested that the LRT would be feasible. He talks about money being available at other levels of government. We've had no indication of that. You know, it seems to me a hundred thousand for something that we've been studying over the years, over and over and over again, it seems to me that we're throwing money out the window. You know, I'd like the Mayor to name the individual who told him that the LRT is feasible and that the cost has come down. Reveal that information to us so we can judge if we should go for this clause. I don't think so. I don't think he'll tell us. I think this is just a political ploy for the coming election. So, I urge you all not to fall into his trap. Do not vote for this.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A long history on the Rapid Transit file here in Winnipeg. Every time the issue comes up which is often in the course of the last five years, we're reminded of Mayor Juba, his original vision even though I wasn't around to hear it in person, I don't believe. What he talked about, what he talked about the mono rail. I assume at the time, again, even though I wasn't in the hallow Chambers of City Hall that that was simply a discussion and the Council of the day could not come to an agreement on what should be done. That continues, I think, to a certain extent today. I think we've always had, even through Mayor Murray's times, a Council that felt differently about this, and cut down on almost the same angles as we see today. I don't mind telling you that it was my distinct impression throughout the tenure of Mayor Murray that he was having a difficult time convincing the Premier of the day, Gary Doer, that this was a priority that Winnipeg should be going along with. I could be wrong about that, but that was a political sense that I had. I know we have people on all sides of the issue still, on this Chamber. I know we have folks who have flat out voted against the idea of Rapid Transit period. I know we have; we have that might be folk instead of folks, I'm not sure. We have people who have been sort of dragged into even the First Phase of Bus Rapid Transit, somewhat unwillingly, and obviously, I think we're not quite at a critical mass where we could get to the Second Phase.

My position on the issue is I am a supporter of the Rapid Transit idea. I believe that we as a City have to evolve to a point where we do have Rapid Transit. I recall this very difficult discussion when Mayor Katz was first elected. At the time we made a difficult choice to move away from the very unsturdily built if I could use that term plan of Rapid Transit of the day that was put on the table by then Mayor Murray just a couple of months before he left to run for Federal

Government. A lot of documents unsigned, a lot of Motions unpassed, really not that much done beyond a simple press conference at the Forks wherein that was announced funding for our waste water upgrades in the amount of $24 million was actually announced as well, and, of course, the one project that was fully funded or almost fully funded was the Kenaston underpass. No surprise that was the first project to come to fruition and completion under that deal.

To get to the next phase, we all understand we need some type of consensus. I think everybody in this Chamber agrees that our preference would be to have rail transit if we could get there. I think every single member of Council, I think the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, are all unanimous on that proposition. The difficulty is, of course, that people are skeptical about our ability to raise money for either one. Our suspicion is and people's suspicion is, I think probably again unanimously on this Council, that the light rail is going to be more expensive. There is, I think, some anecdotal but yet credible evidence that is coming back that Light Rail Rapid Transit is decreasing in cost. That does appear to be a true dynamic in the marketplace. I'm certainly not in a position to say that's come back far enough where it could be something that we do. But, one thing that's for certain, I don't think this Council has enough of a consensus, sort of degree of comfort to move forward with Phase 2 right now on a strict Bus Rapid Transit Plan. If suddenly the money appeared from heaven for the rail transit then that I'm sure would be done. We have a hundred thousand dollars that we are going to put into looking at this issue.

In the context of studying transit in our City, that's a fair amount, I think. We actually spend a lot of money on an ongoing basis looking at various options that we consider on and on going basis. Transit as we all understand is not a chief venture. It also doesn't happen to be a money making adventure. It's a service that we provide to our citizens. I think this is the natural next step for the Rapid Transit discussion in this City. No, I mean I see Councillor Smith chuckling, but doubtless, if this Council is divided, you can take it to the bank that our community is divided as well. If we can get questions or answers, rather to questions that are fairly on people's mind, this is a step that can be taken. Now, the whole thing about killing the project, that was said back in the day as Councillor Pagtakhan would say. That was said when we moved away from the original idea of Bus Rapid Transit when the Mayor first took power. At that time, I said in this Chamber we have to take this step of moving through the questions, getting some of the answers and moving towards consensus and then and only then, are we going to be able to take that step moving into Bus Rapid Transit. I'm not going to take credit for being prophetic but it did happen. We did move through that very difficult process. That would be hard for us to recall a time where this Council was more vitriolic in its opposition and in its division. But, sometimes as a group of 16 we have to do these sorts of things, don't we? We have to sort of separate, we have to yell and scream a little bit. We have to go through a period of getting information. We have to come back and then we have to make a decision. Yes, and sometimes it does take some time, years and years says Councillor Smith. I'm sure Mayor Juba would agree with something like that. But perhaps, and I'm probably not qualified to second guess any former Mayor, but I don't know if there is a process of going through and trying to build that consensus, but obviously, that consensus never was built. If we're okay with sort of setting aside our differences, moving through this process, getting the answers on the rail, which I have to say, I don't really recall us getting this type of information in that clear a form over the course of the last eight years. When was the last time that someone could point to in any real detail, that we've gone back and we've looked at the true issue of Rapid Transit or Light Rail Rapid Transit and what it would bring? Because I am certain of one thing; while I completely understand that it might not necessarily be financially achievable for this City, I have no doubt and I am 100 percent certain that the idea of light rail would be, at the end of the day, much, much more attractive to the consumer who lives in the City of Winnipeg when it comes to their transit choices. Let's take this step. It's a necessary step. I think it'll be the better for it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Some of the previous speakers make it sound like this is a new argument and we really need new information. This is not the first, second or even third time that this has been studied. I can remember back in the early 1990s when Chris Laurent was Chair of at that time Works and Operations, that there was a study that was commissioned and it came back and it said you're going to have to do Bus Transit, Bus Rapid Transit because we don't have the money, we don't have the commitment from the Federal Government to do anything else, and said if you do the Bus Transit, there are ways in the future that you can slip over to rail if we get the support. Now, I've seen the Bus Rapid Transit systems in other communities and I've also seen the light rail ones. And the light rail ones are definitely lovely and they definitely cost and they definitely were funded by the Federal Government. We don't have this happening here. This study is not going to change that. It's a $100,000 that could be gone towards making something happen that is just fiddling while Rome burns.

There have been innumerable studies done on this, innumerable studies that say bus is cheaper. We have two bus companies in town. Their technology is improving each and every time. We can use our bus like Rapid Transit system to show people how it works, to show people the new technology. It would be nice to have an opportunity to showcase something that we do, rather than ship it off to someone else. And in the end, if we get money from the Federal Government, and if it becomes financially feasible, then we could think about going to light rail. But right now, nothing is

being done. Nothing is being done, nothing is being done and nothing is being done. I'm saying that four times for a reason because there are four years when nothing is being done. We've had lots of promises about things to be done and we've had lots of studies, the studies have not changed. The studies over the past 20 odd years have not changed and some people wishing that it was different, some people hoping that it was different, some people closing their eyes and ears and saying la la la. It's not going to make it different. What's happening is nothing is being done and something should be done so please don't do this. It's a waste of a hundred thousand dollars. Actually, complete Phase 1. And what's happened is Phase 1 is not really Phase 1 any more. Phase 2 is supposed to go through Elmwood, Transcona, St. Boniface, along the mission lines. That's not Phase 2 any more because Phase 1 has been divided into three parts and Phase 1, Part 1, Phase 1, Part 2. How much slower can we go? And if people are upset because there is too much traffic on the road if people are upset because there's not enough people using the bus, that's why, people. It's because you're not giving them the option or an alternative. You need to give people the option. And not increasing the number of buses that pick up people, not increasing the capacity in any way, not having dedicated lanes over the Disraeli Bridge or anywhere where you can get transit moving along easily, is making it difficult. We don't need another study to tell us that. What we need is someone who is willing to take action. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. It is actually amazing sometimes when we sit here and we actually listen to each other that there are actually some of us have some very good points to make and I came to this debate, this one as all my debates with an open mind. I have a leaning of course but an open mind and today I've heard one word that has convinced me to support the Motion actually, was consensus. How can we get past this debate? And there was yes, it was actually a; I won't even say the man's name because he'll probably wants to speak more later however it was a very valuable point. I have as a rookie Councillor come in a little bit later so I've had the opportunity to read the Reports, read the fine Report, the Rapid Transit Task Force, it was a little dry in spots, Russ, but it was quite a good read. It alleviated a lot of my concerns, and I am quite confused and still a little baffled why we're doing this now when we really should have done this before we started. So I'm not sure why it's coming a little at this point, however, the objective of gaining consensus so we can start moving forward on to this is a great idea. I don't want to build a LRT, a light rail system that's going to go nowhere. It's a huge waste of money and this Report is asking where are the priorities, where does it fit? That's very good. Again it should've been done before we started this so I'm not too; still a little confused by that. I'm a little confused and a little concerned about the fact that our Mayor has said repeatedly that he will go to Federal Government and lobby for LRT. Well, he doesn't have the study yet. So if there's a big hole how are we going to go lobby the Federal Government when we don't really have a study done yet, if there is so many concerns. So again, this will maybe help the Mayor when he goes to the Federal Government to properly advocate for BRT or LRT, whatever works in our system. So I think that is a good point. I am concerned about the fact that we have never; we heard of an anecdotal, somebody told me that it was a lot cheaper. Well someone has told us today that it's a lot more expensive. Again so where are the facts? Why are we having such a different opinions? Well, again I don't believe it's any cheaper. I can't see how it's going to be any cheaper but how much more expensive if it is? So hopefully this Report will help this Council come to consensus. Sure I do believe there are people on Council that don't wish to have BRT or LRT or any type of Rapid Transit. They may be okay with it, but it's way down their priority list; so hopefully this Report will allow us to say here is what is buyable, here is what's doable and we can move forward. So I will support the Motion to move forward so we have the proper information so we can go forward. I thought it was quite well done in here and the other Reports, however, it obviously as I agree with Councillor Steeves, not everybody is on that same page so let's get everybody on the same page so we all can agree and then we can move these projects forward.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, this is a really difficult issue because you know we're being put in a position of having to vote against studying LRT when we know that you know that many of us are very, very strong Rapid Transit advocates. I'm not against studying LRT but I would like to point out where it's already been studied in this particular corridor and a few other points of history and other questions I have about the study before us. In 2004 when the Rapid Transit Project was cancelled, and there wasn't; consensus was actually reached then by as was discussed earlier, basically agreeing to build the Kenaston underpass and transit because some Councillors preferred road building and some preferred transit and we came to an agreement that way. So it can happen even if everybody doesn't support transit but I highly you know, I'd be amazed if this particular group could come to a consensus and if we wait for them we may be waiting a long time to see Rapid Transit in our City. But obviously we have to build support for it. Although since we are building it right now I actually already thought we had support for it but anyway.

A year later, in 2005 when the Rapid Transit Task Force came out, it did look at LRT. We looked at what should we do and it was studied and the costs at the time, not all of this is included in there but there was information given to the Committee. We studied different method, different technologies and we also looked at LRT and the cost was about three

times the cost. So the cost now for both phases of BRT is about 340 million or so for the whole southwest corridor so that would be around a billion dollars now. So if that money is there, fantastic, show me the money. Councillor concurred with those findings and we actually announced and are building the First Phase and at the time it was also announced that we would seek one third funding for the next phase. So, but it is clear all along in the process that the Mayor has never liked this project. He's always hinted LRT just around the corner. He said it at the announcement of the BRT. He's cancelled it once. He's reluctantly agreed to build it again and now as rather than putting money into our infrastructure list to complete it, you know, that's been taken off the list. So it's very confusing as to where the support lies on this. You know the priorities from earlier this morning are very clear of this Council. They want to build more roads. If they want to spend our all available Federal infrastructure dollars on expanding those road networks I'm really not sure how we're going to afford LRT rather than BRT because it's certainly more expensive. Ken Klassen was here earlier and he looked at the current projects under in Ottawa, Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary and Toronto and the average cost was 105 million per kilometre which is twice the Mayor's number of 50. So those are from actual projects. I'd really love to know where the Mayor's numbers came from. I think we all would, but those are numbers that can be traced back to where they came from. I could go on about you know; it just bothers me there's been a lot of negative comments being made. This whole process is stirring up, you know talk about trying to get consensus, the best way to do it is not to stir up negativity about something that's working very well and people are excited about, and deciding not to finish what we're in the middle of building.

The LRT and BRT debate has paralyzed Council in the past. I think; believe that's what happened in the 80s. Ottawa and Winnipeg both studied LRT and BRT and BRT was what was recommended for both cities. Ottawa went ahead and built it and now they have an extensive BRT network as well as LRT and other things. We're just starting because we didn't start in the 80s because Council was paralyzed and lost by one vote in terms of proceeding. I agree we need an integrated transportation plan to continue with further Rapid Transit development once, I'm hoping we will finish the southwest corridor and that should be based on a thorough unbiased detailed study of transit modality road ways and Active Transportation. So I'm not against studying things okay, but we are studying this at a tune of $1.4 million as part of the Our Winnipeg Process. We are studying this and we are looking at LRT in that study so I don't know why we can't just finish the corridor we started and study future modalities in other corridors. That would make sense since we've already started building this. Now, other cities such as Vancouver, Edmonton, Ottawa and Toronto, are looking at all the different options and I agree, I think we should do that in the future as we move forward with our Rapid Transit Plan, but we really have looked at this thoroughly in this corridor and you know, if we have a billion dollars, show it to us but we've pretty much have the money we need to finish this according to verbal comments from the other two levels of government, so I don't know why we wouldn't complete it at this time.

I don't think you can separate the infrastructure decision today from this decision. Our City is going in a direction that's going to tie up our money in roadway building rather than transit building, so I think it's going to limit the kind of LRT or any other kind of Rapid Transit that we're going to be able to see so I think those attitudes have to change. There was a $53,000 study done about converting BRT to LRT. Why has that not been made available? I think that's important. You know, there's been a lot of numbers thrown around. There's been a lot of names get you know, unnamed experts thrown around. Like people are really confused. I have to say, and I don't know if confusion is actually the goal here. You know, is the goal; is the goal to confuse people so much that all they'll hear is the Mayor wants LRT and then they'll blindly head off to the voting booth and go wow I'll vote for that Mayor because I want LRT?

I happen to have more faith in the public than that, but I am thrilled if the Mayor truly supports a huge investment in Rapid Transit I sincerely hope that's what we're going to see. I'm still waiting because we just sent all the money, just told the everyone that we're spending it on roads rather than Rapid Transit so I hope I'm wrong, believe me, on this. Now my time is ticking. I am concerned again with this impression that we can do it all you know with a sexier technology at the same time, widen all the roads. You know, it does seem kind of, you know it is a pretty good political move. I have to say it. I'm impressed with that. But now the truth is we have a billion dollar infrastructure deficit, and we have to make those choices. I'm going to skip past a few things. I just wanted to say that as I'm running out of time, a lot's been said about already. I'm concerned that this study is a distraction from the fact that Rapid Transit is no longer on our priority list. But I'd like the following questions answered before you can realistically expect people to support the LRT study. And you know, I'd like to support it too because I'm sure you know, people will run off and go, oh Councillor Gerbasi doesn't support Rapid Transit. I'm not sure how many people will believe that but I'm sure it will be said and one; here's the questions I'd like answered and then I'd be happy to support your Motion. Yeah, I'm sure, Councillor Swandel's first in line.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Extension. All those in favour…(Inaudible)

Councillor Gerbasi: Number one. Who is the mystery industry spokesperson who says the cost of LRT is plummeted and where is the evidence? Two. What are the results of the $53,000 LRT conversion study that's already been commissioned and has it; and why has it been kept hidden from us? Three. Tell us how Rapid Transit will be funded if

Rapid Transit is; has been taken off the list of priorities for the building Canada Fund? Four, tell us why another LRT study for $100,000 is needed when we're already paying one and a quarter million to do a thorough transportation plan as part of the plan Winnipeg; Our Winnipeg Initiative. And that that Plan is considering LRT. Five, where is the LRT route being talked about in the study? The study seems to have already decided it's a good idea. What are we talking about converting the southwest corridor from BRT? or are we talking about building a different corridor somewhere else and if so, where? And six, is the southwest corridor going to be completed or will it stop at Jubilee as Councillor Swandel seems to think the bike path is adequate as an integrated transportation strategy without transit. If the Mayor can answer these questions and clear up the mass confusion that's been created by all of this, I would be delighted to support a Motion for an LRT study. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker or Mr. Deputy Speaker. Just for clarity right off the hop, the good Councillor from the St. Norbert Ward, myself supports Bus Rapid Transit past Jubilee. I just don't believe that Bus Rapid Transit has to be two strips of concrete which is what this Council actually voted for and supported in its description on Bus Rapid Transit saying it wasn't just two strips of concrete, it was a comprehensive approach to how do you make buses move faster, more comfortably and more conveniently? So I do support Bus Rapid Transit and I believe that the next step that we need to do on that corridor is building this modern transit station out at the University of Manitoba which is the Bus Rapid Transit priority that's in this list in front of us.

But the matter at hand that's in front of us right now is the LRT and why we want to go and do this study. Well, you know, we heard some delegation this morning and some comments here today talking about numbers and mystery people and what have you. Just from the very beginning, the study for LRT is due to the decreasing costs of LRT and its already known benefits and you need to look no further Mr. Deputy Speaker than what it does for transit oriented development. You go on any sight that talks about BRT and when he has a column of cons, he's got pros and cons. One of the cons is a fact that it does not necessarily; it's not the best set of tool for transit oriented development because the bus isn't always on a corridor. Okay, it's very flexible. You can drive off over into Waverley West for example without a dedicated corridor or out into the RM of West St. Paul if you want to have suburban sprawl. That's one of the big issues that's there and that's just one of many. You know, it's the fixed verses flexible argument. When you have it fixed you can actually drive a lot more development and a lot more density in close proximity to that transportation corridor. I'll get back to that as I go through some of these comments. And what's wrong with looking at the cost benefits when Mr. Klassen's own information says that the cost continues to slide closer to BRT costs and remember, BRT, LRT cost has the coach cost factored in and while BRT does not. Then you know, I took a careful look, kind of like most of my colleagues here today when Mr. Klassen handed out this piece of paper.

In Vancouver, a system was put in place in 2009 cost $108 million per kilometre, Mr. Speaker. In Edmonton, a system that opened in April of 2010, cost dropped significantly down to $90.8 million. In Calgary an LRT system that's coming on line for 2012 dropped down to $83 million, Mr. Speaker. In Toronto a system that's projected to open in 2013 has further dropped to $69 million. That's the facts, Mr. Speaker. Presented to us by Mr. Klassen so if we're going to take what Mr. Klassen says, then let's take all of it. Those are the facts. That's the way it's sliding. The other thing that's on Mr. Klassen's page when it comes to BRT, there is only one city listed as doing BRT, the City of Winnipeg. Why are all these other cities going to LRT and you know when we started on the BRT bandwagon, sort of 5, 6, 8, 10 years ago, today, in 2010 we see Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary and Toronto LRT. Mr. Klassen further stated demand for LRT vehicles has never been greater. Why would it never be greater, Mr. Speaker? Are other cities investing heavily in LRT? It would seem to make sense to me. So, you know, and that also answers the question. Was it the name of the individual who says that costs are coming down? Well, I'll name that individual. Ken Klassen, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Ken Klassen, right here presented for all of you to hold on to and hold up, gone from $108 million in 2009 opening to $69 million for a 2013 opening. Those are the facts that these people want to use, so I'll gladly use them.

Mr. Speaker, it's also common knowledge that LRT has lower operating costs. It's also the fact; also a fact that because most LRT systems run on electricity, that they create less greenhouse gases. (Inaudible) get a couple of other quick points in here. And you also have to be very careful when some of our colleagues are speaking here, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They seem to jump from using the term BRT in certain situations and then just RT in other situations. You've got to listen very carefully because it's the subtle differences there that allow them to jump to say, oh well I don't know I was in favour of that. I said RT there and not BRT. Because more and more modern cities are driving towards LRT as these prices come down so you've got to be listening carefully to what some of our colleagues are saying here. When they say BRT and when they just use the term RT or Rapid Transit. Some comments were made earlier about changing technology. If technology can change for buses well it will also change for cars and perhaps even for; for LRT as well which will affect sort of a couple of areas in greenhouse gases some perhaps in reducing the cost of doing a fixed modes that generate a great deal more efficiency for us.

And I think we also have to be clear that what we're talking about here is not one versus the other. There are places where BRT will make sense to the City of Winnipeg and I think that first leg of the southwest transit corridor made sense at that time. We have the two big hiccups there are Confusion Corner and Jubilee and I keep going back to this because it is where the greatest benefit happens in that corridor and I guess there are some other spots in the city where you can get buses around some of these problem spots and get them going. And out on to faster moving roadways it's the further out you get in you know, from downtown the quicker the traffic moves because a lot of its spills off so you don't necessarily have to have the dedicated roadways just for buses. Somebody made a comment about; there's a couple of people made the comment that this step is costing a $100,000. Well the alternative to this step is costing $200 million, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think when you look at the facts that were laid out here today, what, especially what Mr. Klassen put on the table and when you see the sliding costs of LRT compared to the cost of BRT holding its own. You see what other cities are doing, we're making a decision to spend a hundred thousand dollars so that we're not sort of using five year or 10 year old information that we are dealing in 2010 and we're not going to spend $200 million without a sober second thought when Mr. Klassen's own information and some of the folks that have used it here today suggest that we should. Mr. Speaker, the other pieces that cost versus value. You know, it's like people stand up and say, oh Bus Rapid Transit is so cheap, its' way cheaper than doing LRT or subways or whatever. Certainly, it's way cheaper, but what's the outcome? What do you get out of it? What do you end up with it at the end of the day? How many people can you move? Where can you move them to and what are the overall benefits from greenhouse gases to the economic benefits at the end of the day when you consider the density and the development that you might get out of it. I just want to quickly do a little visioning for you all here. Where would LRT go if you would do a little visioning?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed?

Councillor Wyatt: Well, I just; you know, there's a piece of land we've talked about a lot here goes through Councillor Orlikow's Ward, …it's a Parker Lands you know, that are coming up for redevelopment right away or sometime in the future. That piece of land if you consider you know, the LRT jumping from over off of Taylor Avenue into that piece of land, travelling out of there, going to the north along the Hydro right of way that exists right down the; on the west side of the Latellier Line where we want to put the BRT on the east side, going out into the Fort Garry Industrial Park where we've listed Fort Gary industrial park as a place where we'd like to see redevelopment for being a new employment lands on stream. From there it goes; it continues on; on this Hydro corridor out into the sugar beats lands where it meets Bishop Grandin and eventually goes out into Waverly West and easily connects from there back into the University. So you've got economic development opportunities, you've got housing opportunities, you've got almost zero land acquisition costs. When you start factoring some of these things in and then you consider the fact that a lot of our modern day planning is talking about live, work and play, all in one area, that we're not necessarily moving; wanting to move you know, thousands and tens of thousands of people down into downtown and you look at some commentary around complete communities where you can find employment and all the amenities you need in a very short distance, you might not necessarily have to run a Rapid Transit system, a Light Rail Transit system very long distance to really get the benefits. And just you know, I...the opportunity to be in Las Vegas over Christmas, and the system that they have there runs fairly short distances but it was installed I think for about $20 million a kilometre and when you look at connecting people from an employment centre like the Fort Garry Industrial Park to a new development like Waverley West, there is some other things that we could be looking at while we're studying LRT. So those are my comments, Mr. Speaker, and I think Mr. Klassen's material certainly has proven the argument that we need to be looking at this better.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Swandel. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, this Motion here today before us is directly linked, Mr. Speaker to the discussion we had previously, pertaining to the Building Canada Fund and listed different projects that we're endorsing. The reality is, Mr. Speaker that you know, the argument that we don't have enough money to do one but we have to do the other is really quite unfortunate, because I really believe that we could have a; be having a discussion solely on LRT versus BRT on its own in terms of what we should be funding, how we should be funding versus the roads and bridges discussion. I'll give you an example. The Province has come in the last; well since last fall and last year $90 million for a stadium, $80 million for roads and centre port $80 million which by the way would've been 80 million going into city's infrastructure roads and $40 million for a bear enclosure for a total of $210 million, Mr. Speaker in the last year alone. This tells you that basically at the end of the day that if the Premier has certain priorities. Those priorities get funded and if they're not priorities, they don't get funded and that's the fact of the matter here today, Mr. Speaker. So we're having this debate about LRT to look at the study. Now, I can tell you in involving since I was directly involved with the RTTF Report, the Rapid Transit Task Force that we were asked specifically to look at the most cost effective way to deliver Rapid Transit to Winnipeg in the most cost effective way Mr. Speaker. Bank your buck, the cheapest way to do is Bus Rapid Transit. There's no doubt about it. And based on our terms of reference, that's what we were; I believe had an onus on us to actually Report back on and that's exactly what we did and we were very specific to that fact. Now we did look at LRT, Mr. Speaker as I pointed out and there are a couple of big differences between LRT and BRT. It was rightly pointed out that the cost is a little bit more for LRT than BRT but it was also said that beyond that there is really

no other difference. Well, that's not quite true. We did note in our Report that the difference between LRT and BRT is that LRT will attract a ridership that BRT will not attract for whatever reason. Why that is the case, I don't know, but it's perception, it's marketability. You will have urban professionals, folks who you know, just will not take a bus for whatever reason but they will take a train. They will take LRT. And the other big difference too Mr. Speaker, between LRT and BRT is volumes. You can fit a lot more people on a train than you can on a bus. It's just a reality even an articulated bus so the volume numbers are higher. You can get more people moving up and down on an LRT line by volume; then you can per hour on a BRT line, Mr. Speaker, according to our report. So those are very clear. But you know, at the end of the day really what does this come down to and why is this here today before us? Well, the fact of the matter is I don't think the Mayor has made it a secret that he does not like BRT. You know he's never liked BRT. He's been opposed to BRT or is just not excited about BRT and you know, so he has this Motion before us today to look at LRT and to say, "Is there a way to do it?" I really; I guess I'm rising today because I want to support this because I'm hoping that this is a sincere effort, that indeed that you know, I know it says 90 days here but we don't need 90 days. This could be done a heck of a lot faster, Mr. Speaker, 90 days. We all know what 90 days means around here. Ninety days means you come back and get an extension for another 30 or 60 days so you're right now back into the middle of the election or after the election. You know, we don't need that, Mr. Speaker. You know, we know a lot of; what a lot of those numbers are. We already have an idea of where the lines would run, all right, Mr. Speaker. We have a lot of the data in terms of the type of operation; what type of LRT would work best for us. You know, the fact of the matter is a lot of research has been done on this already for the City. A Report could be delivered probably in a couple of weeks instead of 90 days. That's the reality Mr. Speaker, if this is truly a priority and I want to say that it is a priority because here before us today being moved by the Mayor.

Now, if you were to ask me would you build BRT still or LRT? Well, I'm telling you right now, I mean it's kind of like saying 90 years ago would you prefer to drink muddy water from the Red River or clean water from Shoal Lake? Well, you know, you prefer clean water from Shoal Lake but I can tell you right now Mr. Speaker, that's going to cost us a heck of a lot more, probably a lot more than six times more than running a pipe to the Red River. So you know, Mr. Speaker, our forefathers had the vision to present a plan to do something different. I mean it was an engineering marvel. Building LRT is not that different. Cities across North America are doing it including Canada. It definitely can be done but what needs to happen is there has to be a business case and there has to be a way to present it to the other levels of government to get or buy-in; in a long term buy in because that's the only way we can assure that this is not political but this is actual public policy development that we're going to be implementing this system, across the City. And not just this year, but as we go forward, building the entire system out and it will probably mean that we'll have to raise taxes or some sort of taxes to pay our costs for this, Mr. Speaker. There's no doubt about that in my mind. We better recognize that right up front that would be a requirement to be able to afford the system because minimum Mr. Speaker, from what I've been able to gather from the discussion today you're looking at probably about a billion bucks to get to the U of M from downtown Winnipeg. So if the Mayor said quote unquote I want to go east west, north and south, well that's a billion; roughly a billion times four and if you add in there Mr. Speaker, the fact that the City is divided actually thanks to the rivers, we really don't have a north, south, east, west. We have an east and west and then we have a southwest, southeast we have a northwest and a northeast. We actually have six legs, you know, we talked about that in our Rapid Transit Report so you could argue maybe upwards of six billions. Who knows? It's a big number. Is it impossible? No, it's not impossible. If we made it a priority, it may mean that in the future, you know what, we are not going to be building many more new roads and overpasses and bridges and anything like that it's not going to be going into this. Maybe that's not such a bad thing. But Mr. Speaker, this could be a remarkable day. This could be I would like; I think this is the beginning of a tremendous future for the City. This Motion right here; moved by the Mayor that going forward we are going to be planning a completely different City. One which is not just simply based on the automobile but one that recognizes that there is an alternative and indeed Light Rail is a real alternative. Now a lot has been said about how can we upset the New Flyer Industries by not building buses? Well, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the New Flyer does business all across North America indeed the world. Canada is a very small percentage of its business. Most of the businesses are out of the United States and we will still need buses, Mr. Speaker. As a matter fact, we know we need buses, our fleet has been in 525 buses since early 1980s. That's got to change. But the reality is Mr. Speaker, you can have both systems as those pointed out by Councillor Gerbasi. And the other thing that's not being mentioned is that we know that LRTs primarily run on electricity and what do we have in Manitoba? We have tons of electricity. It's called Hydro, Manitoba Hydro what an opportunity to be able to power the system with Hydro, the clean energy here in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. So Mr. Speaker, I feel that you know, we have an opportunity. Let us support $100,000 to let I believe that the Report being requested here sincere and it's genuine that this is; can be delivered a lot sooner than 90 days and indeed we could even see before the election is coming forward and an arrangement with the higher levels of government to make a long term commitment to invest in this technology in our city and we have to make that decision pretty soon, Mr. Speaker, because if any of those who were watching the Bus Rapid Transit, they're building the tunnel right now but the minute they have to start laying down some cement down there, that's throw away, Mr. Speaker, because you don't need cement for an LRT system, you can just use track and gravel, go right over top. So, we need to know this soon, we need to know this now. We need to know this in less than 90 days. We need an agreement probably in the next; within 90 days. Never mind a Report. I think it's doable. The Mayor's moving this Motion. It clearly has its full support and

strength behind it. I'm excited by it and I'm glad that; to see the leadership is there to drive this home and I'll fully support the Mayor on that leadership to bring that forward, to bring this proposal back and have a full concrete plan to build LRT across the City for the benefit of all citizens of Winnipeg fully financed with all three levels of government participating, Mr. Speaker. So I'll be supporting the Motion. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Mr. Mayor, is it time for you to do a wrap up?

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker; Mr. Deputy Speaker. First of all, if you look at the Motion, an analysis of corporate cost per kilometre for Bus Rapid Transit and Light Rail Transit. No one could be offended by that. The analysis of the comparative advantages of Bus Rapid Transit and Light Rail Rapid Transit prioritize options for Light Rail Rapid Transit routes, recommend options for the types of light rail technology comparison and quantification of anticipated benefits of Light Rail Transit versus Bus Rapid Transit including incremental taxes generated from development, ridership increases, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Mr. Speaker, the realities are, this is exactly what we should be doing. This is our due diligence and I'm going to go a little further than Councillor Swandel went because if you look, you take a really good look at what Ken Klassen presented to all of Council, and I'm going to assume for a moment he is an expert in the industry, all right? If you start off with Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, which would've been somewhere in the year 2008 or further back, it's started at $168 million cost per kilometre for LRT. It's now dropped down to $69 million. That's a drop of 60 percent, Mr. Speaker. I repeat 60 percent. So don't listen to any elected official. That's what Ken Klassen has said in black and white which very frankly speaking, almost echoes exactly what I've said to Council and the media in the past, $38 million dollars approximately per kilometre, for BRT. Mr. Klassen had it at 37.3 which doesn't include the buses. Fifty million dollars per kilometre for LRT at grade which includes the transportation, the vehicles and then $70 million above grade unfortunately he doesn't differentiate between above at grade or above grade so these numbers are in line. We still need to prove them. Number two, Mr. Speaker, you; well Mr. Speaker you will remember. You may not remember because you may; you were here. October the 22nd, 2008 when we had our lovely discussion on BRT, the first time Mr. Speaker probably in your time you had to eject someone on the floor from Council. Not a Councillor, someone up in the Gallery. Mr. Nick Ternette coming here for over 30 years to do what he does best, have his say and make sure everything is on the table. Agree or disagree with you doesn't make a difference he will say it. I don't know if anybody remembers why he was ejected. He took offence to some comments made by a City Councillor, didn't do it properly and he was ejected. The question is, was he right or was he wrong? What I say through you to Councillor Smith, if you think there is some kind of Agenda which there isn't, why don't you ask Nick Ternette? Because he totally disagreed with what we were doing, totally and you were here so ask him because there is no Agenda. Mr. Klassen, one of the key things he pointed out, do a cost benefit analysis. I think everybody here would concur. That's a great idea. Let's do it. We're not afraid to do that, are we? And you know what, Mr. Speaker, the realities are, other cities are doing their due diligence right now. They have shown in their studies that one, LRT increases ridership. God knows why but some people won't leave their vehicles at home to take a bus. It's a shame but it's the facts; so let's deal with the fact. Our job is to motivate them to leave their vehicles at home. This accomplishes it. Number two, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. This does it. Buses don't. Two weeks ago in the media, they showed what a not so good job the Province is doing. And that includes the City of Winnipeg in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Long term high density development, LRT does it. BRT does not, Mr. Speaker. That's what it's all about. Increasing ridership, getting people to think differently and you know what, no disrespect intended, but there's nothing lovely, okay about LRT. LRT is wonderful. I mean, to say that LRT is lovely, it accomplishes so much more. It motivates people. It gets people to talk about your City. It gets people to stay in your City. It gets your young people to their friends, what a great City, we live in. We're going to stay here. Isn't that what it's all about? Growing your city not for today Mr. Speaker, for 20 or 25 years from now. It's a shame that Mayor Juba did not get the full support of Council to build the mono rail. We wouldn't be discussing this. We would've been the leader, the leader not the follower. That's where we should've been, Mr. Speaker. And I can tell you. I have never been shy because I'm on the public record over and over again that I was a big LRT fan. I've said that to anybody who would listen. Councillor, Premier, Prime Minister, media because I believed that would get the job done and I would accomplish what our goals are. Mr. Speaker, all we're doing is some due diligence and you know what it says a maximum of a hundred thousand. Maybe we can do it for half of that. I don't know and you know what Councillor Wyatt's right. I believe we can do it in less than 90 days. I don't know about a couple of weeks but less than 90 days for sure, Mr. Speaker. No one should be upset, no one should be offended. We should all be doing this together because even Councillor Gerbasi if she saw these numbers were right I have no doubt she would stand up and wave with both arms and support LRT. I have no doubt and I hope to be here for that day, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. That being the end of this discussion. We'll ask that we call the question. All those in favour? Opposed? All right, we'll have a recorded vote. All those in favour, recorded vote.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt, Lazarenko and Nordman.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas and Vandal.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 4.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion passed. Okay, I guess we have Notice of Motions. Are you thinking of coming back?

Mr. Speaker: (Inaudible) a Motion, Councillor Gerbasi, please.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg had previously been involved in a Municipal Partnerships program with the City of Kampala, Uganda to strengthen local government involvement and processes and service delivery initiatives;

AND WHEREAS a Member of Parliament in the Republic of Uganda has proposed the Anti-Homosexuality Bill, 2009, that would target lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender Ugandans, their friends, families and neighbours and anyone else who fails to report them to the authorities, whether they are inside or outside of Uganda;

AND WHEREAS the proposed law:

(a) would impose criminal penalties up to life imprisonment for persons engaging in consensual same-sex relationships;

(b) might inflict the death penalty on persons who engage in homosexual activity while living with HIV; and

(c) would criminalize third parties who failed or refused to report homosexual activity of their friends, neighbours or relatives;

AND WHEREAS the international community, including the Government of Canada, the U.S. Government, human rights groups and others have expressed concern about serious potential violations of the human rights of homosexual individuals and even any unmarried Ugandan adult resulting from this proposed law;

AND WHEREAS human rights groups have identified this proposed legislation as potentially causing severe health problems, hindering the fight against HIV/AIDS by preventing those with the illness from seeking medical attention;

AND WHEREAS commentators have raised concerns about the impact of this proposed legislation on the political process and the rule of law in Uganda as it has the potential to create a political climate of fear where allegations of homosexuality are used to extort or silence government critics and stifle dissent;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg City Council join with the Government of Canada and the international community to denounce Uganda's Anti-Homosexuality Bill, 2009 and any similar legislative proposal.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm rising just to briefly introduce the Notice of Motion on the issue with the anti-homosexual law in Uganda and I'd like to thank Mayor Katz for seconding the Motion. I would like to thank Mr. Hasselriis who recently spent quite a bit of time in Uganda, very courageously as a journalist on this issue and who came to speak to us this morning. This is really an obvious situation of serious threat to human rights of gay and lesbian people in Africa. Winnipeg, the reason; one of the reasons this is here we normally don't deal with these kinds of issues but the reason we're dealing with this one here is that Winnipeg has a special relationship with Kampala through the municipal partnership program we have, so that's one of the reasons that it was a particular concern to this Council to

support this. It's terrifying to imagine that people could actually be put to death simply because of their sexual orientation. I'd also remind you Stephen Harper was one of the; as Mr. Hasselriis mentioned earlier, Stephen Harper was one of the first world readers to speak up against this which I think is very positive and as well as Barack Obama. So I urge this Council to unanimously support this and just whereas; I will just read the - Be it Resolved is that Winnipeg City Council join with the government of Canada and the international community to denounce Uganda's anti-homosexual Bill 2009 and any similar legislative proposal. So I thank you for your support.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors, you are ready for the question? All in favour? Contrary? It's Carried.

By-laws, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that the following By-laws be read a first time by-law No. 39/2010, 42/2010, 49/2010 and 51/2010.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 39/2010, 42/2010, 49/2010, and 51/2010.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-laws numbered 39/2010, 42/2010, 49/2010, and 52/2010 be read a Second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 39/2010, 42/2010, 49/2010 and 51/2010.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Rule be Suspended and By-laws numbered 39/2010, 42/2010, 49/2010, 51/2010 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now, are you ready for this one, Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Always ready.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Question period. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is about, there's a $53,000 study that was talked about that talked about the conversion of the BRT corridor we're currently building to LRT. I would like to know if that study has been completed. Have you seen it? And can all members of Council please see it? Because it seems like it was fairly relevant to the vote we just had and as part of this discussion. Can you please shed some light on that issue? Thank you.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I will try as when Councillor Gerbasi brought this up earlier, I inquired of the C.A.O. and I did get some information which I will be happy to share with you.

The HVR study was a look at the business case for LRT. It wasn't a convertibility study. The convertibility review was done by Dillon with S.D.G. as a sub consultant. The cost for the S.D.G. study was approximately $44,000. I don't know if that's it. If there is more to it I will try and find out but I just found this out in the last ten minutes and I will certainly try to find out any more information on that.

Mr. Speaker: Your second supplementary question.

Councillor Gerbasi: So, are you saying that this study was done but you have not seen it and you have no knowledge of it? Because we just voted to do another study. Would not those two issues be related? And I guess I'm wondering, could you please release that study to all members of Council and the public?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker as I just said, I got an e-mail. It wasn't the study for the first time five minutes ago when Councillor Gerbasi discussed it. Number 2, it had nothing to do with what we were just talking about for the last 45 minutes. What we're talking about is a business case study and to verify what the true costs are for BRT per kilometre verses LRT per kilometer. That's what we're trying to determine. We know all the benefits that come with LRT. So that's what we're talking about. They're totally different and any information that I have access to, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to share with Councillor Gerbasi or any other Councillor. At this point in time I've shared everything I know.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Your final, supplementary, third and final.

Councillor Gerbasi: So are you saying that we are not studying the conversion of the southwest corridor? So are we essentially leaving the southwest corridor then at Jubilee and Pembina? Is that what you're saying?

Mayor Katz: No, that is not what I am saying. What I am saying, it's incumbent upon us as the individuals who are basically elected, to make sure we spend the taxpayer's dollar wisely, to confirm what we've actually seen, presented by Ken Klassen, how the numbers have dropped and to verify the numbers, number 1. Number 2, if those numbers are proven to be accurate, then of course we should be looking at conversion if possible as well.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal your first question.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Mayor a few minutes ago you just said a study was paid for by the City of Winnipeg to verify the true costs of LRT. To verify the true cost of LRT. I wrote your words down. So if we already have a study that seeks to verify the true cost of LRT, why do we need another hundred thousand dollars study today that we've just spent, just to prove.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker nowhere did I use the words "true cost".

Councillor Vandal: Okay, well let's go back a step. Could you please re-read your e-mail on the $53,000 study that was done by the City of Winnipeg on light rail transit?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, it was a $44,000 study. It was the H.D.R. study and it was a look at a case for LRT and nothing to do with a convertibility study. The convertibility review was done by Dillon with S.D.G. as a subconsultant. The cost for the S.D.G. study was approximately $44,000. It actually says 44k. This is a summary that was sent to me from the CAO and I believe it came from Dave Wardrop. For any further information, I think we would have to talk to Dave Wardrop. But that's what I have right now.

Councillor Vandal: Would it not be prudent to actually review the existing studies that have been done by the City of Winnipeg? I'm on the Public Works Committee. This is all news to me to review what actually we've done before we go out and spend another $100,000 on another study that's essentially; my point was this has been studied to death. We're just spending another $100,000 on a study that's going to look at something that we have the information in-house.

Mayor Katz: There was no question Mr. Speaker, but I'll answer it anyways. As we said earlier Mr. Speaker, we're not doing a study, Mr. Speaker. We're going to find out what real numbers. If Councillor Vandal is looking to do a renovation to his home, I would assume he would go to somebody who does this and get a price from them and have it verified. That's exactly what we are planning to do Mr. Speaker. No more, no less, and as it said in the motion, a maximum of a hundred thousand dollars, and Mr. Speaker, you have to understand the big picture. What's going on right now is a good thing because about an hour ago, Councillor Vandal stood up and supported me one hundred and ten percent. On the next Motion, zero percent. That's an average of 55 percent. I'm doing very well today with Councillor Vandal. I want to thank him.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, grab the microphone.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. On May the 12th, the Assessment Department is going to be sending out the notices for this year's tax year to everyone in the City. All the realty taxes basically, and as we know, that this is being a reassessment year coming in effect, there is going to be changes in assessment. We did sent out the notification earlier last year, but folks you know, often will look at the bottom line to see the bill and see what they're paying in terms of the change in assessment and if there's a change related to the reassessment, not related to the change in taxes because we've brought the mill rate down because of the zero percent freeze. Would you be prepared to take up with the Assessment Department Mr. Mayor to see them to ensure that they just don't send a bill out but that they include some key information? They are supplying on their web site but some key information in terms of exactly

what's taking place this year? Because you can't say that information enough. There might be a lot of confusion in terms of why taxes are changing, either up or down.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think it's incumbent upon us to try and communicate the message as clearly as possible, especially when it comes to your property tax bill or your business taxes. It is confusing and I would certainly undertake to make sure that the Department does everything humanly possible to make sure that everybody understands it as best as possible and makes any clarifications necessary and addresses all issues and uses all modes of getting the message out there. I think we should be doing that automatically. As Councillor Wyatt knows, we finally have moved to a two-year cycle which I think is terrific and god willing, if we do it annually, we won't have these significant changes, but yes, I would be happy to speak to the Director and I'll speak to the C.A.O. right after this Council meeting.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, a totally different matter. About, I guess a month ago, I gave the Mayor some information regarding the Canada Mortgage and Housing in terms of the loans that they're providing at a very low interest rate specifically for housing geared toward or for development infrastructure geared toward housing such as residential streets. We know our residential streets budget is 10 or 12 million a year roughly, and we could borrow at a very good rate for projects that could be spent by 2012. It's a year longer than the stimulus monies that we've come up. What's the progress with that? Have you had a chance to pursue that with the staff to see if we can borrow money at a very discounted rate to invest back into some residential streets in the next two years, which easily could be done.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, Councillor Wyatt is absolutely correct. He did contact me and made me aware of that. I immediately contacted the Administration. I actually spoke to the Deputy C.A.O, Mr. Phil Sheegl, who was already aware of that and was already having discussions with the Federal Government on those programs, and I would be happy to follow it up.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. As well, since I have the opportunity, I also raised with the Mayor the issue with regards to red tape and the concern that through anecdotal we're hearing that red tape is getting worse in terms of not the public hearing process, political process which we've contracted, but rather it's taking months since people filed, developers and applicants file for applications, to get in front of a public hearing. Plus at the back end, to get actual zoning agreements it's now taking months again. It's taking upwards of almost a year, if not a year for folks to get a shovel in the ground from the date they applied for an application. Any ideas or suggestions or progress on that file or would you like to take it under advisement?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I had a phone conversation with Councillor Wyatt and he actually; I asked for some follow up. He then left me a message and I intend to meet with the Director of the Department at my next C.A.O. meeting and discuss that and see if we can address those issues. I mean, if what Councillor Wyatt has been told is accurate, it's something we need to address it. There may be other answers to it, as well as I've always learned there's always three sides to everything, so yes we intend to address those issues and discuss them and get specific answers absolutely.

(Inaudible speaking by Mr. Speaker)

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I won't take 20 minutes Councillor Swandel.

Mayor Katz: Take as much time as you want Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I'm going to go back. I apologize but I'm still not clear about these LRT studies that have already been done because we all saw in the Free Press Report that there was a $53,000 study done about convertibility of LRT. Now maybe that was not accurate. That's all the information I have is what I read in the Free Press. Now I hear there's a $44,000; two studies and it sounds like what I thought I heard, and maybe you can just confirm this, but one was about the case for LRT and one was about convertibility of LRT. So there's two studies, one of which cost $44,000. How much have we already spent studying this issue, and will you release those studies for all members of Council to see? I mean, are we just going to reproduce those studies? Is that the $100,000? Like, what's going on? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware to date of a $53,000 study. I'm happy to take that under advisement and try and find it. What I was trying to do in the interim was find out what, if any study has taken place. I think I have read verbatim what I was sent about the $44,000 study. I can also tell you that I know there was work done by the Department on having those who are doing the work verify; it's called a peer session, but other than that Councillor Gerbasi, I don't know of any $53,000 study. I'm happy to try and find out. I haven't seen anything, and if I see it, I will gladly share it with you.

Councillor Gerbasi: Would you be willing to share at least the e-mail you received just now from the C.A.O. then, so we could at least verify the same information you've just received?

Mayor Katz: I think it would be much easier, Mr. Speaker, if I talked to the C.A.O. who is probably sitting right behind me and ask him to send it out.

Mr. Speaker: Your final question.

Councillor Gerbasi: My final question has to do with a Motion that was referred back on condominium conversion today. I moved a Motion that was referred back and I just wonder if you would comment, Mr. Mayor, on your willingness to look at that issue. The Standing Committee refused to even look at the issue of condo conversions, and I wonder Mr. Mayor if you will be prepared to consider that issue which is affecting a lot of my constituents and many of our constituents in the City with the lack of affordable rental apartment accommodation.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding Councillor Gerbasi did move a Motion today. It's automatic referral. I believe it will go back to the Standing Committee. They will take a look at it and I guess you'll have to see. When it gets to EPC I can assure you that I will take a very long look at it and address the concerns and what options may or may not be available.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal, your first question.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to close the loop on the studies that may or may not have been done. Can you verify that you will share the H.D.R. study if it has been done with this Council as well as the Dillon conversion study? Will you confirm you will share those studies with this Council?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thought I already had answered the question but I'll try it one more time. Yes. Yes. Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Your second question Councillor.

Councillor Vandal: We're currently spending over a million dollars on a Winnipeg Transportation Study. My question to the Mayor is do you not think that within that $1.1 million transportation study, that we could have accommodated this recent LRT conversion study that we've just approved for a hundred thousand? Instead of spending another hundred thousand why could we not have included in the $1.1 million transportation study which is currently under way?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, the transportation study is something that's under way and something we've never had in the City unfortunately, which is what has caused us so much of our problems. It's long overdue. For whatever the reason may be, I don't know why it's never happened before. That's the question you can ask people from many, many years ago. The facts are we never had one. We have it; it's underway. That's number one. And number two, in the big picture, it's quite possible, not knowing exactly; these are budgeted; if there is money left over from there, it could be used but in the meantime, that is moving forward and I think it's long overdue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your next question Councillor.

Councillor Vandal: My question was not answered. Why did we need to spend another hundred thousand dollars study on transportation, when we have a one million dollar study on transportation we're currently doing?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to do this one real slow. We are in a situation right now, and Councillor Wyatt has pointed out that time is of the essence. What we want to do is verify that our City can accomplish the goal of having light rail transit, like almost every other major City in Canada has, at the numbers that I have said. And I'll say them again. Fifty million dollars at-grade. Seventy million dollars above grade. That's what we're trying to do. We're verifying the numbers. And if those numbers are accurate, I believe that this Council will unanimously support LRT. This isn't a study. We're verifying the numbers. We're getting a price. I don't think anybody on this floor would say if they're getting a price to renovate their washroom, it's a study. It's getting a price from a credible person in the industry. That's what we're doing Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: (Inaudible).

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make sure first that the Mayor is still committed to doing the study that we asked about here today which is looking at, in light of new information that we have that LRT, the cost and benefits may be in a far better position today that we're committed to going down that path and we're not starting to

go off on some political journey here to deal with some old studies that were done years ago prior to the economic melt down and perhaps the opportunity that's in front of us today.

Mayor Katz: Absolutely.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Sometimes when we're in the heat here we forget things. I think it's important Mr. Mayor if you would be kind enough to read the second last be it resolved. I don't know if you have the Motion in front of you, and let all of Council know. I'll just remind you because apparently you forgot this as well, where the funding source is for the hundred thousand dollars, or perhaps I'll get the Clerk here to walk this across to you. The second last piece. If you could read that out, and I think Councillor Vandal's question will be answered very clearly.

Mayor Katz: Be it further resolved that funding to a maximum of $100,000 be approved for costs associated with undertaking such analysis to be allocated from transit capital account.

Councillor Swandel: Just in closing, can you state what that capital account is (inaudible)

Mayor Katz: Transportation Authority Study.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? Let's get on with our business.

Standing Policy Committee on Finance, no Report. Motions if any. I don't believe there is and there isn't any. Consideration of By-laws, none. Question period, None. Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development Report of April 12th, 2010, Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED APRIL 12, 2010

Councillor Swandel: Gees, now that I have the Floor, I'm tempted to move the rest of it as Consent and we'll be done. I'm pleased to move Consent Agenda Item No. 1 of the Downtown Development Committee meeting of April 12th, 2010.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motions. Consideration of By-laws Councillor Swandel.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker. I'll move that By-law No. 43/2010 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.
Clerk: By-law No. 43/2010.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-law No. 43/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 43/2010.

Councillor Swandel: Now Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the Rule be Suspended and By-law No. 43/2010 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period, None. Standing Policy Committee of Property and Development, the Report of April the 6th of 2010, Councillor Steeves.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED APRIL 6, 2010**

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Regarding Report of April 6, 2010 my understanding is Report number; Application No. 1 has been withdrawn by the applicant. I'll therefore be moving Items 2 through 6 as Consent Items and that No. 1 be struck.

Mr. Speaker: Okay we've had a delegation sitting here since early this morning so your concern has been addressed and has been withdrawn. Okay, of the rest, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED APRIL 16, 2010**

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Report April 16th, 2010 I'll introduce Report and Move the Adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.
(Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Two? And Item 1?

(Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: I thought…okay, Item 1. All in favour? Okay, Item 2.

Item 2 – Expropriation of Land Interests for the Disraeli Bridges Project

Councillor Steeves: I'll just wait to hear comments back, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Every time I rise today it seems that I'm about to berate the Mayor on lack of consultation. I rise to speak against the expropriation of these properties and to explain why it is both unnecessary and damaging to my community. I have never seen a project take so much time, have so many twists and turns on what it would look like yet still not manage to create an opportunity to properly consult with the community about what they needed, about what they would like to see, and how they could be accommodated during construction. This community has made abundantly clear with petitions, protests and placards that they would like to see a dual span six lane bridge with two outside lanes dedicated to transit, room for bikes on both sides of the bridge and accommodation for pedestrians on both sides that can be accessed safely. And yet, the latest regurgitation which in no way resembles any of the possibilities offered to the community over the year ago, is not respectful of community needs. While it has changed it is still a single span four lane roadway with only one pedestrian walkway and a separate bicycle bridge both of which are weighted on the east side of the bridge with no pedestrian or bicycle access on the west side, where people are more likely to walk or take their bikes and where there is a totally residential community and yet, it is proposed that on this side the vehicular access be widened and that parts of 12 properties be expropriated and one perfectly good house be torn down so that an underpass can be widened to accommodate big trucks that may wish to blow through this totally residential community. There is no reason for these big trucks to even enter this neighbourhood whatsoever to access the business and industrial area which lie to the east of Henderson Highway. There is a good regional street with a 24 hour truck route near half a kilometre to the north of the bridge which any sensible trucker now takes if they wish to access that business or industrial area. Why would they even consider going further south and taking the underpass to go to Nairn or Talbot? All they would find if they ever went that way are houses, a playground and a linear park way with a bicycle path for three blocks to the east which ends in a bottle neck intersection where Midwinter merges with Nairn, which is why they don't take it now, and why they wouldn't in the future even if the turn around was widened. They would end up in a bottle neck intersection which is why they don't take it. So widening the underpass is not going to improve that bottle neck. The under passes for local access and widening it would not convince any accessible trucker to go out of his or her way to take the roadway. It takes time. It is circuitous and it's not where they want to be. Why then is this expropriated expropriation being contemplated? Mr. Speaker, it is because of lack of community consultation. The community is so frustrated with the lack of process and poor consultation and the inadequate opportunity for input that the community themselves have organized a survey and have asked themselves the kind of questions that they would like to have seen asked of them and have submitted their answers. I am submitting this information to the Clerk so that anyone he wants to can actually see the community's concerns and it would be nice if someone actually looked at them. Anyone who thinks that the two open houses nearly two weeks ago would qualify as

consultation should have been there. There were two stock answers to the communities many questions. When they were asked about the on ramps and off branch and how the bridge would look like when they found the details on the cartoon 3D video display, hard to visualize they were told that the details had been yet to be worked out. But when they felt they had a better solution to some of the details that were shown they were then told the design had been finalized and they couldn't change it. Either it was a final proposal in which case what was the point of the public consultation and the survey forms or they haven't decided what they are doing and which case why not listen to the community incorporate their suggestions into a better bridge? It's like being told you can choose anything you want from a menu but find that it only has one item on it. It's rather pointless. I feel like this upcoming vote.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. First off, I don't share Councillor Thomas' comments regarding the Disraeli Project. Specifically when there was community consultation, the message that was heard over and over again, with people sign petitions for was a 16 month closure was not acceptable. The most close; the closest bridge was going to take a lot of the traffic to Louise Bridge in the morning at rush hour, our traffic engineers said already. It exceeds its theoretical capacity during AM rush hour periods. There are hours during AM rush hour period, the engineers say this is how many vehicles can go over it. It already exceeds that. The message we; I was hearing a lot clear was that the closure was not acceptable. What we're getting now is a 75 year asset we're getting a brand new bridge. It's going to be here for the long term. Certainly there are people that talk about, you know, six lanes and another things like that; but as it is, this is the largest roadway piece of infrastructure on the City's Capital Budget at this point. This is a huge mega project. That said there is also consideration in our five year Capital Budget at this point to look at twinning and doing a four lane Louise Bridge in the future, perhaps reconfiguring it to line up to the Nairn overpass. That's their conversation to come forward and that's going to alleviate traffic to all of northeast Winnipeg going forward and you know, deal with the future growth especially in the Transcona Ward. So I think this is a reasonable solution. In fact, the proposal that's come forward and you know, through these competitive process is in fact expandable to six lanes. The plenary road project that was adopted by our Administration that had the delegated authority to do so, in fact does have that ability to expand in the future going forward. I was at the open houses regarding the adopted project and certainly, people are wanting to have answers about what's happening in their own neighbourhood. Those answers were there and most of their concerns were being alleviated from what I heard and those are residents from her Ward. In fact, my understanding at this point is the residents in Elmwood that are being involved in the potential expropriation have accepted city offers on almost every one of those pieces of land. So my understanding is that there isn't any issue regarding that those particular parcels of land in Elmwood. Again, I; we're getting a 75 year asset. We're going to get active transportation amenities on the old bridge. We're reusing the old piers. I'm very happy with the way the Disraeli Proposal is going forward and I'll certainly be supporting this piece here, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This particular Report, strictly talking about 14 particular properties for expropriation and that the City continued to negotiate with the property owners of the subject properties that are outlined on Schedule A. And by large, Mr. Speaker I'm okay with the Report, but I just want to state for the record as I did in the Executive Policy Committee with respect to property No. 7, that 120 Higgins Ave. This particular business is; that's been affected is the largest of its kind here in the City and the Province of Manitoba and if there is any way we can try and find a solution there Mr. Speaker, that doesn't impact 120 Higgins then that's sort of what I'd be advocating for and I'm heartened that after speaking with our CAO today that they are looking at that and fully exploring that option with that to mitigate that possible negative effects at 120 Higgins. So I just want to put that and I will be supporting the Report.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, what we're doing here is ensuring we have the ability to move forward and do expropriation if, if necessary. We always; it's always our desire to negotiate and to come to agreeable terms with property owners when we need them for the greater good of the City. I don't think it's appropriate that we should be talking about specific properties and either in Chamber here or negotiating them on the front pages of the newspaper or on television stations. This is a simple procedural matter that allows us to continue to move forward on a piece of infrastructure that is extremely important to the City of Winnipeg. It's nothing more than that. So let's all remember that and act responsibly when we have to deal with matters such as this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers? Any further question? Do you want to close, Councillor Steeves?

Councillor Steeves: Just to say one thing Mr. Speaker, I never really contemplated this possibility but I'll say this once and I'll say it slowly, Councillor Thomas. If we don't pass this Report, we go back to the original contemplated plan which was to close the bridge for the 16 month period because we don't have the land necessary to do the project as altered. If

we don't pass this Report, the new influx of capital put forward by the Provincial Government cannot be accomplished and we are back to the original plan of closing down the bridge for the 16 month period.

Mr. Speaker: Ready for the question? All in favour, Item1? Contrary? Councillor Thomas wants to be recorded and Councillor Wyatt and Vandal in opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Motions. Councillor Steeves, there is a Motion by yourself and Councillor Browaty, confirmation of expropriation. Do you want to introduce it?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Steeves,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

WHEREAS:

(a)Pursuant to its By-law No. 1/2010, The City of Winnipeg authorized the expropriation of the lands described therein and made a Declaration of Expropriation dated the 27th day of January, 2010; and

(b)The Lieutenant Governor in Council has deemed it necessary or expedient in the public interest to direct the confirming authority to make its order confirming the Declaration of Expropriation without an inquiry being conducted under Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated the 27th day of January, 2010, made pursuant to By-law No. 1/2010 and expropriating the following lands:

(a) Parcel A,

(b) the lands taken for Waverley Street,

as the same are shown bordered on Plan Deposit 1065/2009 WLTO, prepared by Leslie Neil McLaughlin of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor

is hereby confirmed.

The lands described above in (a) are expropriated subject only to the following existing interest:

Caveat (Instrument No. 1752865) registered by The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation on December 23, 1993.

The lands described above in (b) are expropriated free of encumbrances.

The aforesaid lands except:

mines, minerals and named substances which are excepted from or not included in the Certificate of Title of the registered owner of the surface under The Real Property Act or are not owned by the owner of the surface under The Registry Act; and

reservations in favour of the Crown as excepted from the Title of the owner of the surface, or to which Title is subject by implication under the provisions of The Real Property Act.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, is this Motion No.3?

Councillor Steeves: As far as I understand it this is housekeeping.

Mr. Speaker: Just housekeeping, it is, yes.

Councillor Steeves: Housekeeping type stuff necessary because the Expropriation Act requires it to come on the table twice, lawyer type stuff, Mr. Speaker. I hope you can spend some time speaking about this.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motions we have Motion No 4 is Automatic Referral and Motion No. 5. This is not your Motion. Okay, that's your; you want this Automatic Referral to be as a Notice of Motion, okay fine. It will be on the Agenda for the next month. No. 5 is Automatic Referral by Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Smith and consideration of By-laws. Councillor Steeves, please.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is committed to affordable housing;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has an extremely low vacancy rate that makes it difficult for many Winnipeggers to find affordable housing;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg currently does not address apartment to condominium conversions and its impact on vacancy rates;

AND WHEREAS the cities of Edmonton, Regina and Saskatoon have condominium conversion policies which regulate the creation of condominium properties;

AND WHEREAS the cities of Regina and Saskatoon have condominium conversion policies which protect minimum vacancy rates;

AND WHEREAS the City of Toronto gives opportunity for tenants to address the conversion of their buildings to condominiums through the Ontario Municipal Board and Tenant Support Grants Program;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg Public Service be requested to report back to Council in 120 days with a report including:

(i) examining the salient issues involved in apartment to condominium conversion in the Winnipeg market, compared with other Canadian markets;

(ii) a proposed policy to regulate Condominium Conversion in the City of Winnipeg.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,

WHEREAS landscaping is important to the well being of City of Winnipeg residents, beautifies our City, and actively combats heat island effect and greenhouse gas emissions, by sequestering carbon and contributing to vital pedestrian environments and beautiful streetscapes;

AND WHEREAS the existing City of Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 200/2006 requires that:

a) a landscape plan be submitted as part of any development application subject to the requirements of Part 5: Development and Design Standards – Landscaping and Buffering;

b) installation of required landscaping and buffering be completed before the City will issue a Zoning Compliance Certificate for the principal building;

c) the owner maintain the required landscaping and buffering areas in conformance with set standards;

AND WHEREAS the existing Zoning By-law implies enforcement by the City of Winnipeg and thus the onus is not on the developer to obtain professional certification that landscaping has been completed and maintained in accordance with approved plans;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has difficulty doing enforcement as this city only has five (5) Zoning Field Officers and therefore, only reactive enforcement, instead of proactive enforcement, is possible;

AND WHEREAS other Canadian cities including Mississauga, Windsor, Barrie, Woodstock and Stratford reverse the onus of enforcement of landscape requirements onto the developer by requiring:

a) landscape plans prepared by a Landscape Architect;

b) landscape work securities (letter of credit);

c) *Certificate of Inspection, prepared by a Landscape Architect.*

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

Councillor Steeves: I will move that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law 37/10, By-law 38/10, By-law 41/10.

Mr. Speaker: Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 37/2010, By-law No. 38/2010, By-law No. 41/2010.

Councillor Steeves: I will move that the following By-laws read a first time. By-law 40/10, By-law 44/10, By-law, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, all of 2010.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 40/2010, By-law No. 44/2010, By-law No. 45/2010, By-law No. 46/2010 By-law No. 47/2010, By-law No. 48/2010, By-law No. 50/2010.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move the By-laws No. 40/2010, 44/2010, 48/2010 both inclusive and 50/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered. 40/2010, 44/2010, 48/2010 both inclusive and 50/2010.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move the Rules be Suspended. By-laws numbered 40/2010, 44/2010, to 48/2010 both inclusive and 50/2010 be read a third time and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Mr. Speaker: Standing Policy Committee Protection and Community Services, Report of April 8th of 2010, Councillor Pagtakhan.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED APRIL 8, 2010

Councillor Pagtakhan: Please to move Consent Items 1 through 5.

Mr. Speaker: No. 4? Councillor Gerbasi, are you saying No. 4?

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, No. 4 so 1, 2, 3 and 5 as Consent Agenda. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 4.

Item 4 - The City's Role in the Provision of Arenas

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker. I will refer to my colleagues and respond after.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Item I'm speaking to is the City's Role in the Provision of Arenas Report. There are a number of red flags that what's the problem? Oh sorry you were waving at me. There are a number of red flags that this Report raised concerns. First it's clear that our existing facilities, arenas many of which are located in the Inner City and an older neighbourhood have been ignored and neglected. We know this is true. It's been going on for a long time unfortunately; so, we also know that a lot of money is going to shiny new private sector type facilities while our existing facilities are falling apart. There seems to be a lot of money around recently for fancy privately controlled recreational facilities such as the new Youth for Christ Project, a luxury hotel and water park near the Forks. We're also seeing a new rink complex being built at the edge of the city and far from flung suburbs and I know that Council didn't ask for that to happen. That was other levels of government, but it's happening. And it has no connection to any recreational plan that we have. I'm concerned because I occasionally hear talk about this from some members of Council that the idea of mega facilities and the closing down of local neighbourhood facilities and that there is momentum behind this approach. Now it's certainly true that in some cases mega facilities may certainly make sense and I'm not opposed to the idea of any mega facilities but there is also a great need for local neighbourhood facilities particularly in Inner City areas where people have no means of transportation. This is not something; I don't think all members of Council have embraced this mega facility idea completely. Local, walkable recreational facilities are the fabric of many neighbourhoods. They're essential. And they are the strength of the neighbourhood in many cases so the Report kind of harkens to potential closing of some facilities by saving money. And it also talks about doing an RFP for the private sector to take over operating and managing some of our facilities. We talk about sustainability a lot these days in our new City Plan but having to drive to your recreation facility to the edge of town or far away is not really a very good sustainability approach. And this maneuver now to move further into the private sector to run our currently publicly run arenas concerns me. I'm not sure where this is going. The timing is conveniently so that none of this will happen until after the next election but I think it should be clear that this is a thing putting; being put forward by this particular Council and asking the Administration to go in that direction, a more privately run facilities rather than public and I just think the public needs to know this. It isn't clear to me how having our City facilities privately operated and manages going to work in terms of providing accessible, local and convenient services for everyone. We already have arrangements with some nonprofit groups and I realize there is a place for that. However, when we start expanding the role of the private sector too far we end up with it to be more about dollars and cents than services that and public access for all of our citizens. The Report shines the light as I mentioned before and the fact that we've under invested and neglected many of our existing facilities but the response is to turn them over to the private sector or close them down and I'm not sure if the Public is fully aware of the implications of that. I mean, recreation is a core service. It's not something that we should be turning over to the private sector. And it doesn't seem to me that it makes sense that the private sector's going to pick up the tab for fixing up these old facilities. That's really up to us. They are our facilities and I'm not sure how that's going to work. So I just urge Council to think very carefully before they support the approach put forward in this Report. And I'm concerned about it. I think citizens should be concerned about it. I guess we'll find out the real implications after the election and after these RFPs come back. But I hope there's going to be; the Report also by the way doesn't talk about any public consultation of approach as part of this. So I certainly hope that there will be if they are looking at shutting down inner city arenas or turning them over to the private sector so I hope that's part of the plan and I just wanted to put people on notice that I have some concerns. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Smith please.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I can not support this Clause. You know, the purpose of the Clause is towards more financially sustainable model for years, a more financially sustainable model. That means they want to in affect transfer out of these certain arenas if they can and give it to the private sector. And also this is alternate recreational facilities. You know, what alternative facilities? Where they consulted the public in my neighbourhood for example; what do they want as alternative recreational facilities? You know how this has come about; there was the recreational leisure and library facility policy in 2005 and it said this, a commitment for manage care level of maintenance for new facilities and where possible for existing facilities, where possible. It doesn't list what ones are unmanaged facilities. You know, there's in effect nothing in here to give an idea that we've been maintaining these facilities. Also there's a wording; wording in the Clause. It says for example, the generally accepted Canadian Standard for the provision of indoor ice, the generally accepted Canadians; what Standard is this? Why haven't they listed it? There's no; it's just a bunch of words. You know, this is not very good. It means that we're going to continue…(inaudible) what's that? Councillor Steeves is mumbling around, but the fact is, look at it, there's nothing happening with the arenas. Why don't we have more of them under managed care? Which ones were under managed care? You know, it said where possible for existing facilities. The budget doesn't allow it to happen. In other words, where possible, does not come in to it because we don't budget for maintenance on a management level. So like, you know, which I just think you should not be supportive of this Clause because, you know, it really, in effect, says we want to get rid of the arenas, and it's because we're not maintaining them that we want to do this, and we want to find ways of getting out of them, and I don't think that should be done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Next, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. I think this policy actually starts on the right path and then falls off a cliff a bit because I believe that the best groups to run these facilities are Community Centre groups who are located there, who needs some; who needs some extra revenue sources to be able to sustain themselves and could work in cooperation with other Community Centres in running some facilities. My concern obviously is the fact that downloading or offloading the arenas to the private sector, in some cases it may work, especially in those megaplexes, but will this take away from our existing local Community Centres? For example, I have one that's on the hot list of being closed. However, I believe that the proper preschool that would be able to facilitate and run that either as an arena or another alternative option would be the best group would be a Community Centre group to do that. Again, you're keeping it in the community fold and that's very important. So I am quite concerned and so my questions will be; my vote is not to terminate at this point and I'm hoping that I'll get replies to two of my questions. One is more of a process question that these EOIs, will they be voted on or brought back to Council before they're approved? And secondly, is there a recognition of the fact that having the private sector and the community organizations; it is an unlevel playing field? Private sector is able to gather much more resources quickly than a community group can. They need some more time to be able to get all the pieces together. So, again, if we're just going to send out the tender and say, okay, come back with your ideas, Community Centres and community groups need more time to do that than the private sector. So I'm not sure if that will be taking into consideration when we're doing this. So simply my two questions were: one is Will this Council be able to vote on it on the EOI? Whatever comes forward, and, B, what provisions are there to help the community organizations to make a competitive bid. That's it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Whenever I look at this Clause, I can't help but thinking about our Operating Budget because I voted against our Operating Budget because I felt some of our financing principles was not sustainable. They certainly weren't financially sustainable or sustainable from a community perspective. If I remember right in our Operating Budget, we transferred $6 million of unused Capital money, and what that is is when there's a budget that has a million dollars for street repairs, we spend 800,000, there's 200,000 that is unallocated so we scooped up 6 million of that, and we transferred it to balance the Operating Budget. And that's not a very sound budgetary principle because many of those dollars are Capitalized over 20 years. They should be going towards Capital Projects such as arenas. They should not be going to paying for the salaries of Administrators in the City of Winnipeg and other Operating Costs, and that's something we've been doing more and more of lately. We've been scooping one time dollars that should be going into community facilities, and we've been putting them in to support the Operating Budget because we don't want to raise taxes. Everyone wants better services. So we're doing more with less and we're just cobbling together these short term scratch and claw budgets to make sure that we get re-elected. I'm not talking about myself because I voted against it. So I would've; I'm wondering how many arenas we could've actually brought up to a good condition with that $6 million in the 20; that was allocated to the 2010 Operating Budget. I believe there was another 5, 6 million in 2009. There was probably some in 2008. It's all part of the problem. It's all part of let's get out of public services that, the philosophy, the less government is better, the right wing philosophy that we have around here, and that's what we have. We have arenas that are in poor condition. We have to do something with them. That's what I don't like about this. What I like about this is going out to the public through the expression of interests process and gauging what's out there from community organizations, from some private sector organizations that may have a better idea for amalgamating some of them in strategic locations based on the fundamental principles of Ralphs or Puffs or whatever it's called what we approved and making sure that our constituencies are well served with recreational facilities, and that I like because I think that because of our philosophy; and it's not just; it's because of our philosophy of cobbling together budgets from money from absolutely anywhere and slowing principle out the window, we're in the situation by I do like the fact that we're going out and we're asking about potential there, and I think that there's a great benefit to that. So, for that reason, I'm going to support it to the next level, but I think that we really have to be involved at the next level from a constituency, a community perspective because nobody knows our communities better than us, and I look forward to what comes back through the EOI, and hopefully we can build some new facilities somehow, but it's going to take public investment. There's no two ways about it. There's not a lot of incentive for the private sector to go in and purchase an arena or run an arena because there may be some opportunity there, and we don't know unless we ask but I don't see a heck of a lot of incentives from the privates coming in and doing something with the Bertrand Arena, but there may be some potential by amalgamating a few of them in strategic locations with other attractions and that's why I'm going to support it to the next level and I'm going to keep an eye on the next budgetary year to make sure that whenever we cobble together these unused Capital dollars to make sure that everything balances on the operating side, we're hurting our arenas, we're hurting our swimming pools, we're hurting our infrastructure, and we need to put together some really sustainable principles both on the Capital side and the Operating side in the future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I find myself rising on almost every issue I've spoken on today to get people to pay attention to what's in Reports or information that's already been presented to us. I

think just reading the Recommendation that came out of Committee, we can have some of the questions answered very quickly. Councillor Orlikow, Councillor Gerbasi might want to pay attention to lines like now the City of Winnipeg solicit expression of interest from the private sector and community organizations. Of course you'll set timelines so the community organizations can be involved. You're putting it right in there as part of the expression of interest. Further, the construction of operation of new multi-pad, public use arenas with prime consideration being given to strategic geographic locations so as to maximize accessibility for Winnipeggers. That's part of the expression of interest. So this idea, you know, we're never going to have, and we all agree with this. I don't think anybody believes that we're going to have the days where you have an arena almost every ten blocks. So it's just no longer feasible and you know, the baby boomer demographic has gone away. You know, we probably don't have that type of need any more. There's also a sustainability argument to be made when we talk about megaplexes. You start doing these things and using all the power and the equipment that's required and the chemicals that are required to run these, you don't maximize what you can get out of one site, you're not being sustainable. We've made a commitment on this Council to try to be sustainable as a City. There's some sustainability pieces here that people need to pay attention to rather than trying to play politics. I guess some of the other things that were mentioned were somebody used the term "neglect." I don't think our facilities are there because in the situation that they are because of neglect. I believe they're in the situation they are because they're at the end of their life cycle. Some of us today; some of us today considered community rec facilities as an important issue on the priority list that we passed earlier. Some amongst us were willing to abandon the Inner City when it comes to those types of priorities and put all their eggs in to just BRT as the only basket. So you know, we need to pay attention to what we're doing here because we had this priority in front of us today, and some folks amongst us voted against it. So if you want to wear the hat of champion of the Inner City, pay attention to how you're voting because you had the opportunity to vote to support this type of philosophy already today.

Thankfully there are those of us that are willing to look at the entire spectrum that needs of the City and make informed decisions. I think Councillor Vandal made some good comments. He actually at the end, he mentioned some of the value philosophy or value initiatives that we need to be doing. I think he's probably has one of the Wards that you can find value in the most because he's got a couple of aging single stand alone arenas and he's got some strong community centres that can maybe come together, and you know the community base can find the ability to operate maybe one of these regional type facilities. So there is; there's a lot of value when we're talking about this. On the other hand, Councillor Vandal also made the comment about using Capital dollars to put them back in to the Operating Budget. I again find myself having to remind my colleagues here today that the Capital dollars start at the Operating Budget, and we; it's not unusual for us when we find money to use that money to offset tax increases. There are all opportunities coming in front of us. We have to be sensible when it comes to how we're going to generate revenue, but to stand up and to suggest that we should be raising taxes as opposed to using money that's available to us. I don't think is a wise thing to do for our City. I guess you know, just the answers are all here. This isn't an issue of Inner City versus the rest of this City. This is just good value. You know; the private sector works in that in gaining value for taxpayers and for the users of recreational facilities as a partner, so be it. I mean it would be great if we could do it all with community organizations. History has told us that in our; in our; the communities where the socio-economic situation isn't as strong as in some of our other communities that we don't have that volunteer base to rely on, and we have to look at other opportunities and ways of getting it done where probably somebody else, either the City or some sort of a partnership whether it's the YMCA or whoever else is from the private sector is involved in ensuring that we can maintain these facilities and provide these recreational opportunities that we all, all of us, not just those of us who like to lean to the left as far as we can, but all of us are champions for Inner City recreation as one of the things that are vital to ensuring that young people in the Inner City have proper recreational amenities as an alternative to some of the other choices that they might make. So I don't think we need to be standing up here arguing over this. I think we just need to move ahead and get this done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I'm going to keep my comments brief. I'm going to be supporting the Clause coming forward, but I'd like to add a couple things, Mr. Speaker, and that is there are actually initiatives or I know one initiative under way already in terms of one of these arenas to have a reuse of the site initiative already under way with the City and with the community pertaining to Roland Michener which is in my Ward. It's actually the highest subsidized on the list, I think $195,000, and initiatives already under way because it was identified, if you recall, in the G.C.W.C.C. Report that came to Council last year as a site to be decommissioned with consolidation of multi-use facilities at other; at another Community Club in the neighbourhood, but the key thing, Mr. speaker, is that the way I read the Report is I think there's enough flexibility in the Report that the Administration understands that there's an issue that is already under way, that these initiatives under way would not be jeopardized by this. This is pertaining to all of the arenas that are going forward in the City, and I think also Mr. Speaker, that; Mr. Deputy Speaker that, we need to invest in our arenas. There's no doubt that this $50 million identified is part of the $380 million infrastructure deficit that we're facing. It's just one part of it on an annual basis. And this, Mr. Speaker, speaks to the need for us; arenas are a core municipal responsibility. Recreation's a core municipal responsibility. We should be reinvesting in them and coming up with a strategy to do

exactly that. Clearly going towards a multiplex type of strategy will; is probably the best thing to do, and specializing probably with regards to each multiplex, but the reality is, you know, the $15 million given last year by the Province to the Mooseplex out in Headingley, you know, a $20 million project, $15 million from the Province, five million from Chipman, a very good deal, you know for the Moose, the reality is, Mr. Speaker, that's already having an impact on our arenas and our community club. I know one community club that has twin ice in my community that just has lost all of their ice time for next summer to the new facility. So community clubs and arenas in the City are already being directly impacted because of that decision. So we have to make sure that this is done wisely, that we go forward in terms of how we manage this, and hopefully done in cooperation with the Province so that they don't sidetrack us again with another announcement that will take even more business out of our existing community clubs, facilities, and the city arenas. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Wyatt. Just a comment, the MTS Iceplex is in St. Charles Ward, not in Headingley.

Councillor Wyatt: Oh, okay. (Laughter)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You can see Headingley from there. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I would like to move a Motion to Refer this Item Back to Standing Committee, and I believe I have three minutes to speak to that. The reason I'd like to see it Referred Back is not just because I wasn't there and I was at a family funeral and missed it, but because in reading the Clause, I find that people on both sides of the issue are coming forward and explaining why it's important to do this, and that it's going to be better for our recreation, leisure, and library facilities if we do this, and I think everybody has good points on both sides, but in looking at the Clause, I don't believe the Clause answers those concerns, and I think it would be due diligence if the Standing Committee had an opportunity to take and ask those questions of the Administration, and I'm sure that if we had a month to do that, that we could bring it back forward and make sure that this ends up being a solidly agreed to Motion rather than a Motion that ends up both groups speaking on different sides of the Motion thinking that it's better for the community but really the issues that they're talking to not being addressed in the Clause itself. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Thomas, we'll throw the mic to Councillor Pagtakhan, the Chair of…

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Just with respect to the Motion to Refer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, time is of the essence here. We need to; this is a Recommendation that's coming forth from our Public Service from the Director of Community Services, and that they're looking to develop the Expression of Interest. They're already starting it now. And you know, we need to get moving on this because the arenas within our City don't currently reflect the current needs and requirements of our community. So getting a better handle of what that is is extremely and critically important. So with that you know, I think that it's important we proceed with this, and proceed on the path that here today with respect to voting on this matter today and not to Refer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, we've heard Councillor Thomas ask to Refer, Councillor Pagtakhan to in Opposition to that. I'll call the question on that. All those in favour of Referring the... Those opposed? Chair, record the vote. Let's do that. All those in favour of referring the Motion.

Councillor Steeves: (Inaudible)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of referring the Motion?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith, Thomas and Wyatt.

Nays

Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal and Nordman.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 5, Nays 9.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Motion to Refer is defeated. We have one more Speaker on the Clause and that's Councillor or unless; okay, you can continue, Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. It seems awfully strange to me that there's been studies, studies, and more studies referred to and we seem to have copious time to review our position on Rapid Transit, but when we want a month to look a little bit more closely on these Recommendations, we have to hurry up and do it right away, and people aren't interested in more scrutiny. I find that odd. I had thought when I walked into the Chamber today that I might be voting for this Clause, but I find that the arguments that have been presented to me today about their concerns with regard to the Clause that I feel need to be addressed have led me to vote against this Clause, and I think if it would have been Referred Back, it might have gone through unanimously, and that's sad. You know, I think that it's great that we will be looking at priorizing and making sure that arenas remain open within a facility where the population ratio is good, that they're going to be strategic. However, I would like to point out to this Council that there was a Community Centre that had a very high rate of population, that had a high number of children of low income that was a low income facility that was run rampant over a community that stood up and said they were willing to take responsibility for this. Manitoba Métis Federation was willing to put money towards and help this out, so you know, I really want to make sure that the "i's" are dotted and "t's" are crossed before we go forward with this proposal because unless it's clear what the community needs to do, the community can do back bends and still find their Community Centre or their arena knocked down and while I feel that Terry Sawchuk is strategically located in the middle of my Community and there's no way that it would be knocked down or thrown out with the bathwater, I've already seen that occur, and I can't support this Clause because it's not clear to me what's going to happen here and clarity is what's needed. Thank you.

Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Thomas. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When it comes to recreation infrastructure, I believe the number one priority is accessibility. I believe even Councillor Gerbasi said that in her opening comments. What really works I find in a lot of the communities I think a lot of my colleagues today have said this as well; is the fact that community run organizations have done a very good job running infrastructure. One of the examples that's often brought up both in the media and by people is the Gateway Rec. Centre Complex. They've had two sheets of ice there, had an indoor soccer pitch. They started building these facilities 20 years ago now. When it comes to accessibility, when it's on public land, it's in fact, a civic asset at the end of the day, and it falls under the City's Ice Allocation Policy. There's always conflict in all these things, but there's a fair and measured way to deal with these you know, conflicts with ice usage, and it's at least somewhat fair and reasonable and it's consistent between City Owned and Operated Facilities as well as those that are community operated such as Gateway. I went last week after this Report came out to go take a look at River East Arena, the one in my Ward that's identified as being at crisis response level. While there certainly were some glaring; well not glaring issues, there were certain issues that were identified to me by the staff, I was surprised how much was actually good in that facility in terms of the building envelope, the ice lab, and things like that. What we need to be very cognizant of is when we do start looking at consolidating, if you take Sawchuk and if you take River East and combine it with Gateway as, Rinks 3 and 4, you have to look at the other programming that's available in those facilities. River East Arena for example, has a very popular day care drop in program and kinder program that is operated out of that facility. In fact, it was just brought to my attention their Operating Costs and operating hours are really high because there's a free on operating plant for the ice, and there has to be a carded, a licensed operator of that ice plant in the building even when there's nothing happening on the ice. So you know, looking at recommissioning the River East Facility for some type of other use because, again, there are a lot of things that work there, would be very possible and I think beneficial to the community.

I just want to mention again, I want to thank this Council. We had an opportunity earlier this year to redo the roof at Gateway Rec Centre. We didn't pay 100% of the dollars as we would if we started doing these facilities right now. We didn't even pay a third of the project. We had rink funding from the Province and the Federal Government that paid for over two thirds of it. Gateway Rec Centre through their resource fund, they are doing responsible thing and putting away money for the eventual maintenance that needs to be done on these facilities. They are able to fund a good chunk of it themselves, and part of it is loan guaranteed by the City as well so again, there is a better model. We need to look at each of these individually in each case, but what we're doing here today is just looking at those particular opportunities so I'm definitely very supportive of what we have here today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Councillor Pagtakhan, do you want to sum up?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to thank everyone for speaking today, and I heard a real common theme that arenas are really near and dear to everyone's heart. And obviously, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are community assets within the City of Winnipeg. That also presents a great opportunity all right, that where we're at today. And that's what this Report is talking about, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about an opportunity for our department, Protection and Community Services or for the Director of Protection and Community Services to go out and solicit

requests for Expression of Interest to see what type of uses can appeal to citizens of this City. Now, arenas are well utilized from I can't remember where exactly, but October till March of every year. And for the balance of the year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's an opportunity for those facilities to be utilized by other groups, whether it's basketball, volleyball, gymnastics, indoor soccer. There are many; there are a whole host of organizations, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in our City that I think that are just waiting for the opportunity to partner with us to provide a wider and more varied amount of leisure activities for members of the community interested in those particular sports programs so this is what this is what it's talking about. It also is providing us as Councillors a very detailed analysis of our inventory. And yes, you know, there's certainly work that needs to be done with respect to our arenas, but I think this is the first step and a good first step, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with respect to making our Council in addressing a viable investment solution towards arenas in our City, and this Report isn't talking about closing anything down, certainly not doing that. It's talking about looking at opportunities to partner with organizations to address some of the needs like, I can tell you in Daniel Mc. you can go there on any given weekend; Daniel Mc. entire High School, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and you know what, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Councillor Smith has been there himself, basketball, basketball, basketball. Now there's an opportunity for perhaps at Sargent Park for some of that or for any other arena. Now with respect to indoor soccer, there is a whole demand for indoor soccer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so let's look at that, and the Director of Community Services has told me that they are going to be very sensitive ensure; to ensure that they pull in and they actually research and pull in all of the various sports organizations to make sure that they give them ample opportunity to respond to this request for Expression of Interest. So you know, the Department is extremely sensitive to that, and they want to find a solution. They're going to go ahead and do this work throughout the course of the summer and come back to us later before the calendar year ends. And this Report is important for them to allow them to do that because, as you can see from the Report, the state of arenas certainly needs attention, and this will allow us to provide us that attention with the relevant data that comes back from the Request for Expression of Interest, which we will, by the way, be voting on, analyzing and more than likely have a Council seminar on as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Pagtakhan. Being no further speakers, call the question. All those in favour of the Report? Those opposed? Thank you. All right, we have Councillor Smith and Councillor Thomas in opposition. Thank you.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, being; there are no Motions, Mr. Clerk, is that correct? And there are no By-laws to consider.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Question period for Councillor Pagtakhan. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Councillor Pagtakhan, there's only two of the arenas that were under managed care, and we've let the others deteriorate down to a crisis situation. Why is that?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for the question. You know what, looking forward, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are going to address that and I think this is the first step, like I say, with respect to the previous Report and the Clause on that. And you know, it's just a matter of scarce resources and prioritizing. So here we are. We're moving forward and we're going to address that issue, and hopefully we'll have a community partner with respect to those particular arenas.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any other questions for Councillor Pagtakhan? Being none. Oh, second question.

Councillor Smith: Councillor Pagtakhan, are you saying that it is budgetary, that we didn't budget enough for managed care for these facilities?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Like anything in our budget process, there's many priorities that we have, and you know, this is the first time hearing from Councillor Smith with respect to with whatever arenas he is referring to. I can just say on a go-forward basis, we're here now, on April 28th, 2010, and we're moving forward and we're going to address that problem, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mayor Katz: Are you aware that both the PUFFS reports and the RALPHS Report was extremely critical of the way Council was managing the Community Centres as far as their maintenance and the fact that previous Councillors weren't doing their job? Were you aware of that?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much for the question. I am aware of it now. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any further questions? Okay, we'll move on to Standing Committee of Infrastructure, Renewal, and Public Works, and in the Councillor Clement's absence Councillor Swandel is going to put the Report forward.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED APRIL 6, 2010

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I will move the Report or Introduce the Report and move Adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Motions. There's no Motions? There are no By-laws to consider. Questions. Are there any questions that anyone would like to put forward about infrastructure? All right, being no questions, we'll move to Secretariat Committee and ask Councillor Lazarenko to make a Motion.

REPORT OF THE
COUNCIL SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE
DATED FEBRUARY 8, 2010

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to move the Report of February 8Th of 2010, introduce the Report, and move its Adoption Consent Agenda Item No. 1.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

REPORT OF THE
COUNCIL SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE
DATED APRIL 12, 2010

Councillor Lazarenko: Report of April 12th, 2010, I Move and Introduce the Report and move Adoption of the Consent Agenda Item No. 1.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Lazarenko: By-laws.

COUNCIL SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, we have some By-laws.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I Move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws No. 9/2010, By-law No. 10/2010, By-law No. 52/2010.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-laws numbered 9/2010, 10/2010, 52/2010 be read a second time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 9/2010, 10/2010 and 52/2010.

Councillor Lazarenko: I Move that the Rules be Suspended By-laws numbered 9/2010, 10/2010, 52/2010 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Just before we adjourn, ladies and gentlemen, I'd just like to make an apology on behalf of the sound system that we've had today. I guess we had something crash on the main computer and just to say to Fred and Andrew, what a great job you did getting us through the day on the sound side of things so we appreciate it. I guess we'll move to adjourn. Roll call.

Councillor Lazarenko moves adjournment that Council do now adjourn.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor Lazarenko, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Gerbasi, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Swandel.

Council adjourned at 4:57 p.m.