COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, December 15, 2010

The Council met at 9:31 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 Eadie.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman, His Worship Mayor Katz; Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Smith, Steen, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal and Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: We have two Pages with us today. Ladies where are you? There we go. We would like to welcome Madison Fedyck of Glenlawn Collegiate who resides in the North Kildonan Ward. Give us a wave Madison okay and Alex Goodman of St. Mary's Academy who resides in the Old Kildonan Ward. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you for being with us today. We have guests with us today, the ladies from the Taking Charge Program at Red River Community College are in the Gallery with us today, so welcome. And other members of the community and the media are certainly here today.

MINUTES

Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask Adoption of the Minutes, Councillor Browaty, would you move that, please, of the November; September 22nd, November 2 and November 10th meetings, taken as read. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: We have five delegations with us today, some of them speaking for ten minutes, some speaking for five. We'll invite Mr. Ternette to come forward and make a ten minute presentation.

Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, Mayor Sam Katz and Members of City Council. Please be aware that I am here today as Chairperson of the Transportation Committee of the Manitoba League of Persons with Disabilities and I am not representing myself otherwise I wouldn't be here. On the one hand, we are here to support City Council's Public Works Committee approval to allow changes to Handi-Transit eligibility that will allow people with Alzheimer's disease and other dementias to be eligible for Handi-Transit rides.

We understand this will likely lead to about 700 more people using Handi-Transit. However, and I want to be clear, it was the Manitoba Human Rights Commission who forced Handi-Transit to make this decision after the Alzheimer's Society filed a Human Rights complaint against them over 5 Years ago and to took the Human Rights Commission 5 years to make that decision and they required the Alzheimer's Society to sit down with the Handi-Transit people to negotiate a contract to allow them it use the service. And there are certain conditions that both sides have had to agree. But, it wasn't because Handi-Transit was in a good mood, a Christmas mood and cheerful mood of allowing more people to use Handi-Transit; it was because they were told to. However, MLDP and other disability organizations are concerned about the formalization of Handi-Transit eligibility rules, which will; which were originally introduced in 2006. This is what you're doing today, beyond the other part of the Motion. It is especially concerning that many individuals with disabilities, including myself, were not involved in those initial developments of the eligibility rules and we're not sure that if we agree with many of them. While on the one hand Transit began offering free rides to people who had Handi-Transit Passes, a very good thing, it also required licenses to be reassessed every 3 years by the Handi-Transit staff, even if the registered had a doctor's note.

We do not agree, as Catherine Caldwell the Manager of Handi-Transit suggests that assessments by Occupational Therapists are preferable to doctor's notes. That is simply not fair to suggest that they are more qualified than a doctor to make certain decisions. Ms. Caldwell indicated Occupational Therapist can better judge how severe a person's arthritis condition is, as it varies, and the point is many people who have arthritis have been denied service by Handi-Transit because Handi-Transit Occupational Therapist has indicated that they are perfectly capable of walking to take regular transit when others have not been; have been given access to Handi-Transit. I think it's a very subjective

manner of judging and I think it ought to be looked at. That is simply not true, that Occupational Therapists can better judge how severe (inaudible) that's like saying an Occupational Therapists better qualified to determine someone's physical ability who has been diagnosed with fibromyalgia, also a condition that varies in severity. Some days it's so severe that you have to use Handi-Transit, other days you can use regular transit. You can not simply have people who have that condition being discriminated against. We would recommend, this is our suggestion, that both Physicians and we're talking about the personal individual physician and the physician that works for Handi-Transit, as well as Occupational Therapists, work together, come together in a collective fashion as they do when they assess cancer situations, which is what they did in conducting assessments, where the condition is not clear that that person is immediately eligible for Handi-Transit. Doctors and Therapists working together as a group collectively will make a far better decision and a more human decision; Human Rights decision than Occupational Therapists that seem to be out to lower the number of Handi-Transit Registrants. MLPD received many complaints from individuals who have been disqualified from Handi-Transit by Occupational Therapists to the point that we suspect that they want to lower the number of Handi-Transit Users and that is not what this (inaudible) is all about. Handi-Transit is a parallel Service to provide public service to those who have disabilities and to try to create an environment where people have to fight for the service is simply unjustified. On the issue of Handi-Transit Fares, it will be the result of pressure put on by the students and senior's organizations, that the Manitoba Human Rights Commission will again force the hand of Handi-Transit to provide equal fares to students and seniors who take regular transit. As there are only 12 students at the present time registered with Handi-Transit. It would be a minimal cost to provide a reduced bus pass probably 20% off the regular bus fare.

On the other hand, however, seniors presently make up 52% of the Handi-Transit ridership and 70% of the total Handi-Transit registrants. Reduced senior fares will result in a $240,000 loss for Handi-Transit. So while Handi-Transit has accepted the equalization concept because of pressure again of equality, between seniors and students, they're going to hold off suggesting that the seniors issue be implemented until 2013. However it's going to happen and you'll have a significant loss in revenue. All these changes are being done with the new fare collection technology that is a smart card being developed for the regular transit. However, Handi-Transit won't be able to have smart cards. There won't be any need for cash or tickets, but rather, a photo Identification which will save about $10,000 in printing of tickets and Handi-Transit passes are going to be looked at. Two mechanisms are presently being looked at building. One is that a client will be sent a billing once a month with fares deducted from their account on the days of their trips and the second mechanism is a once a month billing for trips they have taken and can send in their cheque. However, consideration is going to have to be taken into account that some clients would have cognitive difficulties while receiving monthly bills and would probably prefer to pay up front and I understand that that is going to remain in place. There is even discussion concerning attendant fares where attendants can ride free of charge when travelling with clients who require attendance, which would ultimately be a loss of revenue of $160,000. Attendants currently pay a regular fare even if they have their own bus pass, when accompanying a client on a regular transit system. This is definitely discriminatory and needs to be looked at. So, ultimately though, the City must turn its mind how to manage Handi-Transit when the number of elderly will double in a couple of decades. Presently, we have 95,400 seniors in Winnipeg. Within a decade, that is in less than ten years there will be 125,100 seniors that are 65 and over. In 2030 it is projected we will have 167,500 seniors. Remember, take into account that once you're a senior that 70% of those seniors will be registered with Handi-Transit and 52% of them will use it regularly because that's the basic statistics on the basis of seniors at the present time. So, you'll have a significant Increase in the demand of service and an increase in; and also a loss of revenue because they'll be paying the seniors discount which is very important to look at. And those decisions made by a Manitoba Human Rights Commission, (inaudible) discrimination against people with Alzheimer's or dementia. Equalization of fares between regular transit and Handi-Transit, and it will have a significant financial impact on the entire Transit system, not now, in the next couple of years and to be honest, not in the decade. What I'm trying to come here today is first of all to indicate the issues that we would like to have the issue of assessment tabled, that section, and that's the only section is. We support of course the issue of the Alzheimer's Society being able it use Handi-Transit, and we would also like to make you aware, because I don't think you are aware, because I've been starting to press it and others are starting to talk about the tremendous costs that it's going to be, because you're going to lose 240,000, 170,000, that's 400,000 there and plus that; and you'll be short half a million dollars over the next four or five years on implementing Handi-Transit structure. So you have to look at it. Where will the money come from? Will it come from your pocket? Is the City prepared to put another $500,000 into Handi-Transit? Or is it going to have to negotiate with the Province? Or is it actually going to say "no, we can't carry on with Handi-Transit and we want the Province to take over Handi-Transit". These are serious issue that is you are going to be faced and I'm trying to make you aware now, not in two years time, when all of a sudden the budgetary people will come and say we need another $200,000 in order to operate Handi-Transit because we have too many seniors who are eligible and therefore want to use Handi-Transit. So I want you to think about it very seriously in terms of how you are going to look at it but I appreciate you listening to me and I would; in terms of the concerns that the disabled organizations have about Handi-Transit and of course the support we do have in terms of using the Alzheimer's people being able it use Handi-Transit. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Ternette. We're going to hear the second Speaker to this same issue, and then follow up with questions; so we'll invite Molly Sparber to come forward for 5 Minutes. Ms. Sparber, go ahead.

Molly Sparber: Good morning, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. First of all, I would like to extend thanks to those in the City Clerk's Office, as well as all of you for the opportunities given to me both last week and this morning. I've never had the courage to do anything like this before. Now that I'm on my second go around I'm in awe and deeply humbled to be a small part in this process. My emotions are mixed when it comes to the Handi-Transit Proposal up for vote this morning. One part of me applauds it. Those with Alzheimer's and Dementia have every right to access Handi-Transit service as does every one of us in the disability community. But there is another part of me that is so angered by it that I've come to you today to try to persuade you to not vote on this and put it over to next Council Meeting. There are some things you need to consider before considering this proposal. Handi-Transit doesn't work. Period.

It's an over-taxed, burdened, and broken down system that is in desperate need of an overhaul. It is run by individuals with seemingly no understanding of the disability community, the effects of disability on an individual, or even their own eligibility criteria. I've never seen anyone with any type of disability working there. The scheduling is poorly done and can be down right ridiculous to both clients and Handi-drivers. Some drivers can be grumpy while others are ill tempered. I've personally witnessed drivers belittle clients and have been on the receiving end of a few diatribes myself. I've also had drivers speak to me with sexual innuendos and request dates. For anyone with a cognitive impairment such as Dementia any of the above noted scenarios could be completely traumatic yet they need this service, and so do I. When I appeared in front of EPC last week a detailed my experience of being judged not disabled enough to use Handi-Transit. I have fibromyalgia which is a condition of the muscles and is characterized by wide-spread pain and bone-crushing fatigue. Certain things will exacerbate it like changes in the weather or heightened amounts of stress. But it's not something I'll recover from. Ever. It's not a virus that goes away in a week. I'm stuck with it. And in the last 8 years it's gotten steadily worse.

Since being dumped from Handi in November and having to use regular transit to go everywhere I've experienced more stress and more pain. So a vicious cycle was created because a group of biased, partisan individuals made a ridiculous decision long before I set foot on their property. A portion of the denial letter I received reads "Handi-Transit is for people who can not regularly used the fixed route Transit System because they are legally blind or have a physical disability that significantly impair theirs mobility." This confuses me because all you have to do is watch me walk to see my mobility is significantly impaired. The medical professionals say so. Handi professionals say no. Go figure. Yet, I still can't wrap my head around how those with Dementia or Alzheimer fit in this. They don't fit into the criteria set out in my letter, nor do they fit in the criteria set out on the website. None of us do. It's not an exact science. So, how is it justifiable for certain persons to have those coveted seats in Handi-Transit vehicles, while others who have been denied service are left out in the cold? Handi-Transit needs to be fixed. There is no question about that. But you and I both know it won't happen tomorrow. All I'm asking is that before opening it up to certain people while others have been denied take a look into Handi's practices. We all deserve the chance it use the service. We all deserve to be judged fairly and equally, and most of all, we all deserve to be treated with respect. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Sparber. First question, Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to Mr. Ternette. Are you saying that you using an Occupational Therapist is a way for the Handi-Transit to save money?

Nick Ternette: Sorry, would you repeat that.

Councillor Smith: Are you saying that the use of Occupational Therapists instead of Doctors is a way for Handi-Transit to save money?

Nick Ternette: Yes. And in many cases it seems to be that way. I am not saying that they personally are trying to do that, but the complaints that we have received in the office constantly averages 25 to 30 complaints every; especially in the winter time, and in the summer time when people are cut off, based on fibromyalgia cases and other criteria, by not being clearly defined as in my case; I have no problems because I am an amputee but they seem to be oriented in always cutting people off so that they use regular transit and unfortunately many of those people can't use regular transit and that's why I'm saying the way to deal with it is to have a collective approach, where the Doctors—both Doctors. They have Doctors also on staff at Handi-Transit. That your own Doctor, the patient's Doctor and the Handi Doctor and the Occupational Therapist get together to really examine to determine and if there is significant disagreement there should be an appeal process. There is no appeal process at the present time if there is a disagreement between the Doctor and the occupational Therapist. People are simply cut off and that's it. The Occupational Therapist rules over the Doctor. I don't think so. I think at best they're equal in making judgments but not one is superior over the other if you follow what I'm saying.

Councillor Smith: Okay. I have another question. With the other speaker, the other delegation, saying that the Handi-Transit just doesn't work and has to be revamped completely. What are your comments on that?

Nick Ternette: Oh you mean…..

Councillor Smith: I want your comments. I know her comments.

Nick Ternette: You're asking Molly?

Councillor Smith: No you.

Nick Ternette: Oh me, okay. I'm not quite to that stage. I mean I've only been experiencing since November of last year. I don't use Handi-Transit that much I use regular transit a lot. Yes, there are many, many problems with it. It's not completely collapsed yet, but it will especially with the burden of additional usage by seniors and students and others as I indicated. The cost factor will be a major factor that you will have to deal with and that has to be taken into consideration. What are the policies? If the Human Rights Commission indicates we have to be more inclusive and ensure that all people who have disability can use Handi-Transit, well the cost will be significant. Far more than you guys even think about. So yes, I think it needs to be reviewed completely. Personally; and that is not the league's position and I don't want to say that. I opposed the notion of privatization about 6 or 7 years ago when the City privatized them and allowed the private companies to operate, even though the City still has control over it but we have a duality which I think creates significant problems between service being delivered by the private sector while the actual administration is done by the City. I think it's costing the City too much and I think we need to relook again whether that's the best model we ought to have for Handi-Transit.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie you have a question?

Councillor Eadie: I'm not sure; I have a two-part question. The first part to Nick; and the second part to the other presenter. Do you think there's any; do you Nick believe there is any way of actually evaluating on a same-basis, evaluating whether or not various types of disabilities can be eligible to ride on transit. The second part to Molly is, you had presented an idea of a panel to assist in making decisions as to eligibility. Maybe you could describe that a little bit, how you think that might work.

Nick Ternette: Thank you for your question, very good question. I'm not sure that anybody can observe or diagnosis certain diseases or certain things especially fibromyalgia. My wife has fibromyalgia and it doesn't act up all the time. That's the trouble. There are days when is she is perfectly fine to go on Transit and other days where is if she has to go to a board meeting or something she can't. Fibromyalgia does not just; isn't there the whole time. Same with arthritis, it can act up at certain periods of time. I don't know how well you can assess those things but I do believe any assessment will be better served by a collective approach, the Doctors and the therapists working together with nurses and whatever else, in a collective fashion. I must say that's what happened when I had cancer. With my second bout of cancer, I had to go to the Health Sciences Centre and I wound up a whole day, 7 hours with 6 People, two doctors, nurses whatever else, reviewing my case of my cancer and giving me the best advice of the kind of treatment I ought to be looking at. And that was done collectively and not by one Doctor simply determining that that's the treatment I ought to have. So I think that the assessment structure has to be changed because I do think many people are disqualified unjustifiably because they don't really quite qualify in the rules. So the rules may have to be changed also a bit to encompass those people who have Fibromyalgia and things to be able to use Handi-Transit.

Molly Sparber: And to address your second question, Councillor Eadie, I think the panel that needs to be done is an outside panel with former members of Handi-Transit, members of the disability community, and we all just get together, review what the eligibility criteria are, and review how we can change them to make them better, to make everything more inclusive for all who have disabilities. Change the reassessment process so that certain people aren't excluded and others included. Like I said in my presentation, we all deserve the right to the service. And I hope that answers your question.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions of our delegations? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Happy holidays: We will invite Mr. Nathan Weltman. Is he with us today? Sir, you have 10 minutes.

Nathan Weltman: Good morning Mr. Mayor, Members of City Council. I'm Nathan Weltman here regarding the development application opening on the north side of Stormont Avenue. I'm simply here out of an abundance of caution to see if there are any questions and to make sure that this does go through. I know there was some concern early on in this process because there was some city errors in the 1980s that have to do with subdividing requirements, so in that

capacity I'm here to field any questions or either wise I won't take up any more of your time. That's my presentation, Good morning.

Mr. Speaker: No questions of Mr. Weltman?

Mr. Weltman: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you sir. Appreciate your dropping by Cindy Tugwell, Executive Director of Heritage Winnipeg. You have ten minutes.

Cindy Tugwell: Good morning Mr. Mayor and Councillors, I'm here to speak to you today on behalf of Heritage Winnipeg Board of Directors and also Heritage Canada Foundation, with regards to the Shanghai Restaurant building. We would he like to go on record that we do not concur with the recommendation of the Property and Development Committee and EPC, recommending that this building not be placed on the buildings conservation list. And listening to delegations last week, what we would like to address is the long-term economic viability is questionable, and so that's why it's not being placed on the conservation list and the recommendation is that the building eminently be demolished once a viable business plan be put forward. I appeal to you today as good stewards of the City of Winnipeg that we have an amazing stock of built heritage in this City. Although it was commented that this building, which is one of the oldest buildings in the downtown, built in 1883 which the City was actually a main tenant in, while City Hall was being built, and takes up an entire city block in China Town, is not in the Exchange District, the National Historic Site. That point was made, a valid point but it is still part of the warehouse district. The character sector of the warehouse district and it should be pointed out that in just June of this year; Heritage Canada Foundation put the Warehouse District on the 10 most endangered lists; and that was done for a reason because of the pressure of Development. We understand how the two have to work. These buildings cannot be saved unless there is an economic and viable use for these buildings. So we're stepping back and asking the City, it was our understanding that the China Town Development Corporation wanted about 2 to 3 years to look at putting together a business plan and find funding for the senior housing, which we do go on record, we would like; we support the Senior Housing. We think this is wonderful. Heritage advocates would also like to address the Councillors that we do not feel that we are wanting to stifle development. We think this is a fabulous development for China Town. We think that there are other sites that they could be looking at but we certainly have to look at adaptive reuse in this situation. This is a very important building. And this is not a building we want to see come down, if it's questionable. Questionable to me means you're not quite sure what the long term is. If we looked at probably I would say over the last 15 years, most of the heritage projects in the Downtown that have been immensely successful; I bet at one time they were all questionable. I think we are all probably stood back and said is this going to work? There is no guarantee but I think what Heritage Winnipeg and Heritage Canada want to get across today to you is that there was no engineering Report put forward to the best of our knowledge, and we feel when we have a time frame like this, once you demolish a building you can't go back in time and say you've made a mistake. So we would like Council today to rethink their decision, just step back, and ask for the City Department to commission an engineering Report so that we can see at; I think it should be last resort. I think we should look at how we can use adaptive reuse in this particular situation. There are many buildings that have sat as you know, vacant for several years until a decision has been made on their fate. We should step back, get this study done, look at the absolute condition of this building, and the possibility of adaptive reuse, without saying that we don't want to go forward with the senior housing project. We want to go on record that the two are not tied together. We certainly are wanting the downtown to be successful and there is no one in the City that cares more, because really, when you think about Winnipeg and you think of the Exchange in the Warehouse District and the downtown, most of the most prominent and successful projects have been Heritage Building projects and they have really been the crutch of a lot of our downtown development and they have proven time and time again when you invest in them, and you maintain them and we do have flaws in our system, we do not want demolition by neglect. And we feel that you are rewarding building owners by allowing this demolition to take place because they did neglect their building for thirty or forty years and we recognize that there is an immense cost by neglecting your building but it shouldn't be a reward to a developer and building owner. It should be; you should set the precedence to other developers that you do not want to maintain your building, you do not want to invest in your building, you shouldn't own it; it should be an honour to own a Heritage Building especially of this caliber. So again, our recommendation today for you is to step back, defer this decision to take it off the inventory list until an engineering study is commissioned and you can step back and look at looking at all options before we make our final decision. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Cindy. Jordan Van Sewell is also a Board Member of Heritage Winnipeg and will take any questions after he has spoken to the same issue. Jordan.

Jordan Van Sewell: Thank you Mr. Chair and good morning your Honour and Councilors. I'll try not to speak as the bearded jester that you may see before you but rather as a Board Member of Heritage Winnipeg and also the Co- chair of the South Point Douglas Residents Association. I apologize for my deeper state of confusion because last week

when I attended the Property meeting, I left with the feeling that calmer heads would prevail and that a decision would be based upon information. Unfortunately, policy wasn't followed there and there was an architect stood up and said we've done this plan and the building is no good. Well in the private sector, I don't know any decision that would be made on that little Information that was offered last week and really doesn't bode well for the war dog Councillors sitting around the table now, spreading that to the new Councillors because you guys have to operate on policy and that clearly wasn't happening last week. So I concur what Cindy was saying and I add to that that, you know, this is; you know, the clock is ticking away here. I'm supposed to speak on a decision about a hundred year old building and then you're supposed to make a decision on the information that you have. You don't have enough Information to allow this building to be torn down. The idea that this policy and; it's not complete; you know. There are so many issues that haven't been addressed. If the Architect has a Report, let's see it and let's make a decision on the information we have. To make a decision on a lack of information wouldn't be prudent for this Council to do. And that seems to be where you're headed there is a bunch of alternative ideas that haven't been entertained at all, and the lack of confidence that the Administration of the City Hall is showing here, on our City, is appalling. I just give you an example, I think of those skating shacks they put down on the river every year. There are international architects clawing over each other to make a little $10,000 shack because they want to get their foot in the door of the excitement that is happening in Winnipeg. The excitement that could be put over to the Shanghai Building and into the redevelopment of China town. Yeah, it's a great idea to tear these things down and build all new, but this isn't the 19th century thinking of a Steve Juba Council before me. This is the 21st century and you really cannot afford to think in those terms any more. Yeah, you can't save all the buildings and you know, the building that we have, they are no longer the first class Buildings because all those buildings are gone and so now we're left with the Shanghai, we're left with the Mission kitty corner to it and all these buildings, yeah, they can be torn down but the willingness of this Council could prevail a more creative solution to what you can be doing with this building. And then I know that these decisions that you make here today are going to impact the areas adjoining them such as South Point Douglas, and you know, I'm not talking about a hundred; a $190 million decision on a stadium or $190 million coincidentally enough on a new Disraeli Freeway. We're talking about policy here and if we can just leave it at that, policy hasn't been followed. So I ask you and I'm no longer imploring or begging you, I'm just saying come on, you guys wrote the policy on this. You have to, you known, stand up to it and say we don't have enough information to make that decision today or next week. And then the subsequent decision that is going to come out of this, they need to be analyzed, too, because the policy here seems to be lacking and if we're going to operate under protocol, then that's what has to happen so again, in closing, I hope you will think about this for; it's our future that we're talking about. It's not; last time I stood here addressing the issue of the Eaton's Building and we know where that ended up. Now almost 20 years later, this may seem like an insignificant, small issue to be talking on, but this is big. And the policy that is attached to it is something that you have to address as a Council. And as a progressive 21st century City; and I don't see that happening. I end up feeling a little bit disappointed in the whole thing. So I'm just going to leave it at that and hope, you know, something happens. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Jordan. Any questions? Councillor Gerbasi. Cindy, would you like to come forward.

Councillor Gerbasi: I just wanted to ask if you're aware that there is a Motion before this Council this morning, which asks that an objective; an engineering Report be done which will provide objective evidence of the structural viability of the building and the cost of adaptive reuse. So is that essentially what you're asking for in that you; that this could be referred back, the Committee could actually have a document in front of them that would give us that information about not just word of mouth or people's guesses but saying what can or can't be done with this building?

Cindy Tugwell: I think absolutely. We have an immense amount of respect for Ray Won and the Chinese Community but we absolutely need something tangible. We need the experts just like we have the Historical Buildings Committee set up to give their expertise they have to tell you whether this is a heritage-worthy building. We need that Report now to say that the economic viability is in question, and what possibilities do we have, and have we looked at all possibilities so we would be fine with that.

Councillor Gerbasi: And furthermore, the Motion is actually asking not just for Ray Won or the project proponent to put forward a Report but it's saying that the City itself should be providing an objective Report as; which they could easily do under the Heritage Branch, could simply hire a consultant to do an engineering Report which would not be based on someone trying to tear it down but is a little more objective and could come from the City itself. Would you support that?

Cindy Tugwell: I would and I think that in all cases with Heritage Buildings is particularly and downtown and of heritage significance that should be a process that's followed all the time and not just in this particular case. We're asking for the expertise that fair and transparent process that would allow us to make the proper decisions so you feel you know absolutely you're making the right decision. We've got a lot of time on this and we should be stepping back and saying let's get the expertise and make the right decision.

Mr. Speaker: Any other Questions? Thank you Cindy, Jordan. Thank you for the good work you do; appreciate it and that's it for our delegations. I guess we'll Move into the Report for November 17th of the Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 17, 2010

Mayor Katz: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the Report of November the 17th and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 4.

Mr. Speaker: Any items to be stood down? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Number 1 on toilets; number 3.

Mr. Speaker: Number 3? Fair enough. All those in favour of 1, 2 and 4? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Eadie please addresses Council or Mayor Katz first.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would love to hear what Councillor Eadie has to say and I will try and respond so Councillor Eadie.

Item 3 - Amendments - Residential Toilet Replacement Credit Program
By-law No. 111/2009

Councillor Eadie: I just wanted to state that I'm actually in support of this program it's one that I've used myself but I have a concern. In my utilization of this excellent program where you get to replace inefficient toilets with more efficient. I purchased an European dual flush toilet but I don't think it met the requirements of U.S. high efficiency standard and this amendment, I'm a little bit concerned, is I think, possibly tying people into only purchasing or only being able to purchase toilets that are basically manufactured in the United States or North America, or a company that runs it through there. I'm just concerned there are some good European and good Canadian actual producers of toilets too and I just wanted to express my concern. I hope there is some assurances that if you have a high efficiency toilet that you purchased, would meet the requirements even though it doesn't meet the U.S. standard.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Eadie for those comments. The bottom line is we're in a position where we can increase the number of high efficiency toilets from 652 as opposed to the 294 which I think we would all say is a good thing. I think we should definitely move this forward and what I would be happy to do, I don't want to pretend I'm a Mechanical Engineer for Plumber but we do have expertise and I would certainly look into the scenario to see if there are other toilets that would meet the criteria, North American ones and specifically Canadian ones; we will certainly look into that. I appreciate Councillor Eadie making us aware of that fact. We certainly can talk about it. But this is an extremely good program and we want to see more utilization and this will accomplish that goal.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Are you okay with that Councillor Eadie? No other questions?

Councillor Eadie: No, I just; can I make a final comment on it?

Mr. Speaker: No. Sorry. All in favor? Opposed? Carried. The Report of December the 1st, Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 1, 2010

Mayor Katz: I would like to introduce the Report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no Items to be stood down. All those in favor? Opposed? Carried. Report of December the 8th.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 8, 2010**

Mayor Katz: I would like to issue the Report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 9.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing nothing to be stood down; All those in favour one through nine? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. And we have some By-laws.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I move that By-law No. 89/2010 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And we have more.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move the following By-laws be read a first time, By-laws 120/2010, 121/2010, 122/2010, 123/2010, 124/2010, 131/2010, 133/2010, 135/2010 and 136/2010.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 120/2010, 121/2010, 122/2010, 123/2010, 124/2010, 131/2010, 133/2010, 135/2010 and 136/2010 be read a second time.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I move that By-laws numbered 120/2010 to 124/2010, both inclusive and 131/2010, 133/2010, 135/2010 and 136/2010 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in Favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 120/2010 to 124/2010, both inclusive, 131/2010, 133/2010, 135/2010 and 136/2010.

Mayor Katz: And I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 120/2010 to 124/2010 both inclusive, 131/2010, 133/2010, 135/2010 and 136/2010 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD**

Mr. Speaker: Question period. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank You, Mr. Speaker. Today I expect we will be approving a new stadium later in the day today at the University Of Manitoba. And we have a $190 million investment will result in a lot of traffic on Pembina Highway; as a result, in the neighbourhood area as well as around the University. We have 40,000 students at the University of Manitoba and many of these students could be convinced to switch to public transit if the popular; if the proper, excuse me, Infrastructure was in place. And today, in this Council Meeting we're also expected to approve; I'm allowed a 2 minute preamble. They're getting restless. Today we're expected to approve a two hundred million dollars infill housing project and trans-oriented development in the Fort Rouge Yards. This development is integrally linked to the Southwest Transit Corridor. The Fort Rouge Yards Master Plan which we are approving today also shows an integration of the development of transit stations and the fact that this $200 million private investment in our City is happening as well as another 16 storey apartment tower on Donald street is clear and undeniable evidence that this Transit Corridor is already working to stimulate significant economic development. It isn't even completed yet until 2012, and because of previous decisions of this Council there is no funding in place, no design being worked on, no plan at all to complete the Transit Corridor out to the University and the new stadium, linking it with our downtown and the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg. My question for the Mayor is will he clarify to the public, once and for all, whether he intends to commit to finishing Phase 2 of the Southwest Transit Corridor within this next term of Council?

Mayor Katz: I was expecting a longer question. (Laughter) Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. Mr. Speaker, the facts are, to start off with, you never know what's going to happen on the floor of Council. As everyone knows right now there is a Special Meeting called and Council will decide what will and will not approve. It would be foolish to make assumptions, but let's go with the assumptions. Number 1, I think everybody knows that it was this Mayor along with the former Premier who basically put forward the funds to finish and complete the First Phase of Rapid Transit. It's in process right now and I think everybody has had the opportunity to see what's going on. That's number 1. Number 2, there is no commitment from any levels of Government at this particular point in time, Mr. Speaker, to fund the project that Councillor Gerbasi is talking about. As you know, I've said on many occasions let's go to Ottawa and have a meeting, to the Premier, I'm happy to do that any day of the week. The realities are there are no funds from other levels of Government unless Councillor Gerbasi is aware of that and would share that with the rest of us, I don't know how you can do a project if there is no funding for it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, I'm not privy to the internal discussions between the Governments but I think as the Mayor, you can answer and my question is will you be including a commitment from this Council for funding Rapid Transit in the upcoming draft Capital Budget and Five Year Forecast? Will you make that commitment yourself as our Mayor and lobby the other levels of government to; are you committed as our Mayor, to complete this project? Or have you decided to abandon the Second Phase of the Southwest Corridor? Do you think we should even build that project, Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as I said on many occasions before, I am not only prepared to make a commitment but I'm prepared to lead. I've already had conversations with the Federal Government about Rapid Transit. There are monies available and the facts of life are, until I get the Premier on board and we both make our case, because I think Councillor Gerbasi would know, in order to get something done, you need all levels of government working together. So, Mr. Speaker, I would say I've led on this issue and I thank Councillor Gerbasi for the question. (Small laughter)

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Gerbasi: My last; thank you Mr. Mayor, my third question is on a different topic. If I remember correctly during the recent election campaign the Mayor made a commitment to share information about the Veolia Contract with Members of council and the public for the Waste Water upgrades and I'm asking if that Veolia Contract has been signed and will the Mayor share the details of what the City of Winnipeg has agreed to in a transparent manner?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I can stand before you today and tell you there is no level of Government more open, honest and transparent than this government right here. That's just a fact. Number 2, contrary to what some Councillors may have said, or other citizens of Winnipeg, no contract has been signed, and when the contract is signed, I've already said on the record that I would share whatever information I have. Nothing has changed whatsoever, except we're now getting the facts and the truth out there as opposed to misrepresentation and just things that are not true that are said on a regular basis. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank You, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Mayor, not long ago a very serious accusation was publicly made by an Aboriginal man, Evan Maud that he was taken by Members of the Winnipeg Police Service, this is according to him, and driven outside of the City, his jacket was removed and he was given a lighter jacket and then left to walk back into the City. It's an accusation which we all hope is not true. But, I'm wondering what steps you've taken to follow up to ensure that this is investigated properly to ensure that this is not the case. Because as far…

Councillor Steeves: I know the Mayor probably knows this; I just want to make sure that he understands. I'm sure he does and I'm sure in his answer he'll say I believe this matter is under investigation. I don't know that it's appropriate to necessarily talk about this in this forum but with that I'll leave that to the Mayor to discuss.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I appreciate it's under investigation but I think, you know, we were hoping; every one of us hopes that this is not true. Dropping somebody in the middle of winter in the middle of the night….

Mr. Speaker: I think you made your point, Councillor Wyatt. Would you like to respond Councillor; or Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I really very much appreciate my legal Councillor for answering that question and I thank him for that and I hope I won't get a bill for that Mr. Speaker. (Laughter) First of all, I thank Councillor Wyatt for the question; I think I know where he is coming from. As he knows, it's an allegation and Councillor Steeves is absolutely correct, I have never ever made comments on something that is being investigated at this stage of the game. As everybody knows, you know through the media, there has been an allegation, we know there is a process through LERA in addition to that the Chief of Police has also said they will be investigating themselves I can add one thing that I certainly have spoken to the Grand Chief, Ron Evans as well Mr. Speaker on this topic and like Councillor Wyatt, I also hope there is no truth to this as well. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mayor. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, we have an Item coming forward in the Agenda later on regarding us; requiring additional funding for active Transportation projects that were suppose to be funded under the Federal Stimulus program. It would appear now that the Federal contribution, that $21 million project will be $4 million rather than $7 million dollars or approximately $4 million rather than $7 million. Just perhaps the Mayor could give us an idea if the Federal Government has given any indication as to whether or not we will be have access to the $3 million that didn't meet criteria in that package, to do other projects within the new deadline of October 31 I believe, 2011?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Through you, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Councillor for the question. I think the realities are that what we once thought would be 33-cent dollars could turn into 50-cent dollars based on the arithmetic that was just discussed during the question. Mr. Speaker, I do intend to have a conversation with the Minister. I know that the department is following up as well. We already know what the worst-case situation could be; they would be 50-cent dollars which is still extremely good. I think anybody would move forward on that type of a situation. I think the most important thing to do at this stage of the game is to make sure that; and this has happened before, Mr. Speaker, because there are certain expenses that do not qualify which we need to incur. I think what we have to do at this stage of the game is to make sure when we enter into an agreement with the other levels of government which we all believe is one third, one-third, one-third, it actually ends up being one-third, one-third, one-third and I can assure you that I have spoken to the CAO and the department to make sure before we sign these agreements, we make sure we cover ourselves. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Mayor, perhaps the Mayor could give us an indication on a per Capita basis, how much Stimulus Funding is being spent in the City of Winnipeg and how that compares to other cities across the country. $4 million seems like a drop in the bucket compared to what this program was. I was wondering if you could you give us an idea of what it's like relative to the rest of the country?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I can't give you an exact number but I would be happy to get that, but I can share with Councillor Swandel that the money he is referring was for the City of Winnipeg projects, i.e. the government; different levels of government. There were many other Stimulus Projects that have; well some are in process and some are complete. For example, I know that there was $12 million put into the; it use to be called the Moose-Plex they changed the name now it's the MTS Ice-Plex I believe. I know 12 million went into there for sure. I know a significant amount of money went into the new building for the United Way on Main Street. I also believe a significant amount of money went into the Centre for Excellence for Youth for Christ. And I'm sure there are many other projects. I can certainly try to put that together and I would be happy to find that information and share the total number with Councillor Swandel and the rest of Council, but I do not have that number at the top of my head.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any other questions? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I know we've all missed this so much with the Election. Do you want to go in the first Round?

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I couldn't tell if you had noticed me or not. Through you to the Mayor, I had a question I wanted to; during the past election campaign, in the Mynaski Ward, there was a; there was a lot of very serious violence and a lot of people are very afraid. Through the campaign it was very clear that the Number 1 Issue in the Mynaski Ward was related to crime and violent crime at that. It's also violent crime throughout the Inner City so not just to ask the question in terms of just in terms of the Mynaski Ward but, the Mayor campaigned on a commitment to find a 58 new police

officers, which I believe many people in the North End really believe they need because they are afraid to go out of their houses and a lot of them believe that community policing kind of options are proactive ways of dealing with that crime as well; Community Police Officers who are actually out on the street, they're also going to informal and formal places; and my question is basically we do need these Police Officers and I'm wondering though, I'd like to know through; whether - how 58 new Police Officers are actually going to be funded and when can we actually expect to try to get those Police Officers online? I think that's it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie.

Mayor Katz: Thank the Councillor for the question. Mr. Speaker, crime and safety has been one of my top priorities long before this election. I actually addressed it in one of my previous State of the City addresses. Councillor Eadie is absolutely correct that there was a commitment for 58 additional officers. Twenty officers to walk the beat in areas that the Winnipeg Police Service believes they are needed and certainly would give the Residents who live in those areas peace of mind and make sure they can have and enjoy their lifestyle there. An additional 20 officers, Mr. Speaker, would go into the Gang Unit which we think is extremely important and another 18 to basically man an additional patrol car, for a total of 58. Just as a reminder, there were other areas that we also worked on when it came to crime and safety initiatives. As many people here will know we worked very hard to make sure that in conjunction with the Province we were able to acquire a police helicopter, as I'm sure most people know, we now have that helicopter, the training is taking place, and that is one major tool that I think will serve the citizens of Winnipeg and the men and women of the Winnipeg Police Service very well and have a positive impact. In addition to that, we also worked hard to create or recreate the Cadet Program that existed. I'm proud to say that yesterday, I believe, Cadets were actually sworn in and they are on the streets today. So you will be seeing them which is a very good start and there are additional Cadets that will be coming and we worked with the Winnipeg Police Association on this. What will happen now, but specifically regarding Councillor Eadie's question, obviously the funding will be going through the Operating Budget. I can also tell you that you don't just snap your fingers; Mr. Speaker and 58 Officers appear. It's done over a period of time because of the training that takes place and the classes. We're expecting Reports and I believe this is something that we can probably accomplish within a two to three year period of time. I can tell you that the process has already starting. And I can also tell Councillor Eadie that I knocked on doors in that Ward and there is no question that when they heard about the Officers walking the beat, and they heard about Cadets being able to walk, and basically talk to the Neighbours, et cetera, they were absolutely ecstatic. If you; and I are sure Councillor Eadie got the message as well. There are children running around the streets in the wee hours of the morning and we certainly need to make sure that we have their energies directed in a positive fashion and we want to make sure that people, not just in Mynaski but in every part of the City, feel safe. That's what this is all about, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Second Question, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Speaker Nordman. Following up through that question, and agreeing with the Mayor the streets of the North End have gotten much worse since I lived on those streets as a 13-year-old. But; so my concern is and I would like an answer to this question. Without raising taxes, how; where are we finding the money for 58 new Police Officers? And I know we're still waiting to fill some positions that; from commitments in the past. So, how are we actually going to find the money, Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, that task is up to all the people on this floor. That's what we do during the Operating Budget. I should also share with Councillor Eadie that also funding does come from safety issues from both the Province and the Federal Government, and we will continue to work on this. It's all a matter of priorities. You have to decide what are your priorities are and if Councillor Eadie believes that crime and safety is one of our priorities, and then I'm sure he will work with us to make sure this becomes a reality.

Mr. Speaker: Last Question, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: There are so many questions but just one more on that, in terms of Federal funding, I don't believe that we have been able to utilize that funding and so my question to the Mayor is, I don't know why that might be in the mix and maybe he can explain to me how he might be able to utilize some of that fund. As I understand it's very difficult to find money and it's only one time money it's not ongoing support for Police Officers.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I can tell you; there was a specific initiative from the Federal Government. It definitely was one time money; it was a significant amount of money for the entire Province spread out between obviously Rural Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg and the City of Winnipeg because of the size we get more. I can tell you I have spoken to both the Chief of Police in Brandon as well as the Chief of Police here in Winnipeg, Chief McCaskill. And that money is; has already been flowed; has already flowed to the Provincial Government and we're actually discussing that right now. So I thank Councillor Eadie for the question.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank You, Mr. Speaker. If I remember; I'm sorry; the Winnipeg Square Parkade has been sold now for close to a year and the money from that asset, I assume, is sitting in a bank somewhere and a $2 million per year revenue stream has been sold off as a result of that decision. A Council Motion at that time called for a comprehensive parking strategy to be brought to Council last spring. Many Members of Council, including myself participated in the consolidated process of the study which was undertaken by the Parking Authority, under the leadership of the former Chief Operating Officer, David Hill. For those who participated, I know Councillor Steeves and many others came to sessions with the panel of experts which were the best in the world, were brought to Winnipeg to come up with a comprehensive, innovative and proactive parking strategy focusing on our downtown. During the election campaign, the Mayor stated that he had not seen the Report from that group. Considering the expense of the study and the importance of the; of it to the redevelopment of our downtown and the entire City, Members of this Council should have the opportunity to review it before any decisions are made with the 24 million from the sale of the parkade. My question to the Mayor is will you release that study for all of us it see as soon as possible or see that it's released from the Parking Authority if you don't have it?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I thank Councillor Gerbasi, it's my understanding surely would have got a copy of it from the former Director of that department, but the facts of life are Mr. Speaker I can stand before you and tell you: No, I have not seen it, number 1. Number 2, when you talk about that facility, we have had a phenomenal discussion which is all public information, about the fact that we believed through the strategy that's taking place with CentreVenture, the Portage Avenue strategy; that we are trying to make sure that we do five things, okay. First of all, we know that we need maintenance in the Millennium Library as well as the Public Safety, the two Parkades there. In addition to that I think everybody here should be aware of the fact, that there been serious dialogue about the James Street Parkade which would basically inspire; which right now is in the process right now, more residential development which we think is good for the downtown, as well as having a Parkade on the south side of Portage and the north side of Portage. The one thing I can assure Councillor Gerbasi, as soon as I get it, I will definitely read it and will go through the same process they always go through. No different, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, I'm a little surprised, if I have the Report and you as the Mayor do not have the Report, so I'm not sure how that is possible. But; okay, my second question is, will you make a commitment that the full $24 million be invested back into the downtown and not used as one time money, paying off essentially going back to the Operating Budget to pay off of, as I've mentioned before, a so-called debt of the Parking Authority which is really just money we use for Operating the City. Will you make a commitment that all that money will go into Downtown revitalization through a parking strategy and through a comprehensive one that we hope to someday actually receive everything?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, number 1, as the Mayor and as one vote on the floor of Council, I already told the Public and all of Council what I believe should happen with the money. It should be reinvested in what we referred to as our Downtown. That's number 1. That's old news. If Councillor Gerbasi wants me to be redundant, I'm happy to repeat that. For me to make a commitment would be impossible Mr. Speaker because it takes all 16 elected officials to make the commitment, because Council is supreme. I know where my one vote will go, Mr. Speaker and that's all I can tell Councillor Gerbasi.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Mr. Speaker as mentioned as was mentioned earlier this afternoon we will be debating a stadium proposal and we have a massive influx of injection of Provincial money to make this happen, clearly, and it's coming before this Council. My question of the Mayor is; we as a Council have been asking now, since the beginning of this year, about the same amount of money, roughly $189 million about a million off in terms of our Strategic; our Building Canada money to be used for roads and bridges. And we're still waiting. It's now December. We as a Council moved the matter; I believe it was a Motion of Priorities back in May. And we are now bringing forward a Report that will basically give the Province what they want in terms of stadium. Where is our Infrastructure Program for our roads and for our bridges, Mr. Mayor that we've asked for?

Mayor Katz: First of all, Mr. Speaker, let's not mix apples with oranges. Councillor Wyatt is correct that later on today we will be having a discussion and a vote on the project. That's number 1. And just to; it's totally separate than the Building Canada Funds. I'm quite cognizant of what he is referring to. I can tell you that I've had several conversations with the Premier on that topic and I believe we are making headway. Council basically moved the Motion on the floor; I know Councillor Wyatt supported it. Here are our priorities, and they were spread right across the City of Winnipeg. Good, quality projects, as well as projects that were the priority of the departments as well. I could list them for you but I

know Councillor Wyatt knows them so there is no point doing that, but, I can assure Councillor Wyatt that that is being discussed and I'm feeling pretty good that there is hope; where as before there was none, that we'll get some quality infrastructure Projects amongst the 3 levels of Government agreed to, which I think will make major improvements in our City that are overdue and I will agree with Councillor Wyatt on that one. I look forward to that day coming very, very soon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Wyatt: But we have a meeting today where at the snap of the finger the Premier has found $75 million dollars more to invest in the stadium. We are asking for our roads and bridges be addressed now. We heard it through the election campaign, we asking you to address that now. When are we going to have an agreement that comes back to this Council for consideration for the Building Stimulus? We have given the Premier due notice and we are still waiting, Mr. Mayor? When are we going to have that; is it going to be months or weeks? When is that going to come forward because clearly we know the timing in terms of the stadium but not in terms of our requests of our needs.

Mayor Katz: Minor point I never thought 75 but 85 million but that's also a number to be repaid. Building Canada Funds as you know are funds that are invested by the three levels of Government and no one has to pay it back. So, Mr. Speaker, Councillor Wyatt can ask the question through you, but facts are we're working on it and keep in mind, we are hoping to have it soon. That money is available to the year 2014. From my point of view I would like that to have been put to bed two months ago, Mr. Speaker, 3 months ago and we'll continue to work towards that, but for anybody to give a definitive answer, I don't have a crystal ball Mr. Speaker. I can't tell you that. I can only tell you what is actually happening and the fact are there are some quality projects there and we hope that's to be done very soon. It really has nothing to do with the other project we're talking about. Apples and oranges.

Mr. Speaker: Third question.

Councillor Wyatt: My third question is clearly there are obviously still a disagreement that's irritating the situation. Can the Mayor elaborate and tell us what the disagreement is between the Mayor and the Premier, between the City and the Province, and why this couldn't have been brought forward today with an agreement in hand that we could have decided and voted on before the year end?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think Councillor Wyatt has been around long enough to know that when we have Building Canada Funds; all 3 levels of Government have to agree on the projects. At this point in time that's not the case. Are we working towards that Goal? Yes.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Mayor. I'm wondering about Environmental Health. We've been negotiating with the Province for years. Can you give us an update on the negotiations about transferring Environmental Health to the Provincial area?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, could I just ask Councillor Smith to specifically clarify exactly what he is looking for.

Councillor Smith: Well, what's the hold up? Why have we not been able to reach an agreement with the Province for transferring Environmental Health to the Provincial area?

Mr. Speaker: Health Inspections.

Councillor Smith: Health Inspections.

(Chatter)

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Smith for that question. There are many areas for some unknown reason, that the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba duplicate services. Health Inspection is one of them. I can tell you we've had some good dialogue. The department has been discussing that issue and actually, I think we're making headway. The only thing I can tell Councillor Smith who has served both in the Provincial Government and the City of Winnipeg, I would hope things would move a lot quicker, but I think Councillor Smith is well aware of the fact that they take a little longer. I can tell you that the Province is doing their due diligence and we have strongly suggested they take over that. We have one consistent Health Inspection across the City. We are totally supportive of it. I believe right now they are basically doing their due diligence, making sure the costs are what they are and also, keep in mind we have different levels of service as well and I'm sure they're looking at the big picture. And if a Councillor really wants to know,

feel free to call the people on Broadway. I'm sure he has access to them and he could get a more detailed answer but I can only tell you what I know right now.

Mr. Speaker: Second question, Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: What's holding it up? What; where is the disagreement? What is holding up an agreement with the Province to have Health Inspections did by them completely. (Inaudible chatter)

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'm not sure there is anything specific holding it up, okay. We've already put it on the table. Our staff have spoken to their staff and it's now potentially at the political level and they're discussing it and once again, I urge Councillor Smith if he can have any positive input, please do that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Last question Councillor Smith? You're done? I guess we're out of time on this one so we'll thank Question Period for the Mayor and move on to the Standing Policy Committee for Finance. Councillor Fielding.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE DATED DECEMBER 3, 2010

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to move the Report of December 3, move Adoption and Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: Alright, Councillor Fielding.

Item 1 - 2011 Fees and Charges Increases

Councillor Fielding: Sure, I'll give the floor to Councillor Wyatt and hopefully I can address any issues that you do have in regards to the Report.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: These; we've delegated to the Administration that our Fees and Charges, they have the authority to increase them at the rate of inflation. This Report is here today because these are Fees and Charges above the rate of inflation. No, read the Report it's very clear. Read the report. This is why; this is what it's here for and I'm making a point, Mr. Speaker, simply because clearly we know the challenges out there being faced by our Public Service and Departments in terms of construction cost. A lot of it is really construction costs. A lot of it is cemetery service wanting to get up to market speed. I'm simply saying, Mr. Speaker, that this is reflecting the demand and the challenge that we're facing as a City in terms of our operations and our Operating Budget. So you know it's something which we should be cognizant of as we enter into the Operating Budget cycle coming up here Mr. Speaker, and have the discussion that we have this real pressure and that inflation is something that we have been eating as a City for the last 13 years of tax freezes or tax cuts. We've not only been having the freezes but we've actually been making up for inflation on top of that, so Mr. Speaker, it's had a huge impact. This Report is here for a very good reason. I'm supporting it but Mr. Speaker, we should know that this does not mean that we can resolve the issue all at once with this Report of course in terms of the challenges we're facing, the inflationary cuts we're facing across the board with our pay roll and everything else in terms of the Operating Budget Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Understood. Councillor Fielding. (Inaudible dialogue) Oh okay. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: I just want to make a quick comment. Councillor Wyatt referred to the fact that this is about the authority; to go above the Authority of Inflation. There is another policy in place that comes into play in this Report and that is our Administration getting the Fees and Charges to the point of cost recovery. And in ensuring that we are using fees in places where we should use fees and not use the tax-supported funding to pay for fees that should be paid for by fees. That's the two pieces at work here. They are both city policy. This is not outside of city policy. Both those streams are our policies and in addition you'll see in here they are new fees that come forward where we should be getting cost recovery and we've never had a fee in place before. So that's what's in this Report. It's not just specifically on the inflation and going above inflation it's also about our policy of getting to cost recovery.

Mr. Speaker: Understood. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Sure and no in closing fair point, Councillor Wyatt raises as you know; the people that have been here in Council for three, four years we have moved a policy of full cost recovery for these items. They are the items that we delegate authority to the CFO to do the inflationary side of things. There are some new fees that are there, to be fair; these are services that are rendered for the City of Winnipeg. They are costs that are bared by our Departments for a number of the items. We've gone through a number of these items. There are costs that are there and I think it makes sense for users of these items to pay for these costs as opposed to a tax supported side. With that, I will stand down the Report and go from there. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. All those in favour of standing down the Report -- or supporting the Report. All those in favor? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Wyatt No. 2.

Item 2 – Financial Status Report and Forecast to October 31, 2010 – 2010 Year End

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Visa. Councillor Fielding

Councillor Fielding: Sure, I'd be more than happy to introduce this Report. Obviously it's the Financial Status year to date. Our plan moving forward and I'll give the floor to my good friend Councillor Wyatt for his comments and respond back at that point Sir.

Councillor Wyatt: Again Mr. Speaker, I will be voting in support of the Report, obviously if we don't; there is a real risk we're liable to run a deficit at year end which we're not allowed to do based on our Charter and the concern I have, Mr. Speaker is you know, we are taking money out of our reserve to balance the budget here. Clearly, I think this is an outcome of the fact that some of us pointed out that in the previous budget; in the budget that we adopted earlier this year for 2010, there were concerns namely; 10.6 million we estimated that we would achieve through our lawsuit with Manitoba Hydro, has not manifested itself. And I think we're seeing what's happening in terms of…

Councillor Swandel: Please remind Councillor Wyatt that matters that are before the Court shouldn't be discussed here in the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Swandel: It's in the Procedure By-law Councillor. It may be funny to you, but I take the Procedure By-law seriously.

Councillor Gerbasi: Clearly stating on the public record that $10 million in our budget was included regarding a Court case, I think that's completely reasonable to state publicly. It's in our budget.

Mr. Speaker: Understood.

Councillor Wyatt: I'm not going to get into the details of it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: I'm going to just simply say that clearly there was a concern expressed by many of us in this Council that the budget did not reflect real numbers that were solid, that we can rely on to balance our budget, I think this Report now confirms that. I'm going to vote for the report Mr. Speaker because we have to ensure we balance the budget by the end of the year and we have to give our Administration the authority to do that in the event it does not balance out. If we get any more snow we're going to be in even more trouble Mr. Speaker. So I think, Mr. Speaker, we gotta support this Report but I'm pointing out the fact that it's here today because of the fact that we do not have an accurate balanced budget in the first place when it was presented earlier this year in this Council Chamber and we put it to a vote. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Being new…newly elected, I'm not fully cognizant of the whole financial picture of the City of Winnipeg. But I thought that I would stand and; to this one and speak about It and I'll be in support of it too as we want to make sure we do balance our budgets but I do have a concern in how the City has been proceeding over the last; well actually for ten years. I'm kind of concerned about the way we've been preceding in terms of being fiscally prudent. I'm a person who likes to be fiscally prudent. I have a finance background to my education and worked as a financial co-coordinator for an organization although only it be a not for profit, but I do have some

concerns that we are using, for example, the sale of lands, a one time revenues, we're using to pay for ongoing operating costs, and I don't think that that's sustainable over time. Now I understand that there are a number of reserves and I don't know all the reserves, Mr. Speaker, I'm not fully aware of all the reserves that sit within the City of Winnipeg because frankly I haven't had time to look through the huge number of assets that sit on our books and reserves that sit on the books of the City of Winnipeg. But, I just really think that hopefully in the coming year after 2010 this Report is up to the end of the year, I'm quite concerned that we become more fiscally prudent and deal with financial issues in a realistic way because inflation does exist and if we're not taking care of inflation, what we have a problem with then is they have to use reserves that are supposedly dedicated for certain activities and certain contingencies. You should have a contingency no doubt about that, but I really do have a concern that we're using some of these reserves that; to balance budgets that we should be able to fiscally take care of in our upcoming budget and I look forward to being included in both the Capital and Operating budgets processes and hopefully at some point I can actually sit down with somebody and make some suggestions. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel. No? Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled just to rise. Listening to the last two Speakers you might be left with the impression that we have lost something in the context of this $10 million, which I understand we have not. It just hasn't ran its full circle to this point. So that question is as yet unanswered. The question that I think; talking about the Hydro Agreement. Get a ruling on that from the last… We didn't get a ruling? Touché, Mr. Speaker. The question this Council has to answer, sort of an intrinsic, inward looking way, is do we as 15 or 16 men and women who represent the citizens of the City of Winnipeg, do we feel that this money is owed to the City of Winnipeg? Is there one of 16 of us who feels it is not? I dare say there is not a single one in this Council Chamber who with stand up and say Manitoba Hydro does not owe that money to the City of Winnipeg. The reason I mention this and I feel compelled to bring it up in the context this discussion is there has been all sorts of cute discussions about the role of the Provincial Government may or may not ultimately play in the context of this file. We know that the Provincial Government has certain powers, Vis-a-vis the idea they could pass legislation to affect our ability to collect on this credit. The last wing we want to do is see this matter get political. So, while we're discussing this and people are debating the merits or non-merits of the way we draw up our budgets, the real Issue that we should be concerning ourselves with, if Indeed we truly care about the City of Winnipeg taxpayer and the $10 million that they are rightfully owed, is are we going to stand together to make sure that whatever those legal proceedings are or are not be, that they gave their chance to run their course without political interference from our good friends down at the Provincial Legislature. That, my friends, is what this Council should be concerning itself with and that is what we should be protecting our citizens from.

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

Councillor Fielding: In closing, Mr. Speaker, first I want to address something that Councillor Eadie had said in terms of involvement in the process. I would like to do a little bragging here. But for the first time and this was put forth by this Mayor, as well as his Council to introduce pre-budget consultations. We've gone through two sessions on the Capital process I know Councillor Eadie as well as Councillor Smith were in attendance there and we take these items seriously. Last year for instance we did go through the Operating Budget, Councillor Eadie for one had mentioned about expansion of the library hours that is something we took that into account in terms of the operating process and expanded the library in three different locations, the Westwood; the Henderson Highway in Councillor Browaty's Ward as well as the Pembina Trails. So we do take these Items seriously and we do want to consult more on people's ideas so I encourage everyone else to come out to the Council sessions as well. We'll be having two for Operating. Into the topic as put forward, listen, I think what we've seen this year is a strong physical management plan that's there. Year to date we are $3.8 million in a surplus position and I can tell you at this point in 2009, we had about a $2.9 million surplus and by year end we finished at $9 million. The reality is at the year end what happens is we pick up a lot of accounts are closed, variety of things happen and we generally pick up a lot of money that's there. So, once again we've got $3.8 million in terms of the surplus and we see and we anticipate that growing. There's $3.7 million from a surplus we had last year that's still sitting in the general purpose reserve that's there. So what I'm saying is when we talk about financial management. I think the fact we've run operating surpluses from the last number of years, shows the fact that we have a strong plan that's going forward. The October Financial Report, what it is, is a plan to addresses any shortfalls that are there. There's been some talk of the Manitoba Hydro issue that's there and the money I can tell you number 1; talks are still ongoing with Manitoba Hydro. It is within the courts. We were able to negotiate some sort of agreement that I think will be preferable for everyone but I can tell you there has been a continuous debate ongoing negotiations with Manitoba Hydro in terms of the dollars. But as the Report states this is a financial plan going forward. We also anticipate; we're trying quite well in a variety of different revenue sources. Net taxes added which is new houses that come on the market. To date somewhere around $4 million above and beyond our projection right there. So there is $4 million more in the system that is there. The part B also talks about the interest payments that go into the accounts, to the tune of $1.5 million that we can; that we can put forward. So we think that this is a very strong financial management plan that's there. It's addressed things. We anticipated that we will receive; we want to receive that money from Hydro because

the fact of the matter is they owe us that money from Hydro and that's where we are once again negotiating and at the end of the day, if decisions are made we'll go through the course of action. But this is a strong financial position that we're in right now, year to date and we anticipate that will grow by year end. So it's a plan going forward. With that I'll sit down and let everyone.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Fielding. If it snows we'll call the Army. (Chuckling) All those in favor? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Councillor Fielding we have some By-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Fielding: I would like to move the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law item 132/2010 and sorry, By-law 138/2010 as well be read.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 132/2010 and 138/2010.

Councillor Fielding: And I would also like to move that items 132/2010 and 138/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 132/2010 and 138/2010.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 132/2010 and 138/2010 be read a third time and same be passed for signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period for Chairman of Finance. Seeing no questions we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee of Downtown Development. Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 29, 2010

Councillor Swandel: I would like to move adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Questions for Downtown? Seeing none we'll Move onto the Standing Policy Committee for Property and Development. Councillor Browaty.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 2010

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce the Report of September 14, 2010 and move adoption Item 28 for Consent Agenda.

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

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the Report of December 6th and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 10 and Items 12 to 23. It would be my pleasure to hear…

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Consent Agenda 1 through 8 and 10, 22, we're standing down 22. 1 through 8 and 12 to 21, 10, 12 and 21; thank you. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 9 - The Yards at Fort Rouge Area Master Plan

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to put a few short comments on the record. This is a pretty significant development in our City. It's a $200 million private investment in Infill Housing in the heart of our City; in one of our oldest neighbourhoods. And you know, it's not easy bringing in; having; making decisions like this with residents finding change very difficult. These particular residents have had to put up with the Jubilee underpass reconstruction for quite some time and have a lot of issues with traffic and concerns and so, to be able to successfully see a development like this happen I think is a very positive thing for the City. As you know, this is our first major transit oriented development; and the reason I stood down the Master Plan is that a Master Plan was done by the proponent and the Planning Department requested a wish list of detail that be in this Master Plan to look at for this area. And they basically did everything they were asked to do. This Master Plan for the Fort Rouge Yards is more detailed than the Waverley West plans that we've seen. So I just think it's very significant and that people understand there has been some good planning here. It's a difficult issue for some of the residents and I know you'll never have full agreement in a community and as a Councillor it's difficult because many other In-fill projects that this Council have tried to support have either fallen through or been significantly cut back and I hope that people appreciate in a sense the sacrifice that the residents in this area are going to have to make putting up construction and such and change, for it to make our City better and I think ultimately it will make their neighbourhood better, too; I do believe that or I wouldn't have supported it. But I do believe it will provide more population to fill existing schools, existing community club boards, to bring improvements to the green space. It will be a pedestrian environment with cycling friendly and it's going to have sidewalks every where, even on streets that currently don't like Argue Avenue. So there are a number of positive things and I think it's important to point out that this shows the successful impact of the Bus Rapid Transit Corridor in terms of stimulating economic development which is part of the agreement in 2008 that revenue from development was going to help to cover our costs for this development. So I think we need to walk the walk here. I'm one; who's talked, I get up every chance I get to talk about public transit and here we are doing it and I think we should celebrating it and I'm glad to have Council's support for it. It's totally in line with the Transit Orient Development Policy we just brought forward in OurWinnipeg proposal with complete communities. And my residents will be the ones dealing with the construction. They've already been dealing with the construction of the Jubilee Underpass and the Rapid Transit Corridor including the most significant tunnel in this City. The most significant tunnel; the most significant tunnel; if we even have any other tunnels in this City. It's a huge construction project that they've been dealing with for some time, and they'll still be dealing with. So I hope all of Winnipeg will thank the citizens of Fort Rouge that are putting up with all of this development. In the long term we have to look at the long term, the big picture, this is good for our City and it also begs the question in my earlier question in question period, the necessity of finishing this Corridor to the new stadium and to the University. I talked earlier that 11 priorities were sent over to the other levels of government. Unfortunately the 12th priority that was in the original list was taken out and that's the second phase of this Transit Corridor. And I don't know why we're so afraid of success because this is the type of development we should be doing. This is the type of infrastructure that makes sense in terms of cost benefit analysis will show that. In fact there were 3 cost benefit analyses done in the last decade of building bus Rapid Transit for that Phase 1 Corridor and they all show a positive outcome and it made sense. So we really have to start making investments that make sense. We talk about urban sprawl. Well we, in the centre of the City are walking the walk here and saying we're building up, we're building density in existing neighbourhoods which will reduce the costs and pressures on our operating budget. We need to see more like this and I want to thank the residents of Fort Rouge for their understanding on this. I know there's many who aren't happy with it still I know that and as their representative, unfortunately I can't make everybody happy, but I do think this is the right thing for our City and I want to thank all of Council for supporting it thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Thank you Mr. Speaker, this is not happening in my Ward; but it's the best development, the most exciting thing I've seen since I've been on Council. The increased density is where we should be going. I don't want to go out further and further on to the prairie land. I want increased density and this development is excellent as an example of what we can do more of in the future. I think we should all be excited about this, because this is a new direction for the City of Winnipeg. It's worth it for us to pursuing and is a great develop and I hope that we all appreciate what's happening in that area. You know, things like this happen without any great excitement by the Council. We should all be excited. This is fantastic. This is something I've dreamt of for a long time. We need to stop suburban sprawl and this is a development will help us do that. The only thing about is, there is no provision for low income which I regret. But the fact is, it's a good development, it's an exciting development and sure, it will cause havoc for neighbourhoods, for residents with the noise and so forth but it's worth it and all of the City of Winnipeg will benefit from this development. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. I just wanted to take the opportunity to commend the folks that went through this process. I'm pleased to see Councillor Gerbasi supporting this because I think it's a good example of proper public processes and proper public Consultation and one we should emulate going forward and any other decisions that we might make here; a bit of design work and (inaudible) work, a public open house and then straight into the final draft of the area structure plan and moving it on to Council and getting the job done. That's what this Council should be about. It should be noted too, that this particular project is very consistent with what we're doing with OurWinnipeg and the strategies that go along with OurWinnipeg and in particular complete communities. I'm not sure who supported that on the floor of Council and who didn't but it's important to note that that is very consistent with the direction that this Council has chosen to take and albeit that that's in the hands of the Province and we're still waiting final approval on that direction to come back from the Province. I would have hoped we would have that back by now but unfortunately we do not and it's just another one of those things, that seems to lingers over there at the Province but we're able to show the leadership and moving us forward as a modern City, as a City that's growing up rather than growing out as Councillor Smith alluded to. I didn't mean to suggest that Councillor Smith was growing out. (Laughter) But we still have to grow out and there will always be growth land wise in Cities but we can slow that growth and maintain sustainability by growing up at the same time. Just recently I was in Toronto receiving an award for the City of Winnipeg, recognizing Winnipeg as the best city in Canada for redevelopment; by a significant organization in the planning and Brownsfield Development. This is certainly a great example of where the City of Winnipeg is going and what the work this Mayor and Council have been doing. There have been many challenges in doing that, to be recognized as some of the best consultation and public consultation in OurWinnipeg and we're continually praised by the Planning Committee and the Media for the lengths that we go to, to engage the public but yet there are still those among us that are the Nay sayers and that's the probably the greatest hurdle we have to get over in this City. We have got to start saying Yes and we have to start understanding what these opportunities mean, these success stories. We have to stop being the Nay sayers. Winnipeg is a great place to live. The Premier just yesterday pointed out what MacLean's Magazine had to say about Manitoba and Winnipeg. And finally it was something positive out of MacLean's Magazine. It was twice in a couple of months. It was a bit on the cultural side as well in the months before that. So this is very symbolic, this approval today and in particular, recognizing this public consultation process for what it was and ensuring we do something at this level as we go forward. But let's hope our decisions votes as individual Councillors are consistent with this type of thinking and this level of consultation. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Swandel. No further comments? Councillor Browaty

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. I just want to thank first of all, the proponent, the Developer for their vision and tenacity. Redevelopment is never an easy process and we've gone through an exercise here for a Master Plan that I understand is the biggest a developer or the City has been involved in ever. So Its actually fantastic. They're doing an area geothermal program. Apparently unlike the single cord stuff that was proposed for Waverley West. This is a proven technology; this is a green develop on an old Brownfield site. It's absolutely wonderful. We'll see density. We're going to see Transit Oriented Development and we're going to be able to reuse existing community infrastructure. This is a huge win for us and I congratulate the proponent again as well as the City staff that was involved. Thank you

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of Item 9? Opposed? Carried.

Item 22 - Secondary Plan Amendment - Part of Former Railway Line North of Kingsway Street and South of Academy Road
File SPA 3/2010

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I would be more than pleased to hear any comments from the Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. The reason I rise to inquire about this issue is what its doing is; well allowing a strip of land be developed that otherwise couldn't have been developed because of the restrictions on the Airport Vicinity Protection Plan. So they are moving the line over a little bit. So; but based upon the process, my questions are really processed based and also just the inquiry about; the first part is has the Airport agreed to this movement of the line? Are we aware of that? Is there any documentation to that? Or is this a nonstarter already with the Airport? I've heard some anecdotal stuff but I haven't heard anything specifically. And the second part is my concern about having; as the Report mentions, there's going to be multitude of requests at the exact same time. Amending the secondary plan and amending the PDO, rezoning variance, all this is going to hit the community at exactly the same time. I don't believe that's a proper process. I believe it confuses people. They'll going to start taking; how do I defeat this Motion or this request when there's so many different angles that they'll have to go at. I personally think it

should be one at a time if not we can get to the Conditional Uses or Variances at a later point. But until this Secondary Plan Amendment is actually approved the other stuff doesn't matter at that point. So I am concerned about the process, that I will go through with this; I am concerned that I haven't heard that the Airport is a hundred percent behind this, so if I could get some response to that?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: For the record here I think its important it realize what we're doing is the Secondary Plan Amendment here is recommending that the line be moved over from the middle of the rail yard to the edge of the rail yard which is a couple hundred feet and not even a couple hundred feet. In the realm of the Airport Secondary Plan, it's a very minimal modification. I did get wind there was concern about this coming from Councillor Orlikow, so I took the time to ask our planners to contact the Airport Authority to get a response back as to what the Airport Authority's position and the response I got back from our planners was clear the Airport Authority Is not opposed to this Secondary Plan Amendment, so I hope that helps everybody here today in casting their vote. And this is another great example of exactly what Councillor Smith was just referring to where we're getting to; due to the intensification of the use of land here, land that was previously a railroad or rail yard is now going to serve as high quality residential housing, single family residential, or multi-family with bungalow style as I understand it. So again, it's very much consistent with OurWinnipeg and we're waiting for the Province to approve and certainly the complete community's document. So, and knowing that there is no opposition from the Airport Authority has certainly helped us move this forward and get this job of plan intensification and sustainability moving forward. We could stay here and argue this all day long but if you believe in principals of sustainability and we know we need to grow up and we know we need to have some intensification of land use. Let's get the job done and keep things moving ahead for this City that has some great momentum going right now.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank You, Speaker Nordman. I'm standing to speak because I'm a little bit confused. I was hoping to hear a little bit about; it sounds like they're moving a line and I don't understand why the lines moving if the Chairperson of the Standing Committee could explain that to me. In closing I would really appreciate that because I'm not really understanding why the line is being moved as to redeveloping this former railway land.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Not a bad segue into my comments Mr. Speaker. Let me read from the history portion of the Report that might assist Councillor Eadie and others around the table. I wasn't sure from Councillor Orlikow's comments what exactly he was getting at whether he was for or against the overall direction of what we're trying do here which I think was clearly enunciated by Councillor Swandel moments ago. It reads "moving the boundary is required prior to rezoning the subject lands for multiple family residential development. The proposed development which will be considered in subsequent rezoning and variance applications as the final phase of the Centennial Park development which includes a total of 92 bungalow condominiums between Corydon and Academy Road on the former Oak Point Subdivision railway land. The first two phases have already been approved and preliminary site work has commenced. I think we could say with some degree of certainty what we're working towards here is residential infill development. I don't think we need to put any finer point on the mat at this point. I would hate to think; in fact it would mortify me and scare me beyond words Mr. Speaker, to think that anybody after those wonderful words of Councillor Gerbasi would suddenly stand up and not support those principles. It's not that we're beyond flip flopping in this Council but we generally wait more than 10 minutes to do it as all as I'm saying.

Mr. Speaker: I caution you Sir.

Councillor Steeves: Just teasing. So we have had some issues in this area and while I was; I guess gratified to hear Councillor Gerbasi's comments I'm going to just fire one across the bow of a couple of ships here because that development I talked about previously was not one that was supported in Community Committee and it was infill development that met all of those crucial indicators that Councillor Gerbasi spoke about only moments ago. But I don't know why exactly that didn't fly at that particular meeting, but we reversed it at Committee when I was the Chair of that Committee. The decision that has to be made here today, Mr. Speaker, I think, is what are we doing here? What are we doing in this area? What is the general plan? What are the philosophies that we support? Are we supporting some things some times when we think it matches up with our political philosophies but there is no potential for community angst? Or, are we saying that you know what I'm going to support this principle all the time, because it's what I believe. I'll be interested to see how this vote goes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I just wanted to briefly defend myself here that those issues for some of those developments were rather complex and they were related to local issues. Due to the specific nature of some of the developments. And also, that particular Corridor really should have been purchased by the City for other uses. So, I'm sorry Councillor Steeves isn't familiar with the local issues we discussed at that time and is choosing to attack; I guess he's entitled to that. But at this stage, I'm not supporting this but you know, I think if cooler heads could prevail and we can celebrate the things that we are agreeing on, and maybe have more positive tone yourself. Often we as the opposition are accused of being in opposition to everything even when we do something positive. So, I guess I can't really help that attitude. But hopefully, with the positive vote we are having today on a significant infill development for the City, maybe some of that positivity will rub off on all Members of Council. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before we get to, too far ahead of ourselves here, this is Step 1. There still will be community consultation; there will still be public hearings; there are still all sorts of stuff that still needs to happen before any type of redevelopment happens here. Don't get too excited yet. There is still due process to come and I think that's the most important thing to remember here. Why is the line down in the middle of this particular rail bed? Because quite often they describe legal areas at times when there was a rail line that was the easiest ways to do it. You look at all sorts of things up my way. I mean Raleigh and Gateway were the railway tracks were that's how you drew the boundaries for Electoral Wards even. It's just basically a legal description a way of describing an area. And moving it over as Councillor Steeves had pointed out or Councillor Swandel, just a couple of feet isn't a big issue, again, consultations I understand have in fact occurred with the Winnipeg Airport Authority regarding that. So again, this is a first step. Redevelopment is always a dicey issue. But again, there will still be plenty of opportunity for the community to be involved. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I'll call the question. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion Carried.

**Item 23 – The Historical Buildings By-law No. 1474/77 –
Shanghai Restaurant Building (formerly the Robert/ Coronation Block) –
228 King Street**

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would be pleased to hear Comments on who stepped this down.

Mr. Speaker: We would like to introduce the Motion at this point in time?

Councillor Gerbasi: And what I thought I would do in the interests of the spirit of the Christmas season, I would use my ten minutes to both introduce the Motion and make my comments rather than take more of your time on this issue. I think I can do that in ten minutes.

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

WHEREAS on December 6, 2010, the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development recommended that a demolition permit be issued for the Shanghai Restaurant building at 228 King Street in the Point Douglas Ward (formerly the Robert/Coronation Block);

AND WHEREAS there has been no engineering report done which would provide objective evidence of the structural viability of the building and the costs of adaptive re-use;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the matter be referred back to the public service to undertake an engineering study of the property at 228 King Street and then have the matter reconsidered by the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development.

Councillor Gerbasi: The Motion of referral is simple. It says that Therefore Be It Resolved the matter be referred back to the public service to undertake an engineering study of the property at 228 King and then to have the matter reconsidered by the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development" and the Whereas states there has been no engineering report done which would provide objective evidence of the structural viability of the building and the cost of an adaptive reuse. Of course we're talking about the Shanghai Building. I'm speaking on this matter; I spoke at Executive Committee as well as Property and Development Committee, and I'm speaking both with a couple of hats as

Chair of the Historical Buildings Committee. The members of the Committee bring forward a recommendation political Councillors don't vote on those recommendations but I'm speaking on behalf of their recommendation as a Chair and also simply as a Member of Council who believes we should be taking a more stewardship approach of our heritage than we are in some cases. In some cases we have done some very good things but in this case I think we're about to make an unfortunate decision. The reason we're having this discussion today is the owner of the building wants to demolish the building and because it's listed on the Historic Inventory; I'm just outlining this for some of the newer Councillors in case you're not fully aware of our process. The demolition request triggers the process of Heritage evaluation by the Historical Buildings Committee. The decision being made today is about whether or not this building should be placed on the Conservation list or not. If you vote against that decision that's basically the right to demolish with whatever permits and other requirements, yes but, you're basically taking away the Heritage designation potential of this building. And the Historic Buildings Committee is a group which includes expert members from the Province, from the Feds, from professional Architects Association and their recommendation is very clearly from an objective expert point of view, that this building is worthy of a designation. And you can see from the attached Report; I'm not going to get into the details of it but it was 1882, built, and it housed City Hall for 3 years; you know there is a lot you can do in adaptive reuse to commemorate something like that. We've already lost other City Halls and I think that's a pretty significant historical event. But the criteria that the Historical Buildings Committee uses and I want to emphasize this, is a list of very specific objective criteria, it's a couple of pages on which they score points and this building scored high enough to recommend a designation. So aside from what was said at the Committee, dismissing this as nostalgia, dismissing this as sentimentality, which frankly I somewhat found offensive and dismissive of our Heritage volunteer experts on that Committee. It is not nostalgia or it is not sentimentality it is objective heritage analysis that this building has Heritage value that is significant enough to be put on our designation list. So I think people need to understand that. Whether you decide to value that or whether decide to do something else instead fine you can say that but it's not fair to dismiss the facts of the Heritage value that we are making a choice today or you are, if you choose to take; to ignore this recommendation of the Historic Buildings Committee.

It really concerns me and I find it surprising actually that we don't have clear information about the viability of this particular building. There's been no study tabled to back up the claims that this building cannot be adaptively reused and that its going to fall down and hit Councillor Wyatt with a brick on his head as he said he was afraid to walking by the building. You know maybe that would knock some sense on this issue but there's been a study completed by the owner, we believe, and that study has not been tabled at the Standing Committee. I'm just kidding, Russ. Joking; just joking. But a decision to end the life of this; before a decision to end the life of the significant building is made, I think the City should do its own engineering report. Even if they have done a Report. If they've done a Report and they haven't tabled it; you have to wonder what's in it. I don't know. It hasn't not been made public. But, I really think that the most appropriate course of action and we know this project is not happening for several years. So there is absolutely no rush and I don't understand why we can't refer this back and have the proper engineering studies done. If you're convinced that the building is completely un-savable then that's what that engineering report will say. I don't know why we can't refer it back. Have that engineering study and if that study comes back and says the building is unsalable or its economically unviable, or whatever, then let's base our decision on the facts. And that's all I'm asking here. I don't think we should be making decisions on here say, especially important decisions that affect the character of our Warehouse District which is important whether or not its exactly within the boundaries of the Exchange District and I've been hearing that also lately, you know, it's in the Exchange District so we can't touch it but if its outside it or anywhere else it's fair game. Well that's still diminishing a significant Heritage area of our Downtown and we have other Heritage areas like St. Boniface and even Armstrong Point and other areas of our City that are also very important and the Warehouse District is clearly going to be diminished by the loss of a building that covers an entire City block that once housed our City Hall and that can be seen simply by common sense. It is understandable that the owner, from a business point of view, it is demolition by neglect that's been acknowledged. There has not been investment for the last 30 or 40 years. From a business point of view and I'm sure that's what the owner's looking at, which is how many people do look at it, that might make sense to them, but we as the City of Winnipeg and this Council are supposed to be stewards of our Heritage assets. We have that responsibility and I believe we need to find ways to protect this area from losing its value. I mean, that is why people go to the Exchange District and the Warehouse District and China Town, because it's interesting and because it has heritage and we can make it something really special. But that involves some vision, creativity and willingness to do something like we did with Kelly House; like we did with the Ryan Block we did what we could and I also want to point out and in this case when you have a full building in place; you don't want to rush to just saving the facade or reconstructing if that's the last resort; rebuilding something that sort of looks like a Heritage Building. First we need to determine if we can save this building and that's always the first choice and that has not been examined at all. It's a lot easier to simply go with what an owner wants to do or what a developer wants to do, that's the easy route and I can understand okay, there's a housing project, but they don't even have their plans in place. They don't have their funding in place. There is time to revisit that proposal and to consider another option for; there's many other sites in this Warehouse District where development could occur and we know that nobody has tried. CentreVenture hasn't been asked to come forward with a Report with other options. These are many steps we could take in the Property Committee and the Policy Committee could take and I'm concerned about the Policy Committee sort

of going with a Policy that doesn't even do engineering Reports that goes on here say that doesn't even have CentreVenture examine other options but just says, ah, if somebody wants to do something there you go. And that you know would be fine if there was no Heritage value here but we have that identified from our Heritage experts and we're choosing to close our eyes to that. And I don't know why I hope you'll reconsider that. So I'm asking in the Motion; all I'm saying is to refer this back and have the proper due diligence done for the engineering report and to have it reconsidered; have CentreVenture look at it and come up with some other discussions with the Housing Group because we all agree we want more housing in the Downtown and China Town. We know we all agree with that. And it's a bit more challenging to preserve Heritage in that process but I think we're up to the task. We just have to try and frankly I don't think we have tried. Well maybe everybody is tried cause of the election or something but we can't give up that easily. And I also agree with some of the comments made earlier by Ms. Tugwell you know, we can't really reward; it's a mistake to just sort of give in so easily and reward the unfortunate demolition by neglect even though we understand how that happens, you know, we need to be stewards here and not make it easy for people to do that because other buildings that are going to be coming before you very soon you'll going to be facing the same thing with several other buildings and this is going to eat away piece by piece of the character of our Warehouse District so I urge you to not to overlook the importance of this decision. It's not a small decision as some people are thinking that it is. Sometimes these decisions are like that and you can't bring it back once you allow the demolition of the building it's not coming back so I beg you not to do this without proper due diligence that all I'm asking for. It's a very simple thing to Support this Motion and give it another chance. It's not like the project is ready to go ahead any time soon. Please thank you for considering it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman, I stand in support of this Motion to refer back for an Engineer Report to be done and studied. I as a member of the Seven Oaks Historical Society Winnipeg Inc. understand the need of the City to recognize our Historical perspective and to maintain historical buildings within the City? I am not insensitive to the financial ability of developers to move forth a vision of a housing project. And I think it's important that the people moving forth to develop this are talking about housing options in the downtown area. However without an engineering Study, how do we know whether or not we couldn't build housing out of the existing building that is there, and then the newer units could be built over top? And there are different ways that is that may be done. It doesn't have to be built up right in the middle of the; up from the same building. There could be some way of building just above it and then renovating the lower part to maintain the Historical perspective of the building while at the same time allowing for some kind of Housing being in there on the second floor with a commercial at the bottom, whatever that is. But I really think this Motion should; that this Motion should go through to refer this decision on this building as we don't really want to lose this. And as Councillor Gerbasi has mentioned, it's not going to be developed for several years, and I believe that the City of Winnipeg and we do take our responsibility to work with developers to maintain history and without an engineers report how can we even have a discussion with the owner of the property and the potential developers about ways of preserving our History? So it's simply about an engineering report and I'm really concerned as well that we move; that we move ahead without an engineers report here. What happens when the next building comes along that does have heritage value? Should we ignore having an engineering study done? I think this is a bad precedence to set. We need to make sure in building which does have historical value from the historians who have spoken to us and others in the City who recognized that, so, please, I implore all of you to support this Motion to refer this back to have an engineering study done.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes I feel the same way, Mr. Speaker. Let me tell you this. You know, we talk around this Council Chamber a great deal. Not always referring to the facts. You know, I've heard some Councillors say I've walked by the building and they assess the building. Well, you know, we're not architects. We're not Engineers and the idea of having basing our decisions on facts should be something we should welcome. It shouldn't be something that we just say look, that building looks like it should be brought done. It's part of our history. It was a City Hall for many years and something we should seek to preserve it. We should get the facts on the building with an engineer study. Simple as that. I don't think we should be rushed into this. Why are we doing this? I think we should all support referring it back.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: I'm Okay, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillor Gerbasi closes.

Councillor Gerbasi: In closing on the Motion, I hope that the silence from the people who have so far supported removing the designation of this building means they have a change of heart. I'm not sure it does but I certainly hope it

does. I think everything has been said very well by Cindy Tugwell and Jordan Van Sewell, Heritage Winnipeg as well as those other Councillors who spoken to it and I hope that's what the silence I hear right now means that you've had a little bit of sober second thought and you're prepared to simply ask for an engineers report before we move ahead with any kind of decision. So I thank you in advance for that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. The proposal before us, the proposal from the Chinese Community; the stewards of China Town Winnipeg they want to do this. This is driven from the Chinese Community this is the area that they are the stewards of; they know better than us and my opinion as to what the future direction of this particular area is. This particular block is not intact. If you look at the back side of it; the Harmony House on Princess, is a 1970s era housing Project as well. This Council has done very well, I would argue in preserving our Exchange District. Look at some of the very exciting projects we've done. We got the new parade recently opened on King Street; at 100 King Street. A lot of public money involved in that. You've got the Union Tower just across from William from us here at City Hall. It looks to be a fantastic amenity in our downtown and it's a great Historic Building. Kelly House in fact; that could have gone either way, I think we made the right call on it. We found a good reuse for it and today I understand they are already in that particular property. One thing I think I put my foot down on it even 168 King Street. Sorry 168 Bannatyne my apologies. They wanted to put on a new modernist topper on that building. I took a little bit of flack on it initially but I said no, I mean, yeah we want people living downtown, yeah we want new investments in the downtown but it's right across from the Ashtown Warehouse what a great signature building. And even the new developments around there, the parkade they built for Ashtown across Rory was consistent with the area it looked right. The one they proposed we were at the Policy Committee and were sitting there; we were sitting there and I said you know what this doesn't really fit. We have a lot of historic buildings in downtown Winnipeg. We've got a lot of them and they're graded at 1, 2 and 3. Those are buildings that get special attention paid to them because they are very Historic Buildings. A lot of them are in jeopardy and I get that, but bringing people downtown and taking the lesser ones is this case that are not consistent and not in the Exchange District by having new people downtown by having new investment in downtown it improves the viability of these Historic buildings and it makes the better case to improve them and put; in fact in many cases, public dollars towards preserving and protecting our heritage assets in our Downtown especially. So again, I'm supportive of this. The initial notions that were talked about; about doing interim service parking, completely and totally not on. No demolition until a new, proper plan is in place. But again, this is an exciting redevelopment in our downtown and it's again driven by the Chinese Community. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: We have a recorded vote on the motion, number 1. The amendment. The motion to refer. Jenny's motion. All those in favour.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors; Eadie, Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith, Wyatt and Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Steen, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal.

Clerk: The motion Mr. Speaker Yeas 6, Nays 10.

Mr. Speaker: Now on the original question of Item 23. All those in favour? Opposed? You would like a recorded vote on this one also, okay. All right. All those in favor please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Steen, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt and Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Orlikow, Smith.

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

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Now we have Motion 2, Notice of Motion, Councillor Browaty.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Steen,

WHEREAS

(a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 70/2010, The City of Winnipeg ("the City") authorized the expropriation of the lands described therein for the purpose of the Disraeli Freeway Renewal Project and executed a Declaration of Expropriation dated June 23, 2010;

(b) Notice of the intended expropriation was served by the City upon all owners of the lands intended to be expropriated, and was published in a newspaper having general circulation in the locality in which the said lands are situate, pursuant to section 1 of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act;

(c) Notices of objection to the intended expropriation were served upon the City by some of the said owners, pursuant to section 3 of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act;

(d) The City requested the Minister of Justice to appoint an inquiry officer; and

(e) The Minister of Justice on September 23, 2010 appointed an inquiry officer pursuant to section 4(2) of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act, and an inquiry was conducted on September 27, 28, 29 and 30, 2010.

AND WHEREAS the inquiry officer submitted his report to the City on October 20, 2010, wherein he stated that in his opinion the intended expropriation is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the objectives of the City, subject to the Declaration of Expropriation being amended to reduce the amount of land being expropriated from the property located at 120 Higgins Avenue from the full parcel to only a 1.1 metre wide strip.

AND WHEREAS The Expropriation Act provides that Council of the City shall consider the report of the inquiry officer, and where Council makes an order confirming the intended expropriation which is not in accordance with the opinion of the inquiry officer, Council shall state its reasons for making the order.

AND WHEREAS it is advantageous that the City proceed with the expropriation of the lands described in By-law No. 70/2010 with the following exceptions:

- *to reduce the amount of land being expropriated from the property located at 120 Higgins Avenue from the full parcel to a 1.8 metre wide strip; and*
- *to eliminate the proposed expropriation of a portion of the property located at 541 Waterfront Drive.*

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation made June 23, 2010, executed pursuant to By-law No. 70/2010 and expropriating the following lands:

Firstly: The lands taken for Works and shown as Parcels A, B, and C on Plan Deposit 406/2010 WLTO, prepared by Albert Gerhard Degner, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor;

Secondly: The lands taken for Works and shown as Parcel A on Plan Deposit 411/2010 WLTO, prepared by Albert Gerhard Degner, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor;

Thirdly: The lands taken for Works and shown as Parcels A, B, C, D and E on Plan Deposit 415/2010 WLTO, prepared by Albert Gerhard Degner, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor; and

Fourthly: The lands taken for Works and shown as Parcels A, B and C on Plan Deposit 430/2010 WLTO, prepared by Albert Gerhard Degner, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor.

The lands described above are expropriated free of encumbrances, except for part of the lands fourthly described, being Parcel C on Plan Deposit 430/2010 WLTO which is expropriated subject to Centra Gas Manitoba Inc. Certificate of Judgment No. 3216804 WLTO, registered in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office on November 14, 2005.

The lands described above except:

a) 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

b) 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.

BE AMENDED to provide that the lands thirdly described are as follows:

> *Thirdly: The lands taken for Works and shown as Parcels A, B, C and D on Plan Deposit 415/2010 WLTO, prepared by Albert Gerhard Degner, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,*

AND BE AMENDED to replace the original Plan Deposit 415/2010 WLTO with a revised version which:

- *reduces the amount of land being expropriated from the property located at 120 Higgins Avenue from the full parcel to a 1.8 metre wide strip; and*
- *eliminates the proposed expropriation of a portion of the property located at 541 Waterfront Drive.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated June 23, 2010, as amended herein and thereby replaced by an Amended Declaration of Expropriation dated December 15, 2010, is hereby confirmed.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council's reasons for proceeding with the expropriation of a 1.8 metre wide strip of land from the property located at 120 Higgins Avenue instead of a 1.1 metre strip which in the opinion of the Inquiry Officer is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the City's objectives, are as follows:

- *Before the Inquiry the Winnipeg Public Service had engaged a surveyor to prepare the revised version of Plan Deposit 415/2010 which provides for expropriation of a 1.8 metre wide strip of land from the property located at 120 Higgins Avenue.*

- *The Winnipeg Public Service is in discussions with the owner of the property located at 120 Higgins Avenue in an effort to accommodate both the City's land needs for the Disraeli Freeway Renewal Project and the interests of the owner.*

- *The outcome of those discussions will likely affect the precise dimensions of land to be expropriated, which may or not be a 1.1 metre wide strip.*

- *Under the Expropriation Act, where at any time before the City pays due compensation to the owner of expropriated land, if any part of the land is found to be unnecessary for the City's purposes, the City shall notify the owner, who may elect to take back the portion of the land which is unnecessary for the City's purposes and has the right to compensation for consequential damages, or may require the City to retain the land and pay due compensation for it.*

- *To postpone confirmation of the entire expropriation proceeding could have significant implications for the City, including possibly affecting the construction schedule.*

- *Therefore, notwithstanding the possible consequences of having to abandon the expropriation of a small portion of the land located at 120 Higgins Avenue, it is in the City's best interests to make and confirm the Amended Declaration of Expropriation.*

Councillor Browaty: I would like to move this then.

Mr. Speaker: Please move the motion Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Do you really want me it read it. I don't think so.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. You have some By-laws Councillor.

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

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 130/2010 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 130/2010.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead Jeff.

Councillor Browaty: Okay. I move that the following By-laws be read a second time, By-law No. 101/2010 as amended and By-law No. 118/2010.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 101/2010 as amended and 118/2010.

Councillor Browaty: I move By-laws Numbered 101/2010 as amended and 118/2010 be read a third time and same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Councillor Browaty: I'll move the following By-laws be read a first time By-law number 125/2010, 126/2010, 127/2010, 128/2010, 129/2010, 134/2010.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 125/2010, 126/2010, 127/2010, 128/2010, 129/2010, 134/2010.

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-laws numbered 125/2010 to 129/2010 both inclusive and 134/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 125/2010 to 129/2010 both inclusive and 134/2010.

Councillor Browaty: I move the rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 125/2010 to 129/2010, both inclusive, and 134/2010 be read a third time and same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question Period for Councillor Browaty. Any questions on Property and Development? Seeing none, we'll move onto Public Policy; or Standing Policy Committee for Protection and Community Service, Councillor Steeves.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED MAY 3, 2010**

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'll introduce the Report of May 3, 2010 and I'll move Item 6 of the Report dated May 3, 2010 be laid over for up to 60 days.

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

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED NOVEMBER 15, 2010**

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'll move the Report of November 15, 2010; I'll move that the Report; I'll move the Report and adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

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

Councillor Steeves: Regarding By-laws, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We have a Motion.

Councillor Steeves: Well of course. That's an Automatic Referral.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
MOTIONS**

**Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan,
Seconded by Councillor Fielding,**

WHEREAS on March 19, 2008 Council concurred in the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services and adopted that:

- *That the Winnipeg Police Service be directed to investigate the feasibility of Developing a pilot project utilizing monitored crime cameras in high crime areas in the City, which pilot project should include:*
  - *(i) Partnerships with community groups and businesses to link existing Video surveillance systems together in the City of Winnipeg;*
  - *(ii) Corporate sponsorship to help fund the program; and*
  - *(iii) An implementation plan with timeframes*

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Public Service report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services with a current status update on the efficacy, challenges, and outcomes of the pilot project utilizing monitored cameras in high crime areas in the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Automatic referral on that, thank you. By-law?

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

Councillor Steeves: I'll think I'll move it first, yeah, thanks. I didn't know why Visa was standing up taking my thunder there. I'll move By-law No. 119/2010 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 119/2010.

Councillor Steeves: I move By-law No. 119/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 119/2010

Councillor Steeves: I move the rules be suspended and By-law No. 119/2010 be read a third time and same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period. No questions for the Chairman of Protection and Community Services? Moving on Standing Committee of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Vandal.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED NOVEMBER 16, 2010 ADJOURNED TO NOVEMBER 23, 2010

Councillor Vandal: Thank You, Mr. Speaker. I will move the Report of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated November 16th, 2010 adjourned to November 23rd 2010 Items 1 through 6 be moved as Consent Items.

Councillor Swandel: Record me in Opposition to Number 6.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. So

Councillor Wyatt: Record me in Opposition to Number 2.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. All those in favour? Opposed? And Councillor Wyatt Number 2 And Swandel Number 6. Motion is passed. December 7, Councillor Vandal.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED DECEMBER 7, 2010

Councillor Vandal: I'll move the Report dated December 7, Item 1 and 2 be moved as Consent Items.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, Number 1 and likewise Councillor Smith. All those in favour of Item 2? Opposed. Carried. And Councillor.

Item 1 - 2011 Capital Local Streets, Alley Renewals and
Granular Roadways Improvements

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank You, Mr. Speaker. I may say the water rates haven't passed so quietly in quite a while. Item 1 is a litany of Capital Local Streets, Alley Renews and Granular Roadways that are scheduled for improvement coming out of the 2011 Capital Budget. There is about I believe 18 and a half million dollars of projects that are being ruled out. The Administration have consulted with all of the Ward Councillors or at least I hope they have on this issue and the idea behind bringing it forward before the end of the year is to kick start the whole process for constructing these ASAP in 2011. We know this is simply the tip of the iceberg. We know we need a better deal to actually catch up on our infrastructure deficit but nevertheless, this is here for your approval.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank You, Mr. Speaker. I Stand the Item down just simply I'll be voting in favour of the Report Mr. Speaker but I Stand it Down just to point out the fact that, we have consistently now for a number of years been having Capital Budgets where our local streets Budget has been in the 10 to $12 million range, maybe as high as 15 sometimes. And the problem is becoming quite acute. I've seen the list of streets grow in terms of the older streets going from fair to poor status and streets going from what was before good to now fair. It's getting worse, Mr. Speaker. I; there is no other way to say it. The infrastructure is crumbling at a rate which I guess is expected in a City of our age and of our climate. A lot of these roads, Mr. Speaker, were built during the boom of 1960s and 70s and they are now hitting 30, 40 years lifespan where minimal maintenance has gone into them if any and we're really seeing a crunch here Mr. Speaker; where we're going to have to do something. And there is no doubt, we know Mr. Speaker, that these residential streets, local streets were largely paid for when the developments went in, or when they did occur or they were paid for through local improvements. Either way, the individuals, home owners moving into the neighbourhood, buying a home and paying for it through the price of their home, or agreed to paved their roads through an L.I. A local improvement levy that would have been a charge against their property tax. I don't think it's too far to say, Mr. Speaker

that; and I don't think it's unreasonable to say that one shouldn't expect that that will permanently pave your street forever. The fact of the matter is streets collapse and they decay and we have to find a way to pay for it and I think there has to be some responsibility for also those who live on the street, and enjoy and use the street towards paying for those costs. We have to look at options and I know under the charter EPC is charged with the responsibility Mr. Speaker of bringing forward the Capital Budget and the Operating Budget; I would encourage at this point encourage EPC; the Chair of Finance to look at those options. I know there has been discussion in terms of having Frontage Levies dedicated to residential streets, transparent that would be fully funding residential street renewal. That is being considered. I think we should look at other Cities and other communities, not just in Canada but the United States in terms of and northern cities in terms of how they maintain their streets Mr. Speaker. Maybe we need to have a different level of standard with regards to maintenance in this climate like ours. Clearly it is unsustainable. We all know this. I think the Infrastructure Report that we did in this Council in 2009; in July of 2009, estimated that we should be spending in about a hundred million dollars on residential streets alone. $100 million dollars a year just to maintain what we have. It's a huge number, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker right now we don't even have a budget, Mr. Speaker for the Collector Streets, if you want to call them that, the streets that are in industrial parks or around shopping centers. These ones are the ones; this falls under the Local Street Budget Mr. Speaker. Residential streets. It's getting worse Mr. Speaker and so I rise today to say that we just came out of an Election, it was something that I heard on the doorstep and it was sure that something every candidate must have heard in terms of the concern out there. And I think we have to have an honest discussion of what we're going to do to address this concern and you know what, we're not going to solve the entire infrastructure problem overnight. We know that. We know that. The problem has happened over many, many, many years. But let's just try to solve one part of it maybe. Let's pick this year and say you know what we're going to try to get to the heart of the local street problem; the residential street problem and we're going to take that liability and answer the question, how do we address that liability that's growing every year from the City of Winnipeg. Because if we don't do it, Mr. Speaker we're ultimately passing that burden on to a future Council and that's not right or fair. And onto future generations of our City. Mr. Speaker, it's incumbent on us to have this discussion, it won't be easy. It's no doubt that solutions there will be a cost in order to address this. But the fact of the matter should be addressed and local streets is there and I know we've been asking the Provincial governments and federal governments for more money Mr. Speaker, and I know we've been asking for example the idea of a sales tax or part of the existing provincial sales tax but even if we were to get that, Mr. Speaker, let's say 1% which is, you know, would be a godsend, it's about 130 or 140 million to get us up there, well Mr. Speaker we know that would only address part of our existing infrastructure deficit, One-third of it. So the problem is huge, Mr. Speaker. Let's see if we can solve this problem this year. It's not much to ask. I would implore you to take that into consideration as we go forward here and we talk about the Capital. I know I commend the Chair for holding consultation meetings in the City for doing that is it's something I verge over the years and I commend him for doing that in terms of the Capital Budget and now the Operating Budget but I just think, Mr. Speaker; that this is something we know is intrinsic people. It gives pride to the neighbourhood and I think it demoralizes neighborhoods when we let the sidewalks fall apart and streets fall apart and the lanes crack. It's a demoralizing effect, and it sends a message that we're not looking after our Infrastructure and our inventory our Assets, so why should the home owner look after theirs? It's not the right message to send. I think as was said previously this is a greatest City and I think the greatest in the country. We deserve better. Winnipeggers deserve better. Let us rise to this challenge Mr. Speaker; let this be the last budget where we have it in the range of 10 to a 15 million for residential streets. Let us show that leadership Mr. Speaker, and I encourage the Mayor and EPC to take that Forward. Thank you

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith please.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, you know, we're not making any progress. I would like to see more monies allocated for streets and back lanes. You know in my Ward there is over 200 back lanes that have to be reconstructed. You know every year we've said the same thing over and over again and I know many of you don't have back lanes but you should think of the whole City. And Councillor Wyatt made a valid point. It's demoralizing to people to have bad infrastructure where they live. And back lanes are important. I think those City Councillors that have back lanes and are in need of badly needing reconstruction should be voicing that. We have to work together. I'm the only one that basically talks about back lanes in this Council. No, really. I haven't had a ground swell of Councillors saying back lanes are important and it's about time we recognize that, and I expect the Administration to come up with some ideas and maybe a slight improvement would be appreciated. I don't expect a great change; I don't expect you to do 200 back lanes next year but maybe in my Ward instead of 4, maybe 6. A slight improvement. Same with Councillor Gerbasi's Ward and Councillor Orlikow's Ward. Let's have some progress. There is nothing happening whatsoever. You're going on the same route as you did last year and the year before and the year before and you're not spending enough time in building up our Infrastructure. Back lanes are important. I know maybe, it's true; I don't hear a ground swelling of support for people wanting back lanes. I think this Council should be supporting more development of back lanes or doing something with them. I would like the Administration to come up with a proposal of how we handle back lanes. And we will hear from Councillor Fielding on why so meager resources are allocated for back lanes in this budget.

Mr. Speaker: Before we hear from any more speakers on this subject; on this Item I would entertain a Motion for extension beyond the twelve o'clock hour. I'm looking for a Motion here Gord. Thanks. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Eadie then Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman for the opportunity to speak to this Item on our Agenda is very important and I mean, I reflect what Harvey is talking about and the north end is the place of back lanes as well. I just wanted; we do need to find a better way to fund these streets. We; the reality is, that nobody has any respect for the North End, including the hoodlums. When they see a back lane in the North End they see a place to disrespect they see a place to burn garbage cans, they see a place that we're not willing to maintain. What I learned as a School Board Trustee conference, schools that don't maintain and take care of broken objects within the buildings are buildings that are disrespected by young people. Buildings that are really well maintained and are taken care of, broken things are fixed right away are schools that the youth respect and appreciate they don't destroy it. If we look at our back lanes in the North End, really this is about all part of solving our problems in the North End with crime. We need to have more respect for our streets and admittedly we have a by-law that is there to try maintain housing in the area and in the North End, I was just amazed at my next years allotment for streets, 2 city blocks and a front street and two back lanes. There is a huge demand to fix the back lanes in the Mynarski Ward, I was out there, and it was actually the number 2 issue. after crime; the number 2 issue was we need to get our streets fixed and not just sort of patch over them and they're broken up again the next year. So we need to really find a way to solve this problem and funding Projects to fix the broken streets in our older neighborhoods and if we do that, we will find; you will discover that there will be more respect because neighbourhoods who are revitalizing their housing, we know are neighbourhoods that are improved. So if we are revitalizing and we are fixing our back lanes and we are fixing our front streets we know those neighbourhoods are going to do better, crime will go down and so let's figure out a way to do this and that's all I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: I'm going to be very brief because Councillor Steeves normally is on debates here according to City Hall but you know back lanes as a focus for Councillor Smith's purpose, Councillor Nordman and myself moved a Motion in terms of the ravel back lanes that's there; I think there's been some pretty good media coverage on that and I know Councillor Vandal came into his new role as Chair of Finance that was our first thing our first discussion was in terms of some of the gravel back lanes program that's there; there's somewhere between 383 blocks I believe it is of gravel back lanes. So, I think you will see some focus as we move forward. So with that, I will stand down.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Sorry, I require some guidance on the amendment, how that.

Mr. Speaker: I understand there is some misinformation or not quite accurate information on page 8 of the Report in Item 1 Capital local streets, alley renewals and granule roadway improvements. Currently, the 4th one down in River Heights-Fort Garry, street name is McMillan Dorchester Alley and it currently reads from Harrow Street to Stafford Street, it should be corrected to read from Harrow to Guelph, Correct? (laughter)

Councillor Orlikow: I did talk to the Administration beforehand. This back lane is actually a hold over from last year. Because they did the front street, they didn't want to do both streets at once. So I had talked to the Administration about the change because they put the wrong street in and you are actually are correct, Harrow to Stafford back lane is a fantastic back lane that doesn't need repair; that is my back lane; this is a block further down. So it just need a change would be a change that way.

Councillor Steeves: I have a list of back lanes that I'm prepared to launch into right now; I would like to do as well.

Mr. Speaker: We're just switching a name here. It's an error. It's less back lane. No it's more back lane.

Councillor Vandal: I think; can I try to suggest something here?

Mr. Speaker: Sure.

Councillor Vandal: We don't know in this Chambers if the costs are the same here. I don't think there is any great; if we lay this over or bring this to Committee we could talk; I could talk to the Administration. In the meantime make sure that everything is the same amount of money so we're not spending more money. So I would suggest John just sending it Committee and I'll work with the Administration with you to try and get this done as a housekeeping a.s.a.p.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead. Okay. This is referral. We'll get it done. All right. I'm sorry? (inaudible).

Councillor Vandal: No, no, no, no. No. Item moves forward.

Mr. Speaker: All right I'll call the question on.... I'm Sorry? I would like to call a Question on the referral of the Motion. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Vandal you get to wrap up.

Councillor Vandal: What wrap up? I think we're all on the same page. When I look around at the Chamber, the individual Councillors; I can see that I'm one of the old guys because when I was first elected in 95, until 1998, under then Mayor Susan Thompson, we didn't have one penny for residential streets for those whole 3 years and there were reasons for that. We were in an incredibly tight fiscal situation and we're paying I think 30 cents on every dollar was going to debt financing. We certainly didn't have the government grants we do now but the point I'm trying to make is; it took us years and years to get to this situation and it will take us some time to get out of it. And I'm not one who is going to say that we'll ever solve our Infrastructure completely 100% solve the deficit because that's not doable but we can manage it and we can manage it a lot better than what we're doing and I think if you look at every major City that's what they do they manage their deficits their Infrastructure deficits much better than we do and it comes down to money. So, having said that, Ross, I do care about the North End and I respect the North End and I look forward to working with you in the upcoming year. So, I'll move the Motion or the Clause.

Mr. Speaker: Harvey Smith is voting no. Harvey's opposed. Laughter. Out of Order.

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

Councillor Vandal: I'll move the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 137/2010, By-law No. 139/2010.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 137/2010 and 139/2010.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move By-laws No. 137 and 139/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 137/2010 and 139/2010.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that the rules be suspended, and By-laws numbered 137 and 139/2010 be read a third time and same be passed in ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. No questions.

REPORT OF THE
COUNCIL SECRETARIAT COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 6, 2010

Mr. Speaker: We have Secretariat Committee, I'll ask the Deputy Speaker to move this please.

Councillor Pagtakhan: We have Report of the Council Secretariat Committee dated December 6, 2010.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour. Opposed. carried. Okay. (Inaudible)

Councillor Steeves: Stood up as a Councillor and congratulated the Mayor on his upcoming, on his Engagement. The topic over the course; I would ask Council to Congratulate the Mayor and I would just offer up my services although she's never actually clearly enunciated it; I believe my wife thinks that I'm the perfect husband so I could help you in any way.

Mr. Speaker: You're perfect for each other, you're both in love with Gord. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: First of all Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Steeves and you can see even when he congratulates someone it's still all about Gord. (Laughing) Number 2, Mr. Speaker on a serious note as everyone is aware of the fact, there is a special meeting that was called for later on this afternoon, I'm very cognizant of the fact there is a luncheon for the Councillors and we've gone a little overboard. What I would like to do, Mr. Speaker is change the time from 3:30 to two

o'clock, and give you plenty of time to do the Luncheon and then we can move forward and deal with the other issues and I just want to share that with you at this particular point in time before Council adjourns Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We appreciate your consideration on that issue. Having said that, I ask for a Roll Call. Go ahead.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Smith, Steen, Steeves, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt.

Council adjourned at 12:15 p.m.