COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, June 23, 2010

The Council met at 9:36 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 Fielding.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. We'd like to introduce our page today, Kayla Ruiz from Kelvin High School who resides in the Daniel McIntyre Ward. Kayla, will this be your last meeting? Kayla is leaving us after a year of service, and we thank her for that. She is moving on to Quebec to enter the military, so we wish her well in her new endeavours. Congratulations and thank you for your service.

(Applause)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We have some special guests with us and we'd like Mayor Katz to come forward and make a presentation.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take a moment to welcome an extra special guest to City Hall. Her name is Natasha Woloschuk. On May the 17th, 15 youth from across Winnipeg presented speeches regarding civic issues in front of a panel of judges, competing for the Mayor's Leaders of Tomorrow Scholarship. Natasha, a recent graduate of Vincent Massey Collegiate, will be attending the University of Winnipeg this fall and she presented her speech on Engaging Youth in Volunteerism. For her writing, ideas and presentation, Natasha won first place in the Leaders of Tomorrow's Competition, earning herself a scholarship in the amount of $1,500, which I would be pleased to present her with at this particular point in time. Natasha, if you'd please come forward. There you are. First of all congratulations.

Natasha Woloschuk: Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Mayor Katz: The City of Winnipeg, His Worship Mayor Sam Katz and members of City Council are pleased to present a City of Winnipeg Outstanding Achievement Certificate to Natasha Woloschuk, Mayor's Leaders of Tomorrow Scholarship, June 23rd, 2010. Congratulations, and Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would ask for your indulgence so we can all hear the wonderful speech.

Natasha Woloschuk: Before I begin I'd like to give you this gift from my high school, Vincent Massey.

Mayor Katz: I just hope it's not over $200 (Inaudible). Thank you so much. I appreciate that.

Natasha Woloschuk: Good morning and thank you, Mr. Mayor and members of Council, for inviting me to speak to you this morning on the question of How to Engage Youth in Service within the Winnipeg Community. Volunteerism and contributing to the community can leave a young person with a feeling of satisfaction, accomplishment, a few new friends and a notation to add to the resume. Statistics Canada reports that Manitobans are well above the national average in volunteer service with 54 percent of Manitobans over the age of 15 serving their community. With this obvious commitment and spirit of volunteerism as part of our local culture, how can we engage the remaining citizens, particularly those age 15 to 24, and encourage them to volunteer within their community? There is good reason to focus on this particular age group. The 2007 Canada Survey of giving, volunteering and participating reports that the likelihood of volunteering decreases with age and notes that while 15 percent to 15 to 24 year olds volunteer; the number drops to only 36 percent for those ages 65 and over. I believe that there are three main causes of nonparticipation by youth. A lack of awareness of volunteer opportunities, unclear messages regarding what volunteer opportunities entail, and youth not knowing how to apply for a volunteer activity. With over 40 percent of youth aged 15 to 24 years reporting that the primary reason they do not volunteer is because they were not asked to, we must find ways to invite youth to volunteer.

I propose that the best way to market to youth is through a direct invitation. I first learned about volunteering when a teacher at my junior high school approached several students and recommended that we look at volunteering in a library during the summer. For me, this direct approach worked. It was implied endorsement of a volunteer program because if a teacher or a group leader says that this is a great opportunity and you'd be good at it, we tend to believe them. Schools provide a perfect environment for raising awareness through a direct approach. Student Councils and other student-led groups that already provide opportunities for gaining leadership and communication skills within the school community are great sources for volunteers who may want to gain these types of experiences outside of school. Statistics Canada says that 61 percent of current youth volunteers were active in their student government, 54 percent belonged to a club or a choir and 52 percent also participated in organized team sport. This tells me that the way to find new youth volunteers is to ensure that 100 percent of participants in student government, clubs, choirs or teams, receive a clear invitation and a request that they encourage others to do so as well.

Consider this. On the City of Winnipeg website, the description for volunteering in recreation services is "help staff supervise program participants, provide individual support as needed and prepare material and equipment for daily use." What I learned and what is left out of this description is that a volunteer will meet other youth from the community, play games and learn sports, gain practical skills that you can put on your resume, discover a new perspective by baking cookies and making Rice Krispie squares with kids who have never cooked at home before. Be a mentor, and inspire others. Learn how to make 50 water balloons in less than 10 minutes and laugh out loud every day. These are just some of the things I experienced as a volunteer but I never knew about any of them until I started volunteering. I believe that if volunteer programs provide clear information what the volunteer opportunities entail, then more individuals would feel inspired and feel comfortable about participating.

Finding information on volunteer opportunities can be challenging and the search itself may discourage youth from trying. For example, if you visit the City of Winnipeg home page you won't find a shortcut to volunteering on it. The exclusion of a link to volunteer opportunities or any information on volunteering suggests to website visitors that this is not an important feature of the City and one that does not need to be publicized. To me it says volunteers are not needed right now, but thank you for checking. I point this out because it reminds me of a famous line from the film, "The Pirates of the Caribbean" in which the character, Captain Jack Sparrow, played by the handsome actor Johnny Depp, explains that the buried treasure is located on a secret island that can only be found by people who already know where it is. Volunteer opportunities are like buried treasure. We've heard about them, we know there is lots out there, but we just don't know how to find them.

Youth hear several messages. Don't drink and drive, don't smoke, be active, but where is the catchy, have fun, learn and gain valuable experience through volunteering message? If this an important cause, it must receive attention and be marketed to its target audience. I suggest that the City of Winnipeg encourage organizations to promote volunteerism as a valuable and integral part of the young adult lifestyle in addition to any current efforts to recruit volunteers to their own causes. Imagine what could happen if every young person in a school group, club and sports team heard the invitation and learned the simple message, contribute to your community, you'll gain more than you'll give. My suggestions to increase the youth volunteerism are simple. Raise awareness of volunteer opportunities by inviting participation and target the message to those who are already leaders within their own youth community with the request that they participate and encourage others to do so. This will promote volunteerism as a regular part of the young adult lifestyle and I believe that these steps would increase the number of youth volunteers who once involved may continue to serve the community through their adulthood. Thank you.

(Applause)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Natasha. We appreciate you being with us today. Congratulations on your scholarship and good luck at the University of Winnipeg next spring…next fall. Thanks.

Natasha Woloschuk: Thank you very much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. I think we have a leave of absence motion.

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan,

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Adoption of the last Minutes.

MINUTES

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Fielding moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on May 19th, 2010 be taken as read and confirmed.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, you have a…

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes (inaudible). Regarding delegations I would ask to suspend the rules to hear one delegation. Josh Brandon wishes to speak to the Motion that was brought forward at the Special EPC meeting this morning on Mosquitoes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Okay. Mr. Brandon, wherever you are. You have 10 minutes.

Josh Brandon: Thanks. I'll try to be brief. Thanks, Mayor, Councillors, Speaker, for allowing me the opportunity to speak today on short notice. We all know that the issues of mosquitoes and pesticides inflame the passions of Winnipeggers like few others. There has been a lot of debate recently and some has been quite heated. I think we need to turn down the temperature on this debate and have some rational discussion to ensure that we achieve what we can all agree our shared goals for insect control policies. We should seek to be as effective as possible in limiting nuisance insects while maintaining the maximum level of safety per humans in the environment. So in this context I am all favour of revisiting Winnipeg's pesticide policies as the Motion seeks to do, but I think that these changes really need to be made in the context of open discussion backed by science and giving all citizens the right to have their concerns heard. I'd like to note that currently there is no urgent health emergency as the City has found currently that there is few of the disease carrying mosquitoes present in our environment.

So, it's unfortunate that this item is being rushed on to the Agenda with little notice or time for others to comment. And I've just had a chance to briefly look at the Motion now, and I see that it talks about needing a new policy, whereas we've had 150 percent above normal rainfall for the month of May. And really, I think making good policy isn't usually made based on the vagaries of weather. I think we needed to have, you know, look at this in a longer term context.

The Motion also talks about 30 days to discuss this issue, and I'm not sure if I caught it right when they were having the discussion during EPC this morning, but it sounded like they wanted to have even less than 30 days, somewhere less than 30 days, so they could have…so that you could have this discussion before you go on summer break. And I think we need to have more time to have a real thorough discussion about the issue and look at it from all perspectives.

The right to choose is a cornerstone for our political and health systems. It's important that we have notice, proper notice when…if our home is going to be fogged, and that we have a right to choose if our home should be fogged or not. If we're going to go through it, we're going to go down that road of doing fogging. And this…these are important because they are important elements of a fair and transparent public health system. You know, thousands of Winnipeggers suffer from multiple chemical sensitivities and other illnesses that might be affected by the fogging. Statistics Canada notes that…estimates that 650,000 people across the country suffer from multiple chemical sensitivities, so that would be you know 15,000 people here in Winnipeg. Other Winnipeggers have concerns about their children and pets being exposed to potentially dangerous chemicals. The rights of these citizens must be respected and I'm concerned that some of the proposed changes might limit the rights of these citizens.

The other thing I note about the Motion is it talks about looking at the impact of anti pesticide registrant buffer zones on City wide mosquito control efforts and the desirability of maintaining such buffer zones. I think that that introduces a bias into the research question that you'd be handing over to the City officials, the Insect Control Department, because what you're asking is to look at the buffer zones when really you need to look at the effectiveness of the whole program. You can't just take one element of that. You know, we might find that the fogging program as a whole is not the most effective way, and I think you need to look at all different angles of that. You know, there does need to be more study of the effectiveness of the fogging program before we consider expanding it, which what this Motion seems to do. Other jurisdictions have found that the mosquito populations have actually increased when fogging is conducted because it kills not only the target insect but also some of its predators. The most recent trap counts in some areas that I looked on the website yesterday, the area of Charleswood had a count of 146, while other areas that had yet to be sprayed had much lower counts. So we may find, actually, that increasing the amount we fog turns out to be counter productive. We might also find that it increases costs at a time when we have, you know, very limited budgets for Insect Control. I've heard from the Insect Control Department people that they don't have the funding to expand the biological larvicide control program as they'd like to and this is what they say is the most effective way of dealing with the insects. So we have to weigh the balances there. But most of all we need to ensure that the good science is driving this debate and we

deal with the mosquito problem and other pests as effectively as possible and that we get the proper public input and time to have all those concerns addressed. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any questions of Mr. Brandon? Seeing none. Thank you, sir. Appreciate your input. All right. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 2, 2010

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank you. I would like to introduce the Report and move Adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2 of June 2nd, 2010.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No. 1. Stand down on No. 1, No. 2. All right.

Item 1 - Extension of the Neighbourhood Multiple Family/Mixed-Use Building Grant Program

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'd love to hear from the Councillor and I'll try to address any questions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I note that the Neighbourhood Multi-family Mixed-Use Program is a very successful program. I think we're all supportive of it. It's been a very effective way to increase housing stock in existing neighbourhoods, infill housing. The program ended in June. The funding ended for it in June, and basically what I see in front of us here is an extension that we're not going to hear anything back until November after the election. And I'm very concerned. I'd be…I know there is support for the program but why are we going to lose six months of this program? And what can we tell people in organizations that want to build housing in the neighbourhoods? Are they supposed to get on some kind of a waiting list or something for when the program comes into place? Is the program going to be retroactive? I just want assurances that this program is not going to be dropped because I think…I know that there is support for the program, but, if you just look at it in paper and there is no clear communication to builders or developers or non-profits who want to put in multi-family housing, there is no clear indication of what's going to happen for the next six months and then even in November we're just going to get a report, supposedly, not until November. So I'm just wondering why we're waiting so long to ask for that report, and I hope that it's not going to result in any delay in any of these significant potential neighbourhood, multi-family infill housing programs. So that was my comment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, just a couple of quick comments. As everybody is aware, this program has had significant uptake but it's not the only (inaudible) that's being built in the neighbourhoods. This has targeted certain neighbourhoods and certain areas. We have other ongoing issues around some of the multi-family housing. Right now we're looking at some of the issues that were raised around condos being converted into rental and dealing with that piece as well. This is what the Administration is asking for, as far as the time line to get that information together, and I think we…I can't predict the future but I think when you look at some of the issues that have come up in front of us in the last year or two, I know in Councillor Gerbasi's area it's been very hard hit in the last couple of years with a lot of the rental being converted to condo and we need to sort of make sure that any policy that we bring forward or that if we extend this program that we may be putting some pieces in there that steer the multi-family housing back in the direction that it helps to correct some of those issues. That is ongoing and you know, there's a lot of consultation that has to happen with that and numerous stakeholders both on the development side and on the tenancy or ownership side. So I think that's probably the reason why the time request is here, but you know there is still quite a bit of activity out there going on in multi-family construction and this, by no means, slows that down. You can see from the permit processes that are going on that multi-family housing is continuing to be built in the City of Winnipeg and probably at a pace that's outpacing a great deal of the rest of the country. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi for standing the item down. The reason I moved the Motion that's what started this discussion, seconded by Councillor Vandal, was to keep the program moving without any pause or gap. That was the hope. It's unfortunate now that we've got this gap until November of this year. The Motion, if you read it, there's two "be it resolved" clauses. The first one specifically says that we as a city extend our existing program, and then the second one refers to the fact that we should engage the Province as we've engaged them in the downtown program that's now been renewed to do the exact same thing with the program which is

targeted in neighbourhoods throughout the City. And I want to emphasize that, Mr. Speaker, targeted in neighbourhoods which would not necessarily be neighbourhoods that would be encouraging multiple-family. It's brownfield, brownfield not being polluted sites but infilled sites that are not green field sites that are harder to be redeveloped that are…that the market itself do not…does not necessarily make attractive without a bit of assistance, and the program has been successful as Councillor Swandel has rightfully pointed out. Therefore, why are we not keeping this program moving? Why are we letting it stop now in June when we know that this is the time to keep things moving and to keep the momentum, and if all the words on this floor of this Council were truly sincere last month when we talked about multiple family housing, the need to do more for multiple family housing, then why are we not doing more today when we have something that we can control in terms of our public policy?

I appreciate the fact that the Administration has requested until November and maybe that is in light of the second "be it resolved" but in the meantime we can start our program up again, renew it and if the Province joins in through negotiations with them, so be it. We can then amend it at that point. But there is no reason why we cannot keep the existing program. We already have the policy in place, we already have the template. Nothing has to be rewritten other than the dates and changing the dates of that program. It's been successful, Mr. Speaker, and if it ain't broke why fix it? Let's keep it going as far as I'm concerned. So I am disappointed that it's coming back with a November, after the election referral. There is no reason why this couldn't have been dealt with in such a way that we could have gotten part of it going and dealt with the Provincial one in the very near future. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks Councillor Wyatt. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think we all concur that the program has had success. And I think maybe, if Councillor Wyatt had not put in the part about the Province of Manitoba basically expanding, I think Councillor Wyatt is very much cognizant of the fact that it took us three years to get the Province to jump on board with the City of Winnipeg and if they change that, the Administration would've come back and said we can do this quicker. Based on that they've come back with a November time parameter and for all intents and purposes, Mr. Speaker, has nothing to do with an election or no election. That's what they've asked for. I would have no problems if there was a change to the Motion of asking the Administration if they could do it quicker, but I think the Councillor knows when it comes to the Province, it does take longer so I will leave it up to his discretion.

.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further discussion.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, we'll call the question. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 2 - Request to Update Reports - 2009 Existing Infrastructure Deficit – 2009 New Strategic Infrastructure Deficit Report

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, once again I'd love to hear from the Councillor and then I will try and address any of the issues.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I know everybody is chomping at the bit to discuss mosquitoes, so I'll keep my comments to the point. Mr. Speaker, this Motion was moved, really, so that we as a Council are cognizant and we stay up to date in terms of our infrastructure deficit and also in terms of educating the public with the state of the infrastructure. I think the public understands and appreciates where we're at but just the size and the scope of the challenge we're facing, and not just the public, Mr. Speaker, but other levels of government. And, you know, I appreciate the fact that the Motion refers to the Mayor's Council that has now been set up, Infrastructure Funding Council with the AMM, and I was at that announcement and I am very supportive of the Mayor's efforts there. But the reality is, Mr. Speaker, we have a challenge today that we're facing. We have an infrastructure deficit today. We…it's now almost a year old since we determined the infrastructure deficit numbers. July of last year is when this Council received the numbers for 2009. And this Motion is calling up for us to update because clearly those numbers have changed. We're using actually old numbers when we're referring to the infrastructure deficit. Very simple. It would be a straightforward administrative report that would come forward to update us with the numbers. The second part of the Motion is to specify to do some education in terms of an infrastructure deficit clock and just to put it out there, this is what our deficit is, this is what we're facing, Mr. Speaker, and this is how it's growing and it's growing literally every day. You could calculate Mr. Speaker by the second how many dollars is going up to. I think, you know, the last time I calculated it, it was seven dollars in change every second our infrastructure deficit was going up by, Mr. Speaker. That is the state of the problem we're facing today. And I refer back to July of 2009, Mr. Speaker, and the report that we received in this Council Chamber referring to the

infrastructure deficit. Much of the infrastructure deficit is now 40 to 60 years old. It was built in the 1950s, 60s and 70s when the City experienced significant growth and with corresponding new infrastructure being built as a result of the baby boomer generation. This infrastructure is now in decline.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the report clearly outlines that Capital spending has been deferred and during the 1990s with the City's borrowing large sums of money to build new infrastructure, renew existing infrastructure, and in the 1980s it was designed to defer Capital spending to reduce debt cost…the debt…the City debt having grown to over 1 billion, the City stopped borrowing in 1997. It goes on to state, Mr. Speaker, that potential funding that could have been used for Capital was used to balance the Operating Budgets of this City. With the debt being paid down over the last decade, the freed up interest payments were used to fund operations instead of increasing Capital spending. That's going on again, Mr. Speaker, today. As well, the increased G.S.T. exemption was used to fund operations. This is in the City's report that was delivered to this Council. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, documents. I'll ask that management practices and more sophisticated examination has resulted in the infrastructure deficit items being identified more specifically, to the credit of our administration.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is growing, and I think there is almost a sense that it's almost hopeless. And I don't know if that's a sense on the part of the public or a sense on the part of the political leadership. I think it has a sense more on the part of the political leadership that the problem is so massive, how are we going to tackle this huge problem? How are we going to overcome it? Well, Mr. Speaker, we're going to overcome it by addressing it and documenting it and putting the issue out there for the public to look at and to address and putting the issue in front of ourselves on a daily basis. Mr. Speaker, the existing infrastructure deficit, according to the report of last year for bridges, was at over a projected 10 years was 215 million. That works out to 21.5 million for one year for bridges alone. And I'll just jump down the list here. Local roads and lanes, 788 million over ten years is the infrastructure deficit. That's 78 or 79 million a year we are presently underfunding our existing local roads, streets and lanes. The regional streets, Mr. Speaker, we are underfunding by 935 million over ten years. That's 93.5 million a year, Mr. Speaker, 94 million. Mr. Speaker, parks. We all love our parks. The parks, Mr. Speaker, right now we're underfunding by 409 million over 10 years or $41 million a year, Mr. Speaker. The list goes on. I could read about Police, Fire Paramedics, Libraries, Pools, Pools, Arenas, Mr. Speaker, 277 million over ten years.

Mr. Speaker, the list is huge, and it adds up to the existing infrastructure deficit of renewal of $3.8 million dollars. And, of course, Mr. Speaker as this Motion refers to it, this amount has gone up. I think we have tackled some areas but unfortunately, over all, the number has risen. But, that is why I requested the report was to determine what that number was. Mr. Speaker, I believe that with the election coming forward we had a real opportunity in this City to address these issues up front. There is no doubt in my mind that when we're facing a $3.8 billion dollar problem on our existing infrastructure over ten years, that's $380 million a year, we're going to have some tough issues that we have to face and challenges we have to face in terms of funding. There is no doubt in my mind, whether it be this Council or the next Council, that in the very near future, we are going to have to look at taxes such as growth taxes and sales taxes, either driving existing sales taxes from the Province of Manitoba, or a combination of us putting…of having the right to put a municipal sales tax as this Council's previously requested. One percent Mr. Speaker of a Provincial Sales Tax coming to the City is worth $130 million dollars. A hundred thirty million dollars sounds like a lot money Mr. Speaker, but when your annual infrastructure deficit is 380 million a year for just the existing infrastructure, this is not to mention, Mr. Speaker, the new infrastructure that we know is out there, Mr. Speaker, the new strategic infrastructure that we know, the Rapid Transit, the bridges and the roads and the underpasses that don't exist.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is huge. Why can we not have this discussion today instead of referring it off to the Council? Why can we not document these numbers today? That is what this Motion requested. That is what is called for. It was a simple request. I think we should be up front about the challenge we're facing, the problem we're facing as a City. I'm not pointing fingers at anybody in the Chamber. The fact is in the report, quite correctly documents the fact that this deficit has grown over the last 30 years, 40 years, Mr. Speaker. It hasn't happened over night. But, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the leadership and the challenge rests with this Council, and these…this group, to start to address the problem and face the issue. Mr. Speaker, we had one of the largest infrastructure announcements in the history of this country a year and a half ago by the Federal Government. Two years ago the global economy was at peril in October of 2008, almost two years ago. And we have yet to have one single major infrastructure other than…(inaudible)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal moves extension. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: …$20 million for active transportation, new strategic infrastructure and other than $7.5 million to pave Gunn Road, we haven't had…Winnipeg hasn't had its infrastructure project. We had CentrePort, we heard the announcement again, the reannouncement the other day and how all that money is being used over there. That was not our request. Our infrastructure and our request, Mr. Speaker, through the Stimulus Fund, it's not been there. We haven't seen it. Other cities have seen their funding flow, but where is Winnipeg's infrastructure funds? The largest Stimulus

Money Package, Mr. Speaker, in years and Winnipeg hasn't received its infrastructure funding as other Canadian cities have taken advantage, and rightfully so. Mr. Speaker, we've lost a huge opportunity if that has passed us, a huge opportunity, and the citizens of Winnipeg should ask the question why and they should have a right to know why we lost that opportunity. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to support the recommendation coming forward. I believe we can get this information now and go forward with it and document and keep documenting the state of the infrastructure and forwarding that information on to our Provincial and Federal officials because they have to know what's going on in terms of the challenge we are facing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: I just wanted to clarify…I just wanted to clarify my position on this matter. I agree with a lot of what Councillor Wyatt has said, but except for the idea of the clock ticking down with the infrastructure clock part of it. So, I'm not sure how to vote on this because I support the idea of getting the information. I don't support the idea of the clock. I'm not sure what EPC's position was on that because their recommendation is kind of vague. Perhaps when the Mayor closes he could clarify that so I can be a little clear on how to vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I for one don't support the idea of a ticking clock. I think it's a little bit of political stunting. It doesn't do much to serve any purpose and you know, it's like we all know there's an infrastructure problem, we all know that the financial mechanisms that we have in front of us are part of the problem. When you look at one percent of the… a one percent increase of property taxes providing us with approximately four to five million dollars of new revenue, and you consider the infrastructure deficit to be in the billions of dollars and one of the reasons I don't like a clock is because on any given day you can ask five different people assessing that and they'll give you five different answers. But I am comfortable in saying that it's in the billions of dollars and so you know, the issue here really is how do you fund that type of a deficit and you're not going to do it in sort of one to five year periods. It's going to happen in 10 to 50 year periods where you get into the whole managed care level of maintaining our infrastructure. And it's going to have to be a very robust financial package that not only includes the Capital cost at the beginning but the ongoing maintenance cost to insure that you…your life cycle manage that infrastructure properly to maximize its value to taxpayers.

There was some comment that struck me by Councillor Wyatt regarding shifting of dollars from Capital Budgets to Operating Budgets. I don't know if Councillor Wyatt is aware but the monies that are put into the Operating Budget on an annual basis or into the Capital Budget on that…on an annual basis are really operating dollars at some point in time. They all originate, you know, from the same pool of revenue that the City has. What was done was after the program was fully funded for the year, over-budgeted amounts that were left over were re-used to offset tax increases which…and again, I say tax increases aren't going to solve this problem and the amount of money that we moved around to make this City a better City for all. But, as we were doing so on the infrastructure side, there was much more money being invested on an annual basis. We also did it on the financial well being side for citizens, so this is a balancing act. It's not I love infrastructure or I love policing or I love mosquitoes. It's a…it is a balancing act of where you spend the monies in order to ensure that the needs of citizens and the quality of their life is looked after in an appropriate fashion. So I think it's important to recognize that and we do use residual monies from time to time to offset tax increases if the Councillor or any others would prefer tax increases and perhaps putting more work out there that the industry can perform and creating artificial inflation on the construction side of things, driving the cost of our projects up and really harming the City, then put that out there as a policy. Don't put out some flashy clock that is just there to wave a sort of a red, you know, a red cloth in front of the Province and the Federal Government, which is really where the types of monies that you need to address this problem, have to come from. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I'll just make some brief comments, Mr. Speaker.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Swandel: My comments were brief.

Councillor Steeves: Yeah, exactly they were. They were. I obviously agree with the concept of the infrastructure deficit and the idea that we're perilously short in that area funded. It would be impossible though to have this discussion without acknowledging what the City of Winnipeg has done over the course of the last decade. I think all of us or many of us have presided over the Capital Budgets in the last 8, 7, 10 years, whatever it's been and we've seen our Capital Budgets triple. And that's been by virtue of the agreements we've been able to strike, primarily with the Federal Government and

other things we've been able to do and priorities we've been able to set ourselves. I would just caution you on the first part of asking our administration to update the Infrastructure Deficit Report. Nothing wrong with the premise of doing that, but I was part of FCM when we did the full infrastructure deficit update. It's a massive and expensive undertaking and I just want people to be clear about that going into something like this. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities didn't do it themselves. They retained the University of McGill and the Faculty of Engineering to do it, and it wasn't done in-house in any municipality. It's that complicated to do it properly. This is not something, I would argue, that could just be done like that, in-house, change a few numbers and update things. To do it properly and to do it credibly it has to be done right. That would be my only caution on that. We all, I think, understand where the gaps are here. Over the course of the last four or five years we've seen the infrastructure transfer payments from the Federal Government to the Provincial Government quadruple. That's what's happened. I don't think we have seen a fair amount of that money coming from Broadway to City Hall. That's been my assessment. I've said this before on Council Floor. I've never received any argument or dispute from any member of Council or frankly any member of the community. Truth is things have changed a lot in the last year. That part is true but the part that hasn't changed is the fact that we're still probably not getting our fair share. That remains constant.

A bit disappointed in my colleague from Transcona and his comments about the message that we have to send. I agree with the message that we have to send to our colleagues Provincially, and in fact, one lonely Councillor tried to send that exact message during the last New Democrat Party Leadership Debate. I was the Chairperson of the Intergovernmental Affairs portfolio at the time. I sent a letter to both candidates. We were in the unique position of having one of our own members of Council Chair one of the campaigns of one of the leaders who was running. At the time, the letter which I distributed to all members of Council, requested specifically that said leader, through said Councillor, both of whom will remain nameless, were asked to look in to these exact areas of funding, the new areas of funding, the exact same ones that were mentioned by the Councillor this morning, interestingly. The response I received back is that we're not interested in doing that. That's not something that we're going to do. That's not something that we believe in. So I guess at some point, even though I'm not sure how much I truly care about a leadership race, at some point we have to be consistent in our messaging. Either we believe in these things all the time, Mr. Speaker, or we just use them to plug in conveniently when they might make political sense. I hate to say that too quickly, but it does appear that there lacks a bit of consistency in messaging here. The NDP leadership debate would've been a wonderful time and I think even, Mr. Speaker, if I recall correctly, there was even an event right here at City Hall by said leadership candidate, where it would've been a wonderful opportunity to announce some of said new avenues of revenue but instead, the opportunity was taken by said member of Council to mostly criticize the City of Winnipeg and its Capital Expenditures and what we were doing. So, I have some concerns about the integrity of the Motion. I have some concerns about where it's coming from. I think they are fair concerns. Maybe they are not and if people don't want to support me, then they can obviously make their choice. But I did, at the time, copy all of you on the letter that was sent and I wanted to inform you of that and I wanted to let you know that all those items mentioned today by said Councillor were not appreciated at the time. There is a difference.

With respect to the deficit clock, I'm not sure how I feel about that. I might make the constructive comment that I'm aware recently we moved the statue of Sam in Transcona. There's a little board at the base of that perhaps. That would be a good place to put the clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Being no further speakers, Mr. Mayor would you like to close?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Whoever said Council wasn't entertaining was definitely wrong. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all the comments that have been made today, and there is very little doubt that Councillor Wyatt is very familiar with the numbers. It was I who asked him to address this issue and I certainly will not argue with the numbers. So just to make sure we get the numbers on the record again because we do have all the media here, so to repeat some of them that Councillor Wyatt talked about, $250 million for bridges over ten years, $788 million for roads, streets and lanes over ten years, $935 million for regional streets, $409 million for parks, $277 million for pools and arenas, a total of $3.8 billion dollars. It's on the record, Mr. Speaker. I've said it a hundred times. Councillor Wyatt may have said it more. If it gets reported that's a different story but it's on the record. It's in the report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you want to solve a problem, the first thing one must do is to define the problem. We have defined our infrastructure deficit. We've also defined what it would take to be done in addition to fixing what exists. The new construction has to be done. The numbers are there, Mr. Speaker. Now, we need solutions. That's what we're looking for, which is why the City and the AMM basically have the Infrastructure Funding Council. It's the duty for them is to go out there and come back with ideas. Now, if there is a Councillor here today who feels we should address this issue by doubling, doubling property taxes, please let me know, because that's what it would take. We know that's not realistic, Mr. Speaker. We know we need more sources of revenue. The only area that I may disagree with Councillor Wyatt on is I believe that one percent of P.S.T. was approximately 134 million as opposed to 130 but let's not quibble over $4 million. The facts of life are we know we need new revenue sources. We know what we've been told over and over

again. They are not interested. But let me remind everybody of something. When the gas tax came out, Mr. Speaker, we, the City of Winnipeg and the Mayor were told gas tax is not for repairing roads and bridges. Logic and rationale would say if any tax should go to repairing roads and bridges, it would be the gas tax. They are the ones who are driving on the roads and bridges. That's why it's deteriorating. A quarter of a century of neglect, Mr. Speaker. Well guess what Mr. Speaker, we didn't accept that. We went to Ottawa and we met with the Minister and you know what? We didn't win that battle. We went back again and Mr. Speaker, guess what? The gas tax went to repair roads and bridges, our infrastructure. This is the same type of situation. We don't have the right answer today, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't mean you give up. You have to persevere, you have to continue fighting the battle and the facts of life are Mr. Speaker, today as we speak, this Council, this Council moved a Motion and addressed certain infrastructure projects that we want the Province to address with us, with our money, okay, Building Canada Funds. We're still waiting Mr. Speaker. The clock is still ticking Mr. Speaker. Nothing is happening. We're not going to quit, Mr. Speaker. We're going to keep on working towards this because the realities are, we all need to work at this and we're all part of the solution. But let me put something, a fact, on the table. Out of every dollar, out of every dollar of tax that the citizens pay, seven cents, I'll say it again. Seven cents comes to the municipality, Twenty-six cents to the Federal Government, 67 percent to the Provincial Government. That's after land transfers, okay I mean after transfer payments, Mr. Speaker. Those are facts, Mr. Speaker. So for anybody to say that we can solve this on our own is nonsense. We need to work together and we're not going to give up on this fight, because that's what has to happen. We need to be part of the solution along with the other levels of government, and you can see where all the money is, Mr. Speaker. In the meantime, we've defined the problem. We now have a Committee that's going to go out there, come up with suggestions on where to find that revenue. End of story and Councillor Wyatt is right, we need to address this problem, but don't think for a moment we're not working at it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. Being no other speakers we will call the question. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. All right. Mr. Mayor, the Report of June 9th.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 9, 2010

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Report of June 16th.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 16, 2010

Mayor Katz: Introduce the Report Mr. Speaker and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 6.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, three for Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Wyatt, four. Councillor Vandal, six. Anyone else? All right, Mr. Mayor.

(Inaudible)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: One, sure. One, two and five, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 3 - OurWinnipeg Plan - First Reading - By-law No. 67/2010
File PW 1/2010

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear from the Councillor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Jenny

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I recognize that this OurWinnipeg document is coming forward for first reading so I realize today we're just setting up the process for having a public hearing on the matter so I'm not going to get into the specifics of what is in the OurWinnipeg document right now. That I'm saving for the public hearing process which I assume will happen when the meeting is set next month. But I would like to talk about the process, the process which isn't appropriate to talk about for first reading.

First of all, I'd like to acknowledge the Planning Department and the staff who have done an extensive job of consulting with the community to develop this plan and I congratulate them on their hard work. However, there is a rub to that. Here

is the rub. The staff brought back information from this extensive public consultation process. They drafted a report, or several. Those reports then went into the black hole of the EPC back room. And in that back room the documents were edited and I would suggest edited significantly. Of course I can only guess because other members of Council were not privy to this process. Non-EPC Councillors only saw the final printed and edited reports the same day as the media when they were made public a few weeks ago. These reports are considered drafts but, what kind of changes are really going to be made with the process coming up? It's almost like…it appears a lot like a done deal. And it is very hard to analyze the documents without knowing what changes the Mayor and EPC made in their back room discussions. Some of us are pretty good at guessing, however, rather than doing that it would only be fair for the City staff to be asked to provide all members of Council with the exact changes made by the Mayor and Council, Mayor and EPC. This way it can determine what truly reflects what came out from the public process and the non-biased administration, and then what was changed politically by Executive Policy Committee. In the pre…I'd like to point out for some of you who may not have been here at the time. When the previous…the previous Plan Winnipeg Review, the last time it was done, it wasn't a complete revamp of the Plan like this was. It wasn't replacing the existing Plan. It was only a review. But even then, there were…it was overseen by five members of Council, at least two were not members of EPC, and it was a much more transparent process. And this was only a review and an update of the Plan, not a complete rewrite of the Plan which is what this is. This will completely replace our existing Plan Winnipeg. And a process that excludes non-EPC members of Council in this way is terribly flawed. The documents in front of us have been politically, you know…they've received advice and they've been…I'm sure they've been changed to reflect the view of Executive Policy Committee and the Mayor.

Another concern I have is that the direction given by EPC and the Mayor was that this Plan had to be completed before the election, and completed within one year. And, I've said this repeatedly throughout this process that completely doing a brand new City Plan for a 25 year period cannot be completed in one year. I think anyone in…who knows…is aware of how planning processes occur in other cities knows this. Yet the staff have been required to do this within one year. I think they've done an incredible job of doing what they've been asked to do. I just still don't agree with what they've been asked to do and the problem with it is that we have documents going forward now with many important pieces not completed. For example, we won't see the detailed Transportation Strategy for a year from now, yet we're already approving maps and all sorts of things that deciding different transportation routes. Yes, I suppose we can change it, but you know, shouldn't this document be based on the research and the work being done and the background information being done? But it's been politically pushed to meet the timetable of elections and political concerns rather than the best possible approach to planning in my view.

I'm also concerned and I would like to put on the record that I'm concerned how there will be enough staff resources to do all the monitoring and the continued work that's required to complete the Plan properly. So much is incomplete including even establishing the indicators and monitoring criteria. I could go on and on about all the things that we're waiting for over the next year. And this year, a lot of planning work was put on hold because we were doing OurWinnipeg. Everything had to wait because we were doing OurWinnipeg. For example, the Corydon Plan you know was just iced because we're doing Plan Winnipeg so we're still doing OurWinnipeg for the next year, and I'd just like to know which planners and who's going to have the time to do this work? The previous Plan Winnipeg also intended to have indicators and be monitored and all that as you may recall. But that never happened. And again, it may have had to do with staffing, whatever, I mean, I don't think anyone wants to see that repeated. We haven't even developed the indicators. And in the last six years we've seen a significant reduction in the capacity of staff due to huge cuts in professional level staff in order to achieve our budgetary targets. So who's going to do all the work to do this unfinished…I don't think we want to see an unfinished Plan going forward, and I'd like some answers to these concerns. It's important to remember too, and I'd like to put this on the record that the OurWinnipeg Plan does not in any way diminish the need or act as a replacement for neighbourhood planning processes. It's not…we have…it's a high level policy and that's great and there's some very good high level planning policies in there but if anything, it increases the need for the specific neighbourhood plans because there's going to be so much change coming forward, so you know, we really need to address this issue of planning resources. We don't have enough planners. When you look at the number of planning, planners we have per capita or compared to other cities that do really good planning, I mean it's unbelievable, the lack of capacity we have.

And my other concerns about the specific wording of OurWinnipeg I'm going to leave for another day because this is just first reading, but I would like these questions answered today. Will all members of Council be provided with the specific changes made by the Mayor and EPC to the original draft that came forward from the public consultations and the staff? Will an explanation be given of how there will be enough staff capacity to do the remaining work for OurWinnipeg that is required as well as the other planning work that needs to be done in our City such as neighbourhood plans? The staff have done a very extensive public consultation process which is very significant but it would be a terrible shame if the non-transparent political editing that has gone on is allowed to erode the spirit of that effort. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That was a good lesson of why we did things the way we did today. I think, and I hear it from everybody on a regular basis, that the last Plan Winnipeg was very difficult to work with and I think that in large part is due to the fact that there was too many cooks involved in it and the document tried to please all the people all the time. What we've done here is we have taken a booklet of, I don't know, very, very few pages, probably less than 100 pages, and we've created a very robust document and a number of supporting strategies and some that are for informing or guiding, others will actually become by-law and statutory in nature. So I don't know if there is any disagreement that the old Plan Winnipeg was difficult to deal with but my experience has been that everybody seemed to be frustrated by the Plan and I believe wholeheartedly the process that was engaged in at that time was what made that document so wishy-washy, more of a vision statement than an actual Plan or a document that really delivers. And even the old idea that it was supposed to include measuring and never did is a good…as a good indication of that. Today we have a document coming forward that has a whole section on measuring. The bottom line there is, it just wasn't enough focus in the old document. This document drills down.

As for drafts and what's out there, there is a number of working documents, a myriad of stuff. EPC is tasked with bringing in this document forward. EPC looked at a great deal of information with what the stakeholder said, what the professionals said and agreed that this was the draft that was going to come forward to public for first reading. There certainly is opportunity if anybody disagrees with this document to change it or if they want to bring other professionals in to argue some particular piece of it, they are certainly capable of doing that, but this is the document that EPC wants to bring forward to the public. Right now I haven't heard any opposition to this document. As a matter of fact, what we've heard is a great deal of support and praise for the document and the process. You know, I don't know what Councillor Gerbasi means by the term "political editing". I think at the end of the day, what came out of the public process through the stakeholder groups, and not just those like-minded to Councillor Gerbasi but the entire city, people who represented…the stakeholders that represented the entire city, they will see that their voices were heard, their concerns that they brought forward are just in this document. They've been dealt with by the professionals who what was called the most comprehensive public engagement in Plan Winnipeg history and other cities are actually calling us today and asking us for information on how we did that because this process is being praised and I think the document is being praised, too. So I don't know what the political thing is that's going on here but I don't think it's political editing in the document. It's political something, but it certainly isn't political editing. The document speaks for itself. I don't have to say much. The other…the supporting strategies and the…and certainly the Complete Communities which will become our by-law when it comes to land use is an extremely robust document, very comprehensive and really drills into making this City a better place.

I read some comments the other day in the newspaper on this, you know, somebody…one of our colleagues referring to, you know, this explosion of new development in the outskirts, and I hope that that particular Councillor takes the time to actually read the document and understand that this is a demand based document. We know that we've got…I don't know how many Plan Winnipeg amendments sitting in the cue because we are basically running out of land. The document speaks to…we don't want to do that. What it speaks to is that we know we need to up a bit, grow out a bit to accommodate that but we also have to grow up, and that in order to become sustainable, we've got to do that with densification as well as looking after the needs of an ever-changing society. And that may include some new forms of housing or live, work and play that might work better in green's field sites as their often referred to as opposed to sort of this intensification and redevelopment of the existing sites. So, the documents in this; this document and supporting strategies speak very clearly to that so I'm a little bit confused by those comments that I read the other day and maybe it was a misquote and that quite often does happen when it comes to something as detailed and complex as this. I'll leave it at that. I mean, this is a great document and I think it's probably some of the finest planning work that's been done in the country. That planning was greatly supported, it wasn't taxing the department. It was supported by funding from the Province of Manitoba. They actually had a planner from the Province who embedded in the process the whole time so that we were sort of, you know, making sure that we were closely connected with the land use policies in the direction that the Province is going in. So I mean those pieces have all been taken care of. They've all been addressed. This has been an extremely well integrated process. The funding was put forward to bring the appropriate people to the table to ensure that we were going down the right path and that we weren't over-taxing our existing resources and taking them away from other important work that needs to be done. So I'm a little confused by Councillor Gerbasi's comments because it's certainly isn't what the general public is saying and those people are reviewing this document we're reading. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Swandel. Any further comments? Your Worship.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I won't get into any details specifically. As you know, I am part of the body that will be hearing delegations. But, it would be remiss if I didn't make some comments on some of the things that were said. First of all, the political rhetoric about, you know, the black hole. I can only assume Councillor Gerbasi is referring to when she was on EPC with the former Mayor Glen Murray because otherwise I have no idea what she means by that, but I will make reference to the PUFF's Report that did go into that black hole and when I was elected I made sure it was released to

everybody. That's number one, Mr. Speaker. Number two, on the time parameters. The time parameters, as you know, is 14 months ago approximately, made an announcement and I can tell you, it was the Administration after consultation with Deepak Joshi, who had no doubt in their minds they can do it. They're the experts and Mr. Speaker, they did do it. And I will tell you this is probably the most comprehensive we've ever had from getting public input from all the stakeholders. Never happened before in the history of this City. So, Mr. Speaker, it's there for everybody. Everybody can make their comments. We'll be having hearings coming up in the near future. I look forward to all Councillors coming forward with ideas, constructive criticism, whatever the case may be, that's what this process is all about. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Katz. Call the question then. All those in favour? Opposed?

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right we'll go for a recorded vote. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas and Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 4.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Motion passed. No. 4.

Item 4 - Complete Communities Direction Strategy - First Reading - By-law No. 68/2010
File SP 3/2010

Mayor Katz: Here, once again I would love to hear from the Councillor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I just want to vote on it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No. 4, okay. All those in favour? Those opposed? Motion carried. No. 6.

Item 6 - Downtown Residential Development Grant Program By-law

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. I would like to hear from the Councillor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very quickly, I was reading this morning a letter from Streetside Development who are a major infill developer in Winnipeg. I know they're doing about $40 million in St. Boniface as we speak. And I know that there appears to be a misunderstanding about what was promised as to what is being delivered, and let me quote from the letter that there is a substantial difference in our interpretation of the program that greatly affects our decision to further invest 30 million to 40 million in the downtown. So I'm wondering if the Mayor's responded to this letter. I'm wondering if there is…what's the status of this? I see the Downtown Development Chair has his hand up and I'm just wondering for clarification on where we are with this.

Councillor Steeves: Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I am not familiar with what's going on. I am, as Chair of Property and Development, a little bit concerned that some of this might be confidential, in camera information. I have no idea what's being…what's going to be said, what's being suggested. I just caution Councillors to be careful. That's all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you for your advice. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is…I don't know where the misunderstandings come from here but there was no promise made to anybody. This program has always been based on incremental taxes and you know, this letter is a bit troubling you know. It makes reference to 30 to $40 million of investment in the project that is being put forward for the Nygard property. I think that would put the construction cost of the redevelopment cost in the realm of $300 per square foot. If they were investing $300 per square foot and marketing based on that, incremental taxes would be more than sufficient to cover off the…up to $40,000 a door over ten years. The idea of extending this out to 15 years is based because in one particular building as they start, they don't see that there's a huge return there because of the incremental taxes aren't there. Over the entire project there is approximately around $3 million of incremental taxes involved which is a significant amount more than it was available last year, prior to the Province stepping to the table and creating this program, along with the City of Winnipeg where there would probably only have been about 10 or $12,000 a door of incremental taxes, you know, 1.2 to 1.5 million dollars in incremental taxes available because only the Provincial portion of the taxes would do…would be available. So I mean, this is somebody who is in an anomaly situation with a single building. The program has always been up to $40,000 but based on the incremental taxes, I can tell you that, you know, a couple of quick calculations on those properties taking the total square footage of all of those properties as they sit right now and figuring out what the taxes per square foot on those properties are, the multiplier of taxes that you'll get on that property is at 3.6 would be the multiplier. When you look at it as pure residential property and the comparator I used was the Fairchild Lofts which I think is a similar type of residential development, and when you look at the assessments on those they're similar to what the assessments being put forward on what they're looking at as the finished product, the properties in the east Exchange. So there really isn't an issue here other than this particular developer for some reason has decided they are going to ask for something more than what the program offers. The program is put forward as a three year program to be assessed at the end of three years. Certainly, if we do find that there are issues, then we'll take care of them at that time. Right now we've got a couple of projects already off to ground using this program. Why this one was chosen to go this path is beyond me. There is the option to go out to 15 years if the project is done as rental as opposed to condo and that appears to be, you know, this developer is choosing not to go that route. There's also the ability to use commercial space incremental taxes to help offset the cost of…or to increasing incremental taxes available to fund grants on the residential side. So there's a lot of developer ingenuity that can be used here and the City and the Province have come to the table very strongly with this program and this letter is a bit flabbergasting and frustrating in that it really does not speak well. It clearly shows a misunderstanding of the project. My understanding is also that even prior to this program being existing; that the lands were already under contract even before there was any discussion between the Province and the City or at least sort of any public indication that there might be a Provincial involvement in multi-family incremental tax program in the downtown. So I'm not sure…I haven't had a chance to talk directly with these folks prior to this letter coming out. I did meet with them…or since the letter coming out but I did meet with them and talk with them before the letter coming out. It was very clear that this was a business decision that was made and apparently they are not happy with the business decision that they've made and they're looking to change the parameters of our program to help to fit that decision, which is unfortunate because you know, I certainly believe that the program was very clearly articulated when it was brought forward and for somebody to be frustrated by that and to be going down this road is a little…it causes some questions in my mind as to what the motivation is. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Swandel. Councillor, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I very much appreciate Councillor Vandal raising the issue. I think what Councillor Swandel shared with everybody here, Mr. Speaker, was factual information. It appears this could be, you know, apartment versus a condo situation but this is definitely an important project for our downtown, the Exchange District. We also talked about building a parkade in that area to enhance future development, and what I would like to say through you, Mr. Speaker, to Councillor Vandal, I would be happy to look into it and if I get any further information, to contact him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. Report of today's EPC meeting, Councillor…or Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 23, 2011

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the rule be suspended and that the report of Executive Policy Committee dated June the 23rd, 2010 be considered.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: I'm wondering if we can't deal…there's three issues in here. I'm wondering if we can't deal with them one by one with perhaps…I believe whoever moves suspension of the rules has three minutes to explain why the rules should be suspended and then we can take a vote on each issue separately.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Clerk…all right. We'll rule that Mayor Katz will give us a three minute explanation.

Item 1 - Partnership of the Manitoba Capital Region Inc. – Membership, Organization and Governance Structure

Mayor Katz: I'm happy to accommodate the Councillor. So if I may, I will start off with the first one of the chance to do with the Capital Regional Partnership. Mr. Speaker, we have, through the Province and I believe Councillor Steeves is our representative along with yours truly, Councillor Nordman, a relationship, this is something they have to do on an annual basis. I think it's very clear what's been put forward. There is some minor what I would say wordsmithing. I think it's fairly simple and basic. If anybody has a problem, I would love to hear from them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm just speaking to the Request to Waive the Rules to hear this matter. I'm not speaking to the matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, okay.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Vandal: …why we should not Suspend the Rules. If Councillor Gerbasi speaks to it then that's the only speaker that can speak as to why we shouldn't.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yeah.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You have three minutes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, I'm just…this report appeared yesterday afternoon on the agenda at four o'clock or whatever it was…mid-afternoon with…it was three items, one of which wasn't even there until this morning. But, I fail to see any reason why this couldn't go through a proper process. This is certainly not an emergency issue. We've been dealing with Capital Region issues for 30 years. We've been discussing having a policy like this or having an arrangement like this. Many people on Council have not had time to…I realize Councillor Steeves may have distributed it earlier but suddenly it's on a public agenda, the public hasn't had a chance to look at it. There might even be community groups like the Council of Women and others that have an interest in this issue. No one has had time to speak to it; it's just going to be adopted like this without. I just…I see no fire happening here. We have another Council meeting in July you know, it just it's not transparent, it excludes the public. Many Councillors I'm sure haven't read it. I mean, it's just un-democratic to walk on a bunch of things. Sometimes you have to and we all have times where we walk things on and that's fair ball, it happens, we all do it, we did it when we were…you know it happens sometimes it's something urgent and time sensitive. I fail to see the time sensitivity of this. It could've appeared on an agenda you know in the last few weeks and if it wasn't ready it could appear next week and then we can deal with it in a few weeks. So I just think this is just a practice. Just because you have the power to rush everything through and by-pass public process doesn't mean you should be doing that. We're doing this far too often for matters that it's totally unnecessary, and it really makes the public cynical. If someone has an interest in this issue, you know they'll hear about it after it's over. Even members of Council are hearing about it practically after it's over. I mean we need proper notice for things. This is just an example of it and there's others that will come up shortly that are the same kind of thing that we have a proper process for this. I don't understand any urgency to by-pass this. You know, we've been dilly-dallying on this Capital Region issue for years and finally Councillor Steeves is taking some leadership on it. It's great. He's doing some good work on it but let's do it properly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. Recorded vote on Notice of Motion or Suspending the Rules, I'm sorry. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 6. It is lost.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, we do require two-thirds I guess. So, none of these reports are walked on? Just No. 1? Okay. All right. So No. 2, CentreVenture.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I'm hoping that Councillor Gerbasi will contact the Capital Region and explain to them why they won't be getting their funding which they require and they need this to go forward by the end of June and I'm sure she'll be happy to make that phone call. (inaudible) I can't respond. Those are the rules. Mr. Speaker, we'll continue. As far as CentreVenture, a similar situation. CentreVenture is basically doing some great work in our City. We all know about that. This is what they require to continue to move forward. This is what they've asked for and once again nothing will be brought here unless it was time sensitive. I would assume the Councillor would understand that and so here it is again that CentreVenture has said we need this, they've been working on it for a while with the Administration. Here it is today, something has been discussed for awhile. Hopefully, Council will see the light on this one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with this going forward, I intend to support it. I do have problems with No 1. It was unclear to me that it was time sensitive and we do have relative to the item that we voted down, we do have a seminar on the Province of Manitoba Land Use Policy and I think it would've been appropriate to deal with that at the same time. So I'm not going to vote against Item 2. I feel it's a good program. We know that CentreVenture is an important organization and that it should move forward.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Those being the two speakers, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Last one Mr. Mayor.

Item 2 - CentreVenture Development Corporation - Additional Loan Guarantee

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh, we Suspended the Rules on CentreVenture.

Mayor Katz: I don't want to be redundant, Mr. Speaker, I think everybody now knows what this is all about for CentreVenture. I'm just going to ask for the development move forward or not.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of Item 2? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Swandel: Here, just a question. I think, give you the opportunity maybe for someone else to speak on the other side of this but with regard to Item 1 with the Capital Region that we're not; we're not going to Suspend the Rules on…I thought I got a sense from Councillor Gerbasi and certainly Councillor Vandal that they weren't aware that this was connected to funding and is actually time sensitive. I don't know, perhaps you could consult with the Clerk if there's a way that we can maybe go back and revisit that and see if we can perhaps get that job done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We can entertain a Motion to reconsider but again, it requires a two-thirds number to move forward.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: So is there any appetite for someone to move?

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, in light of the conversation, I would certainly be willing to move that we go back and revisit this issue. The issue is funding. There is funding attached to this that is time sensitive and I would like to make sure that everybody on Council is aware of that. The previous vote, if it was just you know, some of the stuff that's in the

governance structure piece, it's not clear that we're talking about something that is connected to funding and timing to access that funding.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Vandal: There is something that comes forward later in the meeting, we deal with it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We have a Motion on the floor that we should be…..

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Swandel you've withdrawn your Motion?

(Inaudible speaking in the background).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. Moving on to Item 3. A Motion to Suspend the Rules and deal with Item 3. All those in favour? Opposed? I think we have two-thirds.

Item 3 - Mosquito Control Program

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, what this Motion is all about is basically asking our department to do a review and get back to us in 30 days with suggestions and recommendations if there are opportunities to change our existing policy. As you probably are aware of, Mr. Speaker, in the past there really was no policy. We put one into effect approximately four years ago and obviously there are things that always change and what I think a lot of people still haven't grasped is that our licence is issued to us by the Province of Manitoba, as well as when it comes to buffer zones that's also dictated by the Province of Manitoba. So, if Council decides to let this move forward and have discussion, and if they were to support it, and if a report comes back, and if there are changes, they still have to go to the Province of Manitoba. So we're just starting this process and you can see it's not exactly as quick as you'd like it to be, but the one thing I can tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, if you look around the City, you are seeing mosquito counts of 204, 208, 600, Mr. Speaker, and outside of the city, 592, 130. There is obviously an issue here, we just want to have the department do its due diligence and come back to Council, Mr. Speaker, and then hopefully have a good productive debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Wyatt, I understand you have an amendment.

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

That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to review the methods and systems engaged by the City of Grand Forks, North Dakota, for adult mosquito control and report back to Executive Policy Committee within 30 days with recommendations on the resources required for a one day / city-wide service for adulticiding operations, versus the present city methods of a city-wide spray that can take up to seven days.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes. (Inaudible) We did that already. (Inaudible) All right, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Mayor's Motion, I want to thank him for bringing it forward and I can tell you that this is a serious matter and I think it should be addressed. The Motion that I have amended with the support of Councillor Vandal, Motion to amend the EPC Clause is to look at the Grand Forks system. A few years back I had a chance to speak with the entomologist there at length. I think we have a lot we can learn from our neighbours to the south. They are a much smaller city than us but it's all relative, Mr. Speaker. They have earmarked enough resources that they can actually adulticide spray their entire city in one day. The benefit of that, Mr. Speaker, verses up to seven days it takes us. The benefit of that Mr. Speaker is simple, that they can see results immediately. They can actually have trap counts where the trap counts are as high as a hundred or more, they go out and they spray and immediately they can see results where it's knocked down to less than 10 in a trap count and then if it goes back and bounce it up again, they can go out there again and knock it back down again. I think the greatest challenge Mr. Speaker, right now is the crews are moving throughout the entire City and they're going based on areas of need with the highest trap counts but the fact of the matter is whether you have 115 in trap count in one end of the city or 350, it's a heck a lot of mosquitoes, and the fact that is takes them…and it's not the fault of our staff. Our staff are working resources they have, but to travel throughout the entire city. I made a point of meeting with Mr…expecting that this would become an issue, met with Taz Stewart back on May the 5th. I had a lengthy meeting with him discussing the situation of where we're at and where we're standing and you know right now, Mr.

Speaker, we have a total of 20 ULBs in the City. That's ultra low volume sprayers. To do the entire city at once in one day, we would need to ramp it up from 20 to 51. This is in a conversation I had, a meeting I had with Mr. Stewart. And of course the City of Grand Forks uses a synthetic product, not Malathion. They use Permethrin which Mr. Speaker, has not been licensed in Canada yet, however it is actively now being reviewed by the Canadian…the Federal officials that require it to be licensed and it's not very far away that he foresees that this product being licensed. It's a far safer product not just in terms of the environment but also for the staff and the employees Mr. Speaker, in terms of handling the product, and on top of that, Mr. Speaker, it's a product which will still do the job effectively. When I spoke to the entomologist a number of years ago down in Grand Forks he was actually surprised that we're still using Malathion because it's such a…it's a very effective product, but so is the product they are using. So I think it's worth looking at. I mean we don't have all the solutions here and I think we can learn from our friends to the south. There is no doubt that there would be a cost tied to this and that's what the Motion refers to and if I'm not too sure if they still fund it the same way but when I spoke to them four or five years ago, they were funding Mr. Speaker through a fee on their water bill I believe and it was just a tag in the City's Insect Control, mosquito control and everybody paid for it and nobody objected paying for it because they knew the service they were getting. So it's all relative. They are a City of about 50,000 people but there's only 50,000 tax payers right? So it's all relative, they are able to knock down and stand outside these mosquitoes, city-wide, in one day. And the other thing they do that we don't do is they combine the use; we do it for larviciding but we don't do it unless a major environmental fear, or scare is the spraying by air. They actively engage in that. They also employ not just trucks but try to keep their cost down. They actually use ATVs to go up and down the streets. They go down the back lanes as well, Mr. Speaker. They just don't go down the front streets because mosquitoes just don't live in the front yard, they also live in the backyards too so Mr. Speaker, they have a very extremely effective system and I think it's…I really welcome. I want to thank the Mayor for bringing this forward. Some people say, "Well, you're just reacting in everything else.", well, yeah, maybe so but Mr. Speaker, what better time to deal with it than to deal with it now, and so I welcome the Motion and I would hope Council will support the amendment because it doesn't tie your hands if you read the Motion carefully. It just says bring back recommendations on what resources would be required and it doesn't say implement these resources or it doesn't say, do this. It doesn't say, spend the money, it just says to specify that and to look at the Grand Forks model, Mr. Speaker. So I hope it has Council's support. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we've already seen a fair bit of chaos this morning with some of the previous Motions with the, you know, walking things on and not sharing all the information with everyone. It's very difficult to have to vote on something you haven't even seen. It was put on our desk after the meeting started, that's what we're voting on today. I commend Councillor Steeves for actually following the appropriate process by bringing forward a Motion which will, I believe, will be referred back to the Standing Policy Committee. There is a word, policy, which is what policy committees are supposed to do and what our Policy Committee should've been doing early in the year, and I chaired that committee for five years and we used to do that. We would ask in February to have the mosquito people come out and we would say what are we doing this year, what policy do we need to look at for our policy? And the policies we implemented four years ago came forward through that Standing Policy Committee process, and they set out the new policy we have today. That's what we should've done earlier in the year. Not waiting till the mosquitoes; everybody is crazed with fighting off mosquitoes and all upset and worked up and right before an election and everybody is emotional and concerned, and with good reason. It's not fun being attacked by mosquitoes and people are upset about it. But you know, this is not a way to run a City. We've got Motions being amended and brought on that we are voting on without having even read or time to think about or time to look at. And I think that's very short sighted. I don't think we're going to be able to change our…as the Mayor even said in his opening comments we're not going to be able to change this policy immediately. It involves the Province. It involves research or at least it should and if it doesn't involve proper research and it's just change it willy-nilly because someone heard a news report then I don't think we should be doing that either. We should be thoughtfully basing our new policy on research and I agree with re-examining our policy, but not without the proper science behind it and not without any public input because this thing is being whipped through. The Motion allows for…it has to be back at this Council for our next meeting is what was the will of EPC, so that means the Administration has to write the report in like two weeks or something so that it can get; in the heat of; in the heart of mosquito season when our staff are all out actually dealing with the problem and Taz Stewart is out dealing with the busiest time of his life, we're asking him to whip off a report on a completely revamped mosquito policy, I guess with no public input because that would take too much time, in about two weeks and then it will have to go through the our Report Information System. I'm sure it will be walked on and then we won't have to time to deal with what it says and to even read it or have proper public input. You know, we don't have to do things this way. I mean, I know you can't change history. We should've been talking about this in February. I'd also like to say, you know, the previous policy that was brought forward when the Standing Committee actually did policy work many years ago was we put; one of the recommendations, it was a blue ribbon panel looking at alternatives to Malathion and looking at alternatives. Well that never happened. That never; you know, we said we didn't have the capacity to do that. So that never happened. If we weren't using Malathion, we wouldn't have buffer zones. This wouldn't even be an issue. And I

know the buffer zones are the issue that's gotten people going. I know Councillor Steeves is frustrated about that because he's hearing from a lot of constituents. I know the Mayor, we're all hearing from constituents. So if we were using something that people weren't concerned about as a health issue we wouldn't even have buffer zones or we wouldn't even be talking about this today.

So that should've happened five years ago. I mean, you can't change the past but to move a Motion forward like this, it's very frustrating to have such a short time frame for it. It's not going to happen that fast. You can't get the Province to change their policy in a couple of weeks. I think we all know that, I mean or a month or two. I mean we're probably talking about next year's mosquito season realistically. So why are we having everybody's blood pressure go through the roof and people panicking and citizens, you know, I mean, Mr. Brandon came here, bless his soul, with a presentation that you know, I'm sure I'm saying nothing that's any better than…what he said was excellent. I would just say ditto to everything Josh Brandon said. He raised some very good questions. Well he heard; read about it in the paper and came down here and had to wade his way through the process. Even City Clerk's didn't know what the Motion was until the meeting. It was tabled at the EPC meeting at nine o'clock this morning. I mean, this is no way to run a City. I'm sorry, it's not transparent. There is a role for the public. There is a role for members of Council. I don't even know if EPC members even knew about the Motion. I don't know what's going on. Three different Motions. You know, Councillor Steeves followed the proper process. Let's put forward a Motion and refer it to the Standing Committee and have them do the policy work. We're just reacting.

Now you know, it's been six years that we've had buffer zones every year, and I think you know, there is such a thing, a concept that I don't know if it's well understood. It's called the tyranny of the majority. And I'm very concerned about that. There's three, Mr. Brandon mentioned there is three percent of people that have a chemical sensitivities. There's people that have allergies. There's people that feel and believe and from what their understanding is; that they are being negatively affected by Malathion and other pesticides in our community. Those people…that's why we have buffer zones for…and other people feel you know it's a pitting of two people's rights against each other and to just take a poll, and you know an internet poll and say, well most people don't want buffer zones and then eliminate them, is really called…that's called the tyranny of the majority. And you know, it's an election year so I know it's right before an election so we're seeing that you know, pandering to that. I'm sorry. We have to do what's right for everybody's health in the community. There are, we are the only place using Malathion any more. I think everybody's more and more uncomfortable with it. We are seeing more buffer zones because people are uncomfortable with it because it's more of an awareness. There's pesticide bans in every, in all the major provinces, Quebec, Ontario and I'm talking about cosmetic pesticides. No one else in Canada is using Malathion and we're just soldiering on for the last six years with the same policy and all of a sudden we have a lot of rain and all of a sudden we're moving a Motion to change the policy in a couple of weeks with no public consultation and no proper process. This is not a way to run a City. I appreciate the concern about mosquitoes. My constituents are concerned about them, too. If we'd eliminated Malathion and studied this issue and researched it in the last few years and done some work on this instead of just reacting at the 11th hour right before an election, you know we wouldn't even have buffer zones because we wouldn't be dumping things that people didn't want dumped on them or some people didn't want dumped on them.

I'd also like to say I'm extremely disappointed with…if we're going to review on mosquito policy, we're still using Dursban for larviciding which is supposed to be banned any day now by the Federal Government. That's because of budgetary cuts. Every year in the budget debate I've had said lets you know, let's switch, we have a biological agent that's safe for larviciding and this Council is more concerned about other issues and money issues and so on that they have not listened to that so we are still using Dursban like, I don't know if it's 60 percent or 50 percent level, very high level. It's about to be banned and then we're going to be stuck with a huge jump in our budget to pay for the new agent we're going to be forced to use, but that's not being a leader to be forced to stop poisoning people with stuff that's banned because they know it's bad for you. The Canadian Cancer Society has a lot of concerns about the pesticide level across this country and that; and I don't think I would take the Canadian Cancer Society lightly when they have…

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

Councillor Gerbasi: I come from a Public Health background and I think that we have a responsibility as leaders not to pander to people's…we could, if this Council would've stood up and said we're going to put the resources into biological agent for larviciding, we're going to get a Blue Ribbon Panel and get the University and get the Province and really fight to deal with this, being the only place that uses Malathion. If we had been working on this over and shown some leadership and said, you know what, I know you don't like mosquitoes but let's try to get rid of the need for buffer zones, let's try to deal with this in other ways by really investing but there has been no leadership in the last six years in it. You know, you can call yourself the Mosquito Mayor or the Rapid Transit Mayor or the Environmental Mayor and everything else right before an election but nothing's been done for six years, Mr. Speaker, nothing. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Hey, everything that person just said is…I don't know what it is, but it certainly hasn't got anything to do that's productive with solving the issues that face our citizens today.

You know, let me start by reading from the Provincial Permit requirements. The Pesticide Permit that we receive, so mosquito, for the mosquito adulticiding program the active ingredients are Malathion and by the way, Councillor Wyatt, Permethrin. The application method is ground application, here are just a few of the criteria that I would like to highlight for you. "The applicant shall not apply insecticides by air for the purposes of mosquito adulticiding", so if you are referring to a jurisdiction where aerial spraying is used as opposed to ground spraying, that's not possible to do, which I'm glad I read your Motion through when it says sort of come back within 30 days. I think the stuff will unfold as it comes back in 30 days. "The applicant shall not play applying mosquito adulticides to parks, playgrounds or ball diamonds when occupied by the public", so you know, again if you want to start doing something more aggressively, you have to make sure that you have systems in place to deal with those situations.

"The applicant shall not use mosquito adulticides adjacent and within 100 metres of an objector's property. Adjacent is defined as property abutting or having a common boarder." It's not the City of Winnipeg's rules. It's the Province of Manitoba's rules as put on us as part of the Permit to use Malathion and Permethrin. You know we've seen in recent years, you know this like… this year in particular sort of the weather anomaly that's causing these problems. We know you know, it slapped in the face this year. We need to react. Councillor Gerbasi made a comment that says we're just reacting, well good leaders need to react when you're slapped in the face with something like the weather that we've had to deal with this year and the onslaught of mosquitoes that we're looking at and so well, I can make all kinds of arguments for and against buffer zones. What I'd like to do is have the people that are experts in the area, our scientific folks over at the City Entomologist Department, come back and tell us, in consultation with the Province who were giving us the licence, because the Province you know, as I understand it, I stand to be corrected on this but the Minister of Conservation has the right to amend that licence at any time. But if that means that a shift to Permethrin or increase Malathion and maintaining the buffer zones, whatever it is, let's have that conversation or at least get the information back to Council. Is 30 days an unreasonable time? I think when you see how the quality of life of our citizens has been affected in the last little while in the last several weeks, doing this in 30 days is a pretty reasonable thing. You know, we talk about climate change everywhere. We've talked about it through OurWinnipeg and our sustainability practices and programs and there's no reason why we shouldn't use climate change and what the climate is doing to us this year and it's not just in with the mosquitoes, it's…you look at our river. It's still, you know, 5, 10 feet above its normal levels so I mean there is a lot more going on here that yeah, we need to react and start addressing these bizarre weather conditions and if that means we have to be nimble, we have to bring about change then let's do that.

You know, there's comments made about what other cities do with regard to mosquitoes. They don't spray. I would suggest respectfully that if other cities had New Jersey trap counts like the City of Winnipeg has, they would be spraying whether it would be with Malathion, Permethrin or some other product because there is no way that if a citizen…a city experiences the onslaught of mosquitoes that this City has experienced this year, that the government would not be up against the public pressure that would push them to bring some sort of action to mitigate the problem created by the mosquitoes and to bring, to restore the quality of life to its citizens, all done under proper permit and licencing from the Federal Health Authority and the Provincial approval processes for the use of any other products. So, I think the idea that no city uses sprays for mosquitoes is a little bit outlandish. You know, it's like if you have mosquitoes at the levels that we experience or are experiencing them right now, I'm pretty certain that other cities would be taking some sort of action to mitigate that problem.

There was another comment made about tyranny of the majority and I found the irony of starting the conversation talking about public consultation and the need for public consultation, how this eliminates public consultation but then dismissing what the public might think as tyranny by majority in the closing remarks. You know, it kind of…there is an irony there that you know, if you want to stand on the soap box and scream public consultation, then don't dismiss it with comments like tyranny by majority.

There was other comments regarding Dursban, you know, the whole idea of going out and getting a report and looking at things comprehensively and asking you know, our guys to talk with the Provincial guys, get some information, get it together and come back here. If you were to eliminate Dursban you might not shift to another larvacide method. You might actually look at maybe there is a new, more friendly chemical to be used for adulticiding. You would do the balancing act. You would measure to have the scientific people tell you where it is that you should go. So the elimination of Dursban when you're taking a comprehensive approach and you're looking at it in the big picture of how the mosquitoes are formed and how they grow and what the outcome is that you're looking for. When you look at it, I don't know that that's what would come back but I would suggest to you that there is a variety of options that might come back. Shifting from Dursban to another larvaciding could be one of them. Shifting Dursban to 51 fogging trucks for adulticiding using Permethrin might be another one. You know, so that's what it is that we're going out and asking. And I think you know, year to year, this as it always has; you know, you've got a problem one year, the next year you don't.

Maybe for three or four years you don't have a problem and it's important not to overreact, but we need to be reactionary because our citizens are asking us to say something, our citizens are asking us to do something, so we need to be there. And we don't want to stand up as politicians sort of jacks of all trades and masters of none. We want to go to our scientists, to our Health Departments and our licensing authorities and say what tools can you allow us to use to restore the quality of life? And just on the issue of buffer zones, last night I was sitting with my father, a couple of my brothers and our families, you know my father and brother were visiting from out of town and we started talking about this, and my brother raised the concern and he said, "Well I don't really have a problem with buffer zones because two doors down I have a neighbour who suffers from Lupus." And Lupus is a nervous system disorder. Malathion is an agent; is a nervous system agent. So when you put things into that kind of perspective, what we do when we go forward will require leadership. It will require making the appropriate decisions because we do have the responsibility of protecting those people as well. But we also have a responsibility to do what we can within some of those parameters to ensure that the quality of life of citizens is where we can get it to and still respect those (inaudible)

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

Councillor Swandel: …the safety that we need to protect, but we need to take a look, we need to be reactionary. We need to do it today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Fielding: Great. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do want to pose a question to Councillor Wyatt. I am fairly amenable to what he is putting forward here. I do want to ask. It looks like what you're proposing or what they do in Grand Forks is a lot of the aerial and assuming you're doing it in one day and so that probably would have an impact if there are buffer zones that are there so I guess if you want to just maybe address that in your…I think you've got a closing comment if I'm not mistaken, closing to his amendment. So I will speak to the whole thing here today, but you know I truly think we really need to take a look at this policy. I do support what Mayor Katz has brought forward and also what Councillor Steeves, I wholeheartedly support that. You know, there's been talk about our residents and rushing things through. Well, I'll tell you what, you know is it reactionary or is it actually listening to our constituents? Because I can tell you I've been swamped with calls from people calling our offices saying that it's out of control. I don't think our current system is working, specifically as it relates to the buffer zones. I think we need to really take a look at that. This is not just a quality of life. There's two sides to the equation; first of all, it is a quality of life thing because you can't go out on a Sunday and enjoy your deck, your balcony, without getting eaten alive and you can't enjoy or have a quality of life here in the City of Winnipeg without that. But on the other side of the equation, I had a constituent that called me the other day and told me the case where they were inside a buffer zone and sure didn't want to be a part of that. She told me a story how her son is allergic to the mosquito bites that happens to come here and she can't do anything about this. She feels hostage within the zone that's there. And I think that and I'm going to speak you know, I'll speak, I won't speak to Gord's comments because I think he's automatically referred, but I'll tell you I think we've got to take a look at how far these buffer zones going, a hundred feet in one way. I would argue that having, you know ensuring that people are staying inside when the Malathion is being sprayed probably makes more sense on a public process and to protect people as opposed to these 100 feet buffer zones that are there. So I can tell you, you know we really need to take a look at this. We need to review our processes. And I don't think there is anything wrong with at all with what the Mayor is saying. We're saying that we want to review this, have our experts come back and we want to react, this is probably the worst season for mosquitoes in I don't know how long, but to react and to make a difference here within a month, I think it's very do-able. You know, these people are busy of course throughout the summer but they have copious time throughout winter to research this and understand this and a further point what Councillor Swandel is saying, what this policy, this policy can be changed with the stroke of a pen with the Minister of Conservation because it's all in the Permit that's put forward. It's not legislation. It's nothing that needs to be changed from there but it may change by a stroke of a pen by the Minister and I think they need to review that and take a look at that from our point of view because I'll tell you, the current system that we have in place specifically as it relates to this year is not working and we need to make changes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mosquito population right now is nuts. It's absolutely crazy out there. But it's not an unusual thing. It's worse than most years but it is really bad right now. Back on September 15th, 2008, the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee moved a Motion requesting that the Public Service prepare a report that addresses the issues of mosquito fogging including but not limited to alternatives to the use of Malathion which may require collaboration with Provincial and Federal Governments to affect licencing of other products that are just as effective and more benign, specifically looking at the Promethium. The eliminating of anti-pesticide buffer zones, providing service to the entire City on a one day time frame similar to that in effect in our Sister City, Grand Forks, North Dakota, where fogging is achieved on a daily basis rather than a weekly basis and use of

technologies including but not limited to altering vehicles, aerial fogging and traditional trucks. That Motion proceeded to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. You know who was at that meeting? My friend Councillor Gerbasi, my friend Councillor Steeves. Councillor Gerbasi you had an opportunity to debate doing the right thing. You had that opportunity. If you want further debate, if you want it stretched out, feel free to use my backyard without any insect repellant on. Mosquitoes need to be addressed now. We don't need 30 days. We need to ask the Province immediately to eliminate buffer zones. We already do it in instances where there are West Niles virus mosquitoes out there. Our tourism industry suffers. Are you familiar with the Capital One TV commercial? I'm using my points off season because it's you know, you're out there playing tennis and it's bug season. That's what Winnipeg is like right now. It's that bad. It's embarrassing. It's a problem. I don't think we need 30 days. We need to ask the Province now. We need to eliminate buffer zones immediately. Those are my comments today, again, we already do it. We do a very great job communicating. You can have phones…I believe there's a phone service now. If you want to be called when your area is going to be fogged that night; I believe we have a phone service. It's posted on the internet. It's very available. I mean if you want to take your kids in, if you want to take their toys in then for sure, you can do that. We do need to look at things like aerial fogging. We do know…I mean even alternatives to Malathion. We do a good job. I respect a lot of the work that's done in terms of the larviciding that's done prior to mosquito outbreaks but in years like this, it's not enough. It's just simply not enough and the adulticiding using the fogging technologies that are available to us now need to be done quickly, thoroughly, and it's just not fair to people that live near these areas. I mean if the Province is looking for some exception to buffer zones, the only place where I see a minimal thing, a minimum amount of wiggle room is requiring a note annually from a doctor saying that you want to have a buffer zone and 100 metres is ridiculous. It's not 100 feet Councillor Fielding, it's 100 metres. It's way too big. My feeling on this and the feedback I get from my constituents is no buffer zones. I mean if we did need to make an exception, it would be only with a medical doctor, a note from a medical doctor. A form on the internet, I could go and fill this in and put any address in there right now I want. There's a form on the City's website. That's way too easy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. It will be somewhat difficult to overcome my personal anger at seeing this Motion, ill-considered Motion but I will do so and I will attempt to speak to the issues here.

People talked about listening to their constituents, getting phone calls, quality of life. Well, I'll tell you when these restrictions were initially put in place, it was with regard to a long series of consultation that was done with the citizens of Winnipeg in this area before they were put into place. Many people showed up to talk about their breathing problems, to talk about the fact that they had to leave town when this was taking place. Yes, there are some people who have Lupus. There are all sorts of a myriad of issues and for some people, because of wind drift, 100 meters is not sufficient for them and they still have to go when that occurs. But now we're not giving people sufficient notice to leave town if that is their option. And what concerns me is our life on this planet is at jeopardy because we are continuing to pollute in vast numbers, vast amount of chemicals in so many directions without proper consideration, and there are alternatives to this. But that doesn't mean that it requires a knee jerk reaction and it does mean that if we are planning on changing directions that the citizens of Winnipeg need to be consulted and their concerns need to be heard. I also recall when there was a blockading of certain areas because people were quite frustrated with the spraying that occurred. People were moving huge garbage cans in order to block the spray trucks. People were bowing, throwing rocks at the spray trucks. By coming on last minute and sneaking this in with nobody knowing till the very last minute so you couldn't get these people who were enraged to come down here and tell you what you think today. You haven't stopped the problem from occurring. What you have is displaced the problem from this Council meeting and put it back onto the streets. And when people don't get the opportunity to come and express their point of view in front of their City Councillors at a meeting because something is rammed through at the last minute, that's what they do is they take it to the streets. And that will happen again, Councillors, if we do something foolish in quick order, because some people are upset about the mosquitoes in their backyards. You have to balance the concerns and the legitimate rights of everyone in the City. And you do it by listening to everybody in this City and offering them the opportunity to come down and speak about what their concerns may be. Doing this at the last minute very quickly, asking for a report, very quickly, so something can be shoved through in the middle of summer when a lot of people are on vacation and not paying attention is not a wise move. It may get something through on the Council floor, but it won't get something through in the City of Winnipeg because you will be dealing again with barricades. You will be dealing again with rock throwing. You'll be dealing again with people being arrested because they felt so strongly, they did that. This is why it's important that you follow proper process. You're supposed to have 96 hours before you bring something like that over. You're not supposed to do it at the last minute. You're not supposed to do that unless it's an emergency. How is a mosquito bite emergency? There is no equine encephalitis by the latest report that I've read. There is no threat of equine encephalitis, there's no threat of West Niles. This is nuisance fogging. Nuisance means I'm bugged by bites, oh yes, I am bugged by bites. I'm one of those people who is allergic to mosquito bites. It's difficult for me. But that doesn't mean that I look at someone who has Lupus, I look at someone who's attached to a breathing machine, I look at someone who cannot get around and say the fact that I have an allergy supersedes their rights. Everyone should have the opportunity to speak. Last minute waltzing

in of items like this does not give people that opportunity. It's disappointing but it's not surprising because it's happened again and again on this Council for the last four years and it's just another one of those last minute Motions that have nothing to do with anything except not wanting citizens to state their point of view. I heard someone saying that yes they are being reactionary and that's exactly what's happening. The people who are bugged by mosquitoes are the ones who are phoning in. The people who are getting relief from their breathing problems, who are not bothered by the mosquitoes, the people who do not have to leave town because their breathing problems are not being affected, the people who are not having a Lupus attack, are not calling you yet. Don't think they won't. Don't think they won't resort to further actions when they feel that their side isn't being heard. And yeah, I go into a lot of people's back yards when I have allergies, and I put up with what I can because I know there's people who might die if they are not properly protected. And surely, when the environment of the world is affected by people making stupid decisions rashly and quickly and having poisons pollute our earth, just one episode of David Suzuki will tell you lots of things that are wrong with our environment. Just one hour of the Daily Planet that Discovery Channel will tell you lots of things that are happening that could be corrected. If we put in a little bit of time and then a little bit of effort into developing healthy society not streaming down the road at break neck speed to our destruction. I could go on and tell you about the things that I've read in an environmental…..

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion to Extend, Councillor Wyatt. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried

Councillor Thomas: …reports that I've read while waiting in the doctor's office. That's very interesting the research that you'll find on your doctor's table if you're willing to listen and they were one of the groups that came and expressed concern with regard to that. I don't know, next week I'm going to find that someone wants to reinstitute smoking in restaurants again. I just never know what is going to greet me when I come to a Council meeting and that's a problem because the community should have at least 96 hours' notice and if we were wise they'd have more notice than that on what should present us on the Council floor. And I can say that I'm disappointed with this, that's here today but sadly I am not surprised.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll start off by; I believe Councillor Thomas was mis-remembering the history of the mosquito debate in the City. The blockades, the garbage cans in front of the trucks, that was pursuant to a declared state of emergency by the Provincial Government when the idea of buffer zones was overridden by the Provincial Government, had nothing to do with existing City Policy at the time. That's what happened in those circumstances. So that is not categorically being contemplated with this Motion today. Just so we're 100 percent clear.

I also want to be clear for Councillor Thomas that this Motion, in terms of timing and the rush aspect of it, doesn't in itself change the policy of the City of Winnipeg. It doesn't do that. What it does is it recommends a method for changing policy. There is a subtle but big difference I would argue. You are aware that I tabled a Motion for today, which will go to the Protection Committee on Monday. But the Mayor's Motion is much more comprehensive involving a lot more pertaining to the debate. However the items I talked about with respect to the buffer zones are somewhat contained within the Motion so I guess I can cross back and forth in terms of the content. I apologize in advance for the confusion.

Where I'm coming from on this particular issue, personally, Mr. Speaker is I have a real sense in our community that emotions being what they are, that we need to act. I think it would be fool hardy and irresponsible to sit back and do nothing. I think that would be the wrong thing to do. You get the phone calls too, and now I'm speaking to my Councillor Colleagues directly. The calls with respect to mosquitoes are among the most emotional calls if not the most emotional calls that a Councillor will get and the calls are often the same. People are concerned about when we're going to spray. The idea of buffer zones, and I would say personally the size of buffer zones and who is encompassed therein. These are the problems. Again I am not a scientist, I'm not a technologist, and I'm not a medical doctor. I am a lay person with some experience by virtue of my position of City Councillor. My sense is that the buffer zones that we are putting out there are too big; too big to be reasonably perceived as responsible, and it is causing problems in our community. How many calls have we got from people who are asking, who is calling? Who has the buffer zones. We don't give that information out, but those types of calls concern me because we know that people in the community have these types of concerns and I worry how it might manifest itself. We have to act and if people get the sense that we are not acting then yes, Councillor Thomas, they will take matters into their own hands and we don't want leave that. We don't want to see that happen.

As Councillor Fielding suggested, there may be some methods of moving this that would be agreeable to all parties just by virtue of the changing of the Permit and that may be possible to do in the short-term. I'm not certain, I don't know that for sure but that's the reason for the Motion and the request for the public service to become involved. I don't know that we can do it. But this is not necessarily things that will require large licencing requirement or change for containment with the details of the permit. It does appear that the Minister of the Provincial Government may have the power to

review things. The problem is that I don't recall throughout the course of this…my history on Council for the last ten years, this Council ever having the discussion about things like the size of buffer zones. Perhaps it did happen but I don't recall us ever talking about the idea that a 200 meter stretch would be sort of left if one person asked for that. That is, 16 houses on one side of the road and another 16 on the other side of the road and who knows how many if we draw a 100 meter perimeter around that given house. I'm not exactly certain that we do that but it would appear that the permitting would require that we do that. These are the types of questions that are problematic.

We talk about behaviours and we talk about how one hour of watching television will change this and change your view on that. We don't have the luxury of doing that I don't think to make policy decisions based on theories and ideas that exist and one hour television specials because we know that our current policy is driving certain behaviours. It's certainly driving emotions isn't it? It's certainly driving the sell out of individual pesticide applicators in our department stores, we know that. We know that as we speak, people are flocking to stores and they're fogging their own yards which I think is a bad outcome. I would rather see us doing it than private citizens doing it. I mean I don't; I acknowledge their right to do it but I think our people know exactly what they're doing; the capacity for harm is less. We haven't really talked about the chemicals themselves but we should actually go there. If we're going to talk about danger to human health, we have to see this debate in its entirety. I have been here for ten years; some people have been here for 30 years. There is precious little. I don't know if it's non-existent but at this stage, precious little empirical data that will show that Malathion is causing harm to Winnipeggers in the method that we are applying it.

Now, the reason I would never support wanton application of chemicals is because we have to support the precautionary principle. There are a lot of unanswered questions out there medically, but each time we have some sort of pesticide debate, whether it's cosmetic use on individuals lawns, whether it's Malathion or whether it's something else, these are the same things that kind of come up. It's hard to say, it's hard to say who the real culprit is, but we do have to be careful, I support that. We also have to acknowledge that there are "X" number of confirmed deaths over the course of the last years from the West Nile virus. That has to be taken into consideration and we know where that harm comes from. We need to do something as a society to act against that I think. Other behaviours that we drive Mr. Speaker are behaviours like the liberal application of insect repellents which is something that has encouraged in the face of mosquito populations. Just so we're clear, insect repellents are staffed primarily by what's called deet which is a slightly yellow liquid at room temperature. It can be prepared by converting toluic acid, 3-methylbenzoic acid to the corresponding acyl chloride reacting with diethylamine and they have the $(C_2H_2)_2NH$ compound. It creates a chemical. It still is worth questioning how we can at this stage of the debate be talking about the application of Malathion while encouraging the application of this to human skin on again a very liberal basis when we know that recently, deet has been found to inhibit the activity of the central nervous system, acetyl cholinesterase in both insects and mammals. The enzyme is involved in a hydrolysis, in the neurotransmitter acetylcholine and it goes on. There are a bunch of sides to this discussion. It has always been of interest to me, Mr. Speaker that…

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Fielding moves extension. All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Steeves: It has always been of interest to me how we can on the one hand, without any strong empirical data, hold up as stated fact, the idea that our spraying of Malathion is harming human health; at the same time encouraging the use of products like this as an application to human skin all over the body. I have yet to see a scientist who has even come close to try to reconcile those two arguments Mr. Speaker, because I have to say candidly they seem illogical. This chemical seems to be at least on face value as damaging as any chemical as being used by this City, but yet one is encouraged and one is actively campaigned against. I don't think we know the answer to these questions and that's part of the problem. I talk about this all the time and the chemical debate is one that has different sides. But the one that interests me most I guess is the issue of smoking. We know that smoking causes problems. We understand that. The societal reaction to smoking, however, despite the fact that we know that it's killed millions of people, has always been that we give people information. We don't know that what we are doing is causing any harm. That is surmised. And in fact, we have years of data that seems empty in terms of proven human harm. It has to be said if we're going to have a debate about chemicals in our community, all of the chemicals in our community, we have to at least base that on some empirical data, none of which, Mr. Speaker, would appear to exist. None.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Steeves. Sum up, Councillor Wyatt. Oh I'm sorry. Councillor Smith wants to speak. Sorry.

Councillor Smith: You know, we've…this mosquito issue has been going on for years and years and you know, I think Councillor Gerbasi is right. You know, this is not going to be solved right now. There's not going to be any quick action to have fogging. You know, it's going to go to Province so it's not going to happen till next year. Why 30 days? Doesn't make any sense. You know, we should have; you know I like personally; I like the idea of reviewing our policy. In fact last time we dealt with this issue, we enlarged the whole idea of going out further, outside of the City with larviciding and that was good. But you know, there's a lot to be gained by review, I don't mind a review but 30 days gives the idea to

people who want to be fogged that something's going to happen. You know, all…nothing is going to happen about this policy until next year because of the Provincial Government. So, all this is doing is making the Mayor and people who want to gain votes, to use this as an election issue. You know, why not go ahead and have…I don't mind the study. I don't mind but 30 days is just ludicrous. You're not gaining anything from that. Why don't we conscientiously look at this issue, have more than 30 days and do something in effect write in establishing scientific evidence about the benefits of fogging and the things that are wrong with fogging. You know, I don't think this Motion is harmful, except when I hear Councillor Browaty, you know, he's frightening. He says I don't care about the health of so many people. I just think that's ludicrous. I think we have to consider the whole population and I think we should…

Councillor Browaty: I'm not saying I don't care about…

Councillor Smith: I know you didn't say that but you advocated that. But you know it doesn't make any sense whatsoever. This Motion is just making people feel good that something is happening when nothing is going to happen. Thank you.

Councillor Steeves: Let the record show Councillor cares about people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal wants his moment.

Councillor Vandal: Very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I think that we need to focus here and actually read the Motion. I agree with Councillor Smith. I don't see anything wrong with reviewing, with consulting, and that's essentially what this Motion is. It's going to come back. I don't even think it'll come back before 30 days. It's going to come back with a path that hopefully we're going to take and hopefully we're going to take it seriously. When I read the Motion, Application of environmentally sensitive products, fine. We're going to study that and we're going to combat adult mosquitoes in their resting place during the day. Adulticiding factor analysis guidelines, alternative methods of conducting larviciding, adulticiding, when I read that, the only thing missing is actual picture of a mosquito on a cardboard with one of those lines cut through it such as Mayor Katz had six years ago in '04. And it's exactly the same announcement that's being repackaged six years later and I hope that this time Sam Katz, Councillor Steeves, the Executive Committee, whoever is Chair in Community Services will actually take this seriously and plan for the mosquitoes that we know are going to be here in the month of June. We've talked about leadership. We've talked about providing leadership. The word reactionary has been used several times and in my dictionary, reactionary is not necessarily a positive value. I think real leaders look at it down the road. They have vision. They can see what's coming. They put plans in place to actually address the problems they know are going to be here. Mosquitoes are going to be here in June and July and we need to take this problem seriously and a lot of it is probably going to fall to budget. In fact, not probably, I know it's going to fall to budget. They need more money. If we want to do a better job larviciding, adulticiding whatever ciding we want, it's going to come down to budgets and we have to be prepared to spend the right money at the right time to make real headway into this problem. No photo ops, no pictures of mosquitoes with lines through them. Serious policy leadership is what we need in this city.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Just a matter for clarification to sum up. The Mayor asked me if the Motion is to; just so all members of Council are aware, this Motion is to amend the Clause but by not changing the existing Clause in any way. It's to add this to the Clause so it's not deleting any part of the existing Clause. It's in addition to it and, my apologies for the handwriting but when Motions come flying you've got to be ready so just to answer some of the questions. I'll go back to an e-mail that I sent to all members of Council, the Mayor and staff as well back on July the 20th, 2005. At that time I had spoken with the Todd Hanson, who was a Mosquito Control Superintendent for Grand Forks, which is our equivalent of our Entomologist, Taz Stewart. Back then it was interesting, history repeats itself. Back then in 2005, we were having the same kind of wet spring and they were having the same cycle we were having. If you recall there was a lot of those members on Council and there was a lot of phone calls and a lot of concerns of residents and became a very big issue here and of course that was combined with the time with the West Nile issue but anyway coming back to Grand Forks. Grand Forks at that point of July 20th, '05 had fogged their entire City already 11 times for adulticiding and at that point we had yet to finish a single fogging in the City. Grand Forks had 19 ground machines, 15 trucks and 4 ATVs for a City of 50,000 compared to Winnipeg which had 10 at that time plus four more. The Province had us at 14. So we've actually improved the amount of vehicles that we have out there.

Grand Forks fogs, to answer your question, 75 percent by ground and 25 percent by air, and the area that they were fogging, I didn't write this down, but from the conversation if I recall right was outside of the populated areas. It was; they had an area like we do, to cover the countryside. Grand Forks doesn't wait for it to get bad. If they think it's going to be bad they take preventative action in advance. They start typically fogging when the traps hit 100. And there's a graph that back from June of 2005 which I think is fascinating because they are able to fog the entire City in one day and one

day on June the 23rd, 2005 their trap count hit a high of 438 mosquitoes average in a trap and they went out and fogged and it dropped down to 41 the next day. In one day. That was the trap count change. Huge benefit. They take with all the resources that I've mentioned, it takes 2.5 hours for them to fog their entire City verses the amount of time it takes for us to fog Winnipeg. They don't wait for most mosquitoes to be out. Most mosquitoes are active before sunset and two hours after sunset. That is when they fog. They don't fog at night. They fog again also first thing in the morning when the mosquitoes are active. They believe that they should be hit while they are in the air. They also do a lot of public education and information sharing with the State Government and their health officials. Grand Forks believes 10 to 40 percent of the mosquitoes are culex mosquitoes. The City of Grant Forks discovered West Nile as well. Their program, you've got to in some ways love the American way. They voted 91.8 percent on November the 7th, 1996, to start the program that they have today, 91.8 percent. I wonder what if we put it to a vote here in Winnipeg what it would be, Mr. Speaker. I dare to say it would probably be just as high. Grand Forks program costs them $600,000. This was in '05, annually and is funded with a $2.50 month charge on their water bill. And as I mentioned they use synthetic products, they don't use Malathion. When I told the Superintendent that we use Malathion, he said well that's very good for mosquito control but you know, it is like taking a hammer, to a sledge hammer to the problem, but that's the only product have because the other products aren't licensed here yet. The chemical they use is less intrusive and more worker friendly, and again they work cooperatively with their State Health officials and the Centre for Disease Control.

Mr. Speaker that just shed some light on…this was in 2005. Things may have changed since then but clearly, I'm assuming that their program is still continuing and they state very specifically that they are in the business, Mr. Speaker, of eliminating not just disease carrying mosquitoes but also a level of annoyance, basically the annoyance of mosquitoes to ensure that; and to do it in an environmentally sensitive matter to make sure they have a quality of life. They say that right up front. So Mr. Speaker, they have a extremely comprehensive program that I think is worth looking at, and as I mentioned it may have changed since 2005 but the results that they got and it was just…and you can see by the graph, one after another, Mr. Speaker, it dropped…you know, they go in and it's up to 97, they go out and they fog the next day it's down to 18. You know, it jumps up to 203, they go out and fog and it's down to 47, you know, in one day for the whole City and they cover 150 square miles back in 2005 not just the City but the whole area surrounding. So that's the Motion and I would encourage Council to support the amendment. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, we'll vote on the amendment. Oh, the Mayor speaks? Thank you.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am going to just not address some of the comments and names that some of the Councillors here have referred to me as because many, many years ago as a youth I learned about sticks and stones may break my bones but names will never hurt me. So we'll just forget about that. Let's just deal with the facts, Mr. Speaker. The realities are we have a Policy, and it was yours truly and Council who implemented a Policy. We have a Policy whereby, Mr. Speaker, we need to have traffic…trap counts of 25 or more for three straight days and then at least one quadrant of the City exceed a hundred, and then we give 48 hours' notice to spray, okay. We know that there are many people who have sensitivities and have medical problems. Just to remind everybody, when there is a West Nile virus alert and the Province decides to spray, any idea what the notice is, Mr. Speaker? Twenty-four hours. Twenty-four hours. And yet I've never heard one Councillor ever say that's not enough, what are you people doing? Not once I ever heard that, Mr. Speaker. The realities are, before the West Nile virus threat is announced, it's already there, Mr. Speaker. We all know it's there. It finally has become brought to our attention. We have a problem here, Mr. Speaker and it's time we make a decision and that's what elected officials are elected to do, to make decisions not run for the hills and hide, but some people here are very good at doing and talking about other things. We need to make a decision and all we're asking here is to go to the experts, have them look at this, and I commend Councillor Wyatt for bringing up the Grand Forks scenario which I am aware of which would've been hopefully one of the things they would've looked at, and look at other alternatives. That's what we are doing. That's what we should be doing to recognize the needs of our citizens because the facts of life are you can't go outside and play. You can't have your children outside. You can't do anything outside. Now that's what people want Winnipeg to be, that's fine. I don't, Mr. Speaker. I want us to enjoy our short, beautiful summers, and there are options available and if there are more costs to doing that, so be it. This Council will make that decision. But there are better ways of doing things. There's always something better out there and usually it does cost money. That's something that we want to look at and we want it brought back here as quickly as possible. This is not knee-jerk in any way shape or form. When was the last time someone remembers over 200 millimeters of rain in 48 hours? When was the last time you could drive around the City even after that three weeks ago? There's standing water everywhere, Mr. Speaker, everywhere. This probably is the most ideal situation for breeding for mosquitoes in all of North America right now. It's time for us to try and take action and the realities are we can only do it as quickly as this Motion says and this Motion was very well thought out, Mr. Speaker. It's before Council. I certainly hope Council supports it unanimously. As far as some of the other misinformation that's been shared, some other Councillors have already corrected it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Mayor Katz. All right, so pose the question for the Amendment. All those in favour? Those opposed? Register Councillor Thomas. All right. On the main Clause Item 3 as amended, all those in favour?

Those opposed? Councillor Thomas. All right. We're looking at a time crunch here for lunch. We haven't got to the question period for the Mayor yet. I don't know what the will? You need lunch?

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, we'll adjourn until 1:30 at which time will do question period. By-laws, I'm sorry.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
June 23, 2010, at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Get back to work. Okay, we'll call our session back in order here and ask Mayor Katz to proceed with his By-laws.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 67/2010 and By-law No. 68/2010.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 67/2010 and By-law No. 68/2010.

Mayor Katz: I move the following By-laws all be read a first time as well, By-law No. 74/2010 and By-law No. 75/2010.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary?

Clerk: By-law No. 74/2010, By-law No. 75/2010.

Mayor Katz: I move that By-laws numbered 74/2010 and 75/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 74/2010, By-law No. 75/2010.

Mayor Katz: Move that the Rule be Suspended and By-laws numbered 74/2010 and 75/2010 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Addendum By-law.

Mayor Katz: Addendum, I'm ready.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, away you go.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that the Rule be Suspended and By-law No. 77/2010 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 77/2010.

Mayor Katz: I move that By-law No. 77/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 77/2010.

Mayor Katz: And I move that the Rule be Suspended and By-law No. 77/2010 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Harvey Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. I'd like to ask you Mr. Mayor, why does the Auditor ignore your office? Why are your trips not audited like mine are, and why are all your expenses not audited? For someone who takes accountability, should you not be concerned with the lack of accountability of your office?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. I thank Councillor Smith for the question. Mr. Speaker, for the record, I was the first elected official to basically put all of my assets on the website so anybody could see what I own and what I don't own. Number two, all my expenses and therefore all my trips, Councillor Smith can take a look anytime, he can come to my office and Number three Mr. Speaker, if an expense is incurred by a Councillor or a Mayor, and you don't have the backup after the Auditor does his review, it's obvious what should take place Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith, second question.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Mayor, will you send each member of Council a list of sponsorships under your Sponsor Program, and will you also give a breakdown on the costs of this program to all of us.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, anytime I go out in public, I actually do more than that. I have a press announcement and announcement to the media what we're doing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: All I want to ask you is for a list of the Sponsorships that this program has attracted, and what the cost of the program is. I think your office can provide that, could it not?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as I just said a moment ago, when we do these types of events, we actually have a Press Conference and a release announcing and making it very public. There is no secret whatsoever, but if Councillor Smith has a specific question of me, he's more than welcome to my office. It would be my pleasure to entertain him.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Smith: Some of the sponsorship….

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I'm sorry, I think, let me just clarify this because I'm the Councillor who is also responsible for Sponsorship. I think what Mr. Smith was asking Mr. Mayor is have we announced any other Sponsorships within the Sponsorship Winnipeg Program, am I correct?

Mayor Katz: I did but I'll do it one more time. Mr. Speaker, we've announced one to date, and we announced that one prior to. It was regarding the library, and when we announce again, there will be an announcement, and as I told the media then, I expect to have another announcement within the next few months and I believe what I said will come to pass. My apologies for not clearly understanding what he was referring to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In dealing with constituency concerns, I'm hearing more and more about a lack of staff resources for a number of issues that are coming up. Especially in the Inner-city there are plenty of need to deal with issues around garbage complaints when there's things like mattresses lying around or; so and I was quite shocked to be told recently that there is only one inspector for the whole City to deal with garbage issues, these kinds of complaints. If this is true, this is totally inadequate. And I've also seen that the Claims Department is now asking citizens to go and chase down, even when their claims have been approved, they are told they have to go chase after a contractor to get their work redone or their damages, even when the work is being done by contractors on behalf of the City. And apparently, the reason I was told was that Claims are under-staffed and they don't have time to do this stuff anymore. So clearly, there are impacts of the budget restraints that have gone on and they are affecting front line services. Would the Mayor care to advise…to comment on this?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any of this. Obviously Councillor Gerbasi is. It would be very appreciated if she might send this to me either through email or letter and I would be more than happy to follow up on that. I can also tell you, Mr. Speaker, during the flooding that took place when we had those rains, I know that more resources were put

on the job, and I know we did have more garbage pick up and I know containers were dropped off for people. I know Councillor Wyatt was very much involved in Transcona and I know that action was taken. So, Councillor Gerbasi's specific issue, I'm not aware of. If she had approached me with that prior to, I maybe could have had an answer for today but now I'll just have to take that information and then get back to her.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. That's fine, thank you.

Being; just having had the Truth and Reconciliation Commission National Event in Winnipeg, Monday was Aboriginal Day, it came to my attention that every year at our National, or Aboriginal Day event we have hamburgers and bison burgers and bannock. Apparently that was cut from some sort of budget. Were you aware of that Mr. Mayor, that there was no food or lunch this year and I'm just wondering why that was the case? I believe it was the City contributed in the past for the peanut gallery over there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker just for the record, I was at Aboriginal Day. I don't think I saw Councillor Gerbasi there. I was there and I spoke and I can tell you it's interesting that Councillor Gerbasi says this because there wasn't one person who asked me that question, and I saw people participating in all sorts of events and functions. So if they're not sharing that information with me when I'm there or prior to, it's interesting it would be shared with someone else, but, Mr. Speaker, once again, I'd be happy to take that under advisement and get back to Councillor Gerbasi.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you for that. My last question is the Winnipeg Police Service has cancelled a recruit class citing fewer retirements than expected, and it's a pretty big concern since we really can't predict retirements and we've made this mistake before years ago and we're left short staffed for a long time to recover from cancelling recruit classes and I'm concerned that this was a way to balance the budget. Do you have a comment on that, Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, I'm not shocked or surprised that would be Councillor Gerbasi's viewpoint. She always looks at the worst case scenario. If for a moment she is questioning the integrity of Police Chief McCaskill, then say that right now because I will defend that man to the bitter end.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. May 29, May 30 the City of Winnipeg saw unprecedented levels of rainfall and widespread basement flooding especially in northeast Winnipeg. It was reported by the City on that weekend that the Hawthorne Pumping Station went down. I have since spoken to people in the department and they've said that the basement flooding and such that was related to the Hawthorne Pumping Station had nothing to do with basements flooding. However, at this point the Mayor was also on the record saying that if the City was at fault for anything, we would be liable for it. The public, in North Kildonan especially, hasn't heard any communication from the City saying that the Hawthorne Pumping Station was not at fault for their basement flooding. Would the Mayor be willing to communicate in some way through the media, through advertising perhaps, what happened at the Hawthorne Pumping Station and that the City was not at fault for it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as you're probably aware of in the past, and I know Councillor Fielding would be very much cognizant of it, if that for some reason the City is at fault we'd be the first to accept responsibility and deal with the citizens; which we have done in the past and St. James is a perfect example. In this situation, I can tell you, I had been out to parts of the City that have been flooded, specifically South Transcona; spoke to the residents. I heard comments about pumping stations being down, etcetera. All sorts of rumours, and after speaking to the department we were…it was confirmed that some pumping stations did go down for an hour or two or three, whatever the case may be, and that specifically, the pumping stations had nothing to do with the flooding per se. That is what has been told to us by the department. That's what we're accepting at this stage of the game. As everyone knows, you certainly can put a claim in for overland flooding at this particular point in time, and I believe that there was a comment that was made prior to this question being asked, and I believe it was also repeated in the media, that there is no City that has the facility to handle the type of rain that we had on that particular point in time. I am paraphrasing. I believe Councillor Wyatt could probably say it better since he was the one who said it first.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Browaty, your second question.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Mayor. I do appreciate that this was an act of God and beyond the scope of a sewage system in any jurisdiction. What I'm asking for though in this case, is the City publicly acknowledged the failure of a particular pumping station in North Kildonan. People in the vicinity of it saw a lot of flooding. Would the Mayor be willing to go out there; I mean, and I've had a good conversation with the Director, Barry MacBride, and I accept the way that station works, and that it, in fact, did not contribute towards basement flooding. Would the Mayor be willing though to communicate that to the public through, say, an ad in the community paper or in addition to releasing information on the City's website?

Mayor Katz: Yes.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you.

Mayor Katz: You're welcome.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Just to follow up from talking with staff, Mr. Mayor, they have indicated to me informally that they are investigating. Water and Waste is investigating everything that occurred in that period of time internally and they plan to have, hopefully, results by the end of July. I went out and had a look at the…one of the pumping stations and the preliminary result is that it wasn't the pumping station's failing but the actual amount of sewage was in there, the septic line was so huge that the pumping station was just moving the stuff around. It wasn't actually going anywhere because the amount of back-up was so massive, but in light of the fact that they are investigating, that they are…will the administration; I just want to pick up on where Councillor Browaty was going just to ensure that we get that information back and that's shared with residents in terms of any investigation they've done, not just the system in northeast Winnipeg but across the City, in terms of the retention ponds as well just so that folks know that the system, as I mentioned before, there is no system in North America built to handle what we had in that period of time. But just so they know that there has been an investigation and they know that the systems are working the way they are supposed to and if they are not, that that is also brought out as well.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, if Councillor Wyatt is asking that whatever conclusions and information they gather from this process be shared, absolutely.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, for the last two years I have been asking about when a firehall in southeast St. Boniface will be constructed and I keep getting feedback that's favourable but still no definitive date on when are reports coming forward, when a firehall will be constructed and where, precisely will be constructed in the southeast corner of the City, the fastest growing portion of the City of Winnipeg. My question to the Mayor is, can you assure Winnipeggers and people living in south St. Boniface that there will be a report to the Protection Committee, to Executive Committee and to the floor of this Council before the next election?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I can assure Councillor Vandal and all the citizens that this matter has gone out for request for proposal. I believe the matter is closed and they are going through it right now, so I think Councillor Vandal knowing how the system works, knows that we're very close to that and as quickly as they can move forward, I certainly would welcome it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Vandal: Are you aware Mr. Speaker to the Mayor that this is the answer I've been getting for the last eight months and we're still…a report is still not delivered and if the Mayor can do everything he can in his power to make sure that a report does come to this floor before the next election.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, when we are finished today's activities, I will actually call the department, get a current status, exactly what it is. I will then communicate with Councillor Vandal, and I can assure you that I will do everything within my power to move this forward as quickly as possible and hoping to get it done by July, absolutely.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Oh, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: It's come to my attention through my Ward that the City provides Permits, Exclusive Use Permits, to organizations to use our fields and I'm just wondering if the Mayor is aware of that? Exclusive Use Permits.

Mayor Katz: Hopefully, through you to Councillor Orlikow, maybe you can clarify. Is he talking about fields or I'm not sure exactly what he is referring to. Maybe you could just qualify that.

Councillor Orlikow: Absolutely no problem. I'm not too sure either. I know it is fields but I'm not sure of the whole scope of it. It's buildings as well. In this specific case it is a field, it's a soccer field that has been given a substantial amount of money from the Federal Government to rehab the field, and I was quite shocked to find out that the general public doesn't have access to that field because it's under an Exclusive Use Agreement with a soccer club. So I was…so I was wondering about this Exclusive Use arrangements in general, so my question is are you aware that we do have these types of Exclusive Use arrangements with organizations to use our soccer fields, to be specific?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I am cognizant about using fields through my own experience playing baseball and softball and I've never seen Exclusive. I always thought different groups and different organizations were using it. If Councillor, if the good Councillor would be…give me the details I'm happy to look into it, specifically if this is a City-owned facility, then we should all be aware of the fact that there is a special agreement out there, and so if the Councillor has some information that he is prepared to share, I'd love to follow up on it.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, that's why I made mention of it today. I am trying to get that information from our Administration and I will provide that information when I receive it as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further questions of the Mayor? All right. Well that's it for EPC.

Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, there is a Motion that I guess is an automatic referral. Councillor Steeves.

(Inaudible speaking in the background).

Councillor Wyatt: Is this Councillor Steeves Motion you're referring to?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg applies, in certain circumstances and pursuant to policy, pesticides designed to abate or lower mosquito populations within the district of the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the License to apply these pesticides is granted by the Province of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS to receive a license to apply these pesticides, the City of Winnipeg is required to offer a "buffer zone" of non-application to any building owner who requests that their property not be subject to the application of pesticides, and that this buffer zone policy can only be usurped by the Province of Manitoba in cases of declared emergency;

AND WHEREAS the City currently offers a 100 meter buffer zone on both sides of a property as well as a distance behind the property and frontage to any citizen who makes that request;

AND WHEREAS a 100 meter buffer zone, in the context of an actual city block, can mean a non-application area of as many as 32 - 40 houses on one street or in one area;

AND WHEREAS the interpretation of the size of the buffer zone is based on the report as done by the Clean Environment Commission in 1982, which spoke of the 100 meter buffer zone;

AND WHEREAS the instigating of a buffer zone in a community is extremely volatile, divisive and misunderstood;

AND WHEREAS the size of the buffer zones, as they currently exist, could result in more and more private application of pesticides;

THEREFOR BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg Council ask the Winnipeg Public Service to review this Buffer Zone Policy with the following questions, along with any information the public service feels is relevant, specifically to be responded to:

1. *Given the type of Pesticide used and the conditions under which they are applied, for safety reasons, is a 100 meter buffer on either side of a property zone still appropriate for property owners who request the buffer zone;*

2. *Does any other city in Canada utilize a buffer zone and if so how does the buffer zone calculation and size in Winnipeg compare to other cities in Canada who fog for mosquitoes;*

3. *What is the Responsibility of the City of Winnipeg when it comes to the specific issue of setting the size of buffer zones for pesticide application, and what is the process for review;*

4. *In their report, was the Clean Environment Commissions' request of 100 meters a total amount, or designed to be applied to all sides of a property?*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Go ahead.

Councillor Wyatt: Is this a Councillor Steeves motion?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, in light of the fact that this is such a pertinent issue right now rather than refer I move Suspension of the Rules that we deal with it right now

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, call the question then. Do we require two-thirds? Yes okay. All those in favour? Those opposed? (Inaudible) Nays have it. Yes. Order, order, order. All right. So it's Automatic Referral. Thank you.

There's no Report from Protection and Community Services. Next one, Standing Policy Committee for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Oh, question period, I'm sorry. Sorry for Councillor Pagtakhan. I tried to help you out Mike. Question period for Councillor Pagtakhan. Being no questions, we'll move forward. Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED MAY 25, 2010

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my honour to move the Report of the Standing Policy Committee meeting of May 25th, 2010. I move that Clauses 1 and 2 be Adopted by Consent.

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

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Under By-laws Mr. Speaker, I move that By-law No. 76/2010 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 76/2010.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Question period.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE OF INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Thank you for taking over the Chair Mike. The question I have is with regard to refuse collection in my area. It's the public refuse collection in those bins that are on the street. Some of them are "Take Pride" containers, some of them are not. I've been having a continuing problem over the past number of years in getting the refuse picked up in that area. I've had to phone two or three times to get them to come and pick up the refuse. Finally, in the last conversation that I had with Barry MacBride's Assistant, I found out that the refuse in the northeast quadrant is

picked up privately as part of the contract, whereas in every other part of the City, it's actually picked up by City forces, and there seems to be some reticence on the service providers to actually go and do the pick-up in the area even though apparently the contract says they are responsible for picking it up on a regular basis, and they only do it whenever I call. So I have to…there's some garbage that I have to end up calling for the same one, particularly the ones in front of Miles MacDonell Collegiate, Elmwood High, and high profile areas on Watt Street that I end up actually calling every two weeks to get this done and it usually takes three phone calls, three weeks in a row before it actually gets picked up, and I…(inaudible comment in the background)…yes, the question is what can we do to rectify…I am allowed a three minute preamble on my first question. What can we do to rectify this situation because the northeast quadrant of the City is being treated differently than other times, and I'm actually getting quite tired of phoning in and asking for the refuse to be picked up from those public containers. Thank you.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Councillor. You of course shouldn't have to do that. The standard should be much, much higher than that, and when the Clerks provide me with the transcript of the question, and I would like it word for word in its entirety so that I can follow it up thoroughly and get back to you and all members of Council with more than an answer. I'll come back also with a solution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any further questions for Councillor O'Shaughnessy? If not we'll move on to Standing Policy Committee for Finance. There's no Report. Any questions on the Finance front for Councillor Fielding? If none, we'll move on to the Downtown Development Committee, Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED JUNE 10, 2010

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce the report and move Adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 3.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No items to stand down? All good news. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Any questions of Councillor Swandel? No questions in question period. All right. Standing Policy Committee for Property and Development. Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JUNE 8, 2010

Councillor Steeves: Regarding June 8, 2010, I'll introduce the Report and move Adoption of Consent Items 1 through 14, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Councillor Steeves: I will move that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law numbers 65, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73 all of/2010 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 65/2010, 66/2010, 69/2010, 70/2010, 71/2010, 72/2010, and 73/2010.

Councillor Steeves: I will move that the By-laws numbered 65/2010, 66/2010, 69/2010 to 73/2010, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 65/2010, 66/2010 and 69/2010 to 73/2010 both inclusive.

Councillor Steeves: I will move that the Rule be Suspended and the By-laws numbered 65/2010, 66/2010, 69/2010 to 73/2010, both inclusive, be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period for Councillor Steeves who is having a bit of an energy crisis.

Councillor Steeves: (Inaudible)

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No questions for Councillor Steeves and Property and Development? Just hang on one second. Mr. Mayor; the Mayor has asked to speak.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would very much, at least try one more time, and I thank Councillor Swandel for giving it a shot earlier. But in light of some of the information that's been shared with Councillors regarding the Capital Region, I would like to bring forward a Motion to Suspend the Rules and deal with it. I have received an email and basically it specifies what we've already said, a balance owing of funding from the Province is dependent upon the receipt of individual resolutions in support of this document. We've been working for years to have a good working relationship with the Capital Region. I'd like to keep that going, so I would beg Council's indulgence to see if we could deal with this issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right we have a Motion to Suspend the Rules. All those in favour? Those opposed? We suspended the Rules so I guess Item 1 from the Executive Policy, June 23rd.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 23, 2010

Item 1 - Partnership of the Manitoba Capital Region Inc. –
Membership, Organization and Governance Structure

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, if I may, two things, number one just for clarity, the Province basically asks that the Capital Region have an agreement with the City of Winnipeg. That's number one. I think everybody understands this. More importantly Mr. Speaker, I would ask whether or not to move this forward we would have to rescind a Motion that's already been voted on or we could move that forward or maybe the Clerk could enlighten us on the proper way to do that. (inaudible) You're correct, this would be the first Motion so then everybody has the Motion in front of them and I would certainly ask for your support so that the Capital Region can get the balance of their funding from the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Seeing no questions, we'll pose the question. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried.

Councillor Swandel moves adjournment. All those in favour? Stand for roll call, please.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 2:04 p.m.