COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, March 23, 2011

Council met this day at 9:34 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

Opening Prayer read by Councillor Smith.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Before we have our opening prayer; Councillors. Before we have our Opening Prayer, we would like to recognize an international tragedy that's happened since our last Council Meeting. Winnipeg has ten Sister Cities across our globe, and the very first one that we ever set up was in Setagaya, Japan, so out of recognition to our friends in the City Council who were here last summer, the Chairman who is the Speaker of their Council and the Mayor of the Setagaya Village were here in Winnipeg and paid us a courtesy visit, they deserve the opportunity to at least have our thoughts put on the record. So, after we have Councillor Smith read the Opening Prayer, we'll have a moment of silence as we all rise. Councillor Smith.

Mr. Speaker: Please remain standing. (Minute of Silence)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We are joined today by our two pages, ladies, Madison Fedyck came from Glenlawn Collegiate who resides in the North Kildonan Ward and Alex Goodman from St. Mary's Academy who resides in the Old Kildonan Ward, Ladies thank you for being here. (applause).

MINUTES

Councillor Pagtakhan moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on February 22 be taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We'll move right into our Delegations, and we have Mr. Martin Boroditsky with us today to speak regarding the Winnipeg Parking Authority, Item 9 in Report A. Mr. Boroditsky.

DELEGATIONS

Martin Boroditsky: Good morning Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: You have ten minutes.

Martin Boroditsky: Thank you, sir. Good morning Mr. Mayor and all my friends at Council. I stand here and realize the last time I was here, I believe about this space right here, Councillor Yanofsky was busy thinking of his next chess move. I know it's a long time ago. I'm kind of surprised myself actually. I'm here to speak in Opposition to the matter of the Business Plan of the Parking Authority. I'm going to leave specifics about the Plan to you Councillors who asked me about, and rather try to provide you with some context about the importance of decision you're about to make as it affects your constituents and the voters and businesses in Winnipeg. This document, although I am sure well intentioned, demonstrates wholly and entirely, why you have to set an example and correct the flawed model of Special Operating Agencies, before it's allowed to expand. Stakeholders are defined by the Parking Authority Model as being anybody but the people most affected by their actions; people who drive and park; and have to pay for the privilege. This situation has resulted in the course of my work with the Great Canadian Talk Show, in discovering that the general public; not only lacked a voice but lacked any recourse through the Parking Authority because they had no genuine complaint process. And I caution you now, that when they try to fool you and say oh well we issued a “x” number of hundreds of thousands of tickets and there were only 37 cases that is go to Court; what they don't tell you is how many times they Stay a Charge on the courthouse steps the same way all chickens does when they know something is about to come home to roost and that is not an infrequent experience of Winnipeggers who take the time out of their days and their lives to stand up for what's right, to try to prove a point, and then after having invested the time, and effort and

getting the run around, they show up at court and the ticket is pulled. It's understandable why the Parking Authority would not want cases to be actually heard; because then there would be more genuine reflection of the inefficiencies of their system and of their bullying of the general public and neighbourhood businesses. The Parking Authority is out of control. It extracts money from drivers with false tickets. They give people a run around in terms of a process to appeal those tickets. They bully neighbourhood businesses and drivers and generally act as though they are above Police and City Council. You can set an example and put a stop to it. When they say oh, we need additional revenue, our efficiencies are at peak performance, there is nothing in the Business Plan that addresses efficiencies and there's nothing in the Business Plan that addresses how they can tighten their own belts; nothing in the Business Plan about public consultation; that dreaded term that you all learned the meaning of in October. I have in my hand over 50 stubs, more or less in groups of ten, it's been well discussed. I know Councillor Browaty and some others have seen these before. These are all examples of where a nickel or dime was put in a pay station and hours when the station was not supposed to operate and where payment was accepted. In other words, malfunctioning machines. We did two separate extensive surveys. Participated in by bloggers and by Kim the Traffic Reporter and the alternative media led the way. This wasn't checking ten machines, but 80 or 90 in a day. In one review I think it was 42% of machines malfunctioned and another 57 or 58 and not a peep in the Business Plan that says, we will fix our machines with the additional revenue we want. That is unacceptable. I'll put a human face on the decision that you would make that would allow them to expand hours, expand fees, and perhaps expand their reach. When stakeholders have been defined by B.I.Z.'s and by the City Administration, there is no impetus to improve. There is no impetus to think of the public. Let me ask you a question. Selkirk Avenue has pay stations. That program has been so successful the Selkirk Avenue B.I.Z. dissolved. How are the people of the North End supposed to get those pay stations removed from Selkirk Avenue now when there is no B.I.Z. representing even nominally the businesses on the Parking Authority Board? If they are allowed to expand, Councillor Steen, you want to see pay station on Henderson Highway? You won't even have a B.I.Z. over there if that is allowed to continue in this manner. So not only have I shown you evidence that the Parking Authority derives revenue when they are aren't entitled, they tell you they need more revenue, this here is but a sampling at a cost I do not yet know, of transcripts paid to a company in Ottawa, out of Province mind you, so that the former CAO, Mr. Hill, could keep track of what was being said about him and his agency on community campus radio. And these transcripts are handy because instead of me having to try and remember everything, Mr. Hill was kind enough it use Parker's money to provide a record I can repeat to you here in Council. Let me put that human face on the kinds of experiences that people have and have had in dealing with the Parking Authority. Let's see. Let's start with oh, Stasia, one of students from Red River College who two months after her Permit at the Civic Parkade had been cancelled; got her credit card billed you remember that one because Councillor Browaty had to intervene. Her experience was miserable. The student does not have time to run around, go to court, start arguing with people, wait on hold. Of course she didn't have to wait on hold because no one answered the damn phone anyways and what she got a hold of Jim Bert he said that's not my Department. He's quality assurance yet he didn't think it was his responsibility to take ten minutes out of his busy day to talk with a student who couldn't afford being dinged a $150.00 that she wasn't suppose to be paying in the first place. As a matter of fact, Stasia who is a very, very articulate young lady made the point on our program of saying, that she felt helpless until Councillor Browaty intervened. Nobody would listen to her. When you have an Agency that won't even listen, when people are being billed improperly, I won't use the term illegally because I'm sure it was some kind of accident. What confidence can you have in a Business Plan moving forward? You can't just abandon people who are victimized and I do use victimized in that way; speaking of victims let's look at the transcript where Mr. Topolniski had the misfortune of having to appear on the Richard Cloutier show on CJOB on a matter of a By-law being enforced about signage in vehicles. It was a computer error was the excuse that was given. Hmm. Not very believable considering humans have to program computers. The experience of Phil Fletcher was recounted on our program and as is found in these transcripts, Mr. Fletcher having had his vehicle disabled, pulled into a handicap parking spot at 3:00 in the morning over at the McPhillips Casino. Now those handicap parking spots are not, in effect, outside of business hours. He pulls in, goes in to use the phone to call the tow truck to come get service whatever and his vehicle is towed. He gets a ticket. He says well listen my vehicle is disabled; nobody is about to park in the disabled parking spot. The Parking Authority tells him to go jump in a lake; he says I'm going to appeal this. Before he could even Appeal the ticket in Court, they had already slapped a lean on his car. The ticket was quashed. He went back to the Parking Authority on two occasions and said please revoke this ticket upon which; revoke this lean. He is still fighting with the Parking Authority in Court to have a lean removed for a ticket that was quashed and the City's Lawyers are defending the Parking Authority, and Hook Ventures. Oh, did I mention that Mr. Fletcher had his privacy rights breached twice by the Parking Authority in the course of his fight and trying to get information and assistance from his City Councillor, Mr. Pagtakhan? These are but a small sampling of the examples of the bullying, abusive behaviour of the Parking Authority towards the people that pay the freight. The Business Plan does nothing to correct or address this and it is rooted in the fact that drivers in the City are seen as cash cows not as human beings. More recently, let's see if I can dig this up. No problem. Bob Axworth's Community Living Newsletter. The story on the back page from a fellow who is a salesperson. This week, I parked on the south side of Bannatyne at 3:38 between 3 other cars. The machine wouldn't take my Toonie, I thought it was broken. Went across to get his ticket. Comes back out at 4:51, car towed, $16.00 cab ride to Dr. Hook; $85.00 tow job; $20.00 storage fee; $50.00 City of Winnipeg Parking Ticket; $25.00 City of Winnipeg Administration charge; two other vehicles parked with him were also towed; that tells you the signage is inadequate as

we discovered many times on our program. If three people get towed that tells you the problem is with the signage not the people but when it comes to the Parking Authority it's always the people's fault. If you; couple of seconds Councillor Nordman. If you make some simple changes to this Business Plan and you ask for a change to the Governance Model as Bob Axworth suggested at Committee last week. If you insist that drivers, a driver advocate or something be added so there is representation from the community and from small businesses that are affected like Osborne House, Social Service Agencies are not represented in this process and they've had no say. I'll make this last point as it pertains to Osborne House. They want to expand their program to five evenings a week; they have a hundred clients that are not in; in active crisis in residence. If paid parking is extended to evening hours, you start multiplying, no it's only $1, let's start doing some math. A dollar per client, 10 clients a night, five nights a week, five days a week, 50 weeks of the year it's $5,000 that goes from the pockets from women and children in crisis to the Parking Authority without the Agency ever having an opportunity to be consulted about the effect on their clients and there are many more Social Agencies in the Inner City that are similarly affected and their clients are similarly affected. So my plea to you is for the Business Plan in terms of fee hikes in terms of extended hours, that all needs to go back to the drawing board and without open public consultation. The Mayor has endorsed it, I know Councillor Browaty has endorsed it in the past, without at least one public session where the people can put the Parking Authority on the spot and ask hard questions and where there is some dialogue, this Business Plan is unfair to the businesses and citizens of Winnipeg and our visitors. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any questions, Councillors? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thanks for coming out, Mr. Boroditsky, to present your concerns with the Parking Authority's Plan for the upcoming short-term, and some long-term issues. I'm just wondering if you can just reflect a little more about the well, I'll point out that on our Agenda today we're voting to establish a B.I.Z. levy for the Selkirk Avenue B.I.Z. so it does exist, so my question to you really is; what do you think a Parking Authority could operate in a better way to help the parking issues on Selkirk Avenue and also the situation for parking on Main Street where the North End B.I.Z. exists.

Martin Boroditsky: Personal opinion only because I haven't canvassed Selkirk Avenue, but my visits in that neighbourhood about 6 or 8 months ago; there was widespread dissension about the paid parking and the deleterious effect it had had on the area businesses and on the Social Service Agencies. I'm sure that and I don't know if it was Sylvia Todaschuk or whoever it was at the Selkirk B.I.Z. at the time thought it was a great idea and the sense in the neighbourhood was that the intention of creating parking turnover had backfired. And In fact, in you are going to continue to have paid parking on Selkirk Avenue, where is the logic and I want to straighten; I'm going to use this opportunity to straighten out a misinterpretation of my remarks at Committee by the mainstream media. I do not endorse installing pay stations on Corydon Avenue. However, how does anybody in this Council justify people going to work or going to school on Selkirk Avenue, paying to park, when people on Corydon don't? Corydon is by and large a destination. It's not people going there because they have little choice in the matter. They have lots of choice about whether to go to this business or that business. And that shows how backwards the Parking Authority's philosophy is, that it picks off in essence the low-hanging fruit because we know that there would be a cataclysmic outcry from the businesses on Corydon, maybe not from the residents who would like it see a little bit of additional order in the neighbourhood but how is it there are no pay stations on Corydon but on the poor streets Ross specific and Selkirk Avenue, there is. That shows you how backwards this is and how parking turnover is not genuinely the Agenda of the Parking Authority but rather empire building. With regards to Selkirk Avenue, when the new B.I.Z. is constituted, membership voted in I assume is what you're referring to is the next step, Councillor Eadie? It still exists, in my understanding was that it had been dissolved, I apologize for the misunderstanding but the fact is that maybe that B.I.Z. should represent the neighbourhood a little more and not just their members. There's something very fishy about how the Parking Authority only answers and takes input from these B.I.Z. Organizations but when I went on Main Street, you referenced Main Street in the Exchange District, believe me there are businesses over there that like Main Meats, they want no part of paid parking in front of their businesses, extended hours of paid parking, etc., they're people who are very angry about the idea, about the rates being doubled and I realize that Council deals with a Budget that's approaching a billion dollars, this is nickel and dime stuff but to Winnipeggers a dollar here and a dollar there adds up and when you look at the kinds of neighbourhoods that are affected it is simply not fair. I think that the B.I.Z.'s themselves should have to go to a seminar where they meet the general public and where they get an earful and then maybe their approach of this would be more balanced and wouldn't have to appeal to you Councillors to intervene and try and make sure the public is represented in the process.

Mr. Speaker: We're talking about parking here not B.I.Z.'s, so…,

Martin Boroditsky: Well the B.I.Z.'s though, Councillor Nordman with respect, they are the ones that are influencing this Policy and the average citizen has no influence on the Parking Authority's Policy or Business Plan, that's why I reference it sir.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? Seeing none, thank you Mr. Boroditsky, appreciate your time.

Martin Boroditsky: Thank you Council.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we'll move into the heart of the meeting, the Report of March the 2nd, EPC, Your Worship.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 2, 2011**

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

Councillor Eadie: I would like to stand down Item 3 please.

Mr. Speaker: All right; all those in favour of 1 and 2; All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item No. 3.

Item 3 - Proposed Winnipeg Police Board By-law – The Police Services Act

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would very much like to hear what Councillor Eadie has it say and then I would be happy to respond.

Mr. Speaker: Thank You. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Speaker Nordman and thanks to the Mayor for answering. This was a Motion that I filed at the last City Council Meeting, last regular City Council that was scheduled last month and I'm standing up today to explain how I'm disappointed that an idea to be proactive in the context to the New Act and our City of Winnipeg having to establish a Police Board yes, it won't be for several months yet, but I was quite disappointed it see that it would just merely be filed and all the work they're going to do is filed. When what should be happening is we should be drafting a By-law, doesn't have to be passed but it should be drafted and get prepared so that we can move quicker and it really reflects what I believe is a very important concept. This Police Board that will be established and Police Boards are commissions that exist all over this Country, and the reality is, this City is going to have to have one. And, under the current Act which hasn't been officially implemented yet, but will be, I think in the Fall or sometime after an election, and the point I was trying to make in this By-law is that there needs to be a wide-spread representation on the Police Board and you need to do that by doing 12, based on the legislation as it's written. In order to get a good representation of City Councillors on our actual Police Board, overseeing the Police Services which now, as reported yesterday is way over 200 million -- is over $200 million a year. That's a huge Budget. Huge. And not only is the Budget huge but it demonstrates that our Police Service is very important to what's happening in the City, and Councillors from all across the City need to be on this Board to ensure that; an overall perspective that the City of Winnipeg Police Services are providing the services that the City wants; and what's really important about having the City Councillor there is we're the ones on the ground hearing from the people in our Wards. And I simply proposed an idea where each Community Committee would elect its own representative to the Police Board, rather than having it just merely appointed by EPC in that manner. I think that there needs to be a more democratic way of doing this so that we can have proper representation on this Board. And so, I was really, again, disappointed to see that we'll just merely file this and pretend that we're not going to have to establish a Police Board, and that pretend that we shouldn't have representation from all our five Community Committee areas, which I think would give us the best representation on there. We are going to have to of course, appoint four citizen representatives on there; and if we started to move ahead on this kind of concept, we could also look at what would make a good citizen representative so that we can present that to the Province, rather than having the Province of Manitoba tell us how we should select people. If we take a proactive approach here we can determine our own fate when it comes to this issue. So again, I just wanted to state that I'm disappointed. That this is just going to be merely filed away and it looks like forgotten. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just advise Council respectfully to maybe keep our powder dry on this. I can assure the Member that no one is pretending that there is not going to be a Police Commission. In fact we're pretty darn sure there is going to be a Police Commission; and Councillor Eadie was not here as a Member of Council, but I can also assure him that there is probably been between 6 and 10 meetings of elected officials, City Administration, and the Province of Manitoba on this issue. We're all aware of the history of this issue, that the Police Commission was essentially announced without I would argue much consultation with the City of Winnipeg; but post-the announcement, there has been consultation on the parameters of how the Police Commission is going to be set up, and

The Act and those types of things. Our concerns, fairly laid out, were presented to the Provincial Government and in the all but some of them appear to have been taken into consideration with respect to The Pending Act. So, what we have before us is essentially one Councillor's opinion of how a By-law should be set up.

Now there is nothing wrong with one Councillor putting forward their opinion on how the By-law should be set up, but there is some pretty specific details in this Motion as to how our ultimate Police Commission is going to be set up. I don't know if this By-law particularly meets the expectations of every single Councillor here. We haven't had that discussion. I don't know if anything in this particular Motion is going to run contrary, ultimately, to what's being set up by the Provincial Government. We do know that the Provincial Government currently is in the process all though, they have just named I guess, the Members of their sort of stand alone Police Commission. The Police Commission that will oversee all the individual Municipal Police Commissions throughout the Province. So, I think we're going to have time to do this. Obviously, the Police Commission is going to have to meet the requirements of this Council and whatever form that might take. I guess my question to Council with respect to this Motion is, it goes through some pretty specific issues, it talks about who is going to be on the ultimate Commission, one Councillor from each region, and it's going to be this many and there's going to be this many people on it, there is going to be appointments, etc. We haven't had these discussions. This By-law to my knowledge does not represent the intent or the wish of this Council. So in that context Mr. Speaker, I don't know why we would sort of say to the Provincial Government that this Motion is what we've decided. I suppose, if Council today was to vote on this Motion and say these are; this is what we want, then I suppose we do have the power to pass this and then send it to the Provincial Government, but that would be I guess, pretty short shrift for a fairly important issue and I think it deserves a little more thought than that. Those are my thoughts, Mr. Speaker. Let's not rush this because we haven't even talked about this. There are 16 of us sitting around this table. I guess we could assume that the Mover of the Motion and the Seconder are in compliance with the details of this, but aside from those two folks, I personally have no idea if anybody else agrees with this or disagrees with the specific details as they appear. I cannot say that these legally, meet the requirements of The Act because we haven't vetted these through our Administration. For all I know, everything in this Motion may be incorrect. I don't know that it is; but we haven't had our Administration to have a chance it look at it so, that's why we're just saying received as information, we'll take it as good intent, well intentioned, but it's a bit premature I think, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was the Seconder of the Motion and it was a privilege to be able to Second Councillor Eadie's Motion. You know, think it was very clear why the Motion was written. There is; this matter is coming forward and will have to be dealt with by Council in the near future. Clearly the Motion was not done as a Notice of Motion. Councillor Eadie purposely did not do it as a Notice of Motion. If it was done as a Notice of Motion it would have simply come back to this Chamber for a debate, at this Council Meeting and then you vote up or down or Amend it. To address Councillor Steeves concern; the very reason why the Motion was referred, Mr. Speaker was to allow the very dialogue that Councillor Steeves was discussing. The hope was that if somebody else has a different idea or better ideas, at least in my opinion I'm all ears. Let's have that discussion in terms of what this should involve. Let's not underestimate the importance of this, Mr. Speaker. As Members of Council we all know in terms of the issue of public safety and the issue of our Police Service, that's a top priority for us in terms of our constituents and in terms of what we hear from our citizens. We know, Mr. Speaker, now as of the debate of yesterday, that the Winnipeg Police Services, the largest Department, well over $200 billion being spent and, we also know that, based on the changes in the Legislation from the Province, that we as a Council will be mandated to approve the Budgets for the Winnipeg Police Service, but everything else, governance, hiring and firing of the Chief, will be the job of this body. This power; these powers will be delegated away from us based on the legislation, the way I understand it. And, Mr. Speaker, that is significant. That's why this discussion is significant. And it's why the Motion was prepared by Councillor Eadie, and if EPC, if the Mayor has different ideas we're definitely open to those ideas, that's why it was referred, it wasn't given as a Notice of Motion. And I'm hoping that clearly the intent here is to send this back so it would be voted down, and if that is the case, I hope that the sentiment contained in this Motion, which I think is it clear, is something which is taken in consideration when EPC does come forward with regards to draft; with regards to the By-law which we'll have to do in terms of the governance of this Commission. So, I hope that's taken into consideration. There is no doubt that every time there is a, you know, a shooting in the Inner City, that microphones will go into the Mayor's face and I can understand the pressure that he feels but we also know that in our communities, every time we have an issue in our community, our phones ring. So, it's a very hot topic and is something we know we have to address, we know we have to have input in terms of how those dollars are spent. Without micromanaging but nevertheless, having some input into that, Mr. Speaker, the idea of the Police Commission is there for that. Therefore, the governance model going to be crucial, and I think citizen representation is a good idea but at the same time, it's the elected representatives who are held accountable in terms of those dollars and how well they are spent. So I just leave those comments there. I'm sure the matter will be defeated, but I hope the sentiment is taken into consideration when the time comes. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I do thank the Councillors who spoke on this issue. Just for the record, Mr. Speaker as was stated, this was not an initiative of the City of Winnipeg. This was done by the Province of Manitoba. In my opinion and I've said this many times before, this was a knee jerk reaction to a specific situation and they were hoping this would basically get everybody off their back. I've never been supportive of it, I'm hoping it works out but I'm not really confident. But the realities here today are that the Province has not even passed the regulations, Mr. Speaker, that will govern the proposed board. That's number 1. So, as was said in the past, we can say all sorts of things to the Province; it's a complete waste of time and energy. I think what we do is we wait for the Province to come up with those regulations and then we take into consideration what everyone is saying here and then we make a determination. As far as I think the term sentiment was used by Councillor Wyatt, I have no problem with the sentiment whatsoever. But it doesn't make sense for us to move now until the Province passes the regulations otherwise it just looks foolish and they say no anyways. Let's 1, wait for them to move forward on the regulations and 2, take into consideration what Councillor Eadie and Councillor Wyatt, and other Councillors have, and we'll come up with hopefully a good mix of Councillors and private citizens. I don't have any problem with that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mayor. Question on Item 3. All in favour? Opposed? Carried. All right.

Mr. Speaker: There is no Report for March the 9th. Report "A" of March the 16th.

**REPORT "A" OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 16, 2011**

Mr. Speaker: Number 1, stand down Number 1. Councillor Smith, did you want to stand down Number 9? Right, Number 9. Okay. 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8, All in favour? 2, 4, 5, 7, 8. We're standing down 1, 3, 9, 6, and 10. Councillor Smith stood down 9. All right. We're moving 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8. All those in favour? Opposed? Item number 1.

Item 1 – 2011 Business Improvement Zone Levies

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would just love to hear from I'm not sure which Councillor stood it down and then we certainly can address the issue.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Very briefly, just going through these trying to read and see what's going on in the different business zones it struck me that we have a similar situation as we use to have with our community centres and keeping the financial records, there was no continuity so when you looked at them it was hard to tell what each B.I.Z. was doing because they all report in different ways. I'm not prepared to do a Motion today but I just wanted to stand it down and just say that I would like to talk to our Administration maybe about doing something to ensure that we get some continuity of the way these things are; these Financial Statements or Budgets come to us; so it's easier to read and understand what's going on in the different B.I.Z.'s. That's the only reason I Stood it Down and perhaps by next Council meeting I'll be prepared to bring a Motion forward.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Of course I support this Motion but I just wanted to talk about, I read through almost all the B.I.Z. proposals and one of the things that really becomes apparent is that each B.I.Z. Zone has its own kind of entrepreneurial spirit and ideas of how to accomplish and move things ahead, and so while I do understand the need for maybe a little more consistent basis of financial reporting, I would say though that it does reflect the perspectives of those business groups and how they prefer to present their information. So I wouldn't want to constrain the entrepreneurial spirits of the B.I.Z.'s in this City; so I think in context if a Motion ever does come to standardize things, I wouldn't want it to be so standardized that certain B.I.Z. zones couldn't present things the way they prefer to. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor. Okay. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item No. 3.

Item 3 – Winnipeg Housing Steering Committee – Mandate

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think I might have Councillor Gerbasi but I'll give a few remarks on this. The whole purpose here is to set out a new Mandate for the Winnipeg Housing and Steering Committee to work with both the Federal and Provincial Governments and Community Partners to develop a policy framework for an affordable housing strategy in

Winnipeg and both the resulting strategy as well as any funding required for implementing would have to come back to Council and right now I would love to hear what Councillor Gerbasi has to say.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. No I'm in support of this Motion. I just had a question about something I noticed in Schedule A about the affordable rental housing. There is a difference in how you describe how this describes what we will be; I guess how we define affordable housing and it's obvious we're saying that there's no problem basically doing social housing if we're dealing with home ownership but there is basically something saying; you know that we're not necessarily; unless I'm reading this wrong and maybe Councillor Pagtakhan can clarify; but I'm concerned that we're saying that we won't consider becoming involved in projects involved with Social Rental Housing. We're defining affordability in a different way for rental than home ownership and I can understand wanting to encourage home ownership but there are also situations where we obviously need social housing and social rental and it's not realistic that everyone can own their only home. So I guess I just wanted to see if there was any further comment and maybe Councillor Pagtakhan who I know is aware of this Motion, could help clarify that for me. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Appreciate the comments and questions from Councillor Gerbasi on this new Mandate here and just so that everyone is clear on this, this is exactly what Mayor Katz was stating. This project, Winnipeg through the Winnipeg Housing and Homeless Initiative, we support many tri-level projects and if there is a mixed development that's coming forward Mr. Speaker, that has a market rental housing, below medium, affordable housing and even as part of that development, we as a City will also be part of that and we might not give funds to it, Mr. Speaker, but in terms of the spirit and intent of being supportive of that particular project, this Mandate I think is consistent with being supportive of that particular aspect as it relates to social housing if it is part of a greater project of mixed housing. So I hope that clarifies the question.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks. Go ahead Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I'll try to give as much information to Councillor Gerbasi. The definition comes from the Department so it's the Department's definition for clarification here.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. Item number 6.

Item 6 – Amendment to the City Organization By-Law No. 71000/97
Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: I believe this was stood down. Do you want me to introduce? This was stood down because there is a Motion for a small Amendment here. Basically Councillor Gerbasi had come to me before that if we're going to move these things together, asking that we highlight the importance of the heritage aspect of the work that's being done in this; this new; not a new Committee but by bringing these Committees together. So the Motion is just to add the word Heritage so that the Committee will be named Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and River Bank Management. And this was; it started Mr. Speaker, from I think when I was Chair of Property and Development, the frustration of hearing some items, pieces; some pieces of legislation would come in the Downtown Development under the Downtown Zoning By-law but then the Heritage aspect of that application would go to Property and Development the and it was sort of; the same application was being heard twice. And also with the River Bank Committee and Downtown Committee, the workload hasn't been that great compared to other Standing Policy Committees do. So this allows us to get a little more work done by this Standing Policy Group and maybe take a little bit of the burden off of Property and Development, which is a very high load, the Standing Policy Committee. So all in all this is a good thing, the amendment is good thing, making sure that we're still identifying the Downtown Heritage and River Banks are very important piece of our City and so all are highlighted there in the name.

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

WHEREAS the Executive Policy Committee has recommended to Council that the mandate of the Standing Policy Committee of Downtown Development be augmented to include responsibility for heritage applications involving real property located entirely or primarily in the area covered by the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law, as well as responsibility for providing policy advice to Council with respect to heritage matters throughout the city, including the administration of the Historical Buildings By-law;

AND WHEREAS the importance of this additional responsibility for heritage matters should be reflected in the name of the committee;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Recommendation 1A of Item 6 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated March 16, 2011 (Amendment to the City Organization By-law No. 7100/97 – Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development – Riverbank Management Committee) be amended to replace the words "Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development and Riverbank Management" with the words "Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management".

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm just going to speak very briefly to this. I appreciate Councillor Swandel moving this motion. I'm seconding it with the suggestion of adding in the word Heritage. So it would be the Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management Committee, appreciate the Mayor's support also for this idea. And I also agree that it does make some sense to have the policy as well as the public hearings and everything at the Standing Committee level all in one place. Of course, I just want to point out the Historical Buildings Committee still exists in its role as an Advisory Committee to the Standing Committees and to Council. So it doesn't change that role in any way. Other than who they report to, I suppose, things like that. So, but I also think, I hope this is seen as an opportunity now that we're essentially elevating Heritage because its name is being acknowledged in a Standing Committee and perhaps I'm hopeful that the Downtown Committee will do some robust policy work on Heritage because we are bringing forward as part of Our Winnipeg processes, as well a Heritage Management Plan which has been in the works and there is a lot of policy work that we need to do to deal with; to continue to preserve our incredible Heritage assets we have. So I would like to thank everybody for accepting my suggestion and I hope you'll all support this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker to put it bluntly, if there's a Motion supported by Councillor Swandel and Gerbasi; I fully support it. (laughing).

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of this Amended Motion? Opposed? Motion Carried. Motion number 9.

Item 9 - Winnipeg Parking Authority Special Operating Agency
2011 Business Plan (Selection Report)

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I would love to hear from the Councillors and then I certainly will respond to any comments or questions.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker. You know, I have had instances where the Parking Authority has put up parking stations where there is no need. For example, the Tecumseh Parking Garage and we have these meters; I had them take them down but the fact is they shouldn't have been up there in the first place and we have these in front of homes, there seems to be no rationale and you heard today, Marty talked about Selkirk compared to Corydon. And in this Report it says this demand based pricing at the Portage Avenue Corridor, Broadway Corridor, Main Street Exchange, and other high demand zones. Other high; this lists them. I have no idea what they would be. So, I cannot support this Business Plan, and I think his delegation this morning made it very clear that there's very little opportunity for consultation with over parking matters with the Parking Authority, so I am, in this Business Plan, I don't see any acknowledgment of the fact that they need to go ahead and have some appeal basis so I'm going to be against this. I urge you all not to Vote for this.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Further to some of the comments made through the delegations, we will take that under advisement and have those matters looked at in terms of the Parking Stubs that were I guess collected on different hours that are there. You know with the Business Plan that is there, I think one thing that is very important is there will be public consultations that's apart of this process so you are; the Business Plan will go through but there will be no changes until we hear back from the public on it. The two big elements of course are in terms of some of the parking demands that are there. I think one could argue that from the downtown point of view, not only is vacancy sometimes an issue where people are driving around and they can't find spots, what the Parking Authority believes is

that; and this is bared out through some pilot projects like they've done through the Health Sciences Centre and also through St. Boniface, that if you do change the parking structure that the fees that are there, it leads to stall turn over which I think is important with the B.I.Z. areas that's there. I know at Committee when the Acting CAO, anyways I forget that terminology but when Randy came in and made his presentation to us, they showed that there was some benefit in certain high demand areas to changing some areas with that. So, I said I would be more; hang on, hang on, so I think it's important we have that public consultation session that's there. My understanding is that Mr. Stefano Grande who represents of the Downtown B.I.Z., the business owners tend to be supportive of the changes in terms of some parking fees, with that being said, I've received a lot of calls from residents that maybe are going downtown that have some concerns over whether they will go downtown, that's part of it. So I really want to see what comes out of public consultation sessions and maybe there is a middle ground we have with fees and I know Councillor Browaty might jump up here as well and say parking fees haven't gone up since the early 90's, if I'm not mistaken. There hasn't been a change in terms of the venue that are there but you know I think we do have to listen to some what the business community and the people that are saying there because what they're saying a lot of times employees are parking down there and customers aren't able to drive up and have that natural turn over so it's actually hindering businesses a part of it. But you know once again, what's important is that public consultation fees and I for sure want to hear what they have to say before any final decisions are made in terms of some parking fees or what goes up, what stays the same or what levels are part of it. So I'm not sure if that answers all your questions, Councillor Smith but with that I'll stand down.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. I'm not going to be supportive of this Business Plan. There are some important points under there that I think as a Parking Authority they and in their Business Plan they do need to follow. However, I wanted to discuss parking as an overall issue. There are parking meters that extend beyond the downtown and I'm really concerned about how we address parking, just in terms of the whole parking and fees. I received some email from the theatre district, I would call it. And I know that any kind of changes to hours and fee structure will have an influence on the peoples attending the theatre and they will be very upset about any changes that would happen. I'm always the promoter that you should take a bus if you're going to go downtown and one of the problems though is to get us downtown we've developed what we call Diamond Lanes to get us downtown in a faster manner or to get us home in faster way. I personally and I don't think the Parking Authority would like this downtown, but you know, technically, where the buses slow down is in the downtown area, we should have Diamond Lanes downtown not on Main Street where we've got eight lanes; there is six lanes of traffic, going three in each way, it's sizeable and it causes a problem for businesses. People are not able to stop and buy the goods that these businesses have to serve. And so I think we need to consider this now, in terms of the downtown's need when it refers to the downtown business need where they want to see a higher turn over of cars so that people can go and buy merchandise, Mr. Boroditsky brought forth the problem on Selkirk Avenue is that it didn't solve the problem for Selkirk Avenue B.I.Z.'s by putting in the parking meters. It hasn't necessarily moved traffic along in a more expedient way necessarily so that business can survive. But, we are going to be discussing a Report further down those talks about downtown, building a couple more parking facilities. And I think that that actually will probably, more than; will definitely assist our parking problem in the downtown. The problems that the Downtown B.I.Z. is talking about; so that when people who are working downtown they will have more parking options, not on the street, but they'll be able to park in places out of the way. They will apparently be North of Portage Avenue, but there are a lot of people who come downtown, they work downtown, it's good if they take buses, but some days you have to drive your car because whether you get off work you have to go and buy your organic food somewhere or you have to use your car to drive your kid out to the University of Manitoba to play in-door soccer. Thank goodness we'll only have to go downtown by the University of Winnipeg to drive our kids to indoor soccer when they are playing that particular sport. So again, I'm a little off but parking is what's needed in order for us to conduct all these activities. And so this Report even though there will be a public consultation; I'm not sure that public consultations necessarily work all that well in terms of getting the full input of all stakeholders because frankly if we're going to do consultations when is these people who are driving their kids to soccer or coming downtown to work, they're at work, they're not at consultation meetings that we might be having so I'm not overly convinced that that will work. So today, Speaker Nordman, I won't be supporting this Business Plan of the Parking Authority because I think it's a little too limited in its it scope in how it considers to deal with parking issues for the City, not just the downtown. I'll probably be speaking in support of this other plan that we will speak about later. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just want to rise on this just to give some positive comments to what our Parking Authority does. I think our Parking Authority in the City of Winnipeg has made some great changes in the last five to ten years. We've seen the modernization and we seen some innovation. We've seen some sort of some not creative thinking but getting in there and trying to figure out what the needs are and address those needs, and bring forward some ideas that might improve parking, you know. There is always the naysayers in the world and we sort of had some good examples this morning of people who just pick anecdotally rather than looking at the big picture on what

we're doing right and we're doing a lot right with our Parking Authority and when you look at our downtown, coming forward with a couple of new parkades going to be built, that will help not just ease some of the parking burden we have right now but also bring some new development with it, certainly we should be applauding our Parking Authority rather than criticizing it today. There is you know, there are a number of other things at play here. I know we've had some information presented to some of us by the Taxicab Board looking at how to accommodate Taxi Stands in our downtown and perhaps even outside of the downtown, that's being considered in our overall Transportation Strategy that we are doing as part of the Our Winnipeg process. I think you're going to see some other good improvements coming in the downtown when it comes to parking and some of that addressed in the Transportation Strategy. But hopefully we'll have that in the not too distant future but again just in closing, I think that the Business Plan is the Business Plan. It speaks to what the Parking Authority's going to do. Talks about some of the numbers, still showing some good positive numbers, making some investments and being innovative and modern and they've really done a good job of modernizing what we do for parking in the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of the Winnipeg Parking Authority's Business Plan. Have there been things they have advertised that haven't exactly performed as advertised? Absolutely. There's brochures out there that say you shouldn't be able to put a nickel in their machines on evenings and weekends. Do some of the machines take them? Yeah. Do they all? No. Does that mean the machine is completely broken? No. The instructions on the machines say, these are the hours you need to pay. Have some of those been wrong sometimes, you bet, that's been the case too. Marty has been very diligent bringing them to our attention and as Past Chair of ASD when we found errors or omissions we certainly brought those to the attention of the Parking Authority. In most cases they were addressed very, very quickly. The Business Plan before you today, as Councillor Fielding mentions the downtown parking rates have been static at $1.00 since 1992. In 1992 minimum wage was $5 an hour and today minimum wage in the Province of Manitoba is $9.50. And if you look at more importantly what are the market conditions for parking? You look at all the private lots and it's now cheaper in many cases to move your car around in the downtown core on the street as opposed to parking in a parkade. The idea with on street parking is, it's a public good and it should be regular turnover. In the area the vicinity of the Health Sciences Centre, the Health Sciences Centre built the very expensive and elaborate Tecumseh Parkade as Councillor Smith partly pointed out but if you're going for a short-term visit to visit someone in the hospital, the idea is there should be high turnover on those streets. If you park close to the door, getting in and out to see your loved one who is in care or getting attention not to have hospital workers whose are there all day long to park on the street because it's cheaper than using a parkade pass. That's not the idea. If you're going to be there all day; you should be in a Parkade. So again I think we need to look at each area individually. I don't know whether going $2 across the board is the right way to go but we'll have that discussion; there will be consultation with Members of Council and elsewhere. I forwarded around to my Council Colleges here today; Downtown Minneapolis, it's a little complicated what they do but parking rates vary between 50 cents and 2.50 an hour. The hours charged are very different from block to block to block. Some areas evenings and weekends it's relevant to charge and other areas of downtown it probably doesn't make sense to go to 8:30 at night. It doesn't seem to make a lot of sense to me. We definitely need to look at it, we need to look at a common sense approach, a business approach as well as being cognizant of people's desire to find parking on the streets. Again, the whole notion of park something to have 15 to 20% available at the curb. I don't buy that this some sort of cash cow for the City, it's really about availability. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it will be a record twice in one day agreeing with Councillor Swandel about something but I'm just kidding but seriously, this Parking Report, I think what I agree with the idea that we do need to step back and look at the bigger picture here. What we have in front of us is the Business Plan for the Winnipeg Parking Authority and the Special Operating Agency itself, I think; I remember since I've been here awhile, what this was like before we had the Parking Authority. And you had five different departments. You had no one in charge. If problems came up you had no one to go to and things were not dealt with in a quick manner and representing most of the downtown or a large part of the downtown as I do, I certainly heard from the downtown representatives in and the business community and such that it's much better to deal with what they have now than what we had in the past. Also, not to mention, should be mentioned that our Parking Authority has won International Awards, significant Awards for the way they are running their organization; so just to put some of that on the record.

Also, I think we have to step back and look at what is the goal of what we're trying to do with our Parking Public Policy in terms of parking and I think it's been said fairly well already by some of the previous speakers but we are trying to encourage downtown living and we're trying to encourage people coming downtown and we don't want to discourage those things obviously and we're balancing that with other issues, the issue of availability. There are a lot of people who work downtown who if they have on street cheap parking will park all day and there will be nothing left for people who

want to run in to go to a business or go somewhere for an hour or two, and that's the problem we have in certain select areas and that's the key and those areas aren't identified in this Report. So to vote against it you don't really know what you're voting against because the decisions haven't been made about the specifics yet and that's the devil is in the details and that's where there could be problems if it's implemented wrong and I think those are valid concerns and it's good that the concerns have been raised by the delegation because I think it's important that we're very vigilant and that we do a very thorough consultation before we bring in any new measures in any area of the City and we identify that there is a real need, that this is about turnover, and it isn't about making more money and its about public policy purpose and so that needs to be shown for those things to be supported in the future. Also residents who live downtown have parking passes so they don't pay meters if they live for example in the Assiniboine area. So whether it's $1.00 or $2.00 it won't make a huge difference for residents there although they may and the turn over is an issue and that may be beneficial to them. Again, each case has to be looked at and I fully agree that people need to be fully consulted in that. I just also rose because Corydon Avenue was mentioned and I want to point out that each area has its unique circumstances and one of the reasons we've resisted putting meters onto Corydon Avenue is that right now, we do have issues with the parking spilling on to the residential streets, which some have restrictions and some don't, and if you were to put meters on Corydon and then have all the residential streets right along the strip being free parking, you know, you're just going to encourage a lot more parking on the residential streets, instead of on the business street, so that's one of the reasons it's been resisted so far. And I guess the time where Corydon is extremely busy is in the evening when you normally won't have the meters in place anyway. So during the day you can actually often find a place on Corydon although there's again we have the same issues with workers parking all day and such, so there might come a point, I don't know, but again I think so far that's why it's been resisted and I just wanted to explain that if anyone is wandering. But there is a case we're looking at each area separately and it should be based on the need to encourage turnover as people have said. So, I also think we set up an SOA; we've accepted a model where they come forward with a Business Plan basically we would be rejecting their entire plan and that's really what we're voting on today and I'm certainly not prepared to do that over this because there is still an opportunity to look at each individual decision going forward with these changes and I do believe that the Parking Authority has been a lot more responsive than the system we had before which was no one in charge and no one using parking as a public policy tool what so ever. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the key consideration for me is that there is local consultation with not only the B.I.Z.'s but with the area Councillors and I just want to read from part of the Report in accordance with municipal best practices of the WPA will consider pay station pilot programs a) where restrictions have been requested by stakeholders, business people and/or residents and b) control of parking and the public right-of-way is deemed appropriate. Where pay station pilots are proposed, the agency will consult directly with the area Councillor and key stakeholders and I think that's the key consideration for me, whether we're talking about Selkirk Avenue or Corydon Avenue or Provencher or Marion; I'll be consulted if the pay stations want to come into St. Boniface, good luck. But the area Councillor will be consulted and the community will be consulted and I think that's key. I think, by and large, the SOA has done a good job and I think the easiest thing in the world to do is to stand up and cherry pick a couple of problems whether we're talking; in any Department and I think that's what happened. I'm not denying the problems, I'm not denying they've been resolved, I'm not denying that there's room for improvement, but I think overall it's been a good thing, what we've done and on a personal, my personal peeve is that we're the City of Loading Zones and there is nothing more frustrating for me when you have a 18 hour loading zone that is used for maybe 30 minutes in the day or 30 minutes every three days and I know that is in the parking plan. Previously it was with Public Works and for whatever reason, loading zones proliferated throughout many parts of Winnipeg, and I think that's my pet peeve and if we could somehow get rid of the City of loading zones where if you need a loading zone I understand that, I think we all do, but you don't need it 18 hours a day, 7 days a week and I think there is it great opportunity for more parking in the Exchange and in the downtown, by just addressing the loading zone issue. So I'm going to support this and I hope we all do. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Vandal, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, I think a lot of us have had experiences with regards to parking and complaints and I think just put it on the record; I think the Parking Authority should be aware that they have, according to businesses that I've heard from, one business in particular where they came in on a street and put up not far from here, these meters without talking to the business at all, and you know, directly impacted their business. That to me, is just unacceptable. They should be; if they are committing to doing the public consultation I think that's good, I think that's positive. The other thing too I've noticed is your level of enforcement. There is no doubt when I think had the contract through to the commissioners I believe it was before, I think the enforcement was different. They've instituted a different level of enforcement with regards to downtown parking which I find odd because they are not checking on all the vehicles on a regular basis in terms of how long they are at meters. They use; there is a different formula they have put

in place on how they do this enforcement and it's basically from what I understand based on revenue and if their revenues go down then they'll go out and enforce it. It's very complicated but it's apparently they're saying this is the national standard across North America. All I know is that people instead before you had to park in a place you'd have to move it after so many hours or whatever the restriction was. This seems to have gone by the wayside. And I know one business in the downtown, this business person I've known him for 25 years, he has been cutting my hair for 25 years but -- a full time job! (Laughter) So I only go there twice a year now, but anyway so but you know, and he doesn't give me half price either; but long story short, Mr. Speaker, this is something that whenever I hear from him when I'm not getting my hair cut, this is what he is usually calling about is the parking issues and it's frustrating because it seems like we're constantly dealing with them and I think the Parking Authority should take these things into consideration. So I really impress the importance of the consultation. If they go in randomly and start to put up parking meters, I think there will be a very, very and there has been; they've done this; so I'm hoping this Report marks a signal and a change. I like the idea that Mr. Boroditsky had in terms of an advocate in terms of having a agents, or an office to, for citizens to go to and to have representation through the Parking Authority in terms of complaints and issues. I think it's not a bad idea and should be considered. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker first of all I think there was some very constructive comments on both sides of the issue. First of all, I think when Councillor Browaty mentioned what's happening in Minneapolis; that was basic economics 101. Okay, demand and supply. Obviously where the demand is higher and the supply is less the price is higher and of course the opposite is true and I think that's exactly what's going on here. Mr. Speaker, there's a couple of things. First of all, I will tell you that I've had the pleasure of being on the Great Canadian Talk Show and for those of you who have been there, you get grilled and then you get cross-examined. And I have seen scenarios whereby I believe that in instances that there was something amiss, okay, and I think we all want it see that corrected, and as most of us know right now, there is a new Acting COO, the former one is no longer here, that's number 1. Number 2, I do believe that quite often if you use common sense, quite often 90% of these problems can be resolved with. I think the idea of and I would like to see the Winnipeg Parking Authority be proactive on their own and having someone who can deal with some of these issues and listen, because usually these can be rectified within three or four minutes in a phone call. The one thing I am concerned about and I hope will be addressed and I think Councillor Vandal already pointed it out, in a situation where they are thinking of a new plan, for example, meters in an area, the Councillor, the residents and the businesses need to be notified, need to have an input, I believe that's been addressed and if that takes place I think we will resolve a lot of issues and problems because unfortunately in the past sometimes that did not happen and that's 100% wrong. So it appears that's being corrected and I think there can be some proactive initiatives taken by the Winnipeg Parking Authority to deal with some of the concerns and I think that would be a positive and I think with the consultation that would probably come out and that's it on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. All those in favour? Opposed? Councillor Smith and Councillor Eadie are opposed. Thank you. Item Number 10. Mr. Mayor.

Item 10 – Local Improvements Audit Report

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, you will see Motion Number 2 and I will try to address this very briefly. First of all, EPC has recommended that Council concur in all the Recommendations of the City Auditor and direct City of Winnipeg Administration to move forward. The purpose of the Motion, quite simply, is that in the future, no local improvements will be allowed for basic infrastructure, defined as land drainage, sewers, combined sewers, waste water sewers, water mains, roadway pavement and that developer are already obligated to install in their development agreement. The logic behind it is quite simple. Let's all assume that there has been no overcharging that has occurred. Council should not even leave the perception that it could occur in the future in similar circumstances and hence the policy statement, Mr. Speaker and that's what I'm hoping to move forward today.

Motion No. 2
Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

WHEREAS the City Auditor has submitted a report to Council entitled "Local Improvements Audit Final Report" (July 2010) (the "Audit Report");

AND WHEREAS Recommendation 5 of the Audit Report states "We recommend that the Assessment and Taxation Department work with other city representatives to amend the Local Improvement Regulation By-Law to state the exclusion of imposing local improvement taxes for basic infrastructure installation that developers are already obligated to install in their development agreements.";

AND WHEREAS Recommendation 5 of the Audit Report provides a prospective manner of addressing such "inside-development local improvements" to ensure that they are not permitted to occur in the future;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable to implement Recommendation 5 of the Audit Report in a timely and expedient manner;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the recommendations of Item 10 of the Report of Executive Policy Committee dated March 16, 2011 (Local Improvements Audit Report) be amended to include the following, and that all existing recommendations be renumbered accordingly:

2. That Council direct the Director of Legal Services / City Solicitor to prepare an amendment to the Local Improvement Regulation By-Law to be submitted to Council at its meeting of April 27, 2011, which amendment shall have the effect of implementing Recommendation 5 of the Audit Report for all future development agreements for the following types of basic infrastructure:

- *land drainage sewers*
- *combined sewers*
- *wastewater sewers*
- *watermains*
- *roadway pavement*

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes I wanted to speak briefly to this, to this Report, actually and I'm in full support of the Motion. I think it's very important; very good that this Motion is there so it's very clear and very specific and very quickly settle. But I just wanted to point out as I read through the Report and the recommendations related to the Local Improvements, I noted and I think it's very important, is one of the recommendations is that generally accepted accounting principles are to be used when looking at these kind of financial transactions, and I would also note that it's always good practice that we follow generally accepted accounting principles in making sure that we are; things are accountable in terms of any kind of financial affairs going on and how they get recorded and reported. So, I was really happy to see that the Auditor came through with this recommendation for generally accepted, as set out by the CICA group which is; they are basically instituted a group of chartered accountants who help to make these rules that every organization should follow when being accountable for their finances. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Eadie. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As Mayor Katz has already indicated, EPC has already endorsed the nine recommendations in the Report and I'm pleased to Second the Motion regarding; asking for the change to come back to our April meeting in regards to the Local Improvement By-law. I think in the interest of transparency that the Auditor mentioned that those are very good points. Where I do take issue with the Auditor's Report is page 20 of the actual Report itself. It states the only notification that the property owners will have that they are paying a local improvement tax is if their lawyers specifically called the local; the senior local improvement clerk prior to purchasing the property to ask if there is a local improvement tax pending on the property or by a separate line item included on the subsequent tax bill with the description local improvement tax land drainage sewer. It goes on to state "we believe it is quite reasonable to assume that the final property owner may pay for the cost of the infrastructure elements twice. Once in the lot price and then again through the local taxes improved or local improvement taxes imposed. All of Council received a letter today from North Grassy Properties which has been involved in several developments where land drainage charges were assessed on the properties, and the letter states we sold all our lots to a select group of participating builders. They were all fully aware of the local improvement levy and the statement to that effect was included in with each sales agreement. In addition I have been assured by each builder that they included a clear statement of the local improvement levy to each of their respective customers; clearly purchases were advised of the local improvement levy and further still saw value in the lot prices. Let me emphatically state purchasers were not charged twice for the land drainage and laterals as implied by the Auditors Report, this is a letter received by all Council today from John Weave. Further to that again, accusations of being double charged, I was absolutely positively alarmed; I consulted with some constituents of mine and in fact they pulled out their Offer to Purchase and in that Offer to Purchase; it stated purchaser agrees to pay all local improvement charges that should be levied by any Federal, Provincial or Municipal authorities except for any pre-paid local improvement charges which are included in the purchase price and shall have been paid by the builder; there is a Schedule L Local Improvement Schedule forming part of the Offer to Purchase that states that we agreed to pay a local improvement levy for land drainage sewer system at 495 per front foot over 20 years. So again, is it open and transparent as I would like to see it? No. The subdivisions in question were approved prior to my being on Council but then again; but most importantly as far as I can tell these residents in these cases were not double charged for it, it was clearly part of the Offer to Purchase they signed off on. The Auditor's Recommendations are right but the indication that you have to call a Senior Clerk to find out about it is

incorrect at least in these cases because again, it was in black and white in the Offer to Purchase. So again happy we're moving forward in the right direction, further transparency, good. But in the cases that were listed here, seems clear to me the purchases; the purchasers knew what they were getting.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that everyone will support the Motion and I very much want to thank Councillor Browaty and also the developer for coming forward and basically putting the details on the table and basically substantiating the fact people were not double charged then thank you for those purchasers who shared information with Councillor Browaty saying the information is right there, we were aware of it. There was no shocker surprise and I think that's good for everyone to know because I think everybody on the floor of Council was genuinely concerned about this issue and I think we now have facts that showed what took place, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, sir. The Motion on the Amended Number 10 item. All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. Report of March 23rd.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 23, 2011

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended and that the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated March 23rd of 2011 be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Item 1 - 2011 Mill Rates for the Education Support Levy and Special Levy

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I think you already know that for 364 days I have waited with baited breath to hear the good Councillor speak so I'm not going to take up any more time. Go Russ go.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker I rise to Oppose the matter before us. New Members of Council just so you know what the process is here, unlike any other item that you have to deal with, this item, actually, you have no choice technically they say, under the law but to vote yes even though you do technically have a right as well as a Councillor to vote no. It's confusing. I want to state Mr. Speaker, that I've spoken on this a number of times as was mentioned and in the past I was always somewhat diplomatic towards the Provincial Government in the sense of saying this has been going on for a long time and that it's been many governments of all parties of all political stripes that have allowed this situation to continue but today I'm going to be a little bit more direct I think. The fact of the matter is one government has been there now for 12 years almost, and one party has been there for 12 years and this issue has not been addressed. You know, at one point in that 12 year period the municipalities of Manitoba realizing that education taxes now are basically 54, 55% of the property tax bill, the concern that they keep rising, the municipalities of this Province came together and requested the previous Premier to do something about it; he named a working group; he created a working group made up of representatives of the School Boards of the municipalities, of members of the teaching world and they worked on this project and came in with a Report that they delivered to then Premier Doer, making clear recommendations in terms of how to reduce the Education Property Tax burden on property. And that Report was then similarly stuck on a shelf and nothing happened. Absolutely nothing happened and we know what's happened since then, it's just gotten worse and worse. This Council's policy as everyone; well those who have been here before, but new Councillors may not be aware; this Council's policy voted on in 2007; a Motion was passed and moved by Councillor Pagtakhan and Seconded by Councillor Smith; That be it Resolved that the City of Winnipeg Council call upon the Manitoba Provincial Government to remove the Mill Rate for Education Support Special Levy from the City of Winnipeg's Municipality Property Tax Bill and be it further resolved that education be funded in the future from the Province's general revenue. That Motion was carried. The Councillors that voted in favour of it at that time in March 21, 2007 were Councillors Browaty, Clement, Fielding, Nordman, Pagtakhan, Smith, Vandal, Wyatt and Lazarenko. So, Mr. Speaker, this is the Policy of this Council. It hasn't changed. Nobody has brought another Motion forward to say differently. The Policy of the Municipal Association that which we are all a member of, the Association Manitoba of Municipalities, Policy voted on at one of their Annual General Meetings, at the annual convention attended by over a thousand municipal officials from across Manitoba is a policy sayings that the Education Taxes should be reduced to a ratio of 80/20. 20% Education Taxes and 80% Municipal Taxes. I want to also say Mr. Speaker, so there's overwhelming support Mr. Speaker in terms

of this issue amongst municipalities, whether it be to remove it completely or to reduce it as a share of the overall burden on the tax bill. I think it's fair to say as well, Mr. Speaker and I always say this every year is that we're not here to point fingers at the School Boards; we know the School Boards like us have only so many tools to be able to do their job and they're attempting to do their job with the tools they have. We understand and we sympathize with them in terms of what they're trying to do and managing our schools. I also want to say that in terms of the challenge that we're facing, Mr. Speaker; I know, we know it won't be solved overnight. I want to thank Councillor Eadie who I saw was eager to put up his hand to speak to this matter as well. For his discussions with me on this matter, and for pointing out that there is somewhat of a relation of property to education; or schools to property and the fact that if you have a community, you have a neighbourhood and you need to have a school typically is the case. So I appreciate that, hearing that from him. But-+ I think, Mr. Speaker, the ratio we have right now of 54% of the Property Tax Bill is not a fair ratio and that's one of the reasons why we know for the last 14 years now we have frozen taxes because in the back of our minds we know that at the end of the day there is one taxpayer, they get one tax bill and on that tax bill is the entire taxes with much; not much room for us to do much as the Schools Divisions have been raising now; the Province has to their Credit increased the Education Credit that has been on the tax bill. If it wasn't for that Mr. Speaker, the increases would have been massive; well above; they are already above the rate of inflation over the last 10 or 15 years, it would have been even been much higher Mr. Speaker. The burden would have been great if it wasn't for that, I believe is now $650 on the tax bill credit. So, Mr. Speaker, but the problem has not gone away. This year I noticed there is a bit of a slow down in terms of what's happening, but I think that's temporary, Mr. Speaker. I think if you look on the average in terms of the increases they're there, they're real. So we need to do something differently Mr. Speaker. The Mayor acknowledged this last year where he stated and I'm now reading from Hansard but in a positive way. There is a problem and I will say this on the record, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what's going to happen or who will be here in 2011, but if there is not genuine talk to address this issue and come with a better mechanism, come up with a separate tax bill, whatever it may be, this will be the last time that yours truly will support you, Mr. Speaker. So, support the matter. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can stand together; and let's just discuss for a moment, Mr. Speaker; and before I forget, Mr. Speaker, last year, the Councillors who stood together to vote against this were Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Nordman, O'Shaughnessy, Smith and Wyatt; this was last year. And I've checked that for the record. Mr. Speaker, as well, there was some excellent speeches given. Councillor Steeves gave an excellent speech last year talking about all; other than when he criticized me, but the rest of the speech was good. But you know, what he spoke about the other jurisdictions, he had done excellent research in terms of the other jurisdictions and exactly that we are one of the last jurisdictions to have this type of burden in our Province. So Mr. Speaker, let's just talk openly in terms of strategy or tactics if we may, in terms of what would happen, worse case scenario if we voted to not approve this today? Technically they have the power to forfeit our seats. That we could be forfeiting our seats. They would be able to call a General Election because we have not followed the law or called by-elections. But would they really want to do that, Mr. Speaker, in a provincial election year, that we or others would be running on this very issue? I highly doubt it. The other option they could do, Mr. Speaker is they could reform the system which we've been asking and come up with a different formula.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: Would they do that knowing how fast the Provincial Government moves, probably not. I think the scenario that would be if we stood our ground, Mr. Speaker, would be that in the case at least of the City of Winnipeg, maybe not the entire province but in the case of the City of Winnipeg they may have to move to send out bills themselves, collect the money themselves and forward it on the school divisions. That's quite frankly I think what the realistic versus a public fight on this matter, because I think the public is tired of this Mr. Speaker. I heard it during the Civic Election campaign last year. People talk my taxes, my taxes, my taxes but of course when you start talking about it; it's very clear what there; they see that the majority of their tax bill is Education Taxes and they keep going up and up and up. The Provincial Government, Mr. Speaker now under the leadership of unelected Premier Greg Selinger has a responsibility to do something about this issue and to do it before the election Mr. Speaker. They call it a levy but it's a tax as we know from yesterday. A tax is a levy and a levy is a tax. (Laughter) So they have a responsibility. They have a responsibility, Mr. Speaker to address this concern and the unelected Premier has the responsibility to come forward and make considerations in terms of this. The Municipalities of this Province, hundreds of municipal officials have spoken loud and clear on this issue and it's a burden and it's just going to continue to get worse and we know that they have challenges in terms of funding education, but with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, those are their challenges. We already have our fair share of challenges as municipalities. Those are their challenges; let them sort out their challenges in terms of funding education; but the burden on property is unfair and it continues to make the City uncompetitive and the Province uncompetitive on property taxes when you compare us still. We pulled the Education Taxes out but when you compare it across the country Mr. Speaker and we add it back in we know we're still uncompetitive because of these Education Taxes so I encourage every Member of Council to support this as in the past, and do so, to vote against this again and to the new members of Council, join us in standing up for this and standing up to this ongoing problem because that's the only live way it can be solved, thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: I'm standing actually, to support the Motion that we're going to pass, to move ahead the mill rates for the School Division. There is only one taxpayer at all levels really. And the property tax bill is a big problem for the people who live, frankly in the Mynarski Ward which has two different school divisions; Winnipeg School Division and the Seven Oaks School Division which you'll note actually I was kind of impressed this time in the mill rates neither one of those two School Divisions is actually raising their property taxes this year. Which means somebody is trying to address it. But really, when I go to the doors it's not just education. I don't dish off and say; well it's the Education Property tax that's hurting you. Well it's not the Municipal Property Tax? Is that not what we debated yesterday about property taxes? Like seriously. Think about this; if we were to shift what is our property tax; $430 million. Let's just get that off the property taxes today and let's just do that. Let's help them. It's not Education or City. The reality is that property tax was established for one reason; overall it's stable. The real problem with our property tax system as it exists today, is when you have people who bought a home 30 years ago, based on their income perspective and they are living in those homes and all of a sudden the market value goes up 125% and not only the City of Winnipeg's property taxes go up on them but the Education's property tax goes up on them. It's a problem we all have at the City level as well as at the Education level. Property taxes are difficult because one part of the system is broken; but we do know that properties related to having to construct a street. We heard about that yesterday. We have to construct a school, one thing I would point out as well; our forefathers were quite intelligent in about how to save money. The reason that we City Council of Winnipeg and other municipalities charge out the Education Tax on our bills is so that we save the money because if we have to have two separate administrations to send out a bill to the same home that costs more money. We do things efficiently just like in elections. The City of Winnipeg runs and other municipalities they basically run for the school boards their elections. And that's because there are efficiencies to be found that way and so yes everybody would love not to have property taxes on their home but really us charging out the mill rate and having it on the City of Winnipeg sending out the bill, I don't think, is causing us a real problem is just how people want to phrase it and talk about this issue. The reality is, is that that is a stable line. In Alberta, I don't know if they have education property tax but what I do know is they spend a lot of money and when they have no money from oil revenues from their royalties, they have to cut. They have to cut fast because again, there is no stability in those growth taxes. You have to be careful. So when we're voting on this particular Motion and yes, I am a new city Councillor but again, I'm a taxpayer in one house. I know that there are efficiencies. I know that my residence may not like what I'm saying but the reality is that the property tax is there because of the stability and yes we do need to move forward but where exactly? There will be a provincial and federal election, they're all going to be running on what, no tax increases is that right? So where's all the money coming to pay for it? It's still going to be us as individuals, so what we should be doing when we talk about this mill rate, we should be talking about having them fix this reassessment boondoggle that hurts people who are seniors, who are trying to live the way they are, taxes have been going up for the people in Mynarski and they've been going up in huge amounts in percentage wise, and it's hurting them and that's what's really broken, so if we're going to the Province to say fix something that's broken. Let's deal with the real, one of the biggest problems the reassessment that is really penalizing people who bought a house based on their income and are trying to live in it after they retire based on setting aside money to try and live in the same house and then all of a sudden bing, I don't understand why we need to diss this particular effort. We are gaining efficiencies and let's try to help solve the school board's problems too and let's move forward after we vote on this, maybe I'll bring a Motion to talk about reassessment in fixing that because the province needs to fix that. That's in the rules and I will remind people all around the table, every government for I don't know how many years has, Provincial Government, has forced the cities and municipalities to do the mill rate. So let's not try to say it's one particular government at all, all those governments that were elected, you know, they'd like to get rid of the problem too and actually the Province did get rid of their special levy, I mean the School Boards still have theirs but they did get rid a tax on the bill over time and kudos to them and maybe we as a City Council can do that on the property taxes and help them as well. So Speaker Nordman, through you to Councillor Wyatt, this new City Councillor well, I know I'm not making popular statements the reality is that it's all of the property taxes on peoples homes who are hurting them.

Mr. Speaker: No further comments. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. And I do thank Councillor Wyatt for quoting me very accurately and I'm proud to say to Councillor Wyatt and everybody else that the tax bill has been changed significantly. I'm hoping to see a new copy of the tax bill where we have actually divided the school portion from the city portion so there has been significant changes made to that. Mr. Speaker as was commented on earlier, there is also been a change because for so many years we were holding the line on property taxes yet they were rising because of the school situation as you can see this year there has been a change. Yes we all know it's an election year and yes we know the province is giving them moneys in a different format so we know that can happen and hopefully that will continue but the realities are, Mr. Speaker, is that what this really is, this is a symptom of what the problem is, okay, we've talked about so many times how we get 6 cents out of every tax dollar and the province gets the majority of that money. And then the federal government gets less and how there has to be a new strategy for sharing it. That's the way we're going to solve our problems, okay, and you know, I just want to share something and everybody talks about. I heard you know, Councillor Eadie say there is only one taxpayer where's the money going to come from we all problems. Well the City is rather

unique Mr. Speaker; we are a creature of the Province. The Province has so many tools to collect monies that we don't. Provincial Sales Tax $120 million they get from license fees etc. There is so much money but let me tell you where one of the biggest comes from Mr. Speaker, which people don't seem to be aware of. And I just want to point this out in 2005, 06 the Provincial Government received Federal Transfer Payments of $2,742,000,000. The following year they got 2,874,000,000, an increase of 131 million; the following year in 07/08 it went up to 3,035,000,000; an increase of 293 million. The next year it went up to 3,336,000,000 an increase of 594 million. The following year, 09-10 it went up to 3,386,000,000, an increase of $644 million, Mr. Speaker. And they've maintained that. Now a year ago the Province was genuinely concerned that they were going to be cut back by half a billion dollars, 500 million, it did not happen Mr. Speaker. When we talk about sharing, it doesn't make a difference where it comes from, but quite often we talk about PST; our share would be about 130 million. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, they don't have to increase anything. The money is there; the City of Winnipeg is not getting their fair share. It's just simple, it's clear, that has to change and I certainly hope that everybody on the floor of Council will support and be unanimous in one direction for us to get our fair share to address our problems, which right now is infrastructure. Mr. Speaker, I hear where Councillor Wyatt is coming from. I respect him for standing up and speaking on it; he's been totally consistent. As the Mayor, I do not believe it is my job to cause chaos. Do I believe for a moment they're going to invoke some of the powers they have? Not for a moment but I believe this is something that as Mayor I need to support and I will. By the same token, I'll fight to get the money we need and deserve and is there coming from the Federal Government year in, year out, being increased dramatically and us getting pennies. That has to change Mr. Speaker and I certainly hope that all of Council will join me in that fight.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. All right we'll Call the Question on the 2011 Mill Rates for Education Levy and Special Levy that the City's required to collect. All those in favour of the Motion?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Smith, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

City Clerk: The Vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 3.

Mr. Speaker: Motion Lost…Carried. Item 2 of the Motion

Item 2 - Land Dedication Reserve Transcona Golf Course

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

Mr. Speaker: The Motion Number 3. Mr. Mayor okay, we have Automatic Referral on Motion No. 3 from Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Smith.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is in the process of hiring a new Chief Administrative Officer;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg will hire a hiring firm which typically conducts a nation wide search for a new CAO and then a committee of Council interviews potential candidates;

AND WHEREAS the final decision on filling the CAO is made by City Council and that the new CAO reports directly to City Council;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that an ad hoc committee of Council be struck to interview potential CAO candidates and make a recommendation to Council for the next CAO;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that said committee be made up of six members of Council, namely:

a) One Councillor elected from each Community Committee by each Community Committee;
b) The Mayor or his appointed designate representative

Mr. Speaker: Okay, By-laws, Mr. Mayor, please.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I know there have been some changes so hopefully we'll start off with By-law No. 18/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 18/2011.

Mayor Katz: And I move that By-law No. 18/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Mayor Katz: I move that By-laws Numbered 30/2011, 32/2011, 35/2011, 36/2011, 46/2011, 47/2011, 49/2011, 52/2011, 54/2011 and 55/2011 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws Numbered 30/2011, 32/2011, 34/2011, 35/2011, 36/2011, 46/2011, 47/2011, 49/2011, 52/2011, 54/2011 and 55/2011.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I move that By-law Nos. 30/2011, 32/2011 34/2011, 35/2011, 36/2011 and 46/2011, 47/2011, 49/2011, 52/2011, 54/2011 and 55/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws Numbered 30/2011, 32/2011, 34 to 36/2011 both inclusive of 2011, 46/2011, 47/2011, 49/2011, 52/2011, 54/2011, and 55/2011.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker I move that the rules be suspended and By-laws Numbered 30/2011, 32/2011, 34/2011 to 36/2011 both inclusive, as well as 46/2011, 47/2011, 49/2011, 52/2011, 54/2011 and 55/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Consideration of By-laws Addendum.

Mayor Katz: Still more, Mr. Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended and Sections 1 to 15 of By-law Number 48/2011, as amended, be read a first time.

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

Clerk: Sections 1 to15 of By-law No. 48/2011 as amended.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that Sections 1 to 15 of By-law No. 48/2011, as amended, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: Sections 1 to 15 of By-law No. 48/2011 as amended.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that the rule be suspended and Sections 1 to 15 of By-law Number 48/2011 as amended be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Mayor Katz: And I think I have one more.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you have one more

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I move that the rule be suspended and the following By-laws be read a first time. Mr. Speaker my apologies; I have an Addendum here. I move that the rule be suspended and Sections 16 of By-law No. 48/2011 be read; as amended be read a first time.

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

Clerk: Section 16 of By-law No. 48/2011 as amended.

Mayor Katz: Now Mr. Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended and the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 50/2011 and By-law No. 51/2011.

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

Clerk: By-laws 50 and 51 of 2011.

Mayor Katz: And I move that By-laws No. 50/2011 and 51/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws 50 and 51/2011.

Mayor Katz: And I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws Numbered 50/2011 and 51/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period Mayor Katz.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mayor Katz: I have no questions of myself thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Last summer, Councillor Wyatt and I moved a Motion regarding a sump pump subsidy program and backwater valve program, similar to what's available in a lot of cities across Canada. With the pending flood this year, there's been a lot of interest in the program and according to the Public Service, as of March 21st, 351 applications had been approved to the tune of $642,000. There is still 657; there's been a total of 657 received. Is there any consideration perhaps as a one-time issue to extend the program in this year?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Browaty, as you know, we all know what happened the previous year. There were some Councillors whose citizens were hit very hard. As a result of that, a Motion did come forward. I can tell you that the Department was extremely pro-active and supportive and came up with a plan on how to address this issue when it came to back-line water valves as well as sump pumps. What we did is we put half a million dollars set aside. We then went to the Province and asked them to match that, and so we have a program for a total of $1 million, and I commend both the Councillors and the Department for this initiative. In addition to that, the City is picking up the cost of administering the program. This program has been announced and the response has been very positive. Approximately 594 applications, the Department's receiving about 25 to 35 applications on a regular basis at this stage of the game. They actually were able to very quickly identify that the money would be used as I think many of us thought it would be. So what the Department did, they actually assessed it and came to the conclusion this is an investment because of the cost down the road, and they recommended that we have a second traunch of money and

they came up with the number of a million dollars. What happened then, Mr. Speaker, is the City approached the Provincial Government to see if they would match our million dollars. It had to go through Cabinet. We waited. We did get an answer last week that they were going to match it, so now in addition to the $1 million which is basically used up, there will be double that available subject to Council's approval of course, of $2 million; a million dollars each from both levels of government. I happen to believe this is a very positive initiative and I'm glad to see that the citizens are taking advantage of it and you can see by the number the amount of intake what the average cost is, and so from my point of view, it's a good thing.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Browaty; Mayor Katz. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question has to do with a decision that was made last May which is now about 10 months ago; to negotiate a contract with Veolia regarding our water and sewer upgrades. And my question is, has the Mayor or members of EPC been briefed on the current status of the Veolia contract and if so, can they share with all Members of Council, what is the delay in terms of the contract being signed? And give us an update.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that there is no delay at this point in time; that they actually have almost very close to completing everything; a complete review, dotted all the "i's", crossed all the "t's" and I believe this could be coming to Council potentially our next meeting, and we will all get the briefing and it will flow through the process. I believe we are there. We were about 96% of the way there about 10 days ago, and I'm assuming it's all been done so that will be made public very shortly and it will flow through the proper process.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: It was mentioned by the head of the Water and Waste to the Public Works Committee a little while ago that personnel from Veolia are already working within the Water and Waste Department prior to the larger contract, I guess, being signed. So my question is, if you could explain how and how much they're being paid or if there is any information you can give us about how that works that they could be working within the Department before the contract is signed.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as one could imagine, when you're working on projects that are hundreds of millions of dollars or billions of dollars, this work started a long time ago, and I know the Department has been working with some people from Veolia. They're getting paid a base cost for their time, nothing more than that, and I would be happy to get that information and share that with the Councillor, but that's all that's taking place to date.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much. My last question has to do with one of the items that was added into the budget at the final tabling, was $250,000, I believe it's over three years for hiring policy somebody I guess ,or I'm not sure, someone with more capacity within the CAO's office to work on policy I assume. I guess I'm just wondering if you could give Council some information about what that person or people, it's about 80,000 a year, will be working on. What was the reasoning behind adding $250,000 for that? I mean, as you are all aware, we eliminated the CAO Secretariat, so I guess I'm just wondering if you can explain what this is all about.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi it would be my pleasure. To start off with Mr. Speaker, just to re-iterate, it was $250,000 allocated to the CAO. It was basically for planning and policy. As many people know, in order to move our City forward, we need to create new policy; we need to create good policy. As Councillor Gerbasi mentioned, it wasn't, I guess it was awhile ago, we actually not only dispensed with the CAO Secretariat but also the EPC Secretariat. It wasn't unanimous, but it was a decision which, you know, a lot of people were surprised with that move but even I still voted to support that. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we still need to get quality policy and right now we don't have that availability for people to do policy or to do planning, and that's why that money was set aside for the CAO to administer and hopefully to move us forward in the right direction so we will see many more headlines of "Peg Thriving".

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Councillor Wyatt (inaudible). Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor we've got a number of issues that are sitting over with the Province. We know we've got pending flood issues, probably more serious for the Province than for the City, and some of our issues are probably going to get delayed because of that, and then coming election in the Fall. Just wondering if the Mayor, knowing that we've been trying to deal with our utility and it's kind of timely that Councillor Gerbasi asked her question. We've had this utility piece over with the Province for quite some time now. Does the Mayor have any idea of when that might be coming forward? I understand it's just an order in Council that's required to get the rest of the pieces of moving our utility, stand

alone utility model forward. Can the Mayor let us know where that's at and when we might be able to expect it to come back from the Province?

Mayor Katz: Through you Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question. I can tell you that I did briefly speak to the Premier over the weekend and we will be having another meeting to discuss that issue and many others that have been dragging on, and on, and on. It certainly would be nice to bring closure, but unfortunately I cannot give Councillor Swandel a definitive answer because I don't have one, but I can assure you that I will bring that up and we're suppose to be meeting within the next couple of weeks, and then I'd be happy to get back to Councillor Swandel.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Swandel: Yes thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we also have OurWinnipeg sitting with the Province. We've got a number of strategies that we're working on, are in mid-stream with, that we're going to be bringing forward. We don't know what the Province has said yet about OurWinnipeg. Can the Mayor let us know if OurWinnipeg will be coming back to us anytime soon? Or are we going to maybe experience some delays with it as a result of floods and elections?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I have not had any word from the Province that there are any problems as far as a direction of OurWinnipeg, so I'm not going to assume there is. Usually that's the first thing you hear if there's something they're not happy with. I have no indication of that whatsoever and I'm hoping that does move forward as quickly as possible. But once again, I would be happy to bring that up and that is one of the items I will bring up at our next meeting, but right now I don't foresee any problems.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: In yesterday's Federal budget, the Minister was fairly positive in terms of municipalities, but it looks like there's going to be, parliament's going to be dissolved in the next few days by the sounds of it, and there won't be a government and assuming that the same party is re-elected, the Conservatives are re-elected, I would like to ask the Mayor in terms of our Building Canada requests that we, as a Council, voted on last April. We voted on 11 different projects we put on the list, and there have been reports that a request went in, or an idea to fund sewer and water hook-up to the R.M. of Rosser, or CentrePort, you recall that. And that was not on the list of 11. The sewer and water was not on our list, so the request for the sewer and water, is that a request coming from us, because it's not our list. It's not endorsed by Council. Or is that a request coming from the Province that we're reading about?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Councillor Wyatt: Or from the Feds?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the good Councillor for that question, but I'm going to refrain from doing so, but I'm going to try to address that anyway. First of all, I think Mr. Speaker we all know the Motion that was approved here on the floor of Council as far as Building Canada funds are concerned and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker that is one of the top conversations that I will have with the Premier. It certainly is time to move those forward. That's number one, and I think we all know the priorities of those infrastructure projects. We also know that funding is available to 2014 and with the budget, I think the government also mentioned that they want to look into doing, you know, further things with Building Canada funds, although nothing was committed at that particular point in time. But that's a good sign. As far as specifically the question, I can tell you there is an issue out there that does exist as far as the request for funding for infrastructure with what Councillor Wyatt talked about. It's been discussed on many occasions. There is nothing official whatsoever when it comes to CentrePort. We know that a significant amount of money is being invested in CentrePort to build a road there. We also know that if you're going to be doing services, you do it at the same time as the roads. You don't dig it up twice. We also know the opportunity that exists with a successful CentrePort which could have a phenomenal positive impact on the City, and the realities are in order to do this, everybody's looking for money, a source of money. There's all sorts of different pots of money. One way or another, the City will have to come up with some money. Where we find it will be up to City Council because City Council will make the decision, and at this particular point in time, there is no decision.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, just another question on that then. The City, we were very clear as a Council. Members of Council were lobbied; members of Council supported this clause, it passed overwhelmingly with the 11 projects, so we as a Council, we as a City are not requesting money. I want confirmation of this. We are not requesting money under

the Building Canada fund for the 50 or 51 million dollars; whatever was reported for sewer and water works into CentrePort. This is not a request from us to respect the Motion that we had last April.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. We have an official request to the Province and to the Federal Government that was outlined in a Motion by this Council. That's number one. That's our official request. Once again, has there been discussions with three levels of government where it's popped up? Absolutely. Has it gone any further than that? No sir.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Wyatt: But that request for that funding for that sewer and water has not come from the Mayor; the Mayor or the Mayor's office?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: The Mayor's office is not making any requests. The request that we made was based on the Motion that was passed by Council, but once again, there has been discussion on that, and if anything were to ever change it would come back to Council, but right now our Motion was very clear on the project that we want to move forward.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mayor Katz. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Just to focus in on the, actually I'll say I'm kind of disappointed that we don't want to deal with the Police Board Motion or even have a dialogue. It's very clear if you read the Act, and I did read the Act and I've done a lot of research in regard to this, and you have what's called a, and for some of the people who have been around who don't understand what the legislation says, it says that there is a Provincial Police Commission which will do investigations about police, potential police wrong-doing or whatever. But there's a whole section on a Police Board which Winnipeg has a separate little piece there and it does give us the ability to decide certain things without being regulated on it. The only regulation that I'm aware of that might come through on that is related to the citizen members that we might appoint and any guidelines that we might have to follow. However I don't think that the Province is going to tell us, the City of Winnipeg, how to use our structure, our organizational structure, to achieve appointing five City Councillors, and so I just want to ask the Mayor this question. Should I now go and actually move forth my idea and negotiate with and say this is what we want to do, to the Province? Or will the Mayor actually, you know, you may not like the Police Board, but will the Mayor, Speaker Nordman, will the Mayor actually allow me to go ahead and try to negotiate the Police Board and what the City itself will do?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as an elected official, Councillor Eadie has the opportunity to go forth and do whatever he so desires. He doesn't need my blessings or the Speaker's blessings. If he, I mean I think, I don't know whether he's being serious or being "tongue-in-cheek"? Whatever the case may be, he may as well just go knock his head on the brick wall because that will accomplish about the same goal. There are many things that the Province does have the power to tell us. As I said earlier, the regulations have not even passed. Once those regulations are passed, I think this Council would be happy to sit down and discuss this issue in an open and productive environment, and that's exactly what I think has been said and hopefully will continue to be said.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Eadie: Second question. Speaker Nordman, I am serious about what I'm talking about. I'm very concerned about how our Police Service is going to continue into the future. As the representative from the Mynarski Ward, it's very important that I do that. So again, I think that…

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Councillor Eadie: My question is simply this. Is it appropriate for a City Councillor to go beyond the rest of Council and talk to another level of government without that support?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I am as concerned as the Councillor is for the Mynarski Ward, as well as the entire rest of the City, because the City is my responsibility; all 15 wards. I think my record on public safety is as good as anybody's record on public safety and probably better. We've made this a number one priority of Council. I

think everybody supported more policing, and because there is crime and safety issues right across the City, not only in the Mynarski Ward but it's definitely there. As far as the last comment by Councillor Eadie, there's not a Councillor in the Chambers right now that does not speak to members of the Provincial Government. Anybody can speak to a member of the Provincial Government. No one's hands are tied. So if the Councillor decides to do that, by all means. I'm actually shocked and surprised he hasn't already done that because I can assure you, on a regular basis, there are people here talking to MLA's. So you know what, once again, you don't need permission from the Speaker or the Mayor. You don't need blessings from the Pope. Feel free to talk to any MLA you so desire, including the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Eadie: I have met with the Minister of Justice to get clarification on certain aspects of the Act. The final question, and it is again on this issue, do you not think that it's fair to have from all across the City, five different Community Committees select one representative from that region to be on a Police Board?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, first of all, based on what Councillor Eadie just said, I find it ironic that the Councillor would ask me if it's OK to go speak to the Province when he's already spoken to the Province. I don't know why he even bothered to ask me that. So that's number one. Number two, I think the question is do I find it realistic? I don't find it unrealistic.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Mr. Mayor. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. During the election campaign and since being elected, I'm hearing from a number of constituents that are opposed to the electronic automated garbage pickup, and the perception is that the waste minimization strategy is a bit of a "fait de complet" in the way it's been advertised and that the end result of the automated autobins has already been pre-determined, and that the consultation process is simply going through the motions. Can the Mayor comment on the validity of some of these concerns?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Havixbeck, I think we all know that we wanted to have a thorough look at a waste minimization strategy, and that's what the Department is looking at, and you can see they are looking at everything from garbage, composting, recycling, changes at the Brady Landfill, and they're getting public input. Number one, nothing is done in any way, shape or form. But most importantly I would like to share with the Councillor and her constituents, and I happen to be one of them, when we first implemented the change, there was a lot of negativity. There were many Councillors who sit around here who, you yourself Mr. Speaker, lived through it. Councillor Fielding, Councillor Pagtakhan, many others. The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, I continue to get emails from people who said they hated it; they can't believe we made them do it, and guess what? Now they love it Mr. Speaker. So once again, there is always fear of the unknown, and usually what comes out is the negative part of it. I think Mr. Speaker; we are so far behind the rest of North America. We're catching up. I personally am looking forward one day hopefully to getting my roll out bin as well as my recycle bin as well. I think it will be a positive thing. I know there are people are concerned but I think many people here who lived through it, learn the hard way that change is difficult to accept and the key mistake that we made, in my opinion, at that point in time Mr. Speaker, something like that should be rolled out in the Spring or the Summer, not the Winter Mr. Speaker. I think you'll concur with me on that one, so just to let Councillor Havixbeck and her constituents know, nothing is decided in any way, shape or form. Anything that is decided, there's always going to be a cost to it, whatever that might be. We're looking for a scenario where we can do better and maybe we can be a leader in having less garbage and more recycling Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Second question Councillor Havixbeck?

Councillor Havixbeck: Second and last. Just wanting to verify and assure that it's not a "fait de complet" and a pre-determined outcome. One of the people who wrote me suggested that this would actually add to the ecological footprint because we're using more vehicles to collect. I'm not sure if there is some analysis on the existing communities, but perhaps that's something that we could look at in implementation should this move forward, and I'm curious to know if the Mayor could comment on that as well.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, first of all, as we know there is a public consultation going forward. There's been a lot talked about in the media as well, which I think is a positive thing. But more importantly, on anything they land, it comes back to Council. Nothing is done until Council votes, so for anybody to think that any decision has been made on any one of the many items that are being discussed is totally inaccurate, and I can assure to the best of my knowledge to Councillor Havixbeck, there is no truth to that whatsoever, and where that rumour is coming from I don't know, but I can assure you there will be a lot more discussion on this topic once we get to the point where they've done their public consultation,

come forward with recommendations, go through the process and come to Council. There'll be a lot, a lot, a lot of discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? Seeing none, we'll carry on with the Report of Standing Policy Committee Property and Development.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED FEBRUARY 8, 2011**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I would like to Introduce Item 8 of the Report for February 8, 2011 and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item Number 8.

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

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED MARCH 10, 2011**

Councillor Browaty: I would like to Introduce and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 9.

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

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker; I would like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 31/2011, 33/2011, 41/2011, 42/2011, 43/2011, 44/2011, 45/2011.

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

Clerk: By-laws Numbered 31/2011, 33/2011, 41/2011, 42/2011, 43/2011, 44/2011, 45/2011.

Councillor Browaty: I would like to move By-laws Numbered 31/2011, 33/2011, and 41/2011; 41/2011 to 45/2011 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws Numbered 31/2011, 33/2011, and 41/2011 to 45/2011 both inclusive.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws Numbered 31/2011, 33/2011, and 41/2011 to 45/2011 both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD**

Mr. Speaker: Question period. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. As the Chair of the Property and Development Committee, can Councillor Browaty tell me whether he has made some specific inquiries with those responsible at the Provincial level, as to what level of priority the Province will place upon the approval of the OurWinnipeg document, which is the vision, the strategic direction of our City? I ask as the Councillor of Charleswood-Tuxedo because I have at least one, if not two, amendments to the plan, and any delays would hold up progress in those areas.
Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I thank the member for her question. I didn't get a permission slip, but a week and half ago I was having lunch with the Assistant Deputy Minister of Local Government, and she assured me at that time that within the coming weeks to a month, that the Province would be providing feedback to the City of Winnipeg on OurWinnipeg. I was a little concerned that it wasn't consent or passing of it because, again, there are developments being held up. The

process again, we thank the Province of Manitoba for funding half of the OurWinnipeg process, however there was also a member of the Provincial Government, a Provincial employee; that was seconded to the City during the entirety of the process. You would think that if there were issues coming out of the process as it was going on, that that feedback would have been going back and forth between the Local Government Department and the City, so I too, it's not an amendment to the new OurWinnipeg, but amendment to the current Plan Winnipeg. Again, this Council adopted OurWinnipeg back in September of last year, so we've been waiting since that time. I too have a development in an area that is identified as an area with major redevelopment that they want to move forward on. I also spoke to the MLA of the area just this morning and she' s also making an inquiry into the Minister of Local Government, so again, it would be very helpful I think for all of us, and good for the future of our City, if this does get adopted quickly.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Havixbeck: Just for clarification, when do we expect a response from the Provincial Government?

Councillor Browaty: Well, again, that was a week and a half ago and she said a couple of weeks to a month, so I would expect within the next three and a half weeks at the latest we should at least have the feedback as to any concerns or comments from the Province on it.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for Property and Development? Seeing none before we proceed with Protection and Community Services, we're just about at twelve o'clock. What's the will of Council at this point? Would you like to continue or break for lunch? All right. We will carry on. What I'm hearing is carry to 12 and break for lunch.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED FEBRUARY 28, 2011

Mr. Speaker: Protection Community Services. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Hello and thank you Mr. Speaker. With respect to the Report of February 28, I move Items 1 and 2; just for clarification, Item 1 is going to be on our next Standing Policy Committee Agenda but it had to come with a Council Motion and we ran out of time last meeting – that's all.

Mr. Speaker: All right we've been asked to stand down Number 2. Review of By-laws governing off road vehicles is that what your saying 's coming to your next meeting?

Councillor Steeves: it has to come all the way back up here, that's all.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Agenda Item 1. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item 2.

Item 2 - Federal Funding of Police Officers

Councillor Steeves: I'll just wait for comments.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this. I just wanted to make a couple of brief comments for the information of Council. As you know, I'm your representative on the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and I did want you to know that this is very consistent with FCM policy and our current advocate strategy. I am also Chair of the Standing Committee on Community Safety and Crime Prevention and so this is part of what we're working on is trying to get this policy to be continued in a way that's sustainable for cities in terms of supporting policing costs. So I just wanted to mention that to you and I'm hoping that when this is passed that the Clerks could provide me with a letter from the City of Winnipeg which I could bring forward to the FCM for their information officially from the City so that we can show that we have cities across the country that are also sharing the same will to see something done here because the funding as the program was initially brought forward really isn't sustainable and that's the problem we're facing now, in that the funding hires the officers and then as our salaries go up it ceases to exist. So I just wanted to let Council know that I appreciate this Motion and it's very consistent with FCM policy and its part of our advocate strategy. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Maybe Councillor Steeves with explain it, then I'll maybe speak on it.

Mr. Speaker: Fair enough.

(inaudible)

Councillor Wyatt: I spoke about this matter before and Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted that Winnipeg, we have special challenges and I think the role of the Federal Government here is very relevant. In terms of the challenge that we as a City face, in terms of safety issues and there is no doubt in my mind that we know in this country, the constitution is very clear that Aboriginal Affairs or Indian Affairs are the full responsibility of the Federal Government and we know the challenges coming in from folks moving in and off reserves into the City and sometimes the difficulty folks have with transitioning and the challenge this creates. We unfortunately have a situation in our society, Mr. Speaker, where you know, the aboriginal community represents maybe 10% of the population of the City, yet today they represent well beyond that in terms of incarceration and difficulties with the law and our courts. And that puts a huge burden, Mr. Speaker, on our municipal service in terms of policing and in terms of what we have to do in terms of upholding the laws of the land. And the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, has to start to appreciate that and understand that and realize that, that cities like Winnipeg, other cities that face a similar challenges are Saskatoon, Regina and Winnipeg, of our size this is the challenge we're facing today, Mr. Speaker. We should not alone be facing this challenge. The citizens of Winnipeg, the taxpayers of Winnipeg should not alone be facing this challenge and an obligation which clearly, Mr. Speaker, in the constitution of this country is the responsibility of the Federal Government. They should be coming to the table not just in terms of the general funding from municipalities in terms of policing but for the unique situation that we are facing here. So it's a challenge we're facing. Nobody, it's a great community but the community is facing challenges within we have to work with them to solve those challenges and the Federal Government has to be part of the solution.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a question?

Councillor Wyatt: No. Speaking on the Motion. Those are my comments thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves to wrap up.

Councillor Steeves: This recommendation doesn't talk about what we really did at Committee. This was, and I think it was in 2008 and I'm not sure if I'm wrong about that. 2007, the Federal Government allotted an amount of money to municipalities across Canada, sort of a one time funding amount. I'm trying to think of our amount, 4 millionish or something like that, give or take. The Provincial Government for reasons that aren't quite clear to me at this stage, hung on our money because money had to go through the Provincial Government. We brought a Motion to our last PCS meeting stating that we wanted our money because we were the last municipality apparently in the free world who hadn't received the money from the Federal Government. The Item appeared on the Agenda and then we instantly received verification from the Province that they would indeed, over 3 years, forward to us the monies that were in fact allotted to us. So now score one for the good guys, Mr. Speaker, I suppose. But here is what's happening, here is potentially the problem in this area is that I think every government wants to be seen to be supporting protection or policing in communities. The problem is, it's best done obviously by municipalities directly, but for a myriad of reasons that we've talked about for the past many years in Council, we don't seem to be able to have the necessary funding levers to access the money that we need to do all the responsibilities, so we're sort of forced into this position of accepting one time amounts, often not adjustable for inflation, to fund operating costs on policing that has already been pointed out by Councillor Gerbasi that these costs go up over time. So, we would love to see funding from other levels of government if that's what they want to do. I would be quick to say for our preference as a municipality, it would be to simply change the entire financial structure to municipalities; don't have to have these types of relationships with other levels of government. That would be most preferable because what's happening, as we keep running into these situations of now we've got essentially 3 levels of government funding our municipal police service which of course is better than nothing, I suppose, but it's not the optimal way to do it. The challenge of course I think other levels of government are concerned that they wouldn't receive "credit" or they wouldn't be seen to be funding policing in communities. But, it is one of those things that is distinctly a municipal responsibility. The problem is with the system and this is a pretty clear example of how it playing itself out. We'll work and see what happens.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have two Motions. One on doing business Winnipeg By-laws Automatic Referral and Motion Number 5 on bed bugs from Councillor Smith and Wyatt, also an Automatic Referral. Question period for Protection Community Services. Alright then, it's 12:01 and we will adjourn and be back in the Chamber at 1:30, thank you.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
MOTIONS

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Smith,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS The City of Winnipeg Doing Business in Winnipeg By-law No. 91/2008 regulates the activities of businesses dealing in used goods;

AND WHEREAS on occasion used goods businesses also sell new or reconditioned items purchased directly from manufacturers or their agents;

AND WHEREAS the Doing Business in Winnipeg By-law requires that a used goods dealer must make and maintain a record of transaction when the used goods dealer acquires goods that are not used as if they were used goods including, paying suppliers by cheque and holding merchandise for at least 15 days after a record of acquisition is delivered to the Police Chief;

AND WHEREAS other retail outlets that sell new and reconditioned merchandise are not subject to the same stringent regulations;

AND WHEREAS The City has received complaints from Used Goods Businesses that the requirement to pay retail suppliers by cheque and holding merchandise delays transactions, and causes financial hardship for the purchaser;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to review the Doing Business in Winnipeg By-law No. 91/2008 and report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Service on the feasibility of amending the Doing Business in Winnipeg By-law to allow used goods businesses to pay commercial retail suppliers for new or refurbished items by credit card, without the requirement for the 15 day holding period for merchandise.

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

WHEREAS bed bugs have become an increasing concern in the City of Winnipeg and citizens have a growing anxiety regarding both increased incidents of infestation as well as the high rate of transferability;

AND WHEREAS, in 2010, bed bug related complaints to the City's Community By-law Enforcement Service went up by 30% to more than 500 complaints;

AND WHEREAS bed bugs are not exclusive to any one area or group of people;

AND WHEREAS to properly protect themselves and their homes, members of the public must know where bed bug infestations have occurred and where they have been declared eradicated;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City's Community Services Department develop a policy to inform the public fully where bed bug infestations have occurred and have been dealt with.

All right then it's 12:01. We will adjourn and be back at 1:30. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
March 23, 2011, at 1:31 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: We'll bring our meeting back to order. I hope everyone enjoyed their lunch and we'll start off with the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED MARCH 8, 2011 ADJOURNED TO MARCH 15, 2011**

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I will Move Items 1 to 3 as Consent of the Report dated March 8 and to March 15th.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried? We have some By-laws.

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

Councillor Vandal: Yeah. I will Move that By-law No. 53/2011 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 53/2011.

Councillor Vandal: I will Move that By-law No. 53/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 53/2011.

Councillor vandal: I will Move that the Rules Be Suspended and By-law No. 53/2011 be moved a third time and same be passed signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period for Infrastructure Renewal of Public Works. Councillor Smith and Councillor Wyatt.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Smith: My question is about garbage carts. When one is stolen, why does the resident have to pay for a new one? Why are they the victim? Why does the victim have to pay for a new cart?

Councillor Vandal: Well under the terms that they were put in, everybody got a free cart, and when one was stolen it was understood that it was the resident's responsibility to replace that cart. I know I can talk to the Administration to try to find out more information behind the rationale behind that, but I'm imagining it's a cost-recovery sort of initiative. There's thousands of carts out there with likely many more to come, maybe. And, you know at one point, the role of government and the hand of government can only extend so far.

Mr. Speaker: Second question Councillor Smith? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, if the Chairman doesn't have the answer now, take in the future but if it be supplied to us, what steps are being taken to prepare for the pot hole season which is soon going to be upon us in terms of equipment and work that'll be ready to start to address all the calls and concerns that we're going to be getting in our communities?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Well Mr. Speaker, the pot hole season indicates to me that Spring is right around the corner, so in that sense it's positive, but it's a very serious issue and rather than try to give answers that aren't complete, let me speak to our Director, Brad Sacher, and I will email everybody about the plan coming forward in, I hope, a few weeks.

Councillor Wyatt: Good. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works? Seeing none we'll move to Standing Committee on Finance. Councillor Fielding.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED MARCH 10, 2011**

Councillor Fielding: Sure, thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to move the Report of March 10th, 2011 be taken as read.

Mr. Speaker: Stand down number one.

Councillor Fielding: There is only one.

Mr. Speaker: This is only one, that's right. All right, Councillor Fielding.

Item 1 - Financial Management Plan

Councillor Fielding: Sure, I'll probably wait a little bit to hear Councillor Eadie's comments on this. This is our financial blue print document coming forward. I went through it last night and I know he had some concerns on it. It seems pretty much to be Mom and apple pie type of items that had been passed through Council and kind of sets forth a blue print but love to hear your comments and I'll respond at that point.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. So I understand the need to have the financial blue print ready to go for meetings with the bond setting people, and what kind of a credit rating we have, and for the most part, I've read through the document and I had an assistant put together some of the tables, and what I read in there looks pretty good in terms of the past financial plan and I noticed the current 8 items that are listed there, and one of the things I'm always concerned when it comes to financial management and the government, one of the reasons the government sometimes does move slowly in what it is able to do is because there needs to be an accountability of our financial portfolio, so to speak, as well as our expenditures, needs to occur, and so one of the things I did not notice in this particular financial plan is the actual goal of achieving more public accountability on the finances and in various contracts and such that we go through and I understand you can't reveal those in the middle of negotiations but I do believe we need to have appropriate public accountability in expressing how our finances are working and what we're actually doing and what the implications are of bigger financial decisions of the City. So, I didn't see that in the goal although I did see in context there was a paragraph there that talked about how the City reports its finances and has in the past, but I think that over time and having not been on Council for a long period of time, Speaker Nordman, but still involved around the City, I believe we can do much better when it comes to the financial accountability that we have for the City. One of the other things I would note that is missing and these 8 goals are good, but in some circumstances they might kind of be cross competitive, but you might have maybe consolidated a couple of them, but I'm not going to get into great detail as I'm trying to remain short on my discussions, but what I didn't notice and I heard the Chamber of Commerce come to speak to us yesterday and talked about how business grows. Business grows and does well when the services they consume from the City perspective, from the city that provides to the businesses, good service provision is how these businesses grow. And while I see there is goals of economic growth and certain expressions there is really no focus, I believe, on the concentration of making sure that not only efficient but effective city services so that businesses can conduct what they do and we heard a question, a lot of businesses utilize the streets and I know in our financial management plan, we talk about making sure that our infrastructure, we maintain our infrastructure, and potholes are huge in operating motor vehicles. So that's good but there are other services that are consumed and we need to make sure they are publicly accountable and presented. And so, I don't see some of those things reflected in this financial plan and that's not to be critical of anybody. I understand this had to be prepared quickly for Moody and that sort of thing, but I would really, and this is actually setting out our financial plan for the next four year term at a minimum, and it's really too bad that, you know, elected people didn't get any ability to interject. I know there was a short meeting when this Report came to a Standing Committee but there you only get 10 minutes to speak to an item as well of such huge importance this say huge document with huge implications, on how we proceed financially as a City so I really, I can't in good conscience vote for this, because I just think there is a real essential component missing the public accountability of the finances and how we expend. so I won't be voting for it today but that's not to say that I'm critical necessarily of the people who were part of putting together the plan, I just think those two components missing. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Others? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes Mr. Speaker, I found the Report very interesting and I want to thank Public Service for this. And just a thought, I'll be supporting the Report but just a thought in terms of the Report; to leave with the Chair and Members of EPC and the Mayor, is the one thing that jumps out most in the Report that I found jumped out, was page 8,

and the managing of expenditures that just in terms of the inflation, plus population growth rate, and the police and fire, paramedic services, the expenditure well beyond the rate of inflation, of course, it's quite pronounced actually. It's a thought you know, I know we have had in the past, I don't know if this was done before '06 or after '06. I think it was after '06 is we have, we had internally contracted with management firms like KPMG and such to; they reviewed real estate at that time, I think if I recall right and I think did detailed operational audits. There is a cost to that of course especially if you're talking in terms of departments like Public Works or Fire or Police. But, you can sometimes identify savings for those costs within the first year or two, even though they are fairly hefty to conduct an operational audit but that might be something to look at, so that we can identify savings especially Police and Fire, and I would say Public Works, well Police and Public Works are two major departments in terms of expenditures. So, just a thought to pass on. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Sure. Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and I will address, appreciate your comments, Councillor Wyatt. You know I know there has been a bit of parson around here with the Budget and everything else and that is a part of it, not to your comments Councillor Wyatt. But this is; this really is an important document. It's not you know, something where political games are being played. The Mayor, CEO and myself are going to be meeting with Bond Rating Agencies over the next little while. I think the first one is in a few weeks or so and others later on down in the summer but this does set kind of the guiding principles, if you will, in terms of the finance that are there, over the next number of; over the next years if you will. There will always be flexibility in terms of what Council can do. This doesn't lock us into one approach verses the other but gives kind of a long term plan. I know it's something that will be talked with the Bond Raters and it's an important document and I think the debt strategy is something as well that will be coming forward to deal with the Bond Raters that are there. There is a bit of an urgency to get this done. It's something that hasn't just been started. We did the first one, I think in 1995, of course we renewed it in 2001 and this document has not been renewed in over ten years, that there, so I think it's a standard process that we're going through. In terms of what Councillor Wyatt had mentioned, I think that's a great idea, in terms of operational efficiencies and some efficiencies that are there. We had the Chamber, saying we should be working hand and glove with them in terms of looking how systems are operated. And I know that the Mayor made in the State of the City Address and there will be some changes to the way alternative service delivery is handled and part of that process will be looking for efficiencies, looking to be streamlined and be more efficient. It's not all about contracting out it's about being more efficient and delivering our services in an effective way and I see that operational audit in some capacity take into account, let's see where the experts say where we can save some money in regards to that. So, once again I don't think this is a partisan document. It's, like I say, it's a guiding principle. It's an important document that we're going to use with the Bond Raters to evaluate how we're borrowing money and what it will cost, so there is a bit of urgency to get this going ahead and just reviewing it, I don't see anything that's, I think that would be super controversial from any of the areas. That's part of it if Councillor Eadie wants more accountability built in I think that's something we as a Council decide to do and move on and that was the focus of yesterday, with that I'll stand down.

Mr. Speaker: All right. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion passed. Question period for Finance. No specific questions. Thank you. Moving on to the Standing Committee for Downtown Heritage and Riverbank Management.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED MARCH 7, 2011

Councillor Swandel: Well for today it's still just a Standing Committee on Downtown Development, Mr. Speaker, but I will move; I'll introduce the Report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: All right. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. The Report of March 15th. Oh, Question Period for Downtown? No. Councillor Fielding.

REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 15, 2011

Councillor Fielding: Sure Mr. Speaker, Love to move introduction of Report, introduce report and move adoption of Consent Agenda 1 to 3. Not as crisp as I normally was for P&D I read these things all day long. Anyways.

Councillor Eadie: I would like to stand down 2.

Mr. Speaker: Anything else? One and 3, All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item number 2.

Item 2 – Winnipeg Parking Authority – Projects for Immediate Action (Parkade Development)

Councillor Fielding: Sure more than pleased to move this. This is something I think that's been a long time coming. We've talked about the money that's in place. I think we have done some due diligence and probably took longer than all of us would like but I think we've got a pretty good plan here of how we're going to invest some of our dollars and with that I'll turn it over to Councillor Gerbasi for her comments.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi. First question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, as I did already say in the media I would like to publicly express my appreciation of the fact that all of the money from the sale of the parkade is in fact staying within the downtown which was something I've been talking about for the last year. Very pleased that that is how it came down because I think when you have an asset that's in the downtown like that parkade that was built for downtown development, that's where the money should go if that asset is sold. So, I'm very thankful for that and I do want to thank the Mayor and EPC for coming to that decision here. I'm very curious to see as this process moves forward, my understanding is there will be a RFP process of some sort to look at the specifics. Like at this stage we don't know the specifics of the projects because there is an opportunity for the private sector, I assume, to come forward to propose different projects. I think this is, the comment I wanted to make is I think it's very important that we look at this as not that we are just building a parkade, we shouldn't be, I think that is the intention is that we're using parking as an economic development tool for our downtown, so what we want to see is not just more parking stalls but mixed use development, hopefully residential, entertainment, whatever fits into the district. And whatever works but obviously, we need more residential downtown as well, and the parking is an economic tool that can make that possible, and make it economically feasible. So I anxiously look forward to as a member of the new longley named Committee, and Justin will need another sign put on there, to see those reports, the RFP process come forward. The other thing I just briefly want to mention is I was; is my understanding that we are still expecting a further parking strategy in terms of part of the OurWinnipeg process. That's what was explained to me and I'm also anxious to see that in terms of addressing the excessive number of surface parking lots we have in our downtown, and using those sites wherever possible to gain the downtown revitalization sites. And the last point I want to make is that I'm pleased to see that we have two projects proposed here, but I was hoping to see originally, the other strategy I heard but I'm not sure talking about more than two and talking about doing more than these two in the future, and I guess I hope that in the future you'll consider the next one, to be in the Assiniboine Broadway area because we are, that is the area where we are really have a lot of downtown living happening now. We have a large residential population downtown there. And there is an issue of if there was a mixed use development that could bring in even more residential but also perhaps provide some parking options, many of the apartments down there were built a long time ago and don't have parking; one stall for the people living there, and so, I hope that you will consider that in the future, so I just wanted to put that out there, because we are trying to encourage downtown living. People who live there, you know, some of them do live without cars but there is obviously many who have one car and don't have any facilities for that. So that could be part of this. And I have mentioned this to the Parking Authority, I've mentioned it to Ross McGowan, I wanted to mention it to you as well. So, once again, I appreciate that we're moving forward on this and I would like to thank the Mayor and EPC. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman, just very short. After hearing a lot of discussion and debate even before I was a City Councillor on where the money proceeds would go from the sale of that parking lot, it's really good to see that it will be improving the parking around the downtown area, and while there are some examples of mixed use parking, say at Colony Square where you have business, residential, happening offices and that sort of thing but whatever those projects are in order to alleviate some of the parking that's really for the general area, they'll have to be able to handle more than the capacity say an entertainment establishment that might end up there or something like that. So, but anyway, I think that this is great and it is a good move to help the parking problem so I just wanted to make sure that people remember it's on the record that I said that this is part of the solution to not raising rates and extending parking hours necessarily downtown. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Eadie. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, I think I kept track it was about 18 occasions where Councillor Gerbasi asked me about this, and on every single occasion we said that the money would go to a parkade in the James area, a parkade North of Portage and one as well South of Portage and that was always the plan as well as to fix up the Millennium Library as well as anybody who drives the Civic Parkade knows we're reinvesting there. The whole purpose, Mr. Speaker in my opinion, was to basically fill a void that would create economic development, residential, commercial, creative ideas, and I am hopeful just as Councillor Gerbasi is, that there will be some creative ideas that come forward in the very near future from these RFP's and hopefully we'll make downtown more vibrant and will also obviously broaden

our tax base; but most importantly we want people downtown all the time. We don't want people departing downtown when everybody leaves after work. We want people living downtown and I have no doubt in my mind that every time Councillor Gerbasi asks that question and I answered it, she had 100% belief in everything I said.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mayor Katz. Councillor Fielding to close.

Councillor Fielding: Sure. Yeah, just in closing once again, very happy, it seems like we have consensus on these items. I think it is important step for downtown. I've always been one that's been a little bit leery of government being involved in parking, a couple of things I was very happy about with the two joint ventures was exactly that, that it was a joint venture, it's not the City of Winnipeg just building parking structures. I truly believe having an equity position in these things. You will see some spurring on some economic development that's part of it, and I think that's a very positive thing and I with like to see the City get out as soon as possible, because at the end of the day, you want to create that work, live, play model where you have some retail possibly on the bottom and create some parking solutions that are much needed and will create some other economic benefits that's there. The way it's proposed here is that through the expression of interest we're going to see what comes back from the private sector in terms of what financial contributions they think they can make, and our position in terms of equity positioning is very much a solid position. So happy that it looks like we'll have consensus on this and thanks to the Mayor once again for the long process. But I think the due diligence made some sense as you're going to have consensus here and Council will move forward on this.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. No further business. Councillor Orlikow moves adjournment. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 1:56 p.m.