COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, July 20, 2011

The Council met at 9:33 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the Meeting to order.

The opening Prayer was read by Councillor Wyatt.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Welcome our guests in the Gallery. I see we have a few and we will be operating I guess without a Page today. Anyway before we get the Meeting started, I'd like to ask Councillor Havixbeck to make an announcement

Councillor Havixbeck: Great. Thank you, Speaker Nordman. This year marks the 120th anniversary of the Ukrainian settlement in Canada. To commemorate this milestone, Dr. Ihor Ostash, Ukrainian ambassador to Canada along with his wife and a delegation of about 25 or so, were in Winnipeg the weekend of July 2nd. And they are riding the train from Halifax to various locations throughout Canada, similar to how many settlers arrived in Canada. During their stop in Winnipeg, Dr. Ostash presented the City of Winnipeg with a beautiful award, to acknowledge the City's contribution to Ukrainian heritage. This beautiful piece represents four corner stones that Winnipeg and one of our sister cities, Lviv have in common, industry including trade, agriculture, manufacturing, arts and culture, faith and spirit, and accomplishment and the bird symbolizes family as they sore across the ocean and join our two cities. The group's visit was sponsored by our friends at Canad Inns and we're grateful that they could spend some time in Winnipeg and the award was presented at the Leo Mol Sculpture Garden.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Havixbeck. We also have an announcement from Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Last week I attended the annual conference of the Canadian Institute of Planners in St. John's, Newfoundland where the City of Winnipeg was presented with a 2011 award for planning excellence for the OurWinnipeg/SpeakUpWinnipeg planning framework. It was an honour to accept the award on behalf of the City of Winnipeg and my colleagues here on City Council. I'm proud to report that the OurWinnipeg framework has received positive attention from planners around the world. And has been referred to as one of the most creative planning processes ever taken by our city or anywhere in the country. Through the SpeakUpWinnipeg process over 42,000 citizens and stakeholders were reached out to determine what our shared vision of OurWinnipeg should look like in the future. The ideas and feedback generated from those who participated in the process was extremely valuable. As our Planners put together the OurWinnipeg framework. As the chair of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, I would like to extend my sincerest congratulations to all City of Winnipeg employees, managers, and citizens who are involved in the OurWinnipeg/SpeakUpWinnipeg Initiative. The recognition that our city has received through this award is proof that hard work and dedication of our public service really pays off. In the correspondence attached to today's Council Agenda, you'll note that the Province of Manitoba has endorsed OurWinnipeg and following its third and final reading today here on Council. We can look forward to working with the comprehensive plan that will guide land use and development for our city over the next 25 years and enable us to change and grow in a sustainable way. Once again, thank you and congratulations to all who participated in this very exciting process.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Browaty. Mayor Katz, you have a comment to make?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I most definitely do. Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure many of us are aware of our colleague, Councillor Steeves, will be stepping down to run Provincially, and I would just like to share on my behalf and I'm sure many of the Councillors will share their thoughts with Councillor Steeves, a phenomenal City Councillor who represents the citizens of St. Vital with basically honesty and integrity as long as I've known him. It's hard for me to believe that he is actually one of the longest serving Councillors here in the City of Winnipeg. He certainly couldn't have said that four or five or six years ago, but he is, and what I've seen from Councillor Steeves on a regular basis Mr. Speaker, is an individual who will listen, who will basically put everything together, ask the questions and come up with a solution for the many difficult problems we face. I thank him very much for his service to the citizens of Winnipeg. I thank him for helping us on a regular basis at City Council and on EPC. We certainly wish you all the best and in your future

endeavours, and I just want to thank you, Gord, for everything you've done and how you've served the people. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Looks to be unanimous. Easy, Councillor Smith. And for the last time, we'll ask Councillor Steeves to move the Minutes of the Meeting of June the 22nd.

Councillor Steeves: That would be my pleasure, Mr. Speaker.

MINUTES

Councillor Steeves moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on June 22, 2011, be taken as read and confirmed.

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

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Okay, we have one Delegation. We'll invite Mr. Marty Gold for ten minutes, on the Ombudsman's Report, Designation, Alteration and Deletion of Truck Routes.

Marty Gold: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning, Councillors. I have to say that I am a little surprised that I'm here. I anticipated perhaps speaking on one of the other matters, for instance the Parking Authority Audit or something else but I realized I didn't really have quite as much to contribute on those matters as I did believe or not as on this. I am surprised to be speaking about something that involves truck routes. I guess that 99% of the population you know, basically in the big picture, who cares about truck routes, how they're created, how they're designated, how they are listed, how they're decommissioned? It's not really something that's going to grab the public's attention. But why should people pay attention? Councillors are paying attention, I'm wondering how many of you sitting here have read the letter from the ombudsman? Show of hands? Councillor Smith, oh…well Councillor Wyatt I expect, Councillor Vandal. I see a few of you don't seem to have read it. Now I'm not talking about the second letter from the ombudsman which was dated on I think it was May the 6th of this year. I've tumbled the one from last November 2nd, November 2nd, 2010 that started this ball rolling. And of you read that one that you can recall? I know you get a lot of paper work, I do, too. Well, I've taken the liberty of reading that letter as well as this one that is really before you, have been placed before you and let me explain why the ombudsman's findings mean that you are responsible not only for this truck route process but for a something much bigger and city-wide. The report provided to you today synopsizes the Ombudsman's findings such as the absence of the matter being reflected on the Agenda at the initial stage of discussion, Day Street residents and other residents potentially affected by the decision may not have been aware of the situation and the report added and this is based on the information I should tell you that there is no copies of the Agenda up in the gallery, but, I have the notes. Most members of the general public would not know the process by which this type of issue would be elevated and be able to find the corresponding Agenda and Minute information. So, as far as I understand, that is the summary that is in front of you right now. Now, the Administration left out the next paragraph in the Ombudsman's letter. I'm going to read it to you, "As such, members of the public were not provided with advanced notice the decision that may affect them was being discussed. The information had been considered and the decision-making process was not clear. There appeared to be no opportunity for residents to state or present their cases. There appear to be no opportunity for potentially impacted residents to challenge or dispute any information that was considered in the decision-making process." And and then there was the last paragraph of that letter that was also left out by the Administration in the material that is placed before you today. It would appear that given the situation, members of the public monitoring the city web site information, would not be able to interpret or be aware of the issue being discussed by which Committee or office in the city and when they would've had the opportunity to make presentations, all of which seem to support the residents' complaints, concerns rather to the Ombudsman. Okay. This is all written in bureaucrat. Let me translate it to you to plain…for you to plain English. a citizen complained and you lost and this is a big deal. The people were left out of the process. They weren't given full information. They were rocked out of protesting and were told the City was following the rules. But the rules about how the truck route were delisted weren't fair, the web site in this case was misleading and incomplete and now the people of Day Street have the pleasure of about 3 or 4 or 500 more trucks a day coming down their street. Now how many of you in the past came on the Great Canadian Talk Show either called in or in the studio and told our listeners, "Hey call 311 now. Give me the information. What is 311? Do they go to the City web site? And 311 will tell people calling go to the City web site, it's easy. The Ombudsman has reported in her correspondence that I encourage you all to read for yourself that the City web site is unnavigable and broken. Why are you not being told in this report before you that that was the case? Who is going to be held responsible for this failure, this obstruction of the people's right to fair treatment, for misleading them when they complain, for them being told, oh we followed the rules and for refusing to make sure to protect the public's chance to have their say? The Ombudsman found that access to the decision-making process in all cases is unnavigable. This is bigger than just the truck route issue. Now, if the City web site doesn't crash your Firefox, it takes five or six clicks even to get to the agenda listings, let alone find out where

everything is and God forbid the information shouldn't even be there. Did you know the ombudsman discovered the original records of the Plessis Road Truck Route Discussions were missing from the web site, who knows what else is missing from other public matters on the web site? I bet your department chiefs don't know and why should they? They know you don't care enough to pay attention. This is your job. You think you're going to come here? You'll just vote to have the Administration fix it. I don't think that's adequate. I think there has to be some direction given. Where is the accountability in this? This is a red flag for all of you. There is no question this is the same story with every major project not just a truck route. Name a project on which the City has delivered fair and proper public consultation from bike paths on Assiniboine and Sherbrook and Barry to the Parking Authority that has no complaint department wants to hike rates to a football stadium to expanding the Convention Centre and to Bus Rapid Transit being rerouted that even the Councillors complained. He figures it's going to get the notification of the information on maybe an hour's notice. What chance does the average person have to fight City Hall? It's been established that one day's notice is considered adequate for people to register to speak that live in Fort Richmond on stadium parking and then when they phone nobody in the City Hall answered the phone on Friday so that they can register. Now, the people have learned that the bureaucracy doesn't care and that's a dichotomy that the department wants things streamlined. They want it simple. They don't want deviation from their plans, but you as politicians say we believe in hearing from the people, we want to hear from you. Well, that's what you say in October, and then when the voters complain you turn around, go to your bureaucrats and you say is this how things work and they go ya. Well, this is what Irene Hamilton had said about what, how the City of Winnipeg does things, "It is not fair. No normal person, no average person can find things and interpret things or find out how they can intervene." The people on Day Street were left out, the Trucking Association only found out after the fact that the Chamber of Commerce, their input sat on the shelf for six years with no record of it ever being tabled to a committee of City Council and yet your officials told the ombudsman, "Oh, those groups had meaningful participation. Why are the home owners on Day Street squawking? They just missed their chance. Which Councillor will move an amendment to immediately take steps for the City web site to be brought up to par, using the guidelines for procedural fairness that were attached on page four of the original letter? Does it really have to wait two or six months to come back to Council while you're off going to barbecues or you know, meeting with the public or whatever it is you do on your summer break? People want to speak up now. They want to get involved in the issues now, before September there has to be specific direction to correct the way the City handles all public notices and consultations. A measuring of every aspect of that against this page of standards and the Council has to stop paying their lip service to public consultation and do something well, now what's it called? A value audit. The ombudsman just gave your web site one. It flunked. Failed, flopped! This is more than just the web site affecting the decision-making process. If it's not navigable on this issue, believe me, it is not navigable to the average person on every other civic issue. Now how do you solve this problem of the public feeling disrespected and them feeling discouraged from participating or for them being kept in the dark? You don't just farm the problem out to the Administration. You take ownership. You tell the public, "we goofed". Help us make it better. Have average people participate in test groups until the web site is easy to get around and find information. You presumably tell, I mean, I don't know if it's Mr. Sheegl or who it is. What is expected by when and he asked me directed by amendment today to immediately improve the web site, make it more accessible and easier to navigate and ensure that all background on matters that are coming before Council is there. It has to be in plain English on the web site not in jargon, not in bureaucrat, I suppose it should be in French too. And you can approve an amendment like that now and expand it beyond just truck routes and seize this issue and another amendment, you can ask whoever in the Administration to take these guidelines from the Ombudsman, that mandate that people be given advance notice of a decision given the information to be considered, a meaningful chance, a meaningful chance to state their case, and this could be taken to every City department, every head of the department, everybody in the Communications Branch and say, are we doing our part to make sure that these guidelines are met? Is our transparency and public processes up to the standard? What are we doing to make sure it is? This report from the ombudsman that on your desk turns into something about truck routes is a red flag. It's not about truck routes in the delisting procedure but about any and all public consultations where you tell the public go to the web site. A number of you discuss the City web site in public consultation on the great Canadian Talk Show in the past and discussed it through main stream media and you defended it. The Ombudsman says you were wrong. You can revolutionize public consultation in this city and make it meaningful with this opportunity, or you can limp along from vaguely worded notices that aren't put up where people can find them to vacant open houses, to public outrage, to lawsuits to Ombudsman's findings on a case by case basis or you can use this opportunity to broaden the motion in front of you, which I support, to have the Administration do a full review against these guidelines the Ombudsman has been kind enough to provide you, fix public consultations now using those guidelines and fix the web site. That is really the Ombudsman meant to send to City Council through that original letter in November but you didn't write it in plain English. I hope you will take the translation I have provided to heart and take broader action than just worrying about truck routes with regards to the information the Ombudsman has uncovered. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions? Seeing none, thank you, Mr.: Gold.

Marty Gold: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we'll ask the Mayor to address the Executive Policy Committee from June the 29th. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 29, 2011

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.
Mr. Speaker: Two and number one? Two. Okay, all right. Mr.: Mayor, we have both 1 and 2.

Item 1 – Sponsor Winnipeg – Winnipeg Sun Sponsorship Agreement – Newspaper Vending Machines

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to hear what the Councillor has to say and I would be more than glad to try to address any questions or issues.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: You know, I read this and it doesn't seem to me this is a…belongs under the sponsorship. We're in effect making an agreement to give exclusive rights to the Winnipeg Sun. It seems to me that we're renting that…those spots and that's made it clear in the financial implication that says the Winnipeg Sun will provide the City of Winnipeg with 125,000 of in kind compensation for a period of one year. So like we're really in effect, this is not a sponsorship thing. This is a rental thing. And I cannot support it at this time. I hope you don't either.

Mr. Speaker: Further comments? Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I hate to disagree with Councillor Smith but I'm not sure he actually grasps what's going on here. First of all, this is a sponsorship. Basically, they were receiving certain locations and in return providing us with $125,000 and that's actually cash, Mr. Speaker. And the reason it's cash because the City of Winnipeg spends in excess of that with them every year. It's a real expense on our bottom line, so it will be received as cash. It's not a one year, it's a four year that we can renew every year for four years so in its entirety, it could be half a million dollars. It was initiated by Sponsor Winnipeg. And to be very frank with you, I would hope…I would hope that Councillor Smith or any Councillor would support something that basically helps us towards our goal of balancing our budget. This is a real cash contribution of $125,000. If Councillor Smith has a cheque to write for 125, we take that as well, Mr. Speaker. This is real and it helps immensely and I can also add that at this particular point in time, hopefully at the end of the day, we'll be over $2 million in Sponsor Winnipeg revenue, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Katz. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Item 2, Mayor Katz.

Item 2 – Land Dedication Reserve – St. Anne's Road Pedestrian Corridor

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll be more than happy to hear the Councillor and then I'll respond.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd actually like to move that this be referred back to the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee and I don't know if I'm allowed to say why I want it referred. No, not allowed to?

Mr. Speaker: You have two minutes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh, thank you. I'm not opposing this or in favour of one way or the other, I'm just concerned that there's no administrative recommendation regarding this and the pedestrian corridors. There is a precedent setting nature of just politically approving them without any administrative recommendation about…. There are safety issues that we could even be putting the public in danger if it isn't appropriate to have pedestrians crossing there. Maybe it is and we can have a political argument about that but I'd like to have the Administration information in front of us. There is a long list of pedestrian corridors and this is basically jumping the cue of all of those other ones without an administrative report and it might well make perfect sense to put it in here and I'm sure the Councillor has many good reasons for wanting it, but I think that we should follow proper process considering there's a long waiting list of pedestrian corridors that we all have in all parts of the city and I think we should follow proper process in this case. It's not…and I'm also a little concerned about a Councillor using their own funds like land's not their own funds, but ward funds to pay for pedestrian corridors if we're all expected to start doing that, we're not going to have the funding for our parks and our other infrastructure needs in our communities and we're going to be start being expected to pay for basic budgetary

items in our own wards. So there's some bigger implications to this whole thing and it's kind of being whipped through the EPC level without going back because it's a land dedication request, I think that's why it went there, but I think it should go through the proper process of Public Works because the wording of what we're approving actually says we approve that pedestrian corridor. It's not just approving the money, that would be one thing but we're actually approving the corridor itself without an administrative report identifying any safety concerns or anything else, so you know, it's nothing against the specific corridor and I'm sure there's residents who want it and maybe it does make sense but I think we should refer it back to the proper Committee like all other corridors have to go through. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Eadie. I'm sorry…sorry, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Pardon me? (Inaudible) I'm speaking to the motion referral, thank you. Oh, is that what you said? Sorry. Get these things off, okay.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, Councillor Eadie but because…

Councillor Eadie: I'm speaking to the motion to refer. thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No, no, no. Can't speak to that. Councillor Gerbasi has asked that we requested we or vote on referral so we will have the vote on the referral. All those in favour? Those opposed? Recorded vote, all right. All those in favour? Please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Smith, Wyatt

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 4, Nays 12. Motion is lost.

Mr. Speaker: On the Clause, would anyone like to speak on the Clause? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I am really concerned about this particular report and motion to use land dedication money to establish a pedestrian corridor. There is, in my particular ward, I have…well, we can debate that and it's always subject to criteria, for whether or not a pedestrian corridor is warranted and if it is warranted, it gets into a cue and it's on a list that needs to be for installation. And frankly, if I was to try to meet the needs of my pedestrian corridors and this is actually setting a precedence that I don't think is appropriate, in that you know, we don't all have the money to pay for installations of pedestrian corridors especially when a land dedication funds for the most part isn't even enough to keep up for the demands in our park spaces and our green spaces for establishing facilities that people can participate in that act…participated and I have some very specific examples of three pedestrian corridors that people are requesting because we have this single vehicle society in this city, in which people can't get across the street safely, and just…well, installing a pedestrian corridor doesn't necessarily mean it's safe, but it does establish the right of a pedestrian to cross the street when there is no opportunity, because, for example, we could have timed lights and timed lights will actually affect the pedestrians because at rush hours how do you get across the streets. We have kids that need to get across McGregor Avenue, for example and so this way of approaching a pedestrian corridor is simply wrong because it's unsustainable. It's not a proper way and it should've been referred to the same process that the pedestrian corridors in my ward has been subjected to, and this thing has not been considered by the Public Works Committee who does consider if we want to jump the cue or if we want to set a precedence and say that this particular pedestrian corridor has a priority over the other. And I will say this, you know somebody is in Election mode and I just…I don't think this is right. It's not right. Thank you.

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

Councillor Swandel: (Inaudible) because when I'm done I'm sure Councillor Eadie will realize how wrong he is. First, let me start by saying the precedence has already been set. I was the one who brought this concept forward to Councillor Steeves because it was something that I had done in the St. Norbert Ward on Pembina Highway where we've got the Richmond Garden Seniors Home across the street from a mall that's got medical facilities, et cetera and where many of the seniors that live in the building need to get across the street to access the services that are on the other

side of the eight lanes of Pembina Highway. When I tried to do it through Public Works in the regular processes, what happened was that I was met with engineering studies and traffic study that didn't take into consideration the anecdotal nature of the particular problem and that anecdotal information that was there. So being creative, I looked for opportunities to do it. The motion that I actually made when I did it, I think it was four or five years ago now, was that to use land dedication but when Public Works saw fit that this would be at the right place in the queue that they would reimburse out of the pedestrian corridors funds in the Public Works accounts. We keep renewing every year but doesn't get spent in its entirety every year but that they would reimburse the land dedication fund. It was a problem. Seniors were being affected and it needed a solution. The problem in the St. Vital Ward is actually far greater than just the seniors that need this connectivity. This connectivity links to the Seine River green corridor. If you…if you've ever driven down the section of St. Anne's Road, you'll see the amount of development that's happening and the growth from that development of the green corridor and the trails that run along the Seine River. This is a key piece of active transportation infrastructure. What my colleagues neglected to mention was that clearly says that this is for active transportation connectivity. Getting across St. Anne's on this section of roadway especially if you're elderly with the speed of traffic and the volume of traffic is difficult. When we're investing money and we're doing development agreements to get facilities, amenities like the Seine River corridor in our hands for the good of the people in St. Vital we've got to be making these types of connections. This was creative and I think it's going to be very successful and a great benefit to St. Vital, whether it's Councillor Steeves that's moving it or any other member of this chamber. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah Mr. Speaker, I voted to refer but it was, you know, I think there's argument in terms of having the Administration look at the safety issue in terms of the location, but Council voted not to refer of course. But I'll be voting in support. I know I've used land dedication outside of criteria where it's necessary, the Councillor's identified something which he thinks is a problem in his ward. He's still the Councillor till he resigns. So he obviously sees an issue. Well, no that's true, you are. And so I'm just saying I respect what my colleagues are saying and I know the ideal world we should have an adequate budget to be funding pedestrian corridors. I went to the Standing Committee just last meeting actually with the pedestrian corridor on, need on Plessis and it's something which I know it's a problem now created because of the past active transportation corridor we put crossing Plessis now we've got all these people and they're crossing four lanes of traffic much like here so, you know Mr. Speaker, I'm sympathetic. It does set a precedent or maybe precedent was already set, which Councillor Swandel says, but you know there's a need. It's unfortunate that 30,000 now being spent on this instead of parks. It does take away from that in his ward but anyway he's identified it as a concern, so I'll digress and give…acknowledge the fact that he knows his ward better than I do. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Appreciate the concern and that's…these are fair comments. Just, I will point you to the Item No. 2 which reads, just at the end, "It's subject to the following condition. Approval of final plans specifications for the project by the City of Winnipeg. So there will be that process. Obviously our Department will be looking at it if there is some mechanical issue, I assume that's going to be brought forward at that time. If it can't be done, I would anticipate our department would do that. Just a little bit of history if you…yeah, if you don't like the process, you can blame Justin there. I got the idea from him. I can tell you my learned friend from St. Norbert. Pedestrian corridors as we all know are one of the most difficult things to do in an area. Justin and I, because we share Dakota as a border between St. Norbert and St. Vital on the one side of the road, Dakota Community Centre, the two lawn bowling facilities, College Jean Sauvé and the College Louis Riel Library or the Louis Riel Library rather, was on the one side of course. The preponderance of the population on the other. There, we had for years, the old simple white sign indicating the pedestrian corridor that people would stop at and then a dozen or so cars would blow through while the person was waiting before anybody realizes that somebody was waiting there. We went back and back and back and took years before we finally got the pedestrian corridor installed which was very, very difficult. Now that it's in there. I can tell you the citizens are very, very pleased that it is in fact there. Part of the problem, of course is that when you try to do the measurements of traffic and people going across and deciding whether or not a controlled pedestrian intersection is warranted here, part of the problem is you're testing something that doesn't yet exist. So how do you test how many people are using this particular corridor if there is not a corridor that exists yet? It's a very, very difficult thing to do. And of course our administration has their formulas and their methods of doing that. I completely respect that, but this is one of those things where I think to a certain degree you have to rely on the wherewithal of the ward Councillor. I think it makes some sense in the area. Had a horrible experience happen to me on St. Annes. A very similar situation at Woodydell and Gosford on St. Anne's. A little girl was hit with an awful outcome. I won't go into it. But went through the process again. But again another one of those pedestrian corridors with a simple white sign. And I'd gone through there. I went there to investigate myself and while I was stopped at that pedestrian walkway not a lit corridor, but just a simple white signs, a little girl or a little boy. There's a Manitoba housing project located directly across St. Anne's from a Mac's Convenience store. Really quite an attractive scenario for young people, and kids. And while the two, the little boy and the little girl were standing there and I

was waiting for them to cross. No fewer than half a dozen cars blew right through the corridor, without seeing them. I completely imagine the drivers did not notice that they were standing there. These are the types of things that happen. And now what we have on between the lit intersections of Southglen and St. Anne's, Nova Vista and St. Anne's. We have a very long stretch of road, probably a couple of kilometres where we have many, many seniors on the one side of the road in the middle and the new Southglen shopping area which has been developed in the last couple of years, on the other side of the road. Obviously, these two entities are coming together a great deal and what's happening is not children, many of these seniors now are making their way across St. Anne's which has become a very busy street without any controlled intersection. I think it makes sense that the intersection of Compark and St. Anne's to have a lit corridor. Problem is, I don't know that I'll necessarily be around to see this one through and I think it's important so I've opted to use the method that I've learned from my colleague in St. Norbert which I hope people will support. I put it forward bonafide and in good faith because I think the area needs it and I think it makes sense. So people can vote their conscience. I completely appreciate that but this wasn't done knee jerk. It's something I've been considering for awhile. I went out and I've met with the residents and sat down, I looked at the area and I think it makes sense in my opinion. So I'll leave it with you Mr. Speaker and again people can vote with their conscience however they feel.

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

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It appears that I think all the facts are now on the table. First of all I think every Councillor here would be very concerned about citizen safety and that's what this issue stems from. Number two, we're not setting precedence. I think it's already been stated by at least two other Councillors that they've both used land dedication and outside of criteria in my humble opinion I think Councillor Wyatt could write a book. We all buy it and probably do us very well because there things happen. I've seen it on many times with community incentive grants outside of criteria. It happens. There's exceptions to every rule. To me, the key thing, it's all about safety so there is nothing new here, Mr. Speaker, but I do appreciate all the comments that made by everybody.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Katz. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. The Report of July the 6th. Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 6, 2011

Mayor Katz: I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no…(Inaudible) We have one, stand down No. 1.

Item 1 – Operational Review of the Winnipeg Parking Authority

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. I'd be delighted to hear from Councillor Eadie and I will respond.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I just wanted to, just really speak briefly. This is of course an Auditor's review of the operations and I will be voting to accept it although I don't know that we have to follow through on the recommendations that are in this report and I just wanted to…it seems like, though, that the recommendations in this report are being followed while at the same time there is supposed to be some kind of process with the stakeholders in parking downtown. And I don't understand that but, again, I will be voting for this but I really as accepting an operating report and I know that we don't have to follow the recommendations in here but it sounds like we're proceeding down that path as I heard out in the media. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Sure, I…thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to add a little bit of context to that, once again, some from the Auditor and there was a number of recommendations I think our administration has said that they agree with the majority of the recommendations. There is a public process and I will inform the chamber here in terms of where we are at in terms of the date, there is some talk about the fees, talking about it for downtown. So this is a letter from our Parking Authority. To date we have conducted the following information sessions with stakeholders, businesses in the Downtown Exchange District. On June 14th, there is a downtown session No. 1 targeted businesses for the highest area of demand, I'm sure there's June 14th, June 15th, downtown session No. 2 targeted businesses at the proposed shed area, June 23, there is a coffee with the parking guy, June 30th, downtown session No. 3, general invite to the Downtown Biz members and June 19th, Exchange session No. 1 open to all members of Exchange Biz. There has been

a lot of work with the local businesses. Upcoming we have the following information session scheduled on June 20th, Exchange session No. 2, July I'm sure there's July 20th, July 21st, Randy Topolniski will meet the CentreVenture to advance the meetings with the Downtown Council, August 4th Coffee with the Parking Authority and we expect to schedule additional meetings and feedback with the stakeholders , I believe that's happening in July, to date the feedback from the Biz members has expressed interest in providing parking rates as opposed to flat rates increases and the fact that processes being driven by date to particular with respect to evening parking that's there. So there has been some ongoing meetings and dialogue just as we promised in regards to one of the main recommendations that the Auditor brought forward, so the Administration is following through with that. So I'd like to add that to the record.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Fielding. Mayor Katz. Close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I very much appreciate Councillor sharing with the Councillor Eadie that there was a process and the stakeholders were involved and now that he knows that hopefully he would support this motion because I certainly will be, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the Clause? Opposed? Motion carried. The July 13th Report, Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 13, 2011

Mayor Katz: I'd like to introduce the report Mr. Speaker, move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 13 with a small clarification for all members of Council. Report No. 3, point No. 2, the date says December 31, 2017, it should be 2016. So just to clarify that for everybody. And that's on the Award of a Contract for Supply and Delivery of Fuels.

Mr. Speaker: Clerk has that correction? Councillor Smith, No. 11, Councillor Gerbasi? Same? Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: No. 1

Mr. Speaker: No. 1. Councillor Orlikow? We're okay? Councillor Swandel? Four and 10, okay. All right. We'll call the Motion on 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion's carried.

Item 1 – OurWinnipeg By-law No. 67/2010

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I will just briefly make a comment on this. It's interesting how Councillor Browaty has basically come back and told us the good news about an Award for the wonderful job that we've done with OurWinnipeg. We know the Province has basically given us their blessings and we also know this has been one of the most comprehensive and transparent processes that we've ever gone through in order to move our city forward, so I'd very much like to hear from the Councillor and then I will address the issue.

Mr. Speaker: Who is No. 1? Councillor Orlikow? (Inaudible) I'm sorry, it was Councillor Eadie. Kirby, I'm feeding back. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. Yes, I was the one who stood down No. 1. So, this is a very important By-law and I think it's great that we received award for planning and I was quite familiar with all of the consultations that were happening in Winnipeg for OurWinnipeg. And it was a very good process, I thought. As I understand it some of the process though involved in bringing it in and I'm not sure how much input all the City Councillors had into this particular really, this planning policy document is so very important to how the City proceeds that I'm hoping that the 16 Councillors that were there at the time had an ability to give meaningful input and ideas for what should be reflected in this document. Now, I stand today, I think it's difficult for me to vote for this particular OurWinnipeg, but I think I'm going to be, well, I will be voting for it as it is something that has already received two Readings but I wouldn't want to be quoted by anybody to say well, you voted for OurWinnipeg if I ever have to criticize a certain portion of it. And I do, as I understand it, I don't think that there is enough in this OurWinnipeg document that takes care of what I've been talking about since I was elected to City Council from the Mynarski Ward. And I don't think that this OurWinnipeg Plan covers enough how we're dealing with the renewal of our older parts of the city, which really, I think is sadly lacking. We are just not dealing with it, and so I will still be speaking out but so just because I voted for this report that doesn't necessarily give enough to about the revitalization of the inner city, you know it's a great thing, revitalization of downtown is progressing. It's working really good and you know, you have to really appreciate all the work that went into that but we really have to look at the whole older sections of our city and how we're dealing with keeping those vital, new, renewed

and so while I will be voting for this I just wanted to put this on the record that I think that it probably…it is lacking I believe in some respects, in respects that I just spoke. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. I rise in support of OurWinnipeg. I've had…I've been using it quite a bit. We had some comments today about lack of transparency at City Hall. You don't get much more transparent in this than with OurWinnipeg document. I can go to any one of my neighbourhoods and say this is what is expected, this is what's coming down the pipe, maybe tomorrow, maybe 25 years from now but that allows a community at least an understanding of what to expect and then we can look at stuff like traffic flows, traffic patterns, how that's all working in a transportation that plan will be coming and now this all kind of works together with that. So OurWinnipeg, I do believe it's a very good document. I think the planning, it does make us more transparent and it really does help our communities be able to adjust to the very exciting fact that Winnipeg is growing. Growing quickly. More quickly than I've ever seen. That's for sure you know, and it's wonderful but again, that does involve change and so if you tell people what change is coming early enough and you communicate, I don't believe enough people are engaged with the OurWinnipeg document. We all know how hard it is to connect people to documents such as this, but again with our Council effort and individual efforts I'm sure we'll get this document out into the hands of people who actually are interested. I do though and as I said before when we…I did approve this OurWinnipeg document before, is I do believe in the words of…with Councillor Eadie is mentioning, again it's helpful because it gives us a framework of language. So what he is referring to in our books on page 84, Complete Communities called reinvestment areas, and yes, OurWinnipeg is short in that chapter. It's actually only one page verses mature communities versus other communities, however I do believe strongly that working with Public Works and working with the Planning Department that we will get that chapter included at a later date. So we are working towards that, however, this is a great document that we need to go forward on. I am committed to getting that reinvestment area chapter expanded. There are some stuff going on already and again I think this will allow that reinvestment sections so we're all kind of on the same page and we know what direction we're going into. So there's still work to be done but this is really a wonderful start.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With the adoption of OurWinnipeg today and this particular item, there's still an opportunity for citizens to speak up. If you look throughout the Complete Communities document though, there is a lot of talk about transformative communities. There is a lot of talk about ways to deal with mature and stable communities and ways that they can be improved and further developed. So I'd encourage if Councillor Eadie you know, being a new member of Council would like to have an opportunity to speak to the people in Property and Development. There's certainly that opportunity to go over the Complete Communities documents. There's also a lot of talk about major redevelopment sites. There's a lot of areas where there were former employment industrial type lands within residential communities that are being redeveloped and re-explored as mixed use type areas so again a lot of the concerns I think that Councillor Eadie brought up are in fact part of Complete Communities. I encourage him to communicate with department staff.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the first thing I'd like to say is that I think this is a great document. I'd also like to just to give thanks to the Director, Deepak Joshi and all the staff. This was something that, of course, we moved forward but they embraced it and they worked to make it a model that other cities would follow. They worked to make it one of the most inclusive processes that's ever taken place and just to share with Councillor Eadie, all citizens and all Councillors got to participate in every way imaginable as often as they want. The opportunity was there and I think that's why this is being heralded. The biggest concern that we had Mr. Speaker, we wanted to move forward and we've been waiting for the Province, finding that the Province is on board and Mr. Speaker, this will be a model that will be followed and from my point of view, I'm extremely proud of this. I will share just one piece of advice with Councillor Eadie. There were times there is a motion on the floor and you agree with most of it but maybe not all of it. The sooner or later, you've got to vote for or against and I can assure you whichever way you vote, you will be reminded in the future because that's what Hansard is for. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No more comments. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you. Item No. 4.

Item 4 – Grants – Multiple Family Residential Projects – Neighbourhood Multiple Family / Mixed Use Building Grant Program By-law No. 122/2007

Mayor Katz: I believe it's Councillor Swandel that stood this down. I'll be happy to listen to his comments.
Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: (Inaudible) a couple of quick comments. This Grant program and the extension of it for these projects represents this money being tied up for a year without the production of I believe 124 units, split evenly between owner and rental units. I think we've got to do a better job in the future of ensuring that people are tying up these funds are getting their conditional approvals early that locks the money in that we put in some triggers or some deadlines in place that the money would expire if they're not moving more quickly. This is…you know, with the time we're seeing some housing, we'll use the term, shortages but the high demand for housing 124 units, that is going to help us increase density in neighbourhoods and in existing neighbourhoods, this isn't something that we should have better language in the agreements to make sure that the projects flow quicker.

Mayor Katz: I appreciate the comments from Councillor Swandel but the realities are these did have a sunset clause and the reason we're here right now because the program no longer exists so we're extending it. The reason we're extending it is we want to see this housing happen and they're waiting for some provincial commitments. We don't want these to fall apart. We don't know how many these will happen in the end. We'd like to see them all but in all fairness it's not actual cash that's sitting in a pot right now, this is incremental monies that will be coming you know, from future taxes, et cetera. They don't build it, there will be nothing. So would I have liked to have seen these projects already started? Yes. They are waiting to get funding from different government levels and they still could become a reality that's good for the City then I'm certainly prepared to give them that one year extension, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Katz. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Item No. 10.

Item 10 – Winnipeg Civic Employees' Benefits Program – Contribution Rates

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I believe it was also Councillor Swandel who stood this down so I'd be more than happy to listen and I'll respond.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. I won't be supporting this Clause. I think we've been a little too hasty in getting this done. I didn't support it at EPC. I just want to make sure that everyone here today realizes that we're…what we are agreeing to do today is…along with the employees, the employer and the City of Winnipeg and the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg will now be paying for some enhanced benefits that were previously paid for out of the Employees' Surplus Fund that was created in 1999 and I believe the contributions coming out of that for the enhanced funds started to flow in the year 2000. So make no bones about it, today you're agreeing to start paying out of City funds, for benefits with, what are referred to as enhanced benefits. That's like the ability to retire before the age of 55 and other such benefits that were previously paid for by the employees. Yes, we're paying for some pieces that will help maintain at least pension benefits to 1999 levels, but we are paying for benefits that were previously paid for by the employees. The report makes reference to other cities and other pension funds, as far as what their costs are and contribution rates are but yet it gives no comparative analysis on what the benefit plans are and how similar they are to the City of Winnipeg and what the retirement ages are, what the other benefits that those people receive. Today we see you know, people throughout history, people have been living longer, but yet our process today of helping to encourage people retire earlier seems to be counterintuitive to that you know. Here at a time when people are living into their 80s and 90s and on, we've got a program that encourages our workforce to retire at or before the age of 55. In addition, these monies that we are paying…now paying for, for the benefits formerly paid for by employees, the other benefits when surpluses start to accrue, if it ever starts to accrue again in the future, the other benefits will come back up and there is no clause in here that gets the City's money repaid to it. But yet things like the reductions in CPI and other benefits that are dropping off for employees here. If surpluses accrue in the future, those surpluses will go to enhancing those benefits again. But yet the City doesn't get any of this money back. And there is no Clause for new employees. You know, I…with pensions, I agree wholeheartedly that we should be looking after existing employees and we should be looking after our retirees but in this day and age we've got to stop the madness somewhere. You know, we can't afford this. This is not sustainable. Cities across this country are finding this in municipal pension plans, clear across the country are finding this. What you see in both private and the public sector is many of them make the decision that the plan will change for new employees. They will protect our existing and retirees with the benefits that they have but we stop it for new employees and you know, doing that, it doesn't make us less competitive because other municipalities are doing the same thing. And when you compare, if you were to do that and you would compare apples to apples, our benefit, our pension benefit package would still be comparable to other major cities in the country. I'm also troubled by the financial information in there. In year 1, it shows for starting September 1st, so for a third of the year, a cost of $600,000, which equates to about $1.8 million a year. But yet in year 2, our cost jumps to 3.6 million additional for that year. Then in year 3, the same 0.5% increase goes down to 3 point…it goes down to about $2 million and again, in year 4, it's in about $2 million. There's no explanation as to why in year 2 or in 2012, the cost is only 2 million…is no explanation as to why it's 3.6 million in 2012 but yet the cost in the other years seems to be only 2 million. There's some language in here about

you know using the surpluses to pay. I know that we have about $80 million in surpluses sitting in there so that it shouldn't be an up and down piece. You know, I'm not sure why that's…that's written like this and there's not explanation for it in the report. So again, you know troubling…it's difficult you know, we're talking about it at the end of this $8 million is the cost over these years and it's $8 million in perpetuity. You know, what does that represent to the City of Winnipeg? Well, $8 million you could go out and you could probably do about $100 million worth of infrastructure work. That's what you could do with $8 million. If you're going to make a cash flow payment of $8 million a year, a hundred million dollars of infrastructure work. So, I mean, you will hear if people try and minimize what I'm saying or minimalize and rationalize it. The reality is today, we as the City of Winnipeg and the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg will now be using some of our money to pay for enhanced benefits to get people to retire earlier. I don't think that should be our priority. I think protecting and preserving benefits for existing employees and retirees should be a priority. I also think infrastructure should be a priority. So before I spend $8 million on paying for something that was previously paid for by employees, I would put that money to infrastructure. Those are my comments. I'm fairly confident the rest of this Council will vote to support this. I don't agree with that then I'll hold to that stand.

Mr. Speaker: No further comments? Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was a little surprised that no one else wants to speak on the issue. First of all, let me say this, Mr. Speaker, I don't disagree with one thing Councillor Swandel just said and that's what makes this extremely difficult. Although, let me share this with you. What we have here as a result of what happened with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and how the economy and the interest rates have changed. Well, we're not producing the same kind of revenues as we once did and many years ago, Council made a choice to basically take a hiatus and both the Union and Council did that. We're in a situation right now, where we have the Union's agreement that in order to basically reach a certain goal, they're going to take out of the 8% that's required, we're going to contribute to, they're going to contribute to, and in addition to that they're going to attribute another 4% in cuts and benefits which means a total of 6% out of the 8% so they're really making a 75% contribution. The problem that happens is sustainability. Because of the surplus we have we can continue this for approximately 7 years. If things don't change, there's going to be big trouble, Mr. Speaker, and that's what really concerns me. And when we have a situation where we cannot sustain it some very difficult decisions are going to have to be made. Not just by Council representing the citizens but as well, by the Unions. The hope is the economy will change, we'll get better interest rates, and we'll have a surplus again. By the same token, Councillor Swandel is accurate saying, well, we'll not be getting the money that we put back. It's not an easy decision Mr. Speaker, but the realities are, I think there comes a point in time you must act in good faith. We gave the Board of Trustees the go ahead to negotiate in good faith and they did, and this is what's been worked out. And, as difficult as it is for yours truly with my one vote, because I do heed the advice of Councillor Swandel. He's not inaccurate on basically anything he said. I am going to support this and God willing things will change and that surplus will not be used up because if it is, we do have a problem.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Swandel and Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 2.

Mr. Speaker: Motion passed.

Item 11 – Traffic Signals Branch Performance Audit

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. I'll just wait to hear the comments and then I'll respond.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: I read the audit and then I read the recommendation from the Executive Policy Committee which basically does nothing. You know, this audit was excruciate…there's no management of the traffic division. After I read that audit. No maintenance. For example, the branch has eight technical employees and what's required is 15 to 20. And the report says for every one dollar invested in optimizing the timing of traffic signals, $40 is returned to the public in time and fuel savings. The U.S. DOT indicates guidelines that are affected operation and maintenance of traffic signals may have safety implications and contribute annually to millions of unnecessary delays, congestion, fuel consumption and air pollution. It seems to me we should be doing something. I don't think it's good to receive just this as information. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My concern here is what we are doing and I think it's Clause 2, is that the traffic signals branch business unit be forwarded to the Alternative Service Delivery evaluation process and I'd like to speak to that because this applies not just to the issue of traffic signalization…synchronization that project that we know is taking a long time. We don't have the staff dedicated to it, it's taking a long time and I think that's the issue Councillor Smith is referring to. But we're talking about the whole business unit and according to the audit; this is what the business unit does. It's responsible for planning, designing and managing the transportation system and traffic regulatory environment to provide a safe, environmentally aware, accessible and sustainable transportation system. More specifically, the branch is responsible for the operation and maintenance of 611 traffic signals, 155 pedestrian corridors, 50 hazard flashers of four all red flashing intersections located in the city as well as new signal development and installation. So this is a huge core city service that is done by City staff and it's not just that synchronization project. And we all know that when something gets referred to the ASD process for evaluation, it means that they're looking at alternative way of delivering that service other than having our City staff and our professional engineering staff doing our traffic management which is the core City service. I'd like to point out that in my opinion, from what I've seen is that the problem with the traffic signal's branch is budget cuts and staff reductions which have left the branch seriously under staffed. There's got as Councillor Smith just pointed out, compared to other cities, we're way behind in staffing. We know we got rid of I don't know how many WAPSO staff…80 a year for a couple of years of our professional qualified staff. Highly professional staff, we got rid of them and now this is coming back to bite us in this Auditor's Report which is saying we don't have enough staff. It isn't rocket science. We don't have enough people to deal with the traffic synchronization project as well as the day to day projects, which is why we have…and maintenance which is why we have massive overtime and slow service response on some issues which the audit points out. We require dedicated professional engineers and qualified people to do this kind of work. And I've heard that mumblings that this is what we're talking about contracting this out or hiring, I don't know if that means hiring consultants or private firms to do this basic City work that should be done by our own City professional staff. If it does go ahead, I certainly hope there's some kind of a case made. I know this isn't just ideology. This is somehow going to save us money because professional staff on a consultant basis are not going to save us money as opposed to having adequate people on staff to deal with our traffic system. I mean that's part of the basic work the City does, so I just hope that that has been very well thought through, with the high cost of consulting fees and hiring outside professionals, I just think that's why most cities have their own traffic engineers and I just hope that I'm reading this wrong and no one is considering going down that road. So that was my main point that you know, in some cases the private sector is not cheaper especially with professional City services and as you note with the amount of things that this department is responsible for, perhaps something needs to be done specifically on the traffic synchronization. If we're going to make a commitment to do all that work on traffic synchronization which was made, you have to have the people to do it and no one was dedicated to it. And that and then, we are already are overworked just doing the basic maintenance and running our transportation system. So that is what my concern is and I'm very, very concerned about supporting that this just simply be referred to the ASD for some process without explaining which part of the department are they talking about the whole branch? Are you talking about just the traffic synchronization project? I would really like some comfort level on this because really this is…we don't really need, I don't think a complicated time consuming ASD review. What we need is some staff in our traffic branch and we don't have enough staff. It's simple. Unfortunately, we'd all like to hear another answer coming back because of the budget situation, but we need to hire some professional staff back in-house to do the work that needs to be done. Thank you, Mr: Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. The previous speaker was quite detailed in explaining the situation, but I wanted to speak to this and actually I'm going to stand…I'm going to actually vote against this report because frankly, Alternative Service Delivery? Why? Okay, I'll tell you why I'm against it. Traffic signals is about traffic control. To have good traffic control, the City needs to have complete control over the process. Rather than trying to communicate with other people that might be hired under contractual obligations which will cost more, it just won't work. It needs to be this particular department, should and must be part of the regular department's operations and, it just demonstrates the negligence that we've seen in this city that we are not supplying the appropriate amounts of employees, professional

employees and there is no lack of people to hire who are traffic engineers. I've met several of them in my work as an advocate, prior to becoming a City Councillor. And I have to say the people that we do have there are very good. And we could hire many more very good people to do the job that needs to be done and again, for me it's the control and there is a number of traffic signal issues that need to be…we need to have complete control over and there is agreements that we have with the communities for mediation to ensure that all our traffic signals are accessible to all of them, all users. And we need to continue to maintain that, and I think well, the best way to do that is to have complete control. There is no alternative way. Hire the people that you need to do the job and you'll get the job done. Like I don't understand why you need to really move this to Alternative, so I will be, again, voting against this Auditor's Operating Report but I'm only voting against it because of this referral to the Alternative Services. It just doesn't make no sense at all. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This audit is certainly a wakeup call for everybody. For the Chair of Public Works, the Executive Committee, the Director of Public Works, the manager of traffic signals and I don't think anybody is satisfied by what they read in the report, Mr.: Speaker. Having said that, the audit was completed about a year and a half ago. The data, we stopped collecting data, the Auditor stopped collecting data at the end of 09. The report was written in November…November, 2010 and we're in July of 2011. So that's 17 months ago which I think is too significant a gap for the whole audit process but that's another issue for another time. Since that time there have been some improvements made and Councillor Smith, there are 19 recommendations in the report, Mr. Speaker, Public Works have accepted to implement all of the reports through different processes and sometimes through straight implementation. I can say, because we have the Director at the Executive Committee last Wednesday, shifts have already started to change which is the major reason why there's so much overtime that have been paid to the department, in the last two years and when I asked him a direct question about when can we expect a weekend shift, he…the response was "very soon" and that's not something that you're going to necessarily alleviate with more staff although possibly you can, but it's the ability to better manage and to get some staff out there that aren't being paid overtime when the work is there. And that's something that's on its way. It's one of the main recommendations. We're talking about first responder teams we're making those changes. Rather than have two electricians, you could have an electrician technician. I understand we need provincial approval to get that done but that process has started. If you check out page 15 in the Audit Report, there is a significant number of major streets that have been approved, but they're not there yet to 100 %. I don't want to leave you the impression that things are satisfactory because they are not. Interesting thing on Chief Peguis Trail was that the privates who were doing Chief Peguis Trail actually hired the Department to do the traffic signalization which surprised the heck out of me, Mr. Speaker because if the privates are there and they can add something to the equation. They can do it better than the public, why are they hiring the City to do that and why are we accepting to do the work when there is regular maintenance that we need to get done? I think that's an interesting issue and one that's going to be addressed through the recommendation through the department. Bottom line Mr. Speaker, though I think some attention and some focus in this business unit at this point is a good thing. There may be a role for the privates in this situation as there is in many other cities throughout Canada. And I'm not one that says get rid of all of the public and replace with the privates but if you check out the Manitoba model other cities if you talk to the Director, if you talk to the Manager, they will say well, perhaps there is some role for the privates in the foreseeable future. The main thing is we're not talking about reduced investment into this business unit, that's the last thing. We need more investment in the business unit and I'm not one that says we're sending it to ASD …to completely privatize the entire business unit because I'm not there. But I will say that we will look at business plans. We will look at performance measurement, best practices with other cities across Canada. We will look at different models where the privates have a role in augmentation of what needs to get done. The Unions will be at the table every step of the way to contribute on those business plan developments and I just think that added focus, added attention to this business unit at this point in time is a good thing and that's why it's being sent to ASD. I think that Bob Dylan said 40 years ago you don't need to be a weather man to know which way the wind blows. Well, you don't need to be an economist to know that 14 years of freezes and three years of budget reductions are not having an impact on all departments across the City of Winnipeg. And yes, there is, I think there is obviously, whether we're talking traffic signals or any other department, it is time to reinvest in those business units and those departments. But it's also time to look at everything, best practices, benchmark against other cities, see which models work. I'll look at what the Province does and come out with a…with something that where we get a real effect of the bang of our buck. Having said that I'm going to support this. I supported it at Executive Committee. I'll support it on the floor of this Council and I hope that within a reasonable period of time we'll have some real improvements in the business unit. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Vandal, like a rolling stone. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr: Speaker. First, let me start by saying that what EPC did here was basically do what we do with all Auditor's reports. We received it as information and moved it forward. The recommendations of the Auditor always come into the Administration to be looked at for implementation or recommendation that they not be

implemented for some usually very specific reasons that you know, in the bigger picture maybe they don't make overall sense to do the specific recommendations, so that's what EPC agreed to do. We agreed to do exactly what we do with every Auditor's report. We didn't do anything different, so for anybody to characterize it as that is wrong. As for the additional recommendation that it be referred to the ASD process. The ASD process, the first step in that process before making any recommendations, to start it does not mean contracting out. The first step in that process is to go through a business planning or business plan process where you can look at what the expenses are. What the revenues are, what the services are, how they are delivered today and other ways to get a better effect or better outcome than what we're doing now. Baseline information is important and understanding what you're doing today, so that you have something to measure against for what you're doing in the future and how you're doing it. That's why anybody would not want to do that is beyond me. You know, we've got an Auditor who's identified a serious problem in an organization within our organization that clearly has got problems. You know, people talk about a shortage of staff. Somebody threw out a number of eight. It's not eight, it's far more than eight people and then you couldn't find the exact number but it's significantly more than eight people, this business unit. You know, in addition to that, you know the 12.5 or $13.5 million that we're spending on signal timing issues, you know, that a large, a vast portion of that money is being spent on paying our employees to do that work. It's not going outside. That Capital money is being spent inside, you know. Yeah there is the hardware, but the installation of that hardware's being spent using our employees. You know, so that money is in there. There's money to pay for more people, this burden of work that's there, we put the money there to get the people to do the work, but the Auditors we're talking about for some reason the work still didn't get done. You know, one of the key things it says in here and then yet you know, contracting out, well guess what there is no capacity to contract out. That's one of the things that the Auditor identifies is when they try to contract out some of this traffic timing work out, they couldn't find private sector people to deliver the work. We had to do it inside. We had to take the money and then do it in our own organization. So, we want to go through…we should, you know, when we established the ASD process, every year, the CAO or Councillors or other entities within the organization can bring forward recommendations for pieces of business within our organization to go through an ASD process. That's not a bad thing. That's taking a detailed look at how we conduct ourselves today and is there a better way of doing it in the future. Why anybody would disagree with looking to find a better way to do it in the future is beyond me. That's what the ASD process asks us to do. If it can't find a better way, it says the process would end up saying status quo would be our recommendation. That's what it would stay. That's what the ASD process does. It might say you know let's get some…let's go out and try and create some more private sector capacity so when we have large scale capital projects. There's somebody there to do the work. It could say a number of different things, create a utility, it could say. You know, and when you look to the United States and many jurisdictions, signals are done by utility companies. They're not done by cities. Utility companies take care of signals. This is my closing comment, as I don't know if anybody can answer this when they sum up on this, but it's interesting we had the conversation about pedestrian corridors this morning and you know, getting them done. I would like to know if this business unit actually does pedestrian corridors as well. Because I think it sort of speaks to the conversation that we were having earlier on as well. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr: Speaker. You know some very good comments about Councillor Vandal and Swandel. I'm not going to add too much more to what they have said but you know, I think when initially this report comes forward; it is a bit troubling because this is something that's going on. I don't think this is…I know there's some new leadership at Public Works and I think maybe that was the person that's there has kind of stepped in to this, this might be things are going on the past. What was troubling for me is that the Auditor has to come in, someone from the outside and you know, put up a whole bunch of recommendations that probably that department should've realized because they're living and breathing it on a daily basis. And so that's what I found a bit troubling with this. Now with that being said, we had the Director of Public Works come up and it sounds like they have taken some initiatives with these things but some of the things we're talking about with overtime, some of the times with the peak hours, these things should've been looked at internal on an internal basis because you're living and breathing this on a day to day basis and these ideas…these issues should've been brought to the forefront. And if there's an issue with fund again, by the way the Auditor's Report does as Councillor Swandel spoke of. The resources seem to be there but the work didn't seem to get done, so I do find this report somewhat troubling. Once again, I think there has been some strides since that time period when the audit took place, but the ASD process, I think makes a lot of sense because number one, it looks as Councillor Swandel said again, it will take a look at best practices of what we're doing and it gives you an overview of what other areas are doing to make it better because you can have things happen to our departments like this that float by whether the departments catch it whether our administration catches it or the politicians catch it in the end but you know, from politicians how are we able to address items that we don't know that's there and the departments need to bring this forward to us, so the Auditor there I think did some good work, some good recommendation that's there. The ASD model once again, it's going to globally take a look at what other jurisdictions are doing, come up with some best practices, not going to exclude anything of the recommendation that was there because I think you've got to take a look at everything, and I think, you know, globally if you can take a look at what's working in other jurisdictions, who can necessarily be opposed to that? So I think the ASD is the right move to take a look at that and hopefully we can address

that and get on with this. I can tell you in the recent election campaigns, last two election campaigns, signal synchronization which is a part of this obviously is a bit part of it. I think to a certain extent there needs to be better communications from this rank because I get people calling me when is Portage Avenue, the area that I'm in, you know getting it done and of course it has…be good to prove some of the stats, Mayor Katz has talked about the Kenaston area before all the construction with IKEA going on. There's some measurable results where you know, you can tell the difference so I think if this process is implemented properly, it really can make a difference and that's part of the ASD model. That's why we're moving to move there, to look at some best practices and make sure this is working for the City. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I echo many of the same concerns and comments that Councillor Swandel, Vandal and Fielding had. I can tell you that the number one issue in Charles wood and I should get a shirt made for this because of the volume of calls we get, is traffic and roads. And that is a top priority for people. The issue of a pedestrian corridor has been with the department in one area since November, since being elected. So, to me, this is a tip of the iceberg, and the biggest red flag to me of course was the overtime. Twenty thousand dollars on average per employee for overtime. If you compare that with police, who often spend a lot of their time in court, theirs is around 8 or $9,000 per year. So that's double, literally and that's…that's very significant and a significant red flag and as a person who came from a business planning background for clients, I can tell you that there would need to be some serious reallocation of resources. There was mention though made that there was…there were budget costs and or budget cuts and staff reductions. The Auditor actually does point out on page 14 that the financial management of the branch's operations is adequate. However, the financial management of the capital project needs significant improvement due to the branch not tracking actual costs. So what I can conclude from that is that we tie up resources that could be used elsewhere in the city, for projects that aren't getting completed on time, and when we look at construction costs, increasing at about an average of 8% per year, we're actually doing, making a, creating a bigger cost to the system. I think it's imperative that we look at what other cities do and who are using private sector to do this similar service? Who could do this locally? All those questions need to be answered and I think that ASD was designed, it was before my time as a Councillor but it was designed and set up to actually have the fortitude to move things like that forward because so often things get lost. We need to use that Committee to look creatively and to…how to allocate people to get the work done. Again, I think in many cases we…the piece on ASD, how many people do we hire in a year? And to me again, I refer back to my point of this being the tip of the iceberg. This is the tip of the iceberg in terms of perhaps some other Public Works kinds of issues. Maybe there's an opportunity for cross training. Employees that are sent home on a construction job because it's a raining, maybe they can be better utilized in this branch. So just exploring some of those questions and getting some of those answers either internally or externally, I think, is valid to our process. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz to close?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, it was enlightening to hear some of the comments and I'd just like to break this up to two categories as far as the audit. First of all, I commend and I thank the Auditor for this report, I think it shed a light where a lot of people didn't realize some of the problems that are being faced but there's two separate categories here. One is operations. And two is traffic synchronization and I think they must be separated. Council over three years ago moved forward to have traffic synchronization done over a five year period of time. We allocated $11.5 million. Part of the problem, Mr. Speaker, is we have electrical, mechanical controllers that are 40 years old. Almost as old as you and I, Mr. Speaker and that gives you a pretty good indication and they also, the new equipment, Mr. Speaker, is very difficult sometimes to mesh with the old, no question they're having a challenge. And if some of the Councillors who expressed concern had the opportunity to listen to the Director say, on that specific issue, it might warrant us talking to the private sector and seeing if they can assist in that specific component. No different, Mr. Speaker, than the Provincial Government does right now. When they're doing traffic lights, they farm it out to private sector quite often. It's not a big deal. It's been done all the time. That's the one area I think we all want to get the traffic synchronization done as quickly as possible. The other side is what really should concern everyone and that's the operational side and what was discovered on asking specific questions and I think Councillor Vandal and Fielding and Swandel pointed out some of them, is number one, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation that the resources are there, but it's the way they're being allocated. For example, there's two shifts, an 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. shift, a 4:00 p.m. to midnight shift. I guess on the surface it sounds okay. But you know what they found out? The majority of that overtime was taking place between 6:00 and 8:00 a.m. in the morning. So maybe there might be some logic for adjusting those shifts which is one of the recommendations and the department is moving forward on that. Number two, Mr. Speaker, because of safety standards, we have a situation when you go out to work, there has to be a group of two people. Makes sense, Mr. Speaker. But what's been happening with us, it's been two electricians. Well you don't need someone on the ground. They can be a technician not an electrician which would also save money so there are many things that we can do from an operational point of view and I'm very thankful for all this being pointed out. As was said earlier, Mr. Speaker, all of the recommendations were being embraced by the department, so we can utilize our existing resources

more efficiently and better. Unfortunately, some of it takes time to make the change we talked about to go to electrician, technician must go through the Provincial Government and we've been having those discussions Mr. Speaker for quite a while now. Hopefully that will prove fruitful. So Mr. Speaker, I think we should be moving this forward and I will support the motion. Thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker,. Can I ask that we vote on the two separately? (Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: All right, so what we'll do, we will…although there is one number, there are two Clauses and we'll vote on Recommendation 1. On 1, all those in favour? Opposed? Okay, on the No. 2? Okay, recorded vote. All those in favour, rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi and Smith

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 3. It's carried.

Mr. Speaker: Motion carried. All right. The Report on July the 15th, EPC, Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 15, 2011**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no standing down here, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS**

Mr. Speaker: All right, we have some motions before us. Motion No. 1, Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Eadie. Automatic referral, Motion No. 2, Councillor Smith and Councillor Eadie, automatic referral. Motion No. 3, Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Eadie, Municipal Boundary Redistribution, automatic referral, please. And Motion No. 4, Councillor Wyatt, Councillor Gerbasi, Public Commitment, automatic referral again to EPC.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Orlikow,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS all Councillors are elected to represent the people of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS specific issues arise which have a significant impact on all the people of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS Council Seminars may not provide all Councillors the opportunity to have input that represents the needs of the people they are elected by;

AND WHEREAS involving all Councillors in the decision making process will improve communication, ensure full public representation and enhance support for Council initiatives;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council creates Transportation Master Plan, Waste Management Plan, Shared Service Agreements and Infrastructure Funding Council Working Groups and the Working Groups are to be made up of Council as a whole with selected administration. The Working Group will meet regularly to receive updates, provide feedback and ensure all of Council is part of the planning process.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Smith,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS the Key to the City used to be a prestigious honour;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that to democratize this process, any member of Council shall be permitted to nominate worthy individuals for the Key to the City by motion at a full meeting of Council;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all future decisions regarding the issuance of Keys to the City be endorsed by a vote of City Council.

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

WHEREAS the Conference Board of Canada's forecast predictions for the growth of the City of Winnipeg have been accurate for the last number of years;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is running out of land in its suburban areas, resulting in more pressure from the development industry to expand into the Municipalities known as the Capital Region;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has a higher level of development standards and services when compared to the substandard requirements permitted in the Capital Region;

AND WHEREAS in recent years there has been pressure to extend City of Winnipeg municipal services, such as sanitary sewer and water into the Rural Municipalities of the Capital Region, and this will have a direct impact on the ability to accommodate future growth in both the City of Winnipeg and the Capital Region;

AND WHEREAS growth in the Capital Region, if serviced by City of Winnipeg services such as sewer and water, will undermine the goals of sustainable planning such as densifying growth preventing ex-urban sprawl and have a direct and negative impact on Winnipeg's services and infrastructure;

AND WHEREAS over $200 million of infrastructure dollars is being spent on new regional roads into the RM of Rosser, diverting said dollars away from badly needed infrastructure works that could have been conducted inside the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS Provincial governments of any political stripe, be it NDP or Conservative, have failed to address the issues of development and sprawl in the Capital Region by ensuring there is orderly and sustainable development;

AND WHEREAS the Mayor recently committed Council to fund $17 million in water and sewer services as part of the Centre Port venture, with much of said services being directly provided in to the Rural Municipality of Rosser, and yet no report has been provided to Council with regard to the source of said funds, the cost recovery (if any) to the City of Winnipeg and a share of Property Tax revenues (if any) from the future growth expected within the RM of Rosser;

AND WHEREAS if Rural Municipal lands now between the City of Winnipeg's existing boundary limit and the Perimeter Highway were to fall under the jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg, development would be allowed to occur in a more orderly and sustainable fashion, and with a higher level development standards;

AND WHEREAS any future development in the ex-urban lands that were previously part of the capital region should be subject to the full cost accounting which would include costs such as transit, fire, police, recreation and leisure services, and said costs be charged back to the development/developer(s);

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg call on the Province of Manitoba to bring into effect Municipal Boundary Redistribution by amending applicable legislation to conduct boundary realignment for the City of Winnipeg and Capital Region municipalities in order to change Winnipeg's existing municipal boundaries by extending it up to the Perimeter Highway.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,
WHEREAS under the system of municipal government, Council is supreme and approves all budgets and policy for the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS recently the Mayor has made a public commitment to fund $17 million of infrastructure works for the Centre Port project, on behalf of the City of Winnipeg, yet he has not attempted to obtain any approval and/or commitment for such a project from City Council;

AND WHEREAS the Mayor's commitment for Centre Port will require the City of Winnipeg to make the unprecedented decision to extend services to the Rural Municipality of Rosser, and yet no Council report or motion has been made available that outlines the source of funds for the said $17 million, the extent of the service extension to be facilitated by said funds, the cost recovery (if any) to the City for such an expenditure, and what, if any, revenue sharing agreement will be implemented between the City of Winnipeg and the RM of Rosser to ensure that Winnipeger's receive long-term benefits from development on its immediate boundary;

AND WHEREAS it could be argued that the Mayor's recent commitment to expand the Winnipeg Convention Centre has indirect Council endorsement by way of the established Accommodation Tax, however, in fact no Council report or motion has yet to be forthcoming that would formally approve and/or commit the City to such a project;

AND WHEREAS the failure to supply Council with a report or motion on the Convention Centre expansion ensures that Council is kept in the dark on matters that would potentially impact its borrowing authority, its existing annual subsidy arrangement for the Winnipeg Convention Centre, as well as outlining any impacts on the existing governance arrangement for the Winnipeg Convention Centre and City of Winnipeg's ownership of said facility;

AND WHEREAS both the Centre Port and Winnipeg Convention Centre projects may be very worthy and positive for our city, however should involve Council participation and decision making;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council establish a policy that the Mayor, or anyone acting on behalf of the Mayor or his office, can only make a public commitment and/or public announcement that will obligate the City of Winnipeg to fund a project or projects by first obtaining approval from City Council.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 3RD READING ONLY

Mr. Speaker: By-laws.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed. By-law No. 67/2010, By-law No. 68/2010 both as amended.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? One vote against. Motion carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 90/2011, 91/2011, 92/2011.

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

Clerk: By-law 90/2011, 91/2011, and 92/2011.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move the by-laws numbered 90/2011 to 92/2011 both inclusive be a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 90/2011 to 92/2011, both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 90/2011 to 92/2011 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, we have Question Period and ladies and gentlemen, I'll just want to remind you once again that this is not for personal…I hesitate to use the word "attacks" but we will certainly remind you that we'll keep this civil. Councillor Gerbasi.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Lately, rarely a day goes by that there isn't an editorial in the newspaper urging the City of Winnipeg to get on with finishing the rapid transit corridor to the U of M. The contentious discussions around the stadium recently have added more fuel to the fire and rightly so. We're going to have 33,000 people heading out to the new stadium at the U of M choking the local neighbourhood with their cars. The University hosts 40,000 people at its peak, making it almost equivalent to the size of the second largest city in Manitoba. There's no complete commuter bike route or rapid transit available as a truly viable alternative to the automobile. We all know that rapid transit investment will not only provide sustainable transportation, but will help revitalize our downtown and foster much needed infill development. This all adds up to social, environmental and financial sustainability. Frankly, this Council is becoming a laughing stock over this issue. Building Community Funds have been diverted from rapid transit to build everything from underpasses in Transcona, thank you Russ, water services, pipes going out to Rosser and who knows what else. We have seen new routes being discussed in the transportation plan but yet there is no funding identified and no time lines for completion identified. My question to the Mayor is this: When is the Southwest corridor going to be completed to the University and where is the money coming from to do so?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, first of all I thank Councillor Gerbasi for the question. Probably the (inaudible) time, but that's fine. Number two Mr. Speaker, I think the good Councillor knows better than to believe or support everything she reads in the paper because I know there are many things she has read which she doesn't agree with, so I guess you can choose whichever time you want to agree or disagree, but the realities are regardless of what the media may say, alright, we are completing from downtown to Jubilee, that's number one. And number two, it goes the rest of the way in the diamond lanes, and if you want to use the football stadium as an example, well Mr. Speaker, on a regular basis, there's a lot of people who go there University everyday, and unfortunately, I believe the coverage did not really accurately reflect what is available there. There is a great deal more parking available than has been identified. I can tell you I personally met with the President of the University and there is another 60 acres of parking that is available, so there really won't be a problem but sometimes people like to create something that doesn't exist, and Mr. Speaker, things sometimes move quickly and sometimes they move slowly, but the realities are, we all know right now that the transportation study is being done and it wasn't that long ago I believe that Councillor Gerbasi said nothing should happen until a transportation study is done period when it came to Kenaston. So I'd like to think she would at least like to wait for the transportation study to be complete Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Gerbasi: The fact that this…the second phase was recommended in 2005 and committed to verbally in 2009 makes it a little different than Kenaston, but I'm concerned to hear the Mayor indicate that he thinks Diamond Lanes…are you saying that you think Diamond Lanes are adequate and that there's enough parking, that the stadium is not an issue? Are you trying to say that you don't actually think it's that important that we proceed with the second phase? Because I thought that was something we committed to and it was certainly approved in 2005 in principle with the Rapid Transit Task Force to complete it to the University and then again announced at the time that the first phase was announced to be done by 2014. Are you reneging on that commitment in those words that a Diamond Lane is good enough?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, yours truly doesn't renege. I can't even spell the word to be very frank with you Mr. Speaker. The realities are, what I'm saying is Councillor Gerbasi is pointing to football and parking as the issue. I'm saying that's not the issue Mr. Speaker. And some Councillors on this floor have actually given the impression to the public and the media that the buses just stop dead at Jubilee, they don't go any further which, of course, is anything but the truth. They cross over to Pembina and they continue all the way down to the University, and also Mr. Speaker, I was enlightening the Councillor, something she was not aware of, that there is an additional 60 acres of parking that for some unknown reason has not been mentioned by anybody. So just trying to share some factual information which I think the Councillor would appreciate having, but if not, then I won't do that in the future, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, last question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the information and I'm not…certainly have listed a whole number of other issues beyond parking but you know the issues I'm talking about are funding and time lines, and I'm still waiting to have…the reason I keep asking the question every meeting since the election, and I will continue to until I get an answer about a) where is the funding since we've diverted it somewhere else, and b) where is the time lines. I'm still waiting for those questions to be answered. That's why I keep asking the question Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I'm not aware of any money that we have diverted and maybe the Councillor could shed some light on that. If she may be referring to the Province or other levels of government, please feel free to say so. But the facts of life are, is that we stated a long time ago that the money was never there in the first place. It's still not there, but as I've said on many occasions, we will continue to work hard to find that money, and I'm hoping Councillor Gerbasi will join me in that quest to find the money, make it available. As we know this cannot be done by one level of government. It takes all three levels of government participating jointly in this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. So, what's been happening, and this is the reality I'm facing in the Mynarski Ward, is I have parks where there is bushes that need to be cleared away and I'm utilizing Land Dedication Reserve money. Recently, there was an article by Gordon Sinclair that talked about the lack or the inability to get flowers planted in the medians of Main Street while at the same time they are being done on Portage Avenue and Pembina Highway, which are also significant streets just like Main Street; a historical street that deserves to have good-looking flowers. I have a peanut park in the north end which actually has been declining in its maintenance and how it looks because the cycle is not working when they replaced…they got rid of the dedicated person who kept that park clean and looking really good. He is not there and they rotate it…garbage will sit there for two weeks, or three weeks. Or…well, there are some community people who do clean them up but there's lots of weeding and stuff that's going on. So these are symptomatic things related to my question and my question is, when are we actually going to fund the Parks Department to the level and restore the cuts that we have actually done to this department?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you I thank the Councillor for the question. First of all I think the Councillor is very much aware of exactly what took place on Main Street, Mr. Speaker. The realities are the North End BIZ did the planting last year and this year they decided not to do it just like other BIZ's do do it. So that's number one, so let's just put that on the record. The other scenario is if there are concerns, concerns exist regarding parks in any Councillor's area, and you really cared about it, I wonder why you'd wait a month until the next Council meeting as opposed to bringing it up. I never received a phone call from Councillor Eadie. I would have been happy to talk to the Department. As a matter of fact, I've said on many occasions we don't have a Parks Department any more Mr. Speaker. That's number one, so for accuracy there is no Parks Department. Problem is we got rid of it. It's now many different departments that do different responsibilities. But if the Councillor cares about peanut park where I used to play when I was a kid, I'd be happy to follow up on that. But if no one tells till the floor of Council in question period, it's hard to basically get the answer, so maybe next time, maybe next time, you'll be happy to share that with me and I'll get on it right away. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Second question Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. The facts are that people who live in my ward as well as many wards around this City see the cuts every day and there's no calling the people who maintain our parks and asking them to do it when they're over extended and they say to you, and I've had the discussion, we cannot do it. Last year, the flowers on Main Street were maintained actually by the City of Winnipeg on an emergency basis because the BIZ did not want to put their employees in jeopardy, the Green Team in jeopardy, a work place safety and health hazard, and I think that the businesses that do the planters in the medians should consider their work place safety and health. So my follow up question again is there was a question last Council meeting about the…its cuts. What's happening is the parks are not being maintained properly and I'll ask again. When will we restore the cuts and actually provide enough money for them to maintain the parks the way they were a decade ago?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, and I know that Councillor Smith will back me up, when I was elected we were doing tree pruning once every 37 years Mr. Speaker. There were cuts, legitimate cuts. We're not making cuts Mr. Speaker. We've been catching up, and as has been pointed out on many occasions, specifically when it came to park maintenance and

street cleaning as well as line painting, that we have fallen behind because we made a conscious decision to help our neighbors and we allocated resources to fight the flood. Every Councillor in this Chamber should be cognizant of that including Councillor Eadie. Now, if he's telling me, because I've seen them catch up and I've seen the grass cut in the parks and it's sitting there, so I know they've caught up. I go to many parks. If Councillor Eadie is saying they haven't caught up yet, then I'd be happy to follow up on that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Last question Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. It's just…the question really is, they cut the grass, they are no longer cleaning the equipment in the parks because they don't have enough people I guess, I don't know why, but the rotation is just cutting grass and doing a bit of trimming. We had people from Arkansas come and clean Pritchard Park, and pull the weeds out of the sand and everything like that, so again, I'm just putting out that reality and again, would we please, when we're coming into our next process after prorogue month, we're going to be starting into our budgets, let's address the real problem here, because it does exist. Yeah they're cutting the grass but that's about it.

Mayor Katz: I don't know if there is a question there but I would very much love to know the names of the people from Arkansas so we can thank them Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes thanks Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor, this time of year we can see very clearly the state of our infrastructure. It's very clear the state of our residential streets, our collector streets, our lanes, our sidewalks which are crumbling, a lot of the mature neighbourhoods as called in OurWinnipeg, and the fact that we're not able to keep up with this infrastructure deficit. We know from 2009 numbers that just the local streets and collector streets alone you're looking at over a hundred million dollars in under-funding on an annual basis. We know even if we add the PST tomorrow from the Provincial Government, the fact is we still would not have enough money to address even half of the infrastructure deficit facing the City. In light of that fact, Mr. Mayor, and in light of the fact that we know that 12 million this year is being spent on local streets yet next year we're going to project to have it down to 10 million and 10 million for the next five years when we should be spending upwards of 100 million. Knowing the shortfall in funding, knowing the challenge we face with our infrastructure deficit, knowing that even tomorrow if the Province waved a magic wand and gave us the money we asked for the last Council meeting it wouldn't even meet half the challenge we're facing. Would you be prepared to undertake a process now, working with Council to find a way to address at least the local street, lane liability that exists today in our infrastructure deficit? The hundred million dollar cost that we as a City would come together to work together to find a way for funding that, to pay for that. And it would take a hundred million off, almost probably over 400 million now infrastructure deficit on an annual basis. We still have a 300 million shortfall but it would be a good start and it would show good faith to the other levels of government. Would you be prepared to do that rather than wait until the Capital Budget when we rush it through and there is no time to have that discussion?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I thank Councillor Wyatt for his comments and his question. First of all Mr. Speaker, if tomorrow we found that magic wand and waved it and we got that 1%, I think you would see a major, major…I know you'd see a major improvement. We'd be able to rest a lot of our problems. That's number one. But more importantly, I believe it's incumbent upon the Mayor and Council on a daily basis to seek solutions to the challenges that we face. So I am more than happy to pursue and have more discussion on that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Second question Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: When and how would we have that discussion? Oh, alright. When and then I'll ask how.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned, on that type of issue, I'm available later today after Council, so Mr. Councillor Wyatt could come speak to me and we can have discussions and see how…what his thoughts are and how to address that type of issue and, Mr. Speaker, as far as the…I'll give him a bonus question…as far as the how is concerned, I think that would be a joint decision by everybody. Everybody here should have an input on whatever and share their ideas whatever they might be Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Last question, with a bonus.

Councillor Wyatt: So you are agreeing that we undertake a process which will come forward with recommendations to this Council prior to the Capital Budget, that we endeavour to do that, to try to address this question because it's something that's affecting every one of us.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I am agreeing to the fact that all Councillors should have the opportunity to have input into the solution to our problems. That could be exactly what Councillor Wyatt just said or it could be another form, but the bottom line is we all have to have input to address this.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Mayor Katz. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Mayor Katz, I've read the press release regarding the City's Active Transportation Network Launches Campaign. My quick question to you is do you believe this is appropriate or appropriate to help educate drivers on how to use a traffic circle?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Orlikow, I think we should endeavor to use every means available to educate the public on traffic circles and this is certainly one of them and there are many others. The realities are unlike many other cities or countries, many people in our city just don't quite get traffic circles even though we've had them here for many years. I think it's incumbent upon us to do everything we can, and that certainly is one of the tools and I believe there are many more available as well.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Orlikow: Mr. Mayor, I don't want to put you on the spot. I've checked for all of these other tools because it's pretty well a daily call and the promise that I made to the Ward that we would educate and provide that education. The time that I tried to do it myself, that was before the web page came up and before the Highway Traffic Act people signed off on it, and I was warned very clearly that I should not send out education pieces that aren't authorized by the City of Winnipeg. Now we have that opportunity. That has been on our web page for awhile and it can be sent out and if there are any mistakes the City of Winnipeg will be liable for it and not the individual Councillor. So that information can go out. However, the same problem is happening here that in my humble respect, it happened the first time. We are targeting our marketing or our information to cyclists. This targets cyclists. It targets people who are, for example, Active Transportation Network Launches Campaign. Well, do you think that's going to drive a driver to go, oh that's how they're going to do…that's the education for the traffic circles I've been waiting for. No. Traffic circles are buried way down there in a little bar and that's all that we have right now. M.P.I. did their 30 second pieces. I know schools have picked up the slack and they did some presentations in schools last year because we weren't doing it, but now I'm left that this is what we are going to offer from the City to help educate people on traffic circles. I'm hoping that, the question is, that we can get more assistance to get better education out there. This doesn't suffice. Mayor, would you be willing to work with myself through a meeting to get some better education for traffic circles specifically.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Orlikow, as I said this would be one of the tools. If Councillor Orlikow has some ideas about other tools we can put in the tool box to educate them, I'd be more than happy to sit down with him. I would have wished because I know I get phone calls on traffic circles. Obviously he does. Why we never got together earlier, I don't know, but yeah, my door's open and we certainly could. If there's some good ideas, I would fight along with Councillor Orlikow to get these implemented to do everything we can to educate all our citizens because if there is anything we did wrong, that would have been number one. We certainly did not communicate and enlighten them exactly what traffic circles were and how they work as opposed to waking up one day in the morning and seeing the circle and not knowing what it's all about. I'd be happy to do it Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mayor Katz. Any further questions for Question Period? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Just quickly, I've heard a number of comments here today regarding cuts. In my time here, I've seen our budgets both on the revenue and the expense side increase by more than inflation and growth combined. I'm not sure where…and that's every year and I believe it goes back to even before my time, back when they were even doing the reductions in taxes, there were still increases in the budget at those times. So I'm not sure where this term "cuts" comes from. I'm wondering if the Mayor can enlighten us as to how we can have budgets that show

increased spending that exceeds inflation and exceeds the City growth but yet we still have people who believe that there are cuts.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I think Mr. Speaker that may be one of those trick questions okay. The facts are Mr. Speaker, we can't. We have increased our budget consistently. We will continue to do so. We often know that, you know, individuals have their own feelings, their own thoughts and they are entitled to share them, whether they are a hundred percent accurate or not really is irrelevant. On the floor of Council you have dialogue, but from my point of view I can tell you, I don't know of a budget that we've ever done where the number one premise was no cut to front line services. So the answer is I cannot tell Councillor Swandel how that could be accomplished. It's beyond me.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Swandel: On a separate matter, I noticed recently there was an announcement from the City of Ottawa regarding a $600 million commitment to light rail from their Provincial Government to fund light rail for the City of Ottawa. Can you give us some sense? I know you're a great advocate of light rail. Can you give us some sense of how your discussions are going with the Province given that Ottawa is a city of about 800,000 people? We're a city of about 700,000. We see a commitment there of 600 million provincially to Ottawa. What's the problem here with getting a commitment?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: As Councillor Swandel is aware of, there was an announcement of a significant investment in light rail transit. I can tell you I met with the Mayor of Edmonton and all their investments are going into light rail transit. I had the opportunity to travel to some smaller cities just recently. 240,000 people, light rail transit. I guess every government has its priorities Mr. Speaker. I cannot speak for the Provincial Government of Ontario. They decided this was a priority and they are making that investment and God willing, that will happen here too and we can have light rail transit just like Vancouver and Calgary and Edmonton and Toronto and Montréal and Ottawa, et cetera, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker: Last question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Back to my original question just supplemental to that. Given the concerns that we've heard today about work not happening in some parks and around and knowing that the budgets have in fact not been cut, should we also be looking at an ASD review process for that service unit as well to try and find a better way of getting the services done and a better use of the dollars, because apparently in some areas it's not getting done. Using the review process I think would be helpful. Would the Mayor consider that?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm always open minded to listen but I'll be very frank with you. Prior to the recent election I gave some serious consideration, and it's still on the table for discussion purposes only. Whether or not we made a mistake when we basically eliminated the Parks Department and put several departments which caused confusion and you know, there are several things you can look but I do have my thoughts that maybe that might have been a mistake and we should consider having a Parks Department. I know I actually discussed it with some of the Councillors here, I guess that's about nine or ten months ago about a Parks Department, and I think that might have some merit. Are there other options that you might want to look at? We can always look at options, but that was something that I did think about back then and I still think it should be something that we should look into it further Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for question period? Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just a quick question for His Worship. My question has to do with active transportation in the Exchange District. And there's a lot of residential development happening on Waterfront Drive and throughout the Exchange and the Downtown Mr. Speaker, and some wonderful active transportation routes that are being built within our Exchange District. So my question is, Mr. Speaker for the Mayor, there is currently an active transportation route being built on McDermot east of Main Street between Rorie and Waterfront Drive, and there is a stretch of sidewalk there. The active transportation route is going to go forward Mr. Speaker, but Public Works has informed me that due to budget constraints, that the sidewalk is not going to be built. Is the Mayor, Mr. Speaker, and this question is on behalf of my residents within the Exchange District, they'd like to know from the Mayor Mr. Speaker, is he committed to ensuring that the monies are going to be there in 2012 to build that connectivity within the Exchange District as part of this A.T. transportation route on McDermot Avenue between Rorie and Waterfront Drive.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Councillor for the question and I certainly will take it under advisement. I'll be happy to look into it and get back to him. The facts are I know that when we allocated the dollars for active transportation that some of the work that was done unfortunately did not qualify for some of the other government funding and maybe that's what caused this. I'm not aware of that. It's the first I've heard about the sidewalk issue, so I can assure Councillor Pagtakhan that I will follow up on that and get back to him.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes. Through you to the Mayor. A number of weeks ago there was an open house for the Transportation Master Plan. I couldn't attend it because of a previous commitment. I requested…I asked my assistant to contact the Director and ask the Director to set up a meeting with the staff working on it to get briefed on it and to give some input from my side, and I was told that they are not in a position to provide briefings to individual Councillors on the open house material. You are welcome to attend the open house which of course I couldn't attend. So, I requested that if I could be briefed, again, and told no. We now know the CAO has indicated that a seminar will be held once he's instructed to hole a seminar. Is it possible, you know, we have resources to hire back retired engineers to participate in this process. We have resources to hire consultants to devise this transportation master plan. Is it possible that individual Councillors, because I know other Councillors have requested this, to be able to get a meeting to speak with staff about the Transportation Master Plan because right now we're being denied that.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Wyatt, it's my understanding that a request came forward and that a Council Seminar would be held so that everybody could voice their concerns, give their thoughts, their opinions, and I believe that was actually taking place. I'll be happy to follow up and find the date but that was my understanding to get all the Councillors together and to have a Council Seminar. And I was fully supportive of that and still am. I will follow up to find out when that is taking place.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I appreciate that. However, if we want to obtain information and to have input ahead of time as members of the public have now had a chance to have input, is it not possible…I can't recall a time being told "no, you cannot meet with our staff," and that's what was said, and is it possible…I don't want to say that there is some sort of gag order. I don't think there is. Maybe there is just miscommunication, so is it possible to lift that so that we can have a meeting?

Mayor Katz: First of all Mr. Speaker, you can't lift something that doesn't exist. That's number one. Number two, is that anything is possible and if that is a request coming from Councillor Wyatt I'd be happy to follow up on it and get back to him.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Last question, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: There's one minute left.

Councillor Eadie: Yes thank you Speaker Nordman. I just think it might be a quick question I'll ask maybe of the person in charge of the Standing Committee, but my question is will the new garbage plan allow for a more competitive bidding process for contracting out bulk waste collection and allow for some social good as part of the delivery system for the bulk waste?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that when we go through any process we endeavour to make sure we have as much competition as possible to make sure that we're getting the biggest bang for the taxpayers' dollar. That certainly would always be my goal. If there is something out there that makes Councillor Eadie believes that's not the case, I'd be happy to sit down with him and let him enlighten me but that is always our goal. Always will be our goal.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? We'll move to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED JUNE 27, 2011**

Councillor Steeves: Regarding June 27, 2011.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie, one. Any others? Seeing none, all those in favour of 2 and 3? Opposed? Carried.

Item 1 – Off Road Vehicle Enforcement Program

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Just briefly by way of introduction for I will say for some reason my system here will not display the report on my computer so I'm flying blind to a certain degree I've seen it before obviously but I'll just lean over my little friend's shoulder here from time to time. The report is…come out of Council; it's coming back to Council by virtue of a report that was originally requested by virtue of a motion. A lot of discussion back and forth that actually went to Standing Committee, up to EPC then back to Standing Committee, back up to EPC and then here, in terms of its route. The…I think discussion has been fair enough in terms of the direction behind it. I think folks may be the one highlight I might make about the report that I would alert people to it if they're not already familiar with it is that in certain parts of the city in the southeast and southwest of the city and in the west of the city and to a lesser degree in the northwest of the city, there are areas where the rules are different than the balance of the city proper. So some amendments coming forward that attempted to address some of those concerns but at the end of the day, the motion or the recommendation is that we request a report back authorizing the police service to give us some ideas and some options with respect to the limited use of off road vehicle in the City of Winnipeg, bearing in mind always that there are differences and I will highlight and underline that there is also a history of use of these vehicles that is different in parts of our city as opposed other parts of our city that we have to be cognizant of. And radical change in that area will either a) not be known or potentially b) not be all that welcomed by residents who have private property, farms for example, and may see their rights changing drastically. Having said all of that, at the Executive Policy Committee meeting last where we had this repot in front of us, I have to say the regulation surrounding this area is not clear and that's probably understating the matter by a fair bit. In discussions with our Police Department and with our Legal Department, we still could not come up with a definitive answer as to who could do what and where in the city so, more diligence I think is required on that front to give people an adequate assessment of what is not going to go forward. Having said that I'll wait the comments of my friend.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I'm speaking to the motion that's on the floor that we'll be voting on is the one that comes from EPC where the original report was amended to reflect the concept that we could consider changing by-laws to reflect not allowing off road vehicles anywhere within the city boundaries and to get rid of the places that say that you can't, it is a very dangerous activity for it to be happening on city grounds weather you live right near the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg or you know, in the middle of the city, the point here is that driving these kind of vehicles in a city limits is not a safe thing to do and we are talking about the actual use of off road vehicles on publicly-owned land. Not…we're not talking about privately own land here. Privately owned land allows…you don't even have to insure a snowmobile if you're only operating on your private land. So this has nothing to do with operating off road vehicles on people's private property. This is about on public property. And so when the amendment came along that would say we would consider these possibilities, could consider doing what was really the recommendation from the Police, the Winnipeg Police Department, which was saying that the actions they were going to take in looking at amending the laws and the regulations, that it would ban, in most circumstances, off road vehicles within the City limits. It did allow for in emergency situations to operate snowmobiles and so on. But it said it would do and so I'm speaking to this motion that changed the whole…what I say is actually change the intention of the original motion that was passed 3-1 at the Standing Committee on Protection and Community Services and so I would just implore up on all of you to if we vote down this particular motion, the report that originally comes from the Standing Committee which really addresses the issue and people have you know, been injured and have died and I talked to a cousin of the person who died in that snowmobile accident, then yeah, accidents happen even if we disallow and accidents happen on streets but the point here is is that this is the kind of activity that we shouldn't be experiencing…shouldn't be really participating no matter where you live in the city, within the city boundaries it shouldn't happen and so let's stand down this…requesting that we stand down this motion, vote against it and then accept the original report. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to rise…from taking advice from the Clerk, the motion that was amended at EPC I cannot support. I can support the motion that came out of the Standing Committee which has voted 3-1 in favour of this with the Chair voting against. The fact is Mr. Speaker, from what I've been told from the Clerk is that when this motion…if this motion is voted down today by Council from the EPC motion, then any member of Council would…can rise. I would be prepared to do that, and move the original recommendation out of the Standing Committee of Protection and Community Services and that's the process the Clerk's informed me of. So that's my intend so I'm not voting against to oppose what's before us today voting against what was changed at the Executive Policy Committee. I want to make that very clear. This is one of those occasions, Mr. Speaker, where I think it is incumbent upon us to lead in terms of a change in the city. And a change where actually legislation and rules will change a culture. And there is a culture that still exists inside the city that goes back generations and it has to do with the fact that we are a winter city, has to do with the fact that you know, we are not a huge city, we're a large…one of the larger cities, in Canada; we're not massive with a culture that I can get on my snowmobile or my outdoor bike and I could ride out of the city and into the floodway or beyond and into other municipalities. There is that element. There is a view or a value that that still is okay, believe it or not. And you know, that culture and that…those ideas, Mr. Speaker, are hitting head on with the fact that we are a growing city. We are a city that's expanding ever more and more into the periphery of the city. It's…it conflicts Mr. Speaker, with the fact that the technology of this equipment has changed so much that now a snowmobile can go as high as 180 miles an hour. You know, you can push them faster than you can push an automobile. The fact is Mr. Speaker, the technology is not safe to using inside the City of Winnipeg and it's not as if Mr. Speaker, you have to go hundreds of kilometers away to be able to access some of the finest, groomed trail networks in North America. They're just outside of the city limits, Mr: Speaker. Now it was raised at the Committee that maybe we should be flexible, that maybe we should allow for, at EPC that we should allow for drop off areas on the floodway and then be able to ride on the floodway. Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, if somebody's not prepared to put their snowmobile on a trailer and drive it to a drop off area outside of the city, they're not going to do it even if it's at the floodway. As a matter of fact, it will even be more in centre Mr. Speaker to get on the snowmobile wherever they live and drive to that point and ride down the floodway. We shouldn't be in the business, Mr. Speaker of providing drop off areas or snowmobile paths. No other levels of government actually is, the Province you can argue maybe indirectly is because of the fact that through the registration of the off road vehicle they collect certain amount of the fee, they pass it on to snowman, Manitoba who goes out and uses that money with volunteers to groom and to run the entire groomed trail network in this province. Mr. Speaker, we're talking about RFPing out arenas. We think we don't have the resources to run, city-run arenas for kids to skate yet now we have resources to start building drop off areas for snowmobilers and for those who can afford a $20,000 sled and a trail. Mr. Speaker, I would argue that we have to make this change, that this is significant. And I would add that the Winnipeg Police Service who've done an excellent job on this report are a 100% in support of the original recommendations that came out of the Standing Committee and unfortunately Chief McCaskill was not at EPC but he was at the Standing Committee and he spoke eloquently about the need to make this change. The importance from the officer's point of view for enforcement that there is a clear line drawn in the sand that you can snowmobile here or in the snow, you can snowmobile here and not over there. That all citizens of the city are treated equally whether you live in a semi-rural area that's still inside the city or whether you live in a densely populated area. The need to update the by-laws which was referenced before. Nobody is disagreeing with that, Mr. Speaker. Everyone agrees on that point, the need to update the by-laws with the laws that exist but Mr. Speaker, a serious tragedy occurred, a tragedy occurred in January that you could argue, some may argue was a fluke. I don't think so. I think it was a matter of time and I think Mr. Speaker, it's probably a matter of time again for it to happen again if we do nothing and we prevaricate. I say let's support what the Winnipeg Police Service wants. They want to ensure that the use of ORVs snowmobiles and ??? inside the city of Winnipeg are not permitted. That is the clear message from the Winnipeg Police Service. Now, why would we be saying to our officers we know better? Sorry guys and ladies, we know better than you. We're not the one's out doing the enforcement. We're not the one that's dealing with the constituents you're calling about this. We are, indirectly, we get the initial call but they go out and do the leg work, they go and do the hard work, they do the talking, they go do the enforcement but we know better than them Mr. Speaker, to be able to tell them that no maybe we will ban the use of ORV's inside the city, maybe we won't. We're not sure but thanks for your advice. Mr. Speaker, I think we have to be able to send a message, now it was said at the Committee that we're a winter city, we should be encouraging that. Absolutely, Mr. Speaker. But why are we not having a snowmobile right down in the mid of the Red River and down in the Assiniboine you know, maybe that's what we should be doing, and let's see what happens Mr. Speaker, for those who live near rivers or back on our rivers and those who represent those constituents who've lived back on the rivers. You know, Mr. Speaker, there is room to promote this and I mentioned it at EPC, I mentioned it at the Standing Committee as ice snowmobile from time to time and when I was younger I even snowmobiled more and I did it with inside the city, breaking the law Mr. Speaker, but it was on a 1972 rap that could go 30 miles an hour at best, Mr. Speaker, at best. And the technology's changed. It's just changed Mr. Speaker, and we have to realize that and we have to realize we have a city its changing rules. So I'm emphatically encouraging this Council. I know that there's some times…and I would remind that EPC was not a 100% united on this. There was a divide there and I would encourage those members on EPC who know this is the right thing to do to not support the recommendation out of EPC and it encourages the Mayor to stand firm with his conviction that he's told me that he supports the ban not to vote for this recommendation and uphold the original committee report where the original, the Councillors, three out of the four voted

and support the Chief because he made the case and it made sense. And that's really what I'm calling for here, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking for us to show leadership and to support the Police on an item which I think makes sense. It's not a right to drive a snowmobile Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege. It's a privilege to drive your car, Mr. Speaker. But the fact of the matter is we're not taking away any rights away here. We're still giving (inaudible)…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steen moves an extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: And those are my comments, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Havixbeck

Councillor Havixbeck: He was first. Councillor Swandel was first.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: wasn't going to speak on this until I heard Councillor Wyatt speak. But I thought he was at EPC but apparently I was mistaken.

Councillor Wyatt: I was there.

Councillor Swandel: We must have been at two different meetings then Mr. Speaker, because when the Police made representation at the meeting, they said their original recommendation was the way it was because of the way the question was posed purely from a police perspective we are to do enforcement probably would be the best recommendation. They went further to say that they believed there would be an ongoing process that would drill down on what the by-laws would eventually say and taken into consideration, off road vehicles and their entire context, not just from the Police perspective. That's what I heard sitting at that meeting. Nobody made suggestions or nobody said that we should go and there's people that suggested that you could have drop off centres. Nobody made recommendations to spend money on drop off centres. The conversation was more about the fact that we do have rural and nature communities in our city and that perhaps we should look at the laws being different for our rural communities and our neighbourhoods or rural policy areas and the neighbourhood policy areas. Pretty straight forward, pretty sensible. You know, it's unfortunate we had this terrible incident that initiated this. Overall we don't have a major problem with ski-doos, other off-road vehicles in the city from time to time. We do get complaints because people go down the back of homes of, back on to the Perimeter Highway, more noise and safety issues. And you know, so let's take a comprehensive look at this, Don't throw the baby out with the bath water. Do what's right. We live in you know, if we want to stick on the snowmobile side, we do live in a winter city and there's a lot of people in our city who enjoy that type of recreation. So you know, yes we need to do something to clarify what the rules are, to strengthen the rules to ensure that the safety is of the utmost importance but at the same time, we also need to be sensible in our approach too.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just reviewing again, the map on page 15 of the report that shows the red areas and Charleswood-Tuxedo is a large red area of that. I think that the motion came out of EPC because I think there was a lot of confusion about wording and I don't think that there was adequate public consultation. First, the direction was to the Police Department to come back with a report. So their emphasis was on safety. This isn't a recreation topic though and there was no involvement by any other department so I think that piece of it is essential. If you look at the map and if you look at well, I can only speak for Charleswood-Tuxedo but if you look at Charleswood and you look at that area south of Wilkes and you stood in the middle of it. You could almost see the Portage, Portage La Prairie. I mean this is rural, this is agricultural based and yes the City is changing but I think there needs to be some balance and some rules and maybe a look at some other cities and what they've accomplished in this because we can't be the only city who has this to take under consideration. I can tell you that this has garnered little or people are not paying attention to this. I've heard from maybe a handful of constituents and they are on both sides of the fence of this, so I'm hearing people concerned about the safety, wanting to go have signage, some other safety, some other enforcement and I've also heard from people that have said, we moved here because we can ride our snowmobiles or we can ride our dirt bikes or whatever else they ride in the area and sometimes, yes, there is cross over there. People riding in ditches. We have ditches in Charleswood, that's what makes us unique and so when we see the cross over of. At EPC the conversation was so confusing and there was such a lack of clarity, for example, the first item is saying that it is legal anywhere within the City of Winnipeg, yet when we ask the Police whether we could ride on private property, they said yes. Well, if some things are illegal, it's illegal. I can imagine how they can be something different so then the whole debate about private property comes up and whether or not you can cross over from one person's property to another and what form of permission is going to be acceptable if the police officer stops somebody riding on private property, I just think that there is so much convolution in here that they need to have somebody come back and give

them more thorough report is more essential and to consult with people who live in those areas and find out what is going to be acceptable and what isn't. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further comments? Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just for clarification, sometimes I think it's difficult to find that grey area sometimes things are black and white, as was mentioned; I always felt that this would be a situation that could be very difficult to accomplish anything black or white. You either can or you can't or by the same token as was mentioned earlier by several other Councillors. There was a lot of confusion within all the departments about what is in different rules and I'm a little surprised with Councillor Wyatt's comments because I was of the impression that he was supportive of this because he was the one that pointed out after talking to the department that no matter what happens here, okay, more information will be put together and then it will come back to Council, what's going on right now is we're giving the WPS the opportunity to go out there and give their recommendation as Councillor Havixbeck pointed out. We certainly talked about public consultation. Is there any Councillor here who doesn't believe public consultation is important? God, I hear that every day, Mr. Speaker. So I don't know what's changed, Mr. Speaker but all that was happening is letting the Police do their due diligence, come back with what their specific recommendations are, look at other things that may or may not be able to become reality and then it has to come back to Councillor no matter what. Nothing's been decided here today. That certainly was my understanding. I believe it's everybody else's and I was…and you'd heard it be Councillor Wyatt because he's the one who told us that. So I just want to put that on the record, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Yeah, thanks again Mr. Speaker. Good discussion and I think symptomatic of some of the confusion out of group that exists around this issue and a horrible circumstance that perhaps gave rise to this discussion. But it has, I think, at least had the benefit of opening up an important discussion this city needs to have. I did just want to be clear, it is illegal to drive an off road vehicle on city streets. That's not allowed. So just in case anybody was of the impression that you could do that. You can't. You can't hop on your snowmobile and just whip down Pembina Highway as you see fit. I'll tell you what though, once you get beyond that into the ditches and out into some of the exurban areas in our city. The regulation surrounding this issue is incredibly complex and unclear. Again, Councillor Wyatt was not at the Executive Policy Committee and I wish he had been there because if he had been there, then he could've…was he? Oh sorry, I thought he wasn't. But the…I don't know. I couldn't see the handsome devil. Yeah, okay, sorry I apologize, I stand correct. I couldn't see the handsome devil I guess behind me. My impression was though is that based on the Police presence that was at the meeting there is that the position of the Police Department was a lot less clear than was represented by Councillor Wyatt. In fact, with respect to the tragedy that occurred, it wasn't in one of these red areas, the aforementioned red areas, it was in one of the areas that we would've assumed automatically through provincial statue that it would be illegal. But I want to just…part of the problem here and I'd ask all Councillors to consider the prescriptive nature of the original recommendation is that all we're doing is we're saying that instead of saying that would consider, we're saying that could consider and Item a) below says, "eliminate the ability to legally use ORV anywhere inside the City of Winnipeg" and it talks about natural disaster events such as blizzards. That's a fairly prescriptive direction to give to anybody who is writing a report. We had a discussion and everyone I think agreed at the meeting in that in residential areas, this should not be Red River, Seine River in the middle of the City of Winnipeg and I think that's fairly clear. Councillor Havixbeck made a good observation at the Executive Policy Committee Meeting. I mean, if the rules say it's illegal to use heroin inside the City of Winnipeg, if that's clear, is it then legal to use it on your private property? Because incredibly that was a representation that was made to us by part of our public administration which to me seems counterintuitive and the best case scenario is that it is going to lead to all sorts of confusion if even this part of the motion goes forward with that type of direction. I mean, let's be honest, if you are a snowmobile owner anywhere in the City of Winnipeg, and the Council passed a motion asking for a report, it's only a report at this stage, bear in mind, but stated…come on Thomas, stated that the recommendations to Council to modernize the By-law that would eliminate the ability to legally use ORV anywhere inside the City of Winnipeg. If you were one of these people that lived in one of these red areas, how would you know that you could then use your own snowmobile on your own private property which apparently is the rules?. That's a very, very confusing message to send at this stage. And Councillor Havixbeck is right. It's kind of an unfair message to say if indeed people are still allow to legally use their snowmobiles on their quarter section of land that exists in St. Norbert next to Labarrier Park. All that we are saying and all we're suggesting by virtue of the recommendation is let's just leave this open and I have every confidence that our Police Department and the Legal Department are going to come back to this Council with an untangled assessment of all of the Provincial Legislation that currently exists around this area and states quite clearly what we can and cannot do with respect to this. I'll say this. I don't know what our rates are by virtue of By-law at this moment. I am not certain what power in fact we do have over top of the Highway Traffic Act or the Off Road Vehicles Act. I don't think anybody on this Council knows. Oh, great. Apparently Councillor Eadie does know so we're very, very lucky. We'll have to consider his input going forward. I can only say that it wasn't all clear to us at Executive Policy Committee, lesser beings though we are than Councillor Eadie it wasn't clear to our Legal Department at that stage with respect and our Police Department,

didn't seem perfectly clear at that stage nor should they because they're in the process of going into the report writing stage, when they come back, I think they will be clear. Let's remember what this was. This was a request from Council, fair enough, based on a motion made at Council going back and then coming up to through the committee structure. All we're saying is let's just open this up slightly to give our folks the right to do what they can do by virtue of the legislation that exists. If we leave it as it was, and we force our Winnipeg or our Police Department and our administration to come back with something that absolutely outlaws everything, what then is the issue of the fact that you can operate on your private property. What if, throughout the course of their discussions and their investigation, our Legal Department and our Police Department discover you know what, there are some things we can't do, I'll tell you what's going to happen. They're going to come back three months from now, with a report that says, "Sorry, we can't do exactly what you set us out to do in a prescriptive nature of the original report because of this. So it will come back and it will be an empty gun essentially and they're going to have to go back with I believe exactly this type of recommendation. We're opening it up a crack just to allow our people to do their job and we're all going to wind up at exactly I believe where we want to be on this issue, because I don't think there's a lot of disagreement around this table on where we want to get. All this is doing in my humble opinion is making a common sense alteration of the motion going forward to give our people the necessary leeway to do a full investigation on this. By the way, with respect to the issue at hand and the enforcement, the enforcement part is still in there. I believe the tragedy that occurred was primarily an issue of enforcement if. If we pass this as it's written today, we're still supporting the augmentation of the dollars to increase the level of enforcement and that is what the Police Department truly wants in this area, increase so they can do better enforcement.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steen moves extension.

Councillor Steeves: Let's just go ahead with it and not delay it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Steeves. Recorded vote on this. All right. All those in favour of the Clause, Off Road Vehicle Enforcement Program, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Smith and Wyatt

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

Mr. Speaker: Motion passed. All right. We will adjourn for lunch, ladies and gentlemen and we'll be back for 1:30.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
July 20, 2011, at 1:30 p.m.**

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves has joined us. We have a motion which is an automatic referral, No. 5, so that's from Councilor Steeves and Councillor Swandel.

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

**Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Steeves,
Seconded by Councillor Swandel,**

WHEREAS it is in the public interest and the interest of the City of Winnipeg to make taxi cabs more accessible to the public;

AND WHEREAS it is in the interest of the public and the interest of the City of Winnipeg to protect fire hydrant street side areas from illegal parking;

AND WHEREAS the City of Calgary, in cooperation with the City of Calgary Fire department has come up with a one year pilot project to explore the idea of taxis using fire hydrant space to wait or stand to optimize the use of street space, provided always that the vehicles are not left unattended, with anticipated benefits of:

1) better protected hydrant space from illegal parking
2) greater access to taxis
3) better and more efficient use of street space
4) increased public parking space.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg administration with the WFPS be asked to investigate and report back to the Standing Policy Committee on the viability of such a project, with safety being the primary consideration.

Mr. Speaker: No by-laws. And do we have Question Period for Protection and Community Services? (Laughter) One for the road? No. The Capital Region Partnership, maybe, no. All right. Having…seeing none. Will move on to the Standing Committee of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, Councillor Vandal.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JUNE 28, 2011

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move Items 1 to 3 of the Report dated June 28th as Consent.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Any comments, questions? Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Report for the July the 14th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JULY 14, 2011

Councillor Vandal: July the 14th. I'd like to move Item 1, Winnipeg Transit Automatic Fare Collection System Project.

Mr. Speaker: No questions? No comments? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: We have a Motion No. 6, Councillor Smith and Councillor Eadie, and it is an automatic referral back to the community or to the Standing Committee.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Smith,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS the City of Murcia, Spain offers its citizens a free life-time transit pass in exchange for a paid-up car in working order, to promote public transit use and to reduce the number of cars in the crowded city;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that City Council ask Winnipeg Transit to consider a similar initiative.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have a By-law? All right. Go ahead, Councillor Vandal.

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

Councillor Vandal: Okay, one second. I just…

Mr. Speaker: Ninety eight, I think. Is it 98?

Councillor Vandal: Here it is. I will move that rules be suspended and By-law 98/2011 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 98/2011.

Councillor Vandal: I move that the By-law No. 98/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law 98/2011.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 98/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question Period, Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Gerbasi.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just, in light of the decision that was just made with the pedestrian corridor; I was wondering if you feel there should be administrative reports going forward with every pedestrian corridor before it's approved to actually go in at a specific site. Like, should they just…is it acceptable to you for something to just go forward from a political motion to install a traffic device or do you think there should be some kind of oversight in terms of a non-political administrative report reviewing the safety and other factors around that? Just in general. I don't want to go back to the same debate but it is a valid question after what was voted this morning.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi, I'm confident that with the funding identified for the traffic corridor that at this point we're going to be talking with the Administration to do all things necessary to implement what was approved this morning, and I'm confident that if there are any safety issues that we haven't…that are not apparent, that the Administration will identify them for us and we will deal with it then.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Gerbasi: My next question is that given that Councillors are now using monies designated for parks and green space improvements in their wards to pay for traffic signals, do you support the notion of additional funding in the Capital Budget next year as a motion that I believe we moved at our committee to look into that for next year, that that really is a better course of action to have money in the general budget for these things based on the priorities set out for traffic reasons? That more money be available so that we don't have to resort to this? We've all been encouraged to resort to this and for some Councillors that isn't even possible, but I just wonder if you have any thoughts on that because there are implications from what was decided this morning.

Councillor Vandal: Well I think in terms of infrastructure funding and the whole Capital Budget is the discussion that we're going to have in early…I'm not sure when the Finance Chair is going to roll this out for 2012, but certainly we know there's a lot of issues that need to be addressed through the Capital Budget. It's quite…I guess based on what was approved over the five year period it is quite compressed and we know about our infrastructure deficit, so I think rather than say yes, I approve more money here, we have to look at the big picture, put it in context and see where the priorities are and move forward as a Council in that way.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. There is the solid waste plan coming probably in the Fall, well more than likely in the Fall, and I was wanting to… I'm wondering if consideration for the following will be given in there and that is, consideration of not having one contract to do bulk pick up with any one corporation, but to allow for a process to hire or contract with more than one supplier of the bulk pick up service for different areas of the City so that we're not sort of tied into what could be a disaster of one corporation. And secondly, in those processes for negotiating new bulk pick up contracts, will we give consideration to contracting with businesses that not only offer a good business case but also offer some social benefit to it?

Councillor Vandal: Well, the whole Recycling Waste Minimization Master Plan will be here in September, and certainly I think you've asked a similar question to the Mayor and I'll echo his comments. I'm in favour of a system where competition is rewarded and the more competition the better. That's, I think, a great way of getting the biggest bang for the buck, and yeah, I'm basically in favour of what you've asked for, but having said that, let's wait until the entire Waste

Minimization Strategy moves forward because I think that's got to be the key consideration that drives what we're doing. We want to get…we want to collect less garbage and do more recycling, more composting, more…put in the policies in place to produce less garbage and I think that's going to be the value that drives the plan. So, I agree with what you've said, but let's wait for the plan to come forward and then we'll get into the details of those issues that you've identified.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Eadie: Yes thank you for that very good and clear answer. Just a follow-up question is just simply, do you feel that there is a business case to have some social contract with a…well basically an organization or a company to provide a service that is also delivering a socially good service as well? Do you believe that that should be part of consideration in contracts?

Councillor Vandal: Well, I think that would have to be part of our procurement process at the City of Winnipeg, and we have to first of all…I'm not against what you said, I think it's certainly worth looking at. We would have to define what a good social service is and balance that against costs and in this instance the driving value is the minimization of garbage and the maximization of recyclables and other alternatives to garbage. So that has to be the driving value. But, I think it's worth looking at what you've mentioned in terms of social benefit. The challenge will be identifying that, quantifying that and dealing with our purchasing policy, our procurement policy and trying to come up with a policy that's reasonable and fair for everyone.

Mr. Speaker: Last question?

Councillor Eadie: Just slightly different. As the leader of the Public Works of our City, I'm asking you this question and that is, will you help champion the cause to involve all City Councillors in workshop type facilities before we actually bring the waste plan to the Council table to vote?

Councillor Vandal: Absolutely.

Mr. Speaker: Any other questions for Public Works and Infrastructure? Seeing none we'll move on. Standing Policy Committee for Finance. There's no report. No motions. No by-laws. Question Period for Finance? Seeing none, we'll move on to Standing Policy Committee for Downtown Development Heritage and Riverbank Management. Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED JULY 4, 2011

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker I'll introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 4 for the meeting of July 4th, 2011.

Councillor Wyatt: I'd like to stand down No. 2.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we'll vote on 1, 3 and 4. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 2 – Downtown Residential Development Strategy – Downtown Residential Development Action Plan

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll wait to hear what Councillor Wyatt or others have to say and respond at that time.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stepped this item down simply to speak to it. This came about, Mr. Speaker, back in 2006, the Downtown Housing Steering Committee, which I was chairing at the time, made a recommendation to Executive Policy Committee to do a downtown housing strategy with the intent of having a strategy to give us guidance in terms of incentives we need as well as and targets to drive more housing in the downtown. And with the recognition, Mr. Speaker, that for the renewal of the downtown to occur, that we need housing and housing, a large housing component indeed. It was argued at the time and I don't think that argument has changed that successful downtowns, typically have approximately 10% or more of the population of the city living in the downtown. So if you were

to take the City of Winnipeg, we're just under 700,000 people, so the argument would be just under 70,000 people should be living in the downtown. Well, if you read the report, you'll see that today, Mr. Speaker, by the end of this year, they're predicting that we'll have about 15,000 people living in downtown Winnipeg so we're quite a bit short of the target of what a successful, healthy, strong downtown would have. And so, the idea behind the strategy was to develop a plan that would put forth both targets, specific targets and ideas in terms how can we achieve that and look at the various neighbourhoods in the downtown, you know, the Exchange District, China Town, the area known between Broadway and Portage, the central business district, south of Broadway between Broadway and Assiniboine, the Central Park neighbourhood, the Old Market, Square Area or the Exchange District, east of the Main, to look at all these neighbourhoods Mr. Speaker and the target and to say okay, this is where we can drive housing stock up in these neighbourhoods and not overnight of course, but to do it over a number of years. The report before us outlines a number of initiatives the City's been working on. But it really doesn't take it any further. It doesn't push the envelope, Mr. Speaker. That we really needed to push with regards to this Housing Strategy. And if I'm use being the numbers from the report, Mr. Speaker, just to give you an example. It's projecting that the population increase between 2011 and 2020 in the next nine years is going to be about 4600 individuals in the downtown. So if you add that to existing population you're looking at approximately 5,000 or another total of about 20,000 people by 2020, living in the downtown. Now that's better than what we have today, Mr. Speaker, absolutely, it's an improvement, definitely. I don't argue that for one minute. However, if you were to look at the very same projections made in OurWinnipeg, which we just recently approved unanimously as you pointed out, Mr. Speaker, the growth in the City of Winnipeg is estimated to be 10,000 a year for the entire city over the next ten years, the Conference Board of Canada and so far they've been right on their projections, and so, based on that, we're looking at between now and 2020, about another 90,000 people. So, if we're almost at 70…700,000, be at 790,000. My argument, Mr. Speaker, without getting too complex is actually the share and the percentage of people who have been living in the downtown is shrinking. It's not keeping up with the growth that's going to be projected to happen in the rest of the city. So the strategy doesn't address and the strategy doesn't rise to the challenge of what we could be doing and that was the whole idea behind the strategy five years ago. Now, we were told, Mr. Speaker, that OurWinnipeg is a visionary document that is supposed to present a pallet for the future, painted and broad strokes. Don't get into too many specifics. Those are the sub documents, the individual documents, the Transportation Master Plan. All the other documents that fall underneath of it including the Housing Strategy. As a matter of fact, the argument of reason why the Housing Strategy never appeared till now is because of OurWinnipeg (inaudible). Well, Mr. Speaker, the document that's supposed to give the specifics doesn't. It doesn't give the targets that we should be trying to reach. It doesn't challenge us to say we can drive up housing in this neighbourhood or that neighbourhood and these are the properties that we could work with. That was the idea. That's why we hired a consultant out of Toronto to help us write this report, Mr. Speaker. And that's why ultimately, the staff of the city finished writing but the target, Mr. Speaker, is not there. There's no specifics. And, if we want to take the downtown and there's great things happening with downtown, Mr. Speaker. We have the entertainment district being the shed as it's called, being planned and talked about. It's coming alive. We have to ensure we keep the momentum here and we keep the pressure up. Now as was said at…you know, I don't know if he was misquoted but the Chair said, "Well, this proves that we don't need incentives anymore. We don't need to have these incentives anymore housing in the downtown because we're succeeding at what we're doing. Well, I would disagree. I think we're actually falling behind compared to the rest of the city. Mr. Speaker, we have to drive the housing up in the downtown if we want a sustainable, successful downtown. I agree that the incentive's in place and the report says that it should be temporary and I agree with that argument that they should be temporary, the problem is Mr. Speaker we're falling behind. We're not reaching where we should go in terms of making the downtown more vibrant with housing. There's a lot of good things in the report, Mr. Speaker. It would be wrong for me not to say there's you know ideas in terms of parking lots, parking lot strategy, they're talking about the existing co-operation with the Provincial Government, you know, they talk about improving transportation in the downtown, getting to and in and around the downtown, initiatives under way, very possible, all very positive. But the key issue Mr. Speaker, in terms of the numbers, in terms of driving those numbers up, basically, the 4600 that's projected is happening with the incentives we have in place, it's happening. It's great, in the next nine years, but it falls very short, Mr. Speaker, of where we need to go. And so, I didn't want to vote against the strategy but I would vote against to send the message that we could be doing better, that this document could've risen to a higher standard in my view in terms of setting and challenging us Mr. Speaker, as city, to make the downtown more vibrant by bringing about a facilitating the private sector to come in and to create more housing than what we're doing today. We're doing a lot, Mr. Speaker, we're doing more than we ever did before, a lot of credit to the Mayor. And with the negotiations with the Province and the new downtown development program that exists for 40…up to 40,000 a door, all these are good things but I'm just…my comments, Mr. Speaker, is simply that we can do a lot more and that's…and to me, it's crucial because as a member of Council I know I don't represent any part of the downtown, I represent Transcona, maybe other than maybe St. Norbert probably the furthest flung from the downtown, or maybe your ward, but you know, we know that if we want to have a vibrant, healthy city it's not just a collection of suburbs but it's also a strong and vibrant downtown and if you look at the most successful cities in North America their downtowns are vibrant. Why? Because they have a large residential component to that downtown. As a matter of fact, it's…they don't have to subsidize, it's the other way around, they subsidize it to make it more affordable because it's too costly to live downtown. Very few places in North America where you'd be able to drive down the street and see a sign saying condos for sale for $20,000…

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

Councillor Wyatt: Like you see today in downtown Winnipeg pointing to you know, different parts of the downtown. Sorry $200,000 or less for…yeah not 20,000, 200,000 or less. You know, that's very rare. So it's very affordable but at the same time it speaks to the fact it hasn't reached that point where we need to take it to and there's more work that needs to be done. So those are my comments, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I think that we're seeing a lot of success with downtown, you know with the whole sports entertainment thing happening and all that kind of building and...I…at the five years ago when there was a consultations about housing and living downtown, I talked about building a dream for people to live downtown because the dream that we had when I was 18, 19, 20 years old living in the North End and houses really close together, that the dream was to move out into the way out into the suburbs and a lot of my friends actually live in the rural areas now because they were looking for that kind of well, we'd like kind of peace and quiet but we like to be close to an urban centre as well, where we have employment, and that was the dream in the 70s and the 80s and probably the 60s. I wouldn't know because I was too young but building the dream of downtown and I'm not sure if these plans I'll be honest I didn't read the full strategic report but I know there is a need to find out how many people do we know that already live in this city who are willing to move into the downtown area to take advantage of being close to the sports events and that sort of thing. I think that there's possibilities in how do you bring that dream or get them to dream that dream or get the young people who are for example, my kids, the dream for them to live downtown and some of that is being built downtown definitely, and I think that's great and it's really good but in hearing the numbers that Councillor Wyatt has presented in regard to 70,000 people, you know, a percentage doesn't have to be exact but you know, that is a lot of people to live in the area and frankly, all around downtown and you know, I have to say this, it's really good to plan for downtown but I believe you cannot plan for downtown without considering what's all around the downtown. And we need to make sure and any residential strategy needs to consider what's happening around downtown because really when you're coming into downtown or leaving downtown, do you really like what you see? Do you really want to be a part of trying to move around there? I guess it's better to just live downtown and not having to see some of these things but you know really, there is a strength in having healthy residential communities all around downtown as well because they're close by and they're participating because really, we can draw a boundary but technically the boundary may or may not be there. For example, I know some people who have moved into St. Boniface and they're downtown. They live on the other side by the bridge, they've got a perfect place to get downtown to enjoy all the things that we're providing there, that creates that dream. So, I would be expecting in this plan to know how they address the issues in terms of residential and what's happening around downtown in proceeding with their plan, so you know I think that's a real important thing to consider and should've been in the strategic plan because it does have an effect. Thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll just speak briefly. This was at the Downtown Standing Committee and we had a fairly lengthy discussion there as well. I have been…this report was a long time coming and I have to say it was fairly frustrating particularly as a Councillor represents a large part of the downtown. I finally saw this report last week or whatever, it was at the Downtown Committee after five years that the process was a little bit closed and very long in coming. But here it is, it's and it's here. It does kind of outline basically the things we're doing and as has been pointed out, many of them are very good. I mean the new program with the $40,000 a door is excellent. We've got the Province on board and that's extremely important. I hope somebody's going to follow up on Councillor Wyatt's concerns about the numbers because I hadn't really heard those numbers before in terms of the fact that we're losing the ratio, you know if that's in fact true that, because the rest…of the growth that we're having that we're still not going to have…really be that high of a percentage living downtown that is a concern. One of the things I wanted to mention, the report does talk harken a future parking strategy. But again that's not really here yet, it's not part of this and I think that's really crucial and I don't know it passed under Consent today but 50 Garry street is a surface parking lot that is being redeveloped. It's contiguous to an existing downtown residential apartment and it's going to be turned into a parkade with expanding the housing downtown and parking for the city will be maintained within their new parkade. That's exactly the kind of thing we want to see. That's happening in that one spot but we do still continue to have a sea of surface parking lots downtown and there's a lot of development potential there. And again, we harken to it in a future report that we're going to look at all of that and we are doing a couple of parkades in the downtown strategy…from the sale of the other parkade and we're starting some of those things, but I think, like especially in an area like this where 50 Gary is, you've got an existing residential neighbourhood and that would be an ideal place to do more. I think we need to do more than the two or so parkades we were talking about. Originally they talked about 5 and I think we need to do more of that redevelopment of those surface lots into mixed use residential and I think that doesn't really get into that enough in this report but I think that's because it's put into a future report. I also agree with the Councillor Eadie about continuing to support the neighbourhoods around the downtown to keep the downtown healthy. You know…and there are so many parts of this that aren't really clearly addressed in here because it's focused on that. So in terms of continuing the mixed

use tax credit programs and that around the downtown, that's really important and I think that's still to come. And another aspect of downtown being effective for the residential population and for the people going downtown is transportation, and so I hope we're looking at in our longer term transportation plan, the idea of the downtown circulator again which would be really great for residents and people working downtown, again that's all part of the whole…as we all know, revitalizing downtown isn't just housing and it isn't just transportation and it isn't just any one of those things, it's all of them so they're all kind of interconnected. And also, supporting the last point was also supporting our existing population down there and that's what I was harkening to a bit with the parking strategy in terms of making it convenient for people to live there who are already living there, another thing, supporting festivals, another thing that we do downtown. So you know, I understand Russ' frustration and wanting to go further. I'm not sure of the value in making a statement by voting against it. It's here. It outlines some good things we're doing. I agree with him, I don't think it's aggressive enough. And I don't appreciate the process. I'm disappointed that the process took so long and was not very inclusive of members of Council, non-EPC members of Council. And it just felt like it was in limbo for a long time and so there was some frustrations around it but in fairness, I mean that's…I think the staff did do a good job of putting all the information together that they have. I mean the leadership and vision has to come from us to say let's really tackle these surface parking lots like let's do something bold and get them into something better and that's going to have to come from us. I think the administration probably did the best they could. And so I will support it but I hope we don't just sort of sit back on our laurels and say okay we've got a five year plan for downtown, let's just sit down and not do anymore because I think we do need to do more, but I do appreciate and will support the report. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say ditto to Councillor Wyatt's remarks, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I'd like to say nyet to Councillor Wyatt. Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, first of all, I think that the department has provided a very good report and I think everyone here should be cognizant of the fact that one of the reasons, the one of the key reasons that we lag behind every other city that has successful downtown was because we had an archaic and ancient policy. We didn't allow a mixed use, Mr. Speaker. You go to any major downtown in Boston or Chicago, you'll see it's all mixed use. It's retail, commercial on the main floor and residential above it and it's a very successful thriving downtown, guess what, Mr. Speaker, we're now doing that. Took a long time but we changed it, we're doing that and Mr. Speaker, if you look on page five and it talks about population growth, from the census period of 2001 to 2006 the population downtown increased by 5%. This was more than double the city's overall 2.2% change and then if you go based on ethnic growth since the 2006 census, the downtown population has grown by additional 6.8% percent between 06 and 2010 exceeding the city's 4.8% overall growth. The downtown right now is the fastest growing in percentage. Do we have a long way to go? Absolutely. I think the programs we put in place have been phenomenal. I'm ecstatic that the city and the Province each put in $20 million. It took awhile as the Councillor Gerbasi said but it was very good. And are these programs we should consider down the road? I'm sure we always consider options to enhance our downtown. But let me tell you something about downtown, Mr. Speaker. The general public has a lot of faith in our downtown compared to the way it was a few years ago and I'll give you an example. Stantec, large architecture engineering company is moving downtown. It was announced a couple of weeks ago and the reason they're moving downtown because believe me they could be somewhere else for a lot less money. They're coming downtown because the young professionals that they employ, they believe, want to live in our downtown. They believe they're going to want to rent because they'll be changing jobs a minimum of six times in their career and they don't want to be locked in. It's incumbent upon yours truly and all members of Council to make sure that we have this housing available to them. Rentals as well as condos. I have no doubt in my mind that's exactly where we're going and I commend the department and I thank the Chair of Downtown Development.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel to close.

Councillor Swandel: Sure. Hi, I'll never ceases to amaze me when we're doing so well in this, in the city of ours, particularly in our downtown people could find a way to put a negative spin on it. Let me start by saying first foremost, loudly and clearly, most of what's been argued are saying that there's something wrong with this is have been inaccuracies and out right it won't need statements. Let's start with the simplest one. Simple math an increase of 4600 units in ten years on a base of 15,000 is pushing close to a 30% increase in population growth in the or 4600 people on a base of 15,000 people is an increase in the realm of 30 % of population over ten years. If you look at the Conference Board of Canada numbers for the entire city of 10,000 people a year, going out for 10 years. That's about one seventh of our current population and our number closer to 15%. Twice as much, twice as much. So don't give it credence to any of the numbers ever put before you hear today. That's the type of erroneous information that we get floated out here that somehow gets reported and makes us look bad. Another statement was made that somehow I said somewhere that we were going to quit giving incentives. One of the goals if anybody had taken the time to read the strategy is to achieve

these things and one of them is to achieve it hopefully with reducing the need to have incentives. And ultimately getting out of incentives. Don't have to have incentives to do new developments in suburban neighborhoods because they are neighbourhoods of choice. The whole statement, the whole argument is about making downtown in neighbourhood of choice. That's what that means, so let's pay attention to what's being said. Let's…read the reports, get into the facts, characterize…also characterize today as our downtown in order to have…it wouldn't be a successful and healthy downtown. We're starting to see the turn around. We've got that tipping point happening. We are being recognized as a successful and increasingly healthy downtown. These are things to celebrate, not to criticize. You know, process, a process went out and it got into the housing needs, the housing opportunities that looks on a neighbourhood by neighbourhood basis you know, if individual Councillors want to sit and micromanage this that have ownership of it so be it but you know, what we have here today is really a tremendous report and I'm going to spend some of the five minutes that I have left here today, I'm just going to read through the table of contents for you. These are some of the strategies that some of our colleagues call not going far enough. Strategy 1, enhance the quality of downtown residential life. Item 1, enhance the strike to get the unique advantages of downtown living. Item No. 2, improve essential retail to support downtown living. Item No. 3, safety, Item No. 4, maintain and support downtown affordable housing, Item No. 5, sky walks, Item No. 6, parks and green spaces and within each of these items there are specific strategies. That's just Strategy 1. Strategy 2, improved transportation options to, from and within downtown, priority snow clearing in the downtown, public transit links to the downtown. Public transit links within the downtown. That was mentioned as not being part of this but guess what it's in there. Automobile parking, bicycle parking, active living. Some of the categories that fall under Strategy 2. There's I think six strategies and going to go into three year, develop a strong planning framework for downtown residential development. Transportation planning, downtown planning, pedestrian facility design guidelines, increased accessibility. Stop me when you don't think this is grand enough for us. Going into No. 4 now, create responsive and integrated city services related to downtown's residential development. Permit and inspection processes, building code equivalencies, developers tool kit, monitoring and tracking, measuring what we're doing and whether we're not being successful. Item…Strategy No. 5 and adopt and develop key financial tool to create incentives for design development. Residential development tax related incentive programs, it's in here. Fees for downtown development. Lesser fees. So, another incentive. Surface parking in the downtown, mentioned today. It's in here, addressing…addressing some of the concerns we have around surface parking. Strategy No. 6, promote living within the developers and potential residential, potential and…with developers and potential residents. Develop information on City's web site. Downtown living tour and exhibition, promotional downtown living package. Marketing downtown living. Downtown as an entertainment hub. Promote active transportation, promote safety and market downtown opportunities. You know, that took a while to get through that. That's just the table of contents Mr. Speaker, but yet for some of us, this isn't good enough. We are successful in this city. We need to celebrate that. Too many of us you know, find a way to put a negative spin on almost anything that we do in this chamber. This is something to celebrate. Get out there, promote our downtown. Stop talking about it like it's something that's not good that's…the activity isn't happening. Activity is happening. People are coming, we are exceeding the population growth compared to the rest of the city. The ratio is right. I guess you know, just in closing Mr. Speaker, voting against this would be wrong just like many of the arguments that were made against it here today.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Steeves. I'll call the question. All those in favour? Opposed?

(Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Okay, we've got it. We've got it. The meeting of July the 14th, Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED JULY 14, 2011

Councillor Swandel: It was already voted on. Where am I here? Mr. Speaker, I'll introduce the report and move adoption to the Consent Agenda, Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. By-laws. No motions, I'm sorry. By-laws, we have one first reading. Councillor Swandel.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 1ST READING ONLY

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-law No. 93/2011 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law 93/2011.

Mr. Speaker: So that's read for the first time. That's only first read, okay. Question Period. Any questions for the Chairman of Downtown? Councillor Eadie.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I wanted to say…start off by just saying a good passionate speech about the housing…about the housing strategic plan for downtown and convince me to support it, but I have this question though, I would really…I don't know if you're interested but the question is just simply, will you consider what's happening in the shoulder neighbourhoods around downtown when you consider building, making downtown a better place because I agree we have a lot to celebrate with our downtown, it's vastly improved since the 1990 discussions, I distinctly remember and even prior to that so but the question again is just I'm asking you to if you're least please consider what's happening in the shoulder neighbourhoods around downtown when you're planning, you're moving forward.

Councillor Swandel: I'm not sure that makes sense to ask for the downtown perspective but as Chair of downtown I don't know but I have the authority to do that but you know certainly we're always interested in the shoulder neighbourhoods around downtown, perhaps changing the representation in some of them might help, I'm not sure but there's a number of impacts that come from shoulder communities into the downtown and we know that we try and co-ordinate our programs with programs that are just outside. The particular neighbourhoods where the value of the housing is lower, you'll see a lot more moneys available through things like building communities programs, some of the housing strategies are identified to specific neighbourhoods and shoulder neighbourhoods and close proximity to our downtown. A lot of the police, the community policing and enhanced policing is dedicated to areas that are sort of the shoulder communities of our downtown and the list goes on and on and on so it's not something that there may not be a specific you know strategy out there, but it's…there is very much so a lot of activity happening in our shoulder communities.

Mr. Speaker: Second question Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, well, I mean given those comments and policing is reactionary of course and there's that kind of stuff, but that's beside the point. I don't know about changing the representation of the people who are elected in the area, but I guess the follow up question would be simply, I think the follow up question, Speaker Nordman is there are defined…there are…well, I shouldn't say this. City Council has defined very limited resources in dealing with various aspects of this whole City of Winnipeg, and so would the Councillor who Chairs the Downtown Committee agree that there are very limited resources in being able to address shoulder community residential, like housing issues.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: No I don't agree with that comment. I believe that we have a significant amount of resources available. We just need to focus on how we use those resources to get our desired outcomes.

Mr. Speaker: Last question? You're good? Any further questions for the Chairman of Downtown? Seeing none, we'll move on to Standing Policy Committee for Property and Development.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JULY 5, 2011

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the Report of July 5th and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 to 13.

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

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JULY 15, 2011**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. I'd like to introduce the Report of July 15th and introduce…and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 11.

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

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

Councillor Browaty: I'd like to move that the following, oh sorry (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: We have a…

Councillor Browaty: By-laws first.

Mr. Speaker: Yeah.

Councillor Browaty: I'd like to move that the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law 71/2011, By-law 81/2011, By-law 82/2011, By-law 83/2011, 84/2011, 85/2011, 86/2011, 87/2011, 88/2011, 89/2011, 94/2011, 95/2011, 96/2011 and 97/2011.

Mayor Katz: Take a breath! (Laughter)

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

Clerk: By-law No. 71/2011, 81/2011, 82/2011, 83/2011, 84/2011, 85/2011, 86/2011, 87/2011, 88/2011, 89/2011, 94/2011, 95/2011, 96/2011, and 97/2011.

Councillor Browaty: I'll move that by-laws numbered 71/2011, 81/2011 to 89/2011 both inclusive and 94/2011 to 97/2011 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law numbered 71/2011, 81/2011 to 89/2011 both inclusive and 94/2011 to 97/2011 both inclusive.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I move the rules be suspended and by-laws numbered 71/2011, 81/2011 to 89/2011 both inclusive and 94/2011 to 97/2011 both inclusive be read a third time and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Councillor Browaty: Mr. Speaker…

Mr. Speaker: Wait, we're going to walk one on here?

Councillor Browaty: Yeah. I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 99/2011 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of suspending the rule? Contrary? Motion carried.

Clerk: By-law 99/2011.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and that By-law 99/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 99/2011.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 99/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question period for Standing Committee, Property and Development. Seeing…okay.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Browaty, and just as one of the newer and younger members of Council, I did … Councillor Steeves last meeting, maybe you could give us a sense of what it was like to work with Councillor Steeves and some of the mentorship and guidance he's…he's got from him in his relatively short career here.

Councillor Browaty: All these wonderful and sage advice he provided to all members of this Council floor, the inspired speeches that could've been said easily in a minute or two that proceeded on for ten minutes. No. I think the most profound thing was the degree to which I was damaged by that chocolate bar with the photoshopped picture a couple of years ago I think that was certainly the highlight. Anyways, (Laughter), I think I can say on behalf of all of our…of all my colleagues, it's been an absolute pleasure to work with the learned member from St. Vital and I thank Councillor Swandel for asking the question. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker: It's not easy being Gord. Seeing no other comments or questions, I will ask for an adjournment. Councillor Steeves. (Inaudible) (Laughter)

Councillor Steeves: (Inaudible) all of you, each one in turn. There's nothing I could say in such a short period of time that would do justice to our work in this hallowed chamber. I'm very proud of all of you and the work that we have done over the course of my tenure and your respective tenures. As I look around, I'm surprised to see only three Councillors left. I would consider more…would be more senior to me in terms of time on Council, Councillor Vandal had a three year hiatus in that period of time, there's been a lot of turnover and I will be very interested in the goings on of Council, it's been entirely my pleasure. I'm going on from one uncertain life to another uncertain life, of course. I don't know exactly what the future holds for me, but for all of the departments, the Directors, all the good people that work for us, all of our Councillors, Mayor Sam Katz who's been a tremendous friend to me and great system of support for many things that I had wanted to do, it has been entirely my pleasure specifically my assistant, Colleen Mayer who's been with you for a long time has been wonderful by extension, all of the executive assistants who work in the Councillors' office who deal with things on a day to day basis, my family of course, who have been very supportive and the people of St. Vital who have been my backbone and have worked with me and counted on me throughout the course of last time. It's been wonderful. You have a lot of responsibility here and you will do your best with that responsibility. I know it's difficult from time to time. If you can, one last parting word of advice, I know over the course of time, I do feel that on all sides, there have been more issues of…maybe partisanship and those types of things. I want us to celebrate the idea and remember always that we are lucky to have been voted in on a non-partisan basis which gives unique opportunities to come together. I've always felt that. I encourage that to remain the spirit with which we cooperate here on Council. That's very, very important. We have had that spirit; I think need to get back to that spirit at the same time. So Russ, Dan, Justin, Thomas, Harvey, Devi , Mike, John, Paula, Jenny, Scott, Ross, Jeff, Sam and everybody else, thank you very much. It's been my pleasure. Bravo.

Mr. Speaker: Here, here. Meeting adjourned.

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: 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 2:26 p.m.