# COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
# Wednesday, October 19, 2011

**The Council met at 9:33 a.m.**

The City Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Eadie.

**ROLL CALL**

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you. Today we're joined by our Page who is Miss Madison Fedyck who attends Glenlawn Collegiate where she's an excellent student and also is in the Elite Soccer Program both provincially and nationally. Madison thank you for being here. (applause) She resides in the North Kildonan Ward. We would like to welcome some guests here today and although we introduced you last month, Mr. McMonagle, your crew here is today. I don't see you specifically -- there you are - thank you. So thanks for joining us, the students from Red River College, welcome. (applause)

And that's all I have on my guest list. I know we have some other folks here so we welcome you folks too.

**MINUTES**

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to call for the adoption of the Minutes, Deputy Speaker Pagtakhan moves that the Minutes of the September 28th Meeting be taken as read.

All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**DELEGATIONS**

Thank you. We have two delegations joining us today and I just lost my computer, oh there it is, so we'll invite Mr. Peter Miller on behalf of the Green Action Centre in favour of the Infrastructure Renewal Public Works Garbage Recycling Master Plan. First, you'll have 10 minutes sir, and you'll be followed by Heinz Saleski who is in opposition, so Mr. Saleski, if you would like to join us, in this little corner over here, we'd be happy to have you. Mr. Miller, ten minutes.

**Peter Miller:** Thank you very much. I won't need that much. Green Action Centre began as the Recycling Council of Manitoba, a collaboration of industry, academics, civil servants and concerned citizens. Some 26 years ago we mounted demonstration recycling projects, promoted recycling, education and awareness and encouraged citizens and their governments to be less wasteful; so we've been at this for a long time. I'll keep this short. Our more detailed comments on the Garbage and Recycling Master Plan were presented to the Public Works Committee and are available at our website, GreenActionCentre.ca. Our message today is pass it, complete it, and improve it.

Pass it. I have nothing to add to Councillor Vandal's defense, a very eloquent one last Saturday, and I assume you've all read it. It's time for Winnipeg to climb out of the cellar on waste diversion and join the progressive cities of Canada who put most of their discards to better use and less environmental harm than burying them. We urge you not to miss this opportunity to follow through on a project you put in motion 18 months ago, when you asked the Public Service to develop a modern Garbage and Recycling Master Plan.

Complete it. The plan you have before you today, however, is only a first installment on a comprehensive integrated waste management plan. Acknowledged major gaps include multifamily dwellings, institutional, commercial and industrial waste, construction and demolition waste. And in addition, there are decisions to be made about organics processing and the development of economic opportunities to process and use recycled materials. Work must continue on these and other fronts and we would like to be a part of that. Unfortunately, the Stake Holder Advisory's Committee has been terminated. We look to Council and the Water and Waste Department to provide another avenue for the participation of citizens knowledgeable about waste and diversion. A good example you might model this on is the City's Active Transportation Advisory Committee, where knowledgeable citizens work with the Public Service in pursuit of shared goals.

Finally, improve it. The plan should be subject to future refinements and improvements. For example, blue carts could accept new materials such as scrap metal which add to the value of recyclables. The community resource recovery centres are largely car and truck dependent. More local recycling opportunities at retail outlets, schools and neighbourhoods need to be developed in collaboration with product stewards. Paper and plastic products from the fast food outlets need better recycling opportunities. And finally, according to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to which Winnipeg belongs, a zero waste community is one that has made a long-term commitment to reducing waste through various measures, including and I'm quoting, "economic instruments to encourage waste reduction". Toronto's graduated garbage fees, according to cart size is an example of such an economic incentive. Another version would be to use a chip reader on the collection trucks to register each time a particular cart is dumped and bill the household accordingly. A fixed fee; to cover the system costs and a variable component to cover the volume that the household is sending to the landfill. Very similar to your water bill. Winnipeg hasn't got there yet, to the economic incentive, but it should. However, we don't believe that should be a deal breaker for Council authorizing the first installment of the Garbage and Recycling Master Plan before you now. The Public Service can review the matter later with a reconstituted advisory committee. So, to conclude, our message is to pass this installment of the Garbage and Recycling Master Plan now, with provision to complete it and improve it in the near future. With further citizen input, including our own. Thanks for your attention.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks Mr. Miller. Questions, Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you for all the work you've done so far on this over the years and for this particular debate and discussion we've had over the last year or so. But I just wanted to ask you, are you aware that there is a motion before this Council, right now, Motion Number 1 I believe -- or one of our Motions, 3, to actually create the advisory committee like you're describing and I guess I just wanted to know if you have anything else about that that you can advise Council. We have to decide whether to create that today, at this meeting and if there is anything further you could add to tell us why we should create that committee, which I think we should, too.

**Peter Miller:** Well, I think first of all, you've got the model of other cities. I put a couple of examples in our original brief, Toronto and Seattle I believe. It's standard practice for a civic government to develop plans in consultation with its citizens. Now that was done in the first phase. But, there are two sorts of committees, I guess, you can have; one is representing the general public. The other is trying to draw on expertise. For instance there are U of M Professors who are experts on composting. Do you or do you not want them to review the planning of your organics processing as it's going ahead? As I've indicated, we've been at this a long time. Harvey Stevens, who is up here in the audience, did an extensive research on local haulers and MURF processors to get their reviews on what would be improvements and he made some recommendations based on that. So we think that that kind of local expertise and it's not costing you money, unless you want to buy them a coke, to get that kind of volunteer committee working. And you do have a model with the Active Transportation Advisory Committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further questions for Mr. Miller? Councillor Smith?

**Councillor Smith:** Mr. Miller, you're concerned about residential garbage, how about the commercial side? Should we not be concerned with all the garbage that is developed in Winnipeg?

**Peter Miller:** Very definitely and that was one of the gaps that I mentioned. The industrial, commercial and institutional and the construction and demolition waste. If you look regionally, I think that all adds up to more than the residential. Not in the Brady Landfill because we only take a small portion of that. And that's why we think to address that, you need to get the province on side with the tipping fees, the R.A.R.S., something like the R.A.R.S. levy and/or landfill bans. There are various mechanisms. But, it's very difficult for Winnipeg to implement them unilaterally if Rosser isn't doing the same. So, you do need, at least in the Capital Region, a common incentive and regulatory system to tackle that.

**Mr. Speaker:** Seeing no further, oh Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, thank you. I had a follow up question. I was under the impression, this is going back a few years now and I'm not sure but you might know this answer, but, I recall that the City raised its tipping fees at the Brady Landfill under great debate and controversy and discussion right here in this very Chamber, and I think it was about three months later that the operator of the Rosser Facility actually upped their fees, similarly or even if not more. Are you saying that when it comes to the commercial waste dumping, that Rosser is offering cheaper fees than Brady?

**Peter Miller:** Well, that was the testimony of I think Mr. Drohomerski a couple of years ago, when he wanted to be able to strike special deals with the haulers because, although they have a stated fee, they give deals to particular haulers at a lower amount. And so, yeah, they do, they are able to undercut. And that's, in a sense, the tragedy of the whole thing. We used to have a monopoly here in the City, but a Provincial Government, a number of years back, started to license the competition and so there was no longer that ability to control the fees, to improve the diversion.

**Mr. Speaker:** Seeing no further questions, thank you, Mr. Miller, appreciate your time here today. Mr. Saleski. Are you with us? You have 10 minutes, sir.

**Heinz Saleski:** Good morning. Good morning, Councillors. My name is Heinz Saleski. I do live at 734 Pritchard Avenue and this is a hazard there, what everybody knows, the Councillor knows it, that this is an area where small contractors or other individuals get rid of their garbage what was too much, you know. So we were always loaded with garbage before we could put our garbage in the bin, we had problems the bin was already overflowing and the garbage was flying to the back lanes and messed up the community. We tried as best as we could to clean up. It's not always easy when you are a certain age and handicapped, to clean up and why should we clean up after these people? We have By-law Officers what should take care of it and check out. The other day, I saw a truck driving by unloading bags of garbage and I was trying to take the license plate number. It was difficult because this gentleman was very clever. He made the license plate so that he could turn it over and you couldn't see it, you know. And this is hard to report somebody when this happens you cannot keep track of this. And maybe when the Police would stop cars like this and check the license plate, if it's solid mounted or if this is flexible, that they can turn it over. This new system, as far as I know, supposed to be with the rolling garbage bins and supposed to stay on the property, it would be nice and on the other side, the back lane would be free and that traffic could go through. In my back lane there was once heavy traffic. There were I think 234 cars passing by in 24 hours and I think for our back lane, this is a lot. And you never control what was going on at night. And we did not go out in the night. In this area you stay at home, you are not going out. People don't want to get in trouble. And this new garbage bins will stay there. I think to get to the point here to the amount of money what we have to pay for, $50, the increase on garbage because we already paid on the tax bill our garbage fee and now it will increase from $50, is not so easy for people who have been on pension and have a certain amount of income, and they have a hard time to get along, to take $50 out of the budget and pay again. Everything goes up. Our pension is not going up. Maybe $2 or $3, you know. This always went up. And now, take $50 out that's not so easy. And maybe I can make a suggestion. I am a single person in a house. My neighbour is a single person in a house. The other side of the neighbour is a single person in a house. When we would take two houses and put together and put the garbage bin -- share the garbage bin and we could split the money, then we have not much garbage. When I have a garbage bag in a month, this is a lot. We are older people. We are not -- we don't have too much garbage, you know. And this would help the pensioners at least, especially in the North End where there are single people, there are couples, the kids moved out already, there are two people in the house. Lots of ownerships what are two people or one person in the house, you know. And this is lots of money when you have to pay $50. The other ones, when a family with four or six people in the household and they have lots

more garbage, this would be not justified that a single person pays the same like the other ones. And this is -- I think the Councillors should consider this and judge on this. And find a resolution, what is justified for everybody. So, this is the garbage – the other things we speak only about the garbage here and I don't want to get into something different. Thank you very much.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Mr. Saleski for your presentation. It is difficult; I think we all, actually, recognize that it is very difficult for people who are living on fixed incomes that are actually low fixed incomes because some people live on higher fixed incomes. But I guess my first question is just, I want to clarify. So you're suggesting that if we had better By-law enforcement, better policing, we would be able to deal with garbage in a much better fashion? And to avoid establishing a new system? Is that what you're saying, sir?

**Heinz Saleski:** Yeah, I think so. Maybe the City should hire more By-law Enforcement Officers and they start checking maybe for a short time to check out what is going on you know.

**Mr. Speaker:** Second question Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, Mr. Saleski. Often a garbage fee is introduced and it's out in the open on a bill because they want to make people aware of and sort of make people take responsibility for their garbage, is usually why a fee would show up like this, a fixed fee on everybody. They say it's a fixed fee because it's a fixed charge for – same charge for every house because it costs the same to pick up garbage no matter how much we distribute. But can you just tell me though, in terms of taking responsibility for garbage, can you tell me how you take responsibility for garbage in your immediate neighbourhood, sir.

**Heinz Saleski:** Where they do recycling and lots of our leftovers go in recycling. I am sorting out paper, plastic and things and recycle it. The other stuff; what is not recyclable, it goes into the garbage and that's why we don't have so much garbage. People who are not recycling, of course they will have more garbage and I wish the people would see this and should be more recycled and this would benefit; - the City would benefit from the garbage dump wouldn't be filled up in many years, drastically when you don't recycle.

**Mr. Speaker:** Last question.

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes and again thanks for coming out Mr. Saleski. My last question is and it's a difficult question, but I'm just wondering what your perspective is on this particular fact which is that the garbage right now is charged on your property taxes and it might be flawed but what is your perspective in terms of using the assessment value of one's home to calculate how much you actually end up paying for garbage and other city services? Are you -- do you think that that's the best way to do it or what's your perspective on that, sir?

**Heinz Saleski:** I'm not so familiar how this works. I know we pay an amount on the tax bill what is garbage. Maybe this could be separated, that this garbage, what we pay, the amount of money what we pay on garbage, that we keep it separate and it's not going into the big pot where when money is needed, take it out and they say oh, the garbage pot is empty, we have to increase the garbage again. I don't see it this way. I see it more this way, that people who are handling money they should be responsible for the money, what they spend on not only taking out -- it's not their money. It's only the taxpayer and when there is not enough money then we are increase the taxes. It shouldn't work like this. We voted the Councillors in to do the best ability, to judge in the best ability and represent the people proper in the community. I think when this is handled so that the money goes in the big pot and spend it out, then there is no control over the money and nobody gives any account of what -- where the money went or what is going on here. I, for instance, I have applied for a Grant to fix my porch roof that was collapsed. I had an inspector coming out, he took pictures and everything. I -- they decided I would get $2,800 for this fixing and then I had brought in two estimates and one estimate was chosen from a guy who lives in the same street. I thought I leave this money in the community, and when he came out and was fixing, I was supposed to have a new roof on the porch. The estimate was made out for this and I was supposed to have aluminum siding to fill it up, looks nice from the street. This gentleman did later a deal with the inspector, and they made an estimate behind my back what wasn't signed

from me and what I wasn't aware of it and they fixed the roof only and they put vinyl siding on the gable side and this was a lot cheaper than to put a new roof on. I had a cheque made out for $2,800 and I had to pay the cheque and I had to sign the cheque and I refused to sign the cheque because this was not the amount what was supposed to be paid for, for this work, kind of work, what they did. And then this gentleman took me to Court. I went into the Court and the judge finished us up on the floor outside the room and he said he did the work and you have to pay him. You have to sign the cheque. And you have to pay so many losses what he had on wages because he missed time to come to Court and to expenses. I did not pay the expenses. I signed the cheque and handed it over. I tried to complain to the Committee what is in charge of it. I couldn't get anywhere. The cheque was made out and I have to pay. I think when this money is going to be spent like this, this is not right.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mr. Saleski we're sort of dealing with the garbage issue here and I know you've sort of -- you've moved laterally into By-law enforcement so I think we'll keep the topic on garbage, please.

**Heinz Saleski:** I just throw this in how this money is handled.

**Mr. Speaker:** Understood. Understood. And you may want to speak to your Councillor if there is an issue with the By-law Enforcement Officer.

**Heinz Saleski:** At this time there was a different Councillor, it was not Eadie.

**Mr. Speaker:** In any event, if you have any concluding remarks regarding garbage?

**Heinz Saleski:** No, I'm done. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you sir. No further questions for Mr. Saleski? Thank you sir, we appreciate your participation today and we'll move into the heart of meeting with the Executive Policy Committee Report for October 5th, Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**DATED OCTOBER 5, 2011**

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the Report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Of the Report of October 12th, Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**DATED OCTOBER 12, 2011**

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would introduce the Report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 5 -- actually I guess I can make it simple. 1 to 3 and then 5, we'll separate 4.

**Mr. Speaker:** We do have an amendment on 1.

**Mayor Katz:** That's right housekeeping.

**Mr. Speaker:** 2, 3 and 5 I think.

**Mayor Katz:** 2, 3 and 5 is correct, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item 1.

**Item 1 - Records Committee - Composition Amendment**

**Mr. Speaker:** We have a motion from Councillor Swandel.

**Motion 1**
**Moved by Councillor Swandel,**
**Seconded by Councillor Browaty,**

*WHEREAS on July 21, 2010, Council approved the composition of the Records Committee as follows: the City Records Manager/Archivist, who shall be the Chairperson of the Committee; the City Clerk; the Chief Financial Officer; the City Auditor; the Director of Legal Services and City Solicitor; and two citizen members who shall not be employees of the City and whose term shall be for not more than three years;*

*AND WHEREAS the intent of the Records Committee was to amend the composition to include the Director of Corporate Support Services or designate in view of advancing technology and addressing electronic records;*

*AND WHEREAS in confirming the Committee composition, the City Treasurer was named instead of the Chief Financial Officer;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 12, 2011 be amended to replace reference to the City Treasurer with the Chief Financial Officer or designate in the composition of the Records Committee.*

**Councillor Swandel:** This is a simple housekeeping Mr. Speaker. The motion is just to amend the Report so that it replaces the reference to the City Treasurer with the City's Chief Financial Officer or designated in the composition of the Records Committee. The Report that initially was submitted with an error.

**Mr. Speaker:** Again, it's moved by Councillor Swandel; Seconded by Councillor Browaty. Any discussion? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. Item Number 4.

**Item 4 - Fort Rouge Yards Brownfield Development Project - Loan Guarantee**

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, I will briefly introduce the motion and then I would love to hear from the Councillor. Mr. Speaker as I look at this, this is a phenomenal opportunity for the City of Winnipeg for taking a Brownfield Site, you will create 900 affordable units. You'll have geothermal energy, Mr. Speaker. You're going to broaden the tax base by approximately $800,000 annually. This will be a transit-oriented community. Mr. Speaker, the developer is actually going to pay for the transit station. There's initiative from the F.C.M. - for actually providing a $1 million grant in addition to I believe $14.7 million dollars of financing. They have asked the developer, with their initiative to ask the City for a guarantee of $10 million dollars. Our department has done their due diligence. They feel this would be great for the City and the City is at no risk. And Mr. Speaker, I would love to hear what other Councillors have to say but I think this is a -- we've always wanted to see more density. This is an area where the services exist. It's exactly what our City is looking for and we need more of this and I will also take the opportunity right now to thank the F.C.M. Rep, Councillor Jenny Gerbasi who I know has done a lot of work with the F.C.M.

**Motion 2**
**Moved Councillor Eadie,**
**Seconded by Councillor Smith,**

*THAT Item 4 of the Report of Executive Policy Committee dated October 12, 2011 be amended by re-numbering recommendations 1.b through 1.d to 1.c through 1.e and adding a new recommendation 1.b as follows:*

*"1.b. The developer signing an agreement with the City of Winnipeg to implement the City's Universal Design Guidelines when constructing all public use facilities associated with the Fort Rouge Yards redevelopment;"*

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Mayor Katz. We have an amendment that's part of this Item, so I'll ask Councillor Eadie to bring that forward.

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, thank you am I just speaking to my motion to amend or can I speak to the whole matter?

**Mr. Speaker:** I think you speak to the whole package including your amendment.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**MOTIONS**

**Motion 5**
**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,**
**Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,**

*WHEREAS through the Our Winnipeg public process, it was identified by Winnipeggers that Forestry and the City of Winnipeg's urban forest is greatly appreciated;*

*AND WHEREAS in the last five years the City of Winnipeg has improved its tree pruning practice from a 30 to 40 year pruning cycle to a 14 year pruning cycle, but is still short of the North American Best Practices standard of an 8 year pruning cycle;*

*AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg presently cannot replace trees that are lost to disease or other factors on a tree by tree basis, thus resulting in a decline, over time, of the size of the overall urban forest;*

*AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has led North America in successfully managing the Dutch Elm Disease epidemic, and maintaining the City's much prized Elm Tree Stock;*

*AND WHEREAS Emerald Ash Borer is a disease that will decimate the City of Winnipeg Ash Tree population in the near future;*

*AND WHEREAS at the last meeting of the Mayor's Environment Advisory Committee a similar motion on this matter was unanimously adopted;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that:*

1. *Council should increase funding for tree pruning so that the City of Winnipeg can achieve the 8 year best practice cycle for tree pruning;*
2. *Council earmark funding for tree planting that would ensure a tree is replaced for every tree lost;*
3. *The City of Winnipeg immediately establish a policy that bans the planting of any Ash trees that would be susceptible to Emerald Ash Borer, on public and private property, in light of the impending epidemic;*
4. *Depending on cost of item 1 and item 2, the City of Winnipeg consider implementing these goals by a phased in approach in order to achieve full funding of these items over the next three years.*

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you. I'm -- I rise to Speaker Nordman, I rise to speak on this particular motion from EPC as well as the amendment in saying that, a $10 million guarantee is basically a liability to the City. It's one that may or may not come to fruition but nonetheless, I believe it should be considered and should be carried on our books on the liability side as a potential possibility that it could cost us money. Now whenever one place has a liability and another entity has an asset. And while again it may not be an asset that you can necessarily exercise, a guarantee is a financial instrument that allows full financing to go through and to make sure that other people's monies are protected in case something goes awry. I do notice in the original motion it talks about ensuring that the developer has the appropriate insurance and I hope that that also includes insurance, in terms of the financial failure of this project. But nonetheless, when I look at who the asset belongs to -- or who the asset really is to, as far as I can read

in this, the guarantee is really an asset from my perspective for F.C.M.'s borrowed money -- or money they're giving to this project, in a sense, because they are giving grants, the money is there, it's for -- partially for building public services and at least well at a minimum, the $10 million is what we would call publicly accessible entities within this Fort Rouge Yards development and I think everybody on City Council agrees that this is a great project. It's what we are trying to achieve with the City; to achieve density, a city that is growing and doing really well. So, I think that really, in a sense, this is an asset for F.C.M. if it is an asset for the developer, I'm not really totally seeing a full path directly to this private enterprise and it has been pointed out in this Report that some adjustments need to be made to some policy I guess that we carry about not for profits only getting guarantees and we really do need a strong plan that deals with these kind of guarantees because frankly, we have a Financial Management Plan that has all these ratios about how much money we can or cannot borrow based on how much revenue we bring in and so on and so forth. If we carry a whole bunch of guarantees, as a portfolio that's basically where we're working as an investment firm and we need to be careful because the more guarantees you put out, the more risk that at least one or two or three of them are going to fail and it's going to cost money and frankly, I don't want it to cost money to road renewal in my Ward or in the Inner City because frankly, the Inner City is crumbling and we need to deal with that. So, I'm concerned about that but I will be voting for this Plan. I do -- with this motion but, on the amendment, because we are putting up public liability here, in covering $10 million, and as I understand it, the developer has verbally agreed that accessibility and our universal design guidelines would be implemented in the public assess facilities on this particular development. I still, because we've seen and experienced many problems, the only actual standards that any builder has to meet is the Building Code. So, what I'm asking simply here with this additional motion, it's not a big deal. The developer has already said that he would deal with it, he or she, I'm not sure, but the developer or the business that's there. That we just simply add b, it's a simple thing, he'll just, in writing, agreed to meet those requirements of our universal design guidelines. I don't see any problem with that, it shouldn't be an issue. So I will be supporting this motion to allow the guarantee, but I really do need to make sure -- I think that we should have follow-up to ensure that our Administration makes sure that we don't get into a whole bunch of problems when it comes to providing loan guarantees related to private developers. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks Councillor Eadie, Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just going to first speak to the amendment of Councillor Eadie. And the motion is simply reiterating or confirming our existing policy for public facilities. There is a transit station and there's streets and sidewalks being built as part of this project. And when I saw the motion this morning I checked with a number of people. It's a good thing I got up early today. And I talked with the Manager of Planning and Land Use to confirm, and she said in an email that the City of Winnipeg has universal design standards and an universal design directive in place that exceed the Manitoba Building Code and other provincial requirements and that these standards are applied to all developments of City of Winnipeg projects and the City of Winnipeg facilities within that project are considered. I also confirm -- to be part of that. I also discussed this with our Chief Operating Officer who confirmed that the transit station and the streets and sidewalks will all be required to follow universal design guidelines and will follow all the specs. So I've also spoken with the developer who assures me, that he has no problem if this motion passes signing something confirming that because it's something he's already committed to do as part of our processes anyway. So I just putting that out there, there's this motion, I don't have a problem with it. I don't think it's really necessary but I don't have a problem with it, if it gives people reassurance that they need. The City of Winnipeg to my general comments on the loan guarantee. The City of Winnipeg has been asked by F.C.M. to guarantee $10 million of this loan. Some of this information has already been gone through that I was going to say today but just to clarify, for anyone who doesn't know, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Green Municipal Fund is a pot of Federal Government dollars that F.C.M. manages on behalf of the government through a green municipal council that is set up and it supports green projects that have environmental benefits to municipalities. There's a reason that F.C.M. supported this particular project and I would also like to mention, they've supported other projects and other of these types of integrated green projects with energy and stuff in other parts of the country also. It's precisely this type of integrated green project that includes energy, active transportation, public transit, infill housing and brownfield development that makes this a cutting edge project and the type of thing F.C.M. is interested in supporting. Brownfield projects, and the reason there is a federal program and the reason there is money that is being asked for and coming to this project is that brownfield projects cost more than a typical suburban development and are more complicated because you have to fit a complex infill project into the midst of an established neighbourhood. You have to integrate transportation and provide environmental friendly energy. It's not easy to deal

with; you have industrial site mediation and all these things add a layer of complexity and cost which is why this program has been created to support brownfield developments. This is why – So I just wanted to clarify that and the City of Winnipeg is a partner in this, in that we are having a transit station built for us, obviously with public -- on Winnipeg Transit's oversight to make sure it's built in the same way as the other stations you're seeing right now, the Osborne station going up, it will be built to those kinds of specifications. I think it's important to step back and look at what this project means to our City. The Fort Rouge Yard development is a transit oriented environmentally friendly infill development that would be a showcase nationally and internationally and people would be coming here to visit and look at it and if it goes through as it is planned; that is why the FCM is interested in it. The geothermally heated bus shelter; it will be part of our first Rapid Transit Corridor; it's a value of $3 million dollars; that the City of Winnipeg will get over and above; we're not actually putting money out, we are guaranteeing a loan but this is over and above. The Area Master Plan and just to clarify any process questions, I wasn't sure if there was going to be issues about that today, the Area Master Plan was approved by Council in December; rezoning process went through and as with any project in an existing neighbourhood that brings significant change; there's going to be some opposition and there is a small coalition that continues to oppose the project but I would also assert that there is significant support in the neighbourhood for the project as well. The new housing will mean people to fill up partially empty neighbourhood schools, community club Boards and will increase the tax base and land values in the area. There will also be improvements to walkability, there will be geothermal energy including our bus shelter, bus station. Active transportation for the facilities and an endowment fund is being created; a $500,000 which will go to neighbourhood playgrounds and parks over and above the 10% land dedication. For this project to realize its full potential and be a truly innovative green project, as I've described, there does need to be that additional support and that's what the green municipal funds are about and as long as all the conditions are met by the developer and there's a lot of due diligence and a lot of requirements, then this extra money will fund some of these extra things like the green aspects of it beyond. There is always a degree of risk with guaranteeing a loan and I realize we are treading on somewhat new ground in terms of partnering with the developer and the FCM and I for one, as you may know, am not always on the page of private partnerships especially when it comes to areas that involve provisions of public services. For example, our Water and Waste Department belongs in the public sector entirely however, there are some circumstances where a private partnership is the only way you're going to get something to happen in our City. And one example of this is the M.T.S. Centre, it was a stretch for some people to support that back then but it was the right thing to do and in the end we have one of the best entertainment facilities in North America in our downtown. We have our N.H.L. team back, and when I tell my colleagues in other cities how little public money went in to get a facility like this, their jaws drop and they can't believe it and they say, "How did you do that?" So, without that partnership, that would never have happened. So sometimes we have to think outside the box and just find a way to get things done in this City and really, that's what I'm trying to do, is find a way to crawl across glass to get something in place to make a really exciting green environmental project in our City and FCM is on board with that because they see the benefit of this too and I think many Members of this Council see it; if not all of you see the benefit of that. So the Fort Rouge Yards is one of those complicated circumstances, that if we don't do something creative and take a little bit of a risk; we may never see this thing realize its potential; and we as a City may never realize our potential and I know there have been questions raised about the risks involved, the CFO has assured me and I have to trust our CFO; that due diligence has been done by himself as well as an outside consultant. The FCM also has its own due diligence process that must be fully carried out and no money flows from FCM until the $10 million dollars' worth of infrastructure is actually already built. so then, and then the City's guarantee would only be called on if the developer defaults after it's built so then the infrastructure is already in place. So really the risk...yes there's some risk…

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

**Councillor Gerbasi:** it's relative a low risk, but there's also a number of safe guards in place, so I would really ask this Council to step back, think big and be excited, as excited as I am about the potential of what we could actually do here; we could actually accomplish something in Winnipeg that people from across the country are going to go, Wow, you have a development like this that's geothermal and has a geothermal heated bus shelter and is walk able, and accessible in all of those things. So I think I've probably; I just urge you to support it and I thank you very much.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, Mr. Speaker. This one has been a little bit complicated for myself, because we are entering some new territory without really a policy in place. I know that's pending. It's kind of a reactionary kind of FCM talked to us, we reacted and off we moved. It does raise questions about the future, where will we go with this type of idea, how far are we going to extend it or are we going to extend it or is it a one of program? I'm not too sure about that but those are the kind of questions I raise. What are our liabilities with this? Will the development go forward? And then I started asking myself why are we even considering this? Why would even FCM consider this? This is a private developer. Let the market decided what you want to do, let the market tell what will happen this is private business. However, when I step back and looked at the why? question, if the City of Winnipeg and ourselves want to have infill development, that is more than just cookie cutter, slap it in there as fast as you can and get out. We're going to have to provide some leadership. We're going to have to provide a way to take some of those inherent costs with infield which is quite pointed out is more expensive. There's less margins you can make as a private developer on a brownfield. That's why we have things like urban sprawl. It's really nice to go into a nice big piece of field and develop it with nothing there. That's where you can make some money. Developers do have some concerns, I would understand that, that the margins may be just too low in a brownfield development, generally and now you've added on all these green features. Again, so that's what they are telling me and I go "you're right". So unless we help you, in some way, you're not going to do green features. You are going to retract back because we have to respect the fact that these developers are putting their hard work and their money into this, they need to make a return. And so they're going to look at that kind of balance. So the City of Winnipeg has an opportunity now, I am still concerned about the liabilities, but I have to in this case and I will, trust the Administration's due diligence, that they have looked at all the angles, that I have met with CFO as well, didn't 100% make me calm but, calmer, but I believe the opportunity is one of those opportunities right now, that we need to go forward on this project and I would definitely strongly recommend because I have two other projects popping up shortly, big, big in-fills. We the Parker land and we have the sugar beet lands. These are both of them in my Ward and I would be very excited if the City took that leadership and those two projects as well. So again, it's impossible for me to sit here today and say no to this project because it's not in my Ward and had a little too much risk and then want it in the other two areas. So I do believe this is the way to go, I am a little concerned but again, the Administration, this is theirs. They said we can do this. This won't be a liability factor. We have the cost recovery in there so I will trust him on that and I actually have to say, at the end of day, after I met yesterday at the University of Manitoba with the visioning conversation about urbanism. That was the last straw that broke me over when they talk about things that you have to show the leadership, you have to tell the developers that this is what we want, and you can't just tell them, you have to support them, and so if we want to have this green development which I can't see anybody in Winnipeg not wanting something like this. This is the minimal amount of risk that I think; we, maybe the maximum amount of risk I'm willing to take, until, at least we have a policy in place. So I'm going to back the Administration on this one. I'm going to back the environment on this, I'm going to back infield development on this, a little bit of concern but again, what decision doesn't have a little bit of concern?

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further comments. Seeing none I'll ask Councillor Eadie -- oh, are you going to speak? Councillor Eadie to close.

**Councillor Eadie:** On the amendment?

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes please.

**Councillor Eadie:** I just simply want to state that while there has always been assurances that the City's Universal Design guidelines/standards are followed, there have been some experiences where it hasn't been followed through and all I want do here is to make sure this developer who is really entering into what we all believe is an excellent project, it's just simply to sign an agreement, just that, that means they are definitely committed and that the people with disabilities would really appreciate that, just for assurance purposes because it has been our experience in the past and the EPC will soon hear about an experience that went awry. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion 2. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Mayor Katz to close on the Item.

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. I believe Councillor Gerbasi covered it and she did it very eloquently about the benefits of this project. There's just a couple of things that I want to add and not be redundant. Number 1, I wanted

to be very clear, that the City is not advancing any monies, Mr. Speaker. It's a guarantee. And, Mr. Speaker, in order for that to become reality, all of the site servicing, all of the geothermal installation, as well as, all of the public infrastructure, Mr. Speaker, has to be completed. Once that is done, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, there is next to zero risk, because I'm not sure if everybody understands what a guarantee is. The guarantee is there only if the job cannot be completed. And if the job is not completed, Mr. Speaker, we do have an instrument that we can use: we can basically take possession of the property and this property, after all the work that I just mentioned has to be done, would be worth significantly more than our guarantee, it would be a wind fall for the City of Winnipeg. So that's number 1, Mr. Speaker. The other situation is, I think everybody is very cognizant of the fact and they should be, that this isn't the first time that we have been involved with the private sector. Maybe everybody forgets what we've been trying to do, to motivate housing in our downtown, that the City of Winnipeg has been basically putting forward $20,000 a door as an incentive. Finally the Province after a few years jumped on, it's now $40,000 a door. We're talking about $20 million out there which were basically giving to the private sector to get residential housing downtown. Later on today Mr. Speaker, you'll see a project which I think is great for our downtown on Portage Avenue. We're actually making a loan to the private sector, Mr. Speaker, which everybody has talked about for a long time and I mentioned that, that something like that would be happening for us to make a contribution to fill the void. It's a great project, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that it is unanimously passed. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Item 4 as amended. All those in favour? Opposed? Two; Pagtakhan and Wyatt. Motion passed. Thank you. EPC motions, you've received motion number 5; which is an automatic referral from Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Orlikow, so we'll just turn that over to the Administration… to EPC, yes. Thank you Sir. Alright, Consideration of By-laws, your Worship.

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

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you Mr. Speaker, I move By-law No. 10/2011 be read a first time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 10/2011.

**Mayor Katz:** I move that By-law No. 104/2011 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 104/2011.

**Mayor Katz:** I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 10 -- sorry By-law No. 104/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Okay, Question Period for EPC, His Worship. Councillor Eadie.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**QUESTION PERIOD**

**Councillor Eadie**: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Always good to be able to ask the Mayor questions.
We just actually recently. we just voted on a development project that is essential to the City, and we also have a development that is trying to happen in the Inner City just outside of the downtown, and my question really is, and I know the Mayor is familiar with this issue, but, there is a great project in my Ward it's called NICHI Commons and it's working towards trying to provide better options, food options as well as business options on Main Street in an area that really does need this kind of development and they, through a bit of misunderstanding as they proceeded, thought that they might be able to obtain some heritage money as they thought they might have a heritage building. Whether or not somebody made some errors there but really, the project stands pretty good and I'm wondering,

through you to the Mayor, I'm wondering if some ideas like allowing them to utilize whatever taxes they are currently paying on the property, to utilize that for loan guarantees or ideas to allow maybe…maybe we could expand CentreVenture or some other planner who might cover the area to extend their boundaries a little bit past the underpass to allow what I think is good commercial development.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker; through you to Councillor Eadie. I think it's incumbent upon us, if there are good projects, to listen to them, to let the Administration put together a Report and then see if there is a solution. I would certainly be happy to follow up on that with Councillor Eadie. I know he enjoys asking me questions but we speak on a regular basis. Monday night we probably spoke for 40 minutes together and always happy to communicate and see if there's a solution to problems. Until all the details are out Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible for me to say anything more than that, but to look into it and have the Administration get back to us and see if there are some potential solutions to the challenges they are facing. Be more than happy to do that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Second question Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Excellent. Thank you Speaker Nordman and I would just like the Mayor to offer us a little discussion about and I think our Mayor should be able to talk about some of the good things that he's trying to be involved in and they are talking about the acquisition of the Merchants Hotel on Selkirk Avenue, and I know that the Mayor appeared at the public announcement of this initiative and I'd just like, for the record, for the Mayor to let us know how he's going to help contribute to this project.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Through you to Councillor Eadie. I was present when they announced the project. From what I've seen it's an excellent project. I've had a discussion with the architect as well as Dr. Lloyd Axworthy who is involved in the project. Right now, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you they are out there doing some due diligence, but more importantly they still have significant monies to raise. There was a request from the Dudley Thompson, the Architect. Right next to that project, there is some vacant land that is owned by the City of Winnipeg which they would want to make that part of the project. I have told them that would be something that I would be extremely supportive of, considering it's been sitting there on Selkirk Avenue for almost as long as you and I have been around, Mr. Speaker, a very long time, doing nothing. It would enhance the area immensely. I have asked the CAO to look into that, to identify it. So far I have heard nothing negative, but keep in mind, in the end it will not be me making that decision. It will be us making that decision, Mr. Speaker. But that's something I am definitely supportive of.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further questions Councillor Eadie?

**Councillor Eadie:** Just to follow up yes, it is City Council who decides whether or not to call land surplus and to sell it for what they're asking for a dollar to go into a project, and I just wanted to…I guess it's not really a question, but, well it is and it isn't. But it would be interesting if some business people, there's a lot of discussion about what kind of business could operate out of the main floor of this particular project, and I guess I'm asking the Mayor with his business savvy, maybe he might consider supplying with some ideas of what he thinks might work on the main floor for attracting actual business because they are looking at doing a number of things here that all will be good for what is really a neighbourhood that needs this revitalization.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, I think I should set up a consulting company but that might be a conflict of interest. Mr. Speaker, I've already told those involved in this project, and I agree with Councillor Eadie. One of the things and we're talking about Selkirk Avenue, and many of you, know about Selkirk Avenue, but it once was an unbelievably vibrant, exciting street full of people. I mean, growing up right next to Selkirk it was actually our Portage Avenue. That's where we all went to shop. And I think Councillor Eadie at least I know is on the right track because I told him

the key thing we need to do on Selkirk Avenue is have more retail. We need the private enterprise to come in there and fill the voids so Selkirk Avenue has that mix again. Fortunately there still are some retail establishments there and doing very well. We need to get more. From my point of view, Mr. Speaker, the private sector has always identified when there is a void to come and fill it. If the Councillor wants to come and speak to me one on one and throw around ideas, happy to do so, no charge whatsoever Mr. Speaker.

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

**Councillor Wyatt:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor, probably one of the biggest crisis facing our City today, infrastructure. We had a Provincial Election. Unfortunately, you could argue that we didn't get the kind of commitments we were hoping from the various parties. They fell short in terms of what the Municipalities, not just Winnipeg but across the Province, were looking for. Having said that though, it's clear, I believe that the majority of Manitobans clearly heard the issue during the election campaign because of the fact that Municipalities were raising it over and over. It did resonate with the average person across this Province, and there is a clear, there's a sense that the Provincial Government appreciates that now and understands that. So my question is, what steps now will be taken as your role of Intergovernmental Affairs to develop a new strategy to take forward this issue to the Provincial Government so that it is kept front and center, because it's not going away, it's just getting worse.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Wyatt, first of all Mr. Speaker, I'm still extremely disappointed and I concur with Councillor Wyatt that none of the parties really made infrastructure the issue that it should be. The facts of life are, Mr. Speaker, our City is falling apart all over the place, and we're no different than the majority of Municipalities right across the Country. Our roads, our bridges, our sidewalks, this one's for Councillor Smith - our back lanes, our community centres, City-owned buildings. They're a mess, Mr. Speaker. They're old. They haven't been maintained properly. That's just reality. And everybody seems to want to ignore that. It's not going to go away, Mr. Speaker. It's basically going to get worse. And you know, I believe the City has a responsibility to play a role in this. But keep in mind, Mr. Speaker; out of every tax dollar that's collected in this Province, we get eight cents, Mr. Speaker. The Province gets the vast majority of money. The vast majority of money and then comes the Federal Government, which means they need to come to the table. Now, Mr. Speaker, every time I talk about the Province coming to the table and you know how we were looking for one point of the Provincial Sales Tax that would give us approximately $139 million, give the rest to the Province about a hundred million dollars, you'd have this long term, imagine what we could do because now you can actually take on debt because you can service it. They have vehemently said "no". And the response would be look at what we've done for infrastructure. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you right now. Since 2002 the Provincial Government's contribution to our infrastructure has gone up by 58%. Sounds pretty good Mr. Speaker 58%. Here's the problem, Mr. Speaker. In cities like Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Regina, they've gone up 150%, 200%, 250%, 351%, Mr. Speaker. That's why the City's in trouble. That's why the other cities are making progress. And the realities are, Mr. Speaker, this Council united has to address that issue, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I've actually initiated conversations with the A.M.M. to see how we together can address this issue. We cannot sit around and do nothing when our infrastructure commitment from the Provincial Government has gone up 58% and all the rest are 150 to 350%. We're lagging far behind. A statistic you don't often hear but you will hear it's gone up by 58% Mr. Speaker. I'm telling you the other side of the equation. So I join Councillor Wyatt and all the rest of Council in working with us because we need to come up with some creative ideas to address this. Hopefully, the Provincial Government will come to the table, but I'm not convinced we can count on that, Mr. Speaker, but hopefully they will and that would make me a very happy man.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Wyatt, second question?

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yeah. To follow up on my first question, will there be a strategy that the Mayor will undertake that will be clear, concise, that he will passionately lead with the risk Council backing him in terms of finding that funding from the Province, securing that funding from the Province. We need that strategy.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** The short answer, Mr. Speaker, is definitely yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** Last question.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Last question. In the first term of the Mayor, he spear-headed, which I think created a lot of great ideas, a summit, a city summit which was unique and it created a lot of great ideas that came out of that; the beautification funding for the Downtown and the City, and it got a lot of energy and excitement. Would the Mayor entertain or consider in 2013, a summit on the infrastructure crisis facing our City?

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker that is an idea I am definitely open to. By the same token, I can tell you that not that long ago, I attended a summit in Regina which was based on infrastructure crisis and how to address it. I can tell you, all the answers are there. It's just a matter of which ones you can move forward with, and what levels of government, to what extent they're going to participate. But it's something I would be more than happy to discuss with the Councillor. I would also reiterate this is something that I would do in conjunction with the A.M.M. because we're talking about Provincial-wide. The City is a member of that. We are the largest member but I'm telling you, our entire Province is in trouble. Yes, the City of Winnipeg is two-thirds of that Province but we're all in trouble, and we all need to work together to find a solution.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Mayor Katz. Councillor Pagtakhan.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Mayor. Mr. Speaker, the Building Canada Fund, about a year and a half ago, we approved a list of 10 infrastructure projects, and I'm just curious, what is the status of that list of projects, and I'd like the Mayor to enlighten this Council with the status?

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Pagtakhan, I thank him for the question. We sent a list of approximately 10 different infrastructure projects. The one that has been endorsed to date by both the other levels of government, the Federal and the Provincial Government, is the Plessis and Dugald project, Mr. Speaker. We believe that project is somewhere in the neighbourhood of $75 million. As Councillor Pagtakhan is aware of, in order to move forward with Canada Building Fund, we need all three levels of government to agree. There are many other projects on there. I can tell you just recently, actually prior to the Election, I shouldn't say recently, prior to the Election I did speak to Premier Selinger and told him that the Community Investment Fund for community centres was basically depleted and that certainly should be a priority. But right now one has been completed. The number I believe that we have available is about $61 million and I think it's $66 million which would be matched by all three levels of government. Keeping in mind, Mr. Speaker, that a flaw in the system quite often, even though we think of it as one-third, one-third, one-third, it's almost always the City paying more than one-third because certain costs that we incur prior to, they don't qualify and some of the soft costs don't qualify but in general that's what it's supposed to be. It would be nice if we could change that. So that's the one project to date. I think that's been in the public where both the Provincial and the Federal Government have basically said they are supportive of that and they want to see that move forward.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Pagtakhan.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Through you to the Mayor, I thank the Mayor for that response. Just further to that, Mr. Speaker, what's it going to take to get the level of commitment from both the Provincial and Federal Government for the remainder of the infrastructure projects on that Building Canada Fund list, and start construction in 2012?

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Quite simply Mr. Speaker, that would never happen, and the reason that would never happen is because the list of projects far exceed the amount of money that's available in Building Canada Funds for this tranche

of money, which I believe is good till the year 2014. Hopefully, the Federal Government will move forward and there will be more Building Canada Funds coming up which is why there is a list of projects which are all important projects and hopefully we can all agree on some of those projects, but to get them all done will not happen with these funds that are available.

**Mr. Speaker:** Last question Councillor Pagtakhan.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just on another topic, with respect to the upcoming budget in 2012, is the Mayor committed to doing community consultations throughout the City of Winnipeg and when will they commence?

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, I think Councillor Pagtakhan is aware of the fact that in the past, the Chair of Finance has done community consultation and it's my understanding that that will be continued. It's also my understanding that that will be happening very shortly, Mr. Speaker, but I'll let the Chair talk about that later during his Question Period.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question has to do with the golf courses, and as we're all aware, Council voted to do an Expression of Interest in all our public golf courses. Some of us voted against that. We don't support that, many of us. But it did pass and that Expression of Interest has gone out and the particular issue I want to ask about is Crescent Drive Golf Course in my area. We agreed to do a private partnership with the Golf Course to allow a Spa in a Public Golf Course and I supported that with a little bit of discomfort but supported it because it would make that Golf Course viable and a valuable asset to the City, and I made comments at that time on the floor of Council that one of the reasons I was supporting it was that so that we could continue to have a viable, publicly run Golf Course that would actually be a revenue source for our City rather than a liability. I'm not even sure it is a liability now, but it would be even a better revenue source, and so now this Expression of Interest has gone out and I'm having trouble explaining to residents why we would sell that off after I've already made that case to them that we're doing this partnership, we're allowing this development which would create the new club house and make it viable. Why would we consider selling it off now that it's worth more…it should be worth more to us as a viable Golf Course for the public? So I guess I just want to know what your thoughts are on that, if you see us selling off that Golf Course along with the others?

**Mr. Speaker**: Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, the Expression of Interest is exactly what it says. It's an Expression of Interest to see what ideas may come forward for all the Golf Courses that we basically own and operate. Some of them we obviously have leases on, and there's many of them Mr. Speaker. The public probably has no idea how many Golf Courses that we actually own. That's number one. Number two, Mr. Speaker, I think we all know that lately, the golf business has not been doing so well. It's been a tough haul. Right now we probably have more Golf Courses than we need per capita. All we're looking for is ideas. I think at this particular point in time, it would be premature for anybody to draw a conclusion on what may or may not happen, and keep something in mind Mr. Speaker. With Expressions of Interest, if there are good ideas that come forward, which in the end Councillor Gerbasi may support some and may not, they have to come back to Council regardless Mr. Speaker. So you know what? Why don't we wait and see if there is something exciting out there, and maybe it will be good for the City and maybe it would be supported by Council unanimously. Right now we don't know. We've asked for ideas, for Expressions of Interest, where people get to be creative to basically address an issue that's right across North America right now. Golf is just not a growing industry Mr. Speaker. That's just a fact. You cannot deny it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Gerbasi, second question?

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you. On another issue, it was just mentioned that our Building Canada Funds are getting, are being spent most of which on the Plessis Underpass and other things. We know Rapid Transit is not on

that list. It was taken off the list, and that was and when questioned about that through you to the Mayor, Mr. Mayor, you said that you were going to advocate as hard as you could to the Federal Government to get other sources of Transit funding. I don't see that funding on the horizon and I guess I'm just wondering; when do you see us proceeding with further Rapid Transit? I know we have to wait for the Master Plan, whatever. We're going to be starting our first half of our Transit Corridor is going to be opening in the Spring. What can I tell people who are constantly asking me, when are we going to see that finished and future Rapid Transit development? Is there anything more you can say? Has the new Prime Minister told you anything else?

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Through you to Councillor Gerbasi. Mr. Speaker, first of all just for clarification, I think it's extremely exciting that from Queen Elizabeth all the way to Jubilee, will be completed in the next very near future. And just for clarification, because unfortunately the way sometimes the message is put out there, it doesn't stop there, Mr. Speaker. It crosses Pembina Highway and keeps on going all the way. It doesn't stop. That's number one. Number two, I can tell Councillor Gerbasi that just yesterday, I actually spoke to a Member of Parliament and we discussed this issue. As I'm sure Councillor Gerbasi is aware of, it's not easy getting millions of dollars from the Federal Government. This is something you have to keep on. You have to let them know that this is the top priority and when a program comes into place, and keep in mind, that's how this came into effect. There was a green initiative. The Premier and I joined forces and we made this one happen, and hopefully it will happen again in the near future, but for me to give a date, I can't do that Mr. Speaker. We all know that no one is basically flush with money today as we speak, but we do know there are always going to be programs for infrastructure, for green, for environment, and we just have to make sure they know Winnipeg's there and we're near the top of the list. Unfortunately we're not Ottawa where things are much easier, but we are in Winnipeg, and I think persistence is the key.

**Mr. Speaker:** Last question Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** I just want to make sure I understood correctly and I don't want to misinterpret your words, but are you saying that you feel that a diamond lane to the University without a separate Active Transportation Route, because there isn't a complete Route unless we build the corridor, are you saying that that's enough, that we're finished with the Southwest Corridor if we leave it as a diamond lane, and then we should build Rapid Transit elsewhere, or are you saying that your intention is to complete the corridor with the accompanying Active Transportation Route so that students can take transit or bus to the University as well as the Stadium?

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Simply put, no and then yes, but I'll elaborate Mr. Speaker. Number one, many people on this floor of Council have given the public the impression that you get to Jubilee and then you have to get off and go somewhere. I'm clarifying that that is totally inaccurate. That's number one. You go to Pembina Highway and then you go down the diamond lane. Number two Mr. Speaker, as Councillor Gerbasi mentioned, there is a Transportation Master Plan that we're waiting for. Number three, I think most people would concur that the southwest is probably, will probably still be the priority. That could change but I doubt it. And Number four, I think you always finish what you start Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Smith.

**Councillor Smith:** Yes. Mr. Mayor, the Federal Government is allocating 28 million to celebrate the War of 1812. What is your Administration doing in this regard?

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, I need clarification. Was that a question or is that a stand-up routine? I'm not sure which one it was Mr. Speaker. I'm assuming it was a question and I will take that under advisement. I studied the War of 1812 in History in school, so during our lunch break Mr. Speaker, I'll follow up on that and I will get back to the Councillor in good time.

**Mr. Speaker:** Harvey was there…(laughter)

**Mayor Katz:** I'd never say that.

**Mr. Speaker:** Second question Councillor Smith. Councillor Smith, do you have a second question? Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Thank you. Mr. Speaker, recently it was in the news the Kapyong Barracks came up. This is a matter that's been now with the Treaty One First Nations taking the Federal Government to court, a Federal court has already ruled in their favour. The Federal Government has appealed it. We as a Council are on record of being in favour of urban reserves because we know that it creates development opportunities, jobs, and opportunities for young Aboriginal members of our society, to counter act the crime and the challenges we have and to build a stronger and healthier Aboriginal community. We're not a litigious people, the Americans are. You know, let them have the lawsuits and take everybody to court. Mr. Mayor, would you be prepared as the Mayor of the City to pull the Federal Government in the room and the Provincial Government and say enough is enough, let's settle this. Let's make this work. The treaty land entitlement process is clear. They have to do a municipal development service agreement with us in terms of services to pay what they would pay normally. Would you be prepared to do that so that we can bring this to an end this, we could see the Kapyong Barracks being renewed and developed and opportunities for Aboriginal people and at the same time Mr. Mayor end this conflict which is completely counter-productive in our City?

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, I will tell you the Kapyong Barracks story is a very sad and pathetic situation, and I can tell you that different governments in Ottawa have both made mistakes and this has dragged on and on and on. In the meantime, it's costing everybody. There are those who believe the houses should be used. There are those such as yours truly who believes the City of Winnipeg is losing millions of dollars in property taxes. I remember in year two of being Mayor when I sat down with Canada Land Banks and discussed the types of development that can be there. The realities and I know the good Councillor is well intentioned, but you know what? If I thought it would help, I'd stand on the top of one of the high-rises at Portage and Main and yell at the top of my lungs enough is enough, let's move on, but the facts are I am not in a position to tell the Federal Government what to do. There is a process. However, I can share with Councillor Wyatt that I myself got fed-up and I have had discussions with some of the Chiefs that are involved to see if we could potentially find a resolution without all this insanity that's going on in the courts, Mr. Speaker, that could go on for God knows how long and I agree, it's not helping anybody, and I can share with Councillor Wyatt, even that is a difficult task just trying to get all those Chiefs together. It's not easy, believe me. Everybody has a different opinion. But that I am trying to do.

**Mr. Speaker:** Second question.

**Councillor Wyatt:** I appreciate the response, Mr. Mayor, and I think there is, unfortunately, still a lot of misinformation and ignorance in terms of this issue, in terms of what kind of development would occur there, and it's clear that we have to overcome, that if we're going to resolve this issue. So, would you be prepared to again, pull the Federal Minister in, the Premier in, and the leaders in terms of this and say look, enough is enough. Let's resolve this. Let's find a way to resolve this, because it's only going to take somebody like yourself Mr. Mayor, who can actually do that; the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, to say enough of this bickering and fighting. It's ridiculous as you just said. Let's resolve it once and for all.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker first of all…..

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

**Mayor Katz:** As Councillor Wyatt is aware of, this Council has approved an Economic Development Zone in the area of I believe it's Madison. I don't know what stage it's at, but we've done that. The situation is, I can also share with the rest of Council that I have had a discussion with the lead Minister, Minister Toews, on this topic and I'm going to continue to discuss it and I can assure Councillor Wyatt and the rest of Council that I will do everything I can to see if

we can move this forward as quickly as possible. The realities are; there are many entities involved with this. It's not the simplest scenario to say the least but I think we all agree that the earlier we get a resolution, the better it will be for all of us, and I will commit to doing the best I can in that situation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Mayor Katz. That concludes the Question Period on EPC. Next up; our Standing Policy Committee for Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank, Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED OCTOBER 3, 2011**

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you. I'm pleased to introduce the Report and move adoption, the Report of October 3, 2011; Move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. October 7th, I'm sorry.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED OCTOBER 7, 2011**

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'll introduce the Report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Item 1.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. No motions. No by-laws and do we have Question Period for Councillor Swandel? Seeing none, we'll move onto Standing Policy Committee for Property and Development, Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED OCTOBER 4, 2011**

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, I will introduce the Report of October 4 and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 15. Okay, I'll move Items 1 through 9 and 11 through 15 please.

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

**Item 10 - Rezoning 705 McMillan Avenue
eFile DAZ 213/2011**

**Councillor Browaty:** I will like to move Item 10.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Okay, before we do the by-laws we do have a motion that we are going to walk-on today and you have all received the document. This is an issue that is somewhat time sensitive and unfortunately needs to be dealt with so the Project can go forward. I'll turn it over to Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** I asked the Clerk to send you an electronic copy.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Browaty if you can share with us where we're at with this. Sure. This is By-law No. 125/2011 again, it's time sensitive I understand due to Federal funding. It is in Councillor Fielding's Ward if he wanted to rise on a Point of Privilege just to give Councillor Eadie a little bit of backup on this. I would welcome him to do so.

**Councillor Fielding:** Sure, pleasure to do that. I did receive an email this morning from Mr. Roy Nicol who represents the Westlands Corporation. Essentially what this is, it's a housing development happening in my Ward.

What the City did was we used our land. We sold them land for $1. There is a whole bunch of Provincial dollars that they are getting through stimulus dollars through the Federal Government for $2.1 million. It was a zoning that went to Committee, was approved by all Committees and I believe it came through here as well through Council and there is no opposition at all to the development that's happened. I guess through a variety of sources they had to get some site work and that stuff, that's where it's done; got a call this morning that, you know, if they don't get started on the project right away, the Federal stimulus dollars for Westlands Corporation could be in jeopardy and they've got to expend the money by March 31, 2002. I think it's an amount of $2.1 million the Westlands would be lost; site - just reading kind of the email exactly; the age of the site has some subdivision and rezoning's that are part of it. Anyway it's a fantastic project, in any event, just the By-law that's there.

**Mr. Speaker:** Do you want to suspended the rules?

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

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you Councillor Fielding and now I'll ready to move that the Rule be suspended and By-law Number 125/2011 be read a first time.

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

**Clerk:** By-Law No. 125/2011

**Councillor Browaty:** I move that By-law No. 125/2011 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 125/2011.

**Councillor Browaty:** I move that the Rule be suspended and By-law No. 125/2011 be read a third time and the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And you have another list of by-laws there.

**Councillor Browaty:** I'd like to move the following by-laws; By-law No. 122/2011, 123/2011, 124/2011.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 122/2011, By-law No. 123/2011 and By-law No. 124/2011.

**Councillor Browaty:** I move that By-law Nos. 122/2011 to 124/2011 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law Nos. 122/2011 to 124/2011 both inclusive.

**Councillor Browaty:** I move that the Rules be suspended and By-law Nos. 122/2011 to 124/2011 both inclusive be read a third time and same be passed in ordered to be signed and sealed.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period now for Policy Committee of Property and Development, Councillor Wyatt.

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

**Councillor Wyatt:** Thank you. Councillor, you recently moved a motion a couple of meetings ago on electronic signs, and that we should have a review done and that we should have a policy in terms of these electronic signs and the growth and development and the change in technology that's driving this with these new digital signs. Where is that review and how soon can we expect a policy coming back to the Committee and to Council or consideration?

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Through you Mr. Speaker to Councillor Wyatt. I believe you were at the policy meeting where we had that discussion, and I believe the instructions we gave the Administration was to research what other Canadian and U.S. jurisdictions are doing in terms of best policies, as well as exploring quite specifically revenue opportunities, making sure that these national and international ventures that are doing these sort of billboards in Winnipeg, that they're paying the same amounts or better than they are in other jurisdictions in the country. We asked 180 days, which I believe was back in June or July. I believe the last word I heard from the Department was we were looking at the January or February Standing Policy Committee meeting.

**Mr. Speaker:** Second question?

**Councillor Wyatt:** Since it's only January or February, clearly word has gotten out that we may be changing the rules regarding electronic signs and there is a rush out there in the industry to get up electronic signs hitherto all over the place before we make a change in the rules. Would you entertain the idea of maybe approaching the industry with a voluntary ban on applying for more electronic signs until we as a City have a Policy, because right now, they're running around trying to get…voluntary…

**Councillor Browaty:** Again, the review that we asked to do was rather all-encompassing. There's third party advertising, billboards, the digital ones that are done by companies like Pattison and CBS Outdoor, and then there's also ones on private property, which again at the moment under I think most of the Zoning By-laws do not permit third party advertising. There's all sorts of rules about motion and non-motion. It's really all-encompassing, and picking and choosing what's suspended and not suspended is a little challenging, I'd argue. I don't even know if we have the legal means to do so in an immediate fashion. I will certainly bring this up with the Department and ask if there's in fact been a rush of them; if there is any means to look at a temporary suspension in new ones while we go through this process. Again, it's an important part of industry. We don't want to slow things down but it is something that we can discuss.

**Mr. Speaker:** Last question.

**Councillor Wyatt:** I appreciate that, and I stress voluntary. I mean I realize legally we may not be able to do that, but if we approached and say asked for a voluntary good faith. We know we're going to be coming out with a Policy as soon as January or February. It's not far away. Okay, hold off guys. A voluntary slow-down. Stop applying for these signs until we have a Policy to show good faith.

**Mr. Speaker:** Last response.

**Councillor Browaty:** I thank the Councillor for the question, I mean, we could ask for anything we like, but I think his asking on the floor of Council here gets that message across that we'd request that. So if we can do something…if he wants to be a little more formal than that, I'd be willing to hear what he suggests. As an individual Councillor you can certainly do that as well.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further questions for Property and Development? Seeing none, we'll move on to Standing Policy Committee for Protection and Community Services, Councillor Havixbeck is the Chair.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED SEPTEMBER 26, 2011**

**Councillor Havixbeck**: Yes. I would like to advise that Item 1 has been referred to the Capital Budget process and Item 2 to the Operating Budget Review process and I move those Items.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Smith you have… (inaudible). You can speak to the referred-- it's been referred to the Operating Budget and you can speak to the referral but at the Committee, okay. Fair enough. Carry on Councillor Havixbeck. Motion; there's no motions; we have by-laws.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** I move that By-law No. 121/2011 be read a first time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 121/2011.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** I move that By-law No. 121/2011 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 121/2011.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** I move that the Rule be suspended and By-law No. 121/2011 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period for Protection and Community Services, Councillor Wyatt.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD**

**Councillor Wyatt:** As the new Chair, or relatively new Chair of Protection and Community Services, the decision was made by E.P.C. on motion that went to your Committee before the summer, to send back to the Administration with a Report with regards to the issue of banning snowmobiling inside the City of Winnipeg. The Winnipeg Police Service and the Chief of Police, Keith McCaskill, made a very strong and passionate case at the Standing Committee a party being Chair; that there should be a City-wide ban on snowmobiling inside the City. And it went to E.P.C., E.P.C. debated it, sent it back to Administration with a Report coming back to your Committee. Now where is that at? The snow is about to fly. It's getting cold, and we don't have a resolution to this at the beginning of the snowmobiling season, and that's a concern for me because of what happened in January of this year.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Havixbeck.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Through you Mr. Speaker, I thank you to Councillor Wyatt for raising that. I am not aware at this moment exactly where that Report is at but we will follow up with the Departments who were sent off to work on it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you. Second question?

**Councillor Wyatt:** Would, in light of the fact that the season is starting soon; can we have an assurance that we'll get this Report moving? The Police are very much in support of this and they want to see it happen and bring this recommendation back so we can amend Council Policy.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Havixbeck.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Sure. Thank you. Yes absolutely, we meet on Monday so I will raise it for Monday's meeting.

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

**Councillor Smith:** Councillor, at the last Standing Committee, you made a commitment to take me out to look at this goose problem. When does your schedule allow for that? I haven't heard from you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Havixbeck.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** This is true. At our Standing Committee meeting I committed to Councillor Smith to taking him out to Kenaston and some of the areas where the retention ponds are seeing a higher population of geese, and I asked my Assistant to set that up, so there will be something set up before the geese fly south. I can guarantee that.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further questions for Protection and Community Services? Seeing none, I will call on Councillor Vandal to introduce Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED OCTOBER 3, 2011**

**Councillor Vandal:** Thank you Speaker Nordman. It's my pleasure to move Item 2 as Consent and a short Introduction for Item 1 which is our Master Plan on Recycling and Garbage.

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

**Item 1 - Garbage and Recycling Master Plan**

**Councillor Vandal:** Thank you Speaker Nordman. It's my pleasure to present the -- what is called the Recycling and Garbage Master Plan. I would like to call it the Waste Minimization Master Plan, Mr. Speaker, which was adopted unanimously by the Committee of Public Works on October 3 and tie vote at Executive Committee. I call it the Waste Minimization Master Plan, Mr. Speaker, because that's exactly what it is. The underlying value principal behind the entirety of the Plan over the next 8 to 10 years is to minimize waste. And Mr. Speaker, if this Plan is approved today and I sincerely hope that it is, the changes will result in our residential garbage diversion increasing to about 55% from the meager 15% which it is today, within the next 8 to 10 years Mr. Speaker. At 15% we're at the bottom of the diversion list across major cities in Canada. In fact, we are tied with the City of Regina and nobody wants to be tied with Regina. And if these improvements are implemented over a 8 to 10 year period we will be near the top of that list. To put this in context, Speaker Nordman, this means the greenhouse gas reductions will be removed from these improvements, will be approximately 300,000 tons. And this is the equivalent of removing 54,000 vehicles from our City of Winnipeg streets, a number that is incredibly significant as we strive to meet our greenhouse gas reduction goals which we adopted I believe in 2008 or 2007 which all major cities have adopted for themselves. Mr. Speaker, on a very practical basis the changes will include and I'm reading from the Report our Garbage Collection System we will have an Automated Garbage Cart Collecting System consisting of a 240 liter green bin at the curb which will be picked up every week which is the equivalent of 3 garbage bags. We will have the same sort of bin which is collected, 240 litres for recycling which is the equivalent of 4 blue boxes. Mr. Speaker, we will have a Leaf and Yard Waste Collection Program at the curb, picked up at the curb, beginning in the 7 months out of the year beginning in 2013 at which point the Leaf-It Depots will be phased out. We are going to implement a residential kitchen organic pilot project for pick up in 2014 and pending anticipated positive take up by our constituents, we are going to roll it out completely in 2017. And we are also going to be constructing community resource recovery centres, CRRC's, four CRRC's across the city beginning with the Brady Road Landfill which will pick up, which will accommodate other garbage that won't be picked up at the curb, not organics but lumber, electronics, hazardous waste and other larger type recycling Mr. Speaker. There are other initiatives of course that are going to be rolled out or other capital costs that are going to be rolled out. The Administration have done a great job. I want to thank the CEO and his staff. There have been all sorts of public consultations Mr. Speaker, there's

been workshops for all of Council. We've had a special working session for Standing Committee. And over all, Mr. Speaker I'm proud to move this forward. I'm going to talk; I think at this point I've Introduced it. I'm going to listen to what the comments are and I'm going to try to address those comments as we sum up, as I sum up, before the vote is taken. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks Councillor Vandal. We do have actually two motions with regard to this Item, so the first one is Motion 3 from Councillor Gerbasi if you would like to speak to Motion 3.

Motion 3
Moved Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Vandal,

THAT Item 1 of the Report of Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated October 3, 2011 be amended by adding a new recommendation 1.30 which states:

"30. Be it resolved that a Waste and Diversion Advisory Committee of knowledgeable volunteer citizens (similar to the Active Transportation Advisory Committee) be created to work with the Public Service to provide advice and recommendations for the completion, implementation, and continual improvement of the Garbage and Recycling Master Plan."

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Am I speaking to the motion or doing…

**Mr. Speaker:** We'll do the whole…

**Councillor Gerbasi:** The whole thing at once to save time, I think I can do that. The motion is very simple. It's based on -- you heard the delegation earlier, Mr. Miller recommended this and I think it's a very good recommendation. The motion is seconded by Councillor Vandal and it asks that a Waste Aversion Advisory Committee of knowledgeable volunteer citizens similar to the Active Transportation Advisory Committee that we have be created to work with the public service to provide advice and recommendations for completion, implementation and continual improvement of the Garbage and Recycling Master Plan. I think it's very straightforward. I hope you'll support it. We have knowledgeable citizens who have spent years and years working on these issues and they are a huge asset to us and I think we should use their support in improving this system as it goes forward.

These are my comments in general on the Garbage and Recycling Master Plan. One thing I've learned from my time on Council is that bringing forward environmentally friendly initiatives is not -- in this city is not easy. For one thing there are so many competing priorities, and that the things that people see as life and death are more important and that always happens and so years go by and we continue to behave in ways that neglect and damage our earth and put our future in jeopardy in the longer term. In the words of Kurt Vonnegut Junior, we could have saved the earth but we were too damn cheap". I don't want to be that way. Now I'm not claiming that this Garbage and Recycling Master Plan is perfect or that it can in fact save the earth by itself. However, it's true that it is a huge step forward and in compared to what we are currently doing. Our current diversion rate of 15% is a national disgrace; if nothing else, this Plan could pull us out of the deep dark cellar of shame that many people feel about our City's standing compared to other cities. Other cities that have diversion rates of 50 to 80%. It will also result in a significant reduction as Councillor Vandal just mentioned of greenhouse gas emissions an impacted equivalent to removing 54,000 automobiles off the street. The truth is that we like all other Municipalities should be doing their part to deal with the climate change crisis that our society has brought upon itself; and that this Council has in fact committed to do that by being part of the FCM Partners for climate change protection and we need to take some action, we need to do something. It blows my mind that it was back in 2003 already that there was an attempt by the previous Mayor to limit the amount of garbage people could throw out and that effort was shot down and here we are, I think about five of us supported it back then. And now, here we are, almost ten years later with a diversion rate of 15% and people can throw out as much garbage as they want and we'll pick it up; that's our current situation. And so please tell me this Council is not going to shoot this thing down and go back to -- and stay where we are. I just hope that isn't an option for anybody. If that happens, I will have to face my colleagues across the country, incredibly humbled and red faced to explain what is happening on Winnipeg City Council but worse than that is answering to our constituents that

nothing is going to change and that we will continue to have an outdated and terribly wasteful collection system. I just hope that won't happen today. I would also like to put in context that this Council, over a year ago, this Council was making decisions about garbage and recycling systems in a mad rush to meet deadlines for contracts as the individual contracts came up and some of us challenged that approach and said "let's hold off with those contracts, let's develop a plan, extend the existing ones until we can up with a comprehensive plan". Something that will make some difference in our diversion rate and Council listened to that, which doesn't always happen around here that everybody listens and we worked together on something and that's what happened. And there was this Garbage and Recycling Master Plan process. There was significant public consultation and a lot of times we hear complaints about that public consultation process. In this case we haven't heard a lot of complaints because it was a pretty good process. They did a pretty good job of hearing from the public and trying to respond with something that address some of those concerns and provides significant improvements. There are many aspects of the plan I can talk to but I know there's not time. I would like to mention that clearly, it's time for the residential communal auto bin to go the way of the dinosaur. Its day is done. With the individual automated bins being brought in, I'm able to support that because we'll have bins with lids that will keep our back lanes tidy and people will take individual responsibility for how much they throw out. The reality is and furthermore, the plan will reduce illegal dumping that occurs because of the very existence of the auto bin it is encourages illegal dumping. The diversion rates from these bins are terrible and their unsightly sources of vandalism, arson and illegal dumping. It's also part of the plan which might address the delegation earlier, to tighten up the By-laws and give them some more teeth in terms of enforcing cases of illegal dumping which is a serious problem in our City. We have been assured that abandoned waste will continue to be picked up for free and that community groups in the inner city can call in with lists of abandoned waste that they see as they do now and that will continue being picked up. So I think that's important. There is the issue of the $50 fee and I appreciate Councillor Eadie's effort, I know he did a lot of work to come up with numbers and to try and come up an alternative based on the ability to pay but I'm not really convinced that it's the best way to go, the way he is describing it. The broad categories of the home, you can understand them but they are so broad, it's not really -- like for example, my house is assessed at under $200,000 but I should be paying $50. I just can't reconcile it, I mean if we want to do something for those that cannot afford to pay, and I think we need to do it in a different way. But I totally appreciate the intent of Councillor Eadie and we all have, many of us, have residents who are; any increase in any fee is very difficult. And the other thing about Ross's motion that I'm concerned about is that it raises only 7.5 million instead of 10 million as proposed by the fee that is in our Report. And the reason I think we need to raise that 10 million is that is going into a dedicated reserve fund as recommended by our Committee, only for diversion efforts; only for environmental efforts. So, if we don't have that pot of money in that reserve, I don't see us ever moving ahead to curbside compost, I don't see us ever and we'll never get over that 50%; we'll never get anywhere unless we actually put the money aside and that's what the original plan does and I think we have to stick to that. And the Committee very clearly amended the Report to clearly say, that the reserve fund be established and all surplus monies collected through the user fee be dedicated to Waste Diversion Programs which is also a concern of our delegation earlier. That money that's dedicated in an user fee has to go to that it cannot be taken off into general revenue, you know, because our citizens trust that they are paying something for something. You just can't do that. It just not right. In my view in an ideal world and maybe we can move towards this and I think we should; is that the payment system should be based somehow connected to how much garbage your throwing out and there's been some suggestions on that, put forward by the green action folks, you know, and this has been talked about that if you produce less you should pay less. I realize there's some, you know, you can save, if you want a super-size bin you should pay for it but really we could do more in terms of, in rewarding environmental stewardship by saying, you know if you throw out less; you pay less and giving people a choice. You can pay more if you want to produce more garbage; if you want to buy those packaging choices and so on. So, I think there is room to improve the payment structure here but I also agree, that we need to move forward and I've seen it stalled; I've seen it stopped and in 2003 it was shot down completely and we're still where we were. We haven't gone anywhere. It's a shame to see us sit like this at this level of diversion and it's also been mentioned there's many more areas that we really need to address to make a difference like the construction waste and commercial waste but that's why I put forward the motion with Councillor Vandal on the Advisory Committee because I really believe the expertise is there on how we can make this better in terms of the payment structure going forward so it's rewarding behaviour that where people choose to produce less garbage in terms of ideas of dealing with some of the recycling and really dealing with the material and finding new ways to compost and using that expertise that we have out there, to really improve our diversion rates. So I urge everyone to move this thing forward. Let's get started. I do agree, it may seem like a big step compared to what we've done before….

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Orlikow moves Extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** It may seem like a big step but is still is only a first step in a sense it's still more, many more steps to go to achieve the kind of environmental footprint we should but it's still very, very positive in terms of greenhouse gas reduction. In terms of decreasing our diversion rate to something more respectable that we can be proud of as a City and I actually think that citizens do really care about environmental issues, it's just right in your face, there's other issues push them off the table and we never move forward and we never get anything done because there's money goes to something else that we also need. So here's a chance and a system and methodology to pay for to move us forward, so I hope we will move forward today. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Eadie to put forward a motion for.

Motion 4
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,

THAT Item 1 of the report of Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated October 3, 2011 be amended by deleting recommendations 1.21 and 1.27 and replacing them with the following:

"21. A. That user fee charges per single-family residential dwelling unit, as defined by the Solid Waste By-law No. 1340/76 of seven or less dwellings per property, be billed as follows:

i) $2.09 per month collected quarterly on the water bill at $6.25 for 3 months on properties having assessment values of 0 to $199,999,

ii) $4.17 per month collected quarterly on the water bill at $12.50 for 3 months on properties having assessment values of $200,000 to $399,999,

iii) $6.25 per month collected quarterly on the water bill at $18.75 for 3 months on properties having assessment values of $400,000 and greater,

be approved, to be implemented no earlier than October 1, 2012; and

B. the property assessment values used to indicate what a single-family residential unit will pay quarterly be updated every five years to reflect changing assessment values; and

C. a waste diversion reserve fund be established where all surplus monies collected through this user fee be dedicated to waste diversion programs; and

D. changes in the garbage user fee must be approved by a two thirds vote of City Council."

"27. That small commercial establishments eligible for garbage collection service under the Solid Waste By-law No. 1340/76, be charged the same user fee as single-family residential dwelling units with assessment values $400,000 and greater and therefore be eligible for the same waste diversion services."

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes thank you Speaker Nordman. My opportunity to speak to all of the motions and the recommendations that came from Public Works not concurred in by EPC. First of all, I want just like to start to talk about you can be emotional about garbage and I know when they brought auto bins in, it was very emotional debate and there was a lot of controversy, and so my ideas as I presented them and my ideas are actually a compromise. As people will know I tried to bring forth an even more simpler method which I'll speak of briefly in a moment but I just wanted to explain to you, all of Council and those who are listening in, and who will read about these stories later, hopefully people will realize this, there was a conservative government I'm sure that was in place in this Province when they came up with the property tax, market value assessment methodology to calculating one's property taxes

in this Province. So, I would just like to point out to people that it is not a -- technically not a socialist concept that we used market value assessment to determine one's ability to pay for said property taxes where we should all share in the core services and the core services included garbage but also include all those other services like being able to participate at a Community Centre no matter what your ability you have to pay. And so in this motion, what I was proposing is a compromise because ultimately what should of happened here is you didn't need to change the Charter, you didn't need to change anything here, all you could do is take the data, create a garbage rate which by the way is 0.000238, in order to apply against the value of any home which is what we would, which is actually what would happen basically to that degree under your property taxes. And so I wanted to incorporate that in a water bill. It's a simple thing, yes, a water bill's good. Mr. Saleski today told us about accountability for the money you spend. Well, yes, if it's on the water bill there's a separate line for it and it will be there and we expect the Water and Waste Department to actually report how much they are collecting, in all revenues, how much they are expending and how we deal with this and that's what we as City Councillor's, all of us, agree we need to do to be fiscally prudent because that, we were elected to make sure we have a fiduciary obligation to our constituents. Now going back to the methodology. I would point out to you that Mr. Saleski who is producing very little garbage, as a matter of fact, he has no option. He gets to pay $50 no matter what. Mr. Saleski worked hard all his life; like there are working families all over this City and they have values of homes that are different and if they were paying it on the Property Taxes, Mr. Saleski would be paying $14.98 to achieve $10 million dollars across the whole City. I'll speak to the $10 million dollars later because that's another part. So, in terms of determining our rate, because people thought that it was too complex to create a garbage rate, it is not complex, it's a simple thing to do. We can apply it to every house we do it for Property Taxes, we can do it in a Water Bill System, it's no big deal, you don't need to change the Charter. Now, what we did then, compromise, 25, 50, 75. If I was living in a $500,000 home and it's on my property taxes and remember, lots of the diversion is going on the property taxes but a $500,000 home is $119.00. Under this plan we're subsidized the rich they only have to pay 75! Never mind I'm attacking the rich. I'm giving the rich a break because if we did do this the way our forefathers decided that we were charge for garbage services they would pay $119.00 and I'm not saying that those people are rich, you know, a $500,000 house, your market value creeps up man and creeps up really fast. I know people who originally bought houses in Tuxedo; I'm sure they bought them for 200,000 and now they are worth over a million; that's because they bought in a place where they could afford at the time. Now, going on to my second part of this, so, that's why I came up with those fees and I don't know why people can't live with that because you know what ,ou add costs the same amount of money at every house to pick up the garbage but you know what, the way we paid for that core service is the way we should continue to do that and Mr. Saleski who you heard takes good care to recycle all his goods, he produces one bag maybe a week of garbage he says, right, so why not let him pay $14.98? Let's be fair. Okay, now, when it comes to the surplus now, this thing has a pro vision; there are surpluses still, this plan still comes up with a minimal $300,000 surplus that goes into the diversion rate but it goes into diversion; it's a surplus for diversion; and I want to point out something. In Item 20. We are voting on Item 20. There is a controversy here. There's a conflict. There is actually a hypocritical Section in here, Section 20 before 21, where we will charge the fee, Section 20 says that "we will put all diversion costs on property taxes and we will put the garbage collection on the water bill. That is not what we're doing when we're collecting a $3 million surplus, to go ahead and spend money down in the future. If we're going to do; let's follow the principal that's in there okay; let's do that, and there still a surplus. I don't understand the problem with this, so these are facts. These are facts. This is not me making up anything. I did the research, you know, it was already… actually I want to point out something about this plan. This plan was already decided because we got a seminar, yeah it was a month before we vote on it but it was released to the public the next day and everybody already took a position that that's the way they're going to be. So you know what, there's no proper input here. Put in the work and you try to save, let's compromise and come up with the best plan. I can't vote for this Recycle Plan if we don't deal with garbage in a fair manner for working families, seniors like Mr. Saleski and he would pay a lot less. I would also point out in this particular proposal that I'm making, that there's a two-thirds vote requirement. That's a right wing idea eh? Let's prevent, let's make it really difficult to increase the fee on the water bill because frankly that's what most of the people in this City are worried about when they hear a new $50.00 tax is basically what it is. When they hear that, what they is, uh oh, that's increasing what's going to happen here it could increase so put in a two-thirds vote. What's the matter with that? It's not a problem. And we also in Section 27 we talk about small commercial being moved in. Let's have small commercial be participant in our garbage program. You know, ultimately we need to catch a full commercial aspect. We can't get 50% diversion only on residential. In Copenhagen they're directing all residential and corporate -- all garbage, 95%. They paid a lot of money for it but yet producing 95% diversion and only 5% going into landfills. And I know why they paid for it, they don't have a lot of land but you know what, it's probably very innovative. Now, so let's

have the two-thirds vote and I wanted to speak just a little bit about the garbage plan itself. You know, auto bins are not the greatest thing. People do throw out garbage but you know, bringing in these small garbage carts is not going to solve the garbage problem in some parts of the north end. It is not, because if their grey bins get full they'll just throw the garbage in the back lane. Where are we hiring the By-law enforcement people because these people what they do are they'll throw the garbage in a back lane behind somebody else's house. And then who do we charge for that. So this is not a perfect solution. We need to understand that and it's considered but I can't, frankly, vote for this plan unless we go with this proposed amendment to this plan so that we can actually follow some of the principles that we set aside. And the seconder, Councillor Harvey Smith to this motion, I'm, I believe will have a good thing to speak about. Why aren't we getting the commercial waste? And I know it involves the Province but I am; Councillor Smith also has the same concerns that people's ability to pay is very important when we move ahead with a waste minimization plan as Councillor Vandal has mentioned. So I've pretty well spoken my piece. There's way more I could say but you know, the fact of the matter is, I can't vote for this plan unless we recognize that some people have different abilities to pay. It just works out, we couldn't implement the plan with a smaller bin; you pay a smaller fee but if implement charging these taxes in the manner that we already do for garbage – oh, it was alluded that $75.00 is the cost for a current garbage plan. That sounds like a flat fee it is not. Of that $75.00, Mr. Saleski does not currently pay $75.00 a year for garbage. He pays way less and he produces way less. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Eadie. Now, as we go forward with the discussion here we're going to be discussing both Motion 3 and Motion 4 as well as the original Item. So first on the list is Councillor Sharma.

**Councillor Sharma:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to reaffirm the position I took at the Infrastructure and Public Works meeting where I supported this Master Plan. The 240 litre rolling garbage carts were introduced in February 2010 in a few parts of the City. My Ward was one of those areas and I can tell you they work. This pilot project has decreased the amount of garbage collected and there has been an increase in yard collection and recycling. I feel this can be accomplished city wide. This plan is about our future, Mr. Speaker. Over the next 20 years, this Master Plan has the potential to keep more than 50% of our garbage out of the Brady Landfill. This would mean several things. Less long term care of the landfill, less toxic liquid to be captured and treated. Less greenhouse gas, an extended lifespan of the landfill and a reduced cost to manage and operate Brady road. Our city has the worst waste diversion rate in Canada at 15%. It is so important that we find a sustainable way to deal with our garbage now so future generations don't have to carry this burden. The environmental benefits of this plan are many and I believe the action plan is well thought out and moving in the right direction. I will be supporting this, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks Councillor Sharma, Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yes Mr. Speaker, I rise on the Item. First I want to speak to the motion which I think would be the one that this more contentious Councillor Eadie's amendment with seconded by Councillor Smith. You know, I want to say it's been a year working with Councillor Eadie now since he was elected last fall and I think he is a great addition to our Council. He's very hard working, very diligent and the work he has done here is impressive. I sat with him last week when he was actually on his keyboard, typing on a -- looked like an excel sheet I'm guessing and firing in numbers and coming up with solutions that I wouldn't -- or most people wouldn't be able to do and he did that and it Very impressed that he came with some ideas and solutions; I think, again, Mr. Speaker, I think it's not so much what he is coming forward with is the problem it's not the problem, I think this is definitely workable, what he is proposing and I supporting the motion to amend. Again, it's the process, which I think you know everybody gets themselves in our process here, wrapped up into a box, you know, put into a position where they can't come down from, in terms of stated positions in terms of now. We had this Council Seminar and I want to thank the Mayor for calling that, and I had the impression from the Council Seminar, it was on a Friday and we were supposed to consider this matter at the Standing Policy Committee the following week on I think it was a Monday or a Tuesday. But the decision was made to cancel that Standing Committee Meeting on Public Works and delay it for another week because of the fact that we were having a seminar just before and I thought, I assumed, that that meant that the Report wasn't going to be published immediately and that there would have been time for this kind of dialogue, informally, to take place where we could have had the dialogue in terms of this. I understand why and basically later that same day, you know, literally an hour or two after the Seminar, boom, there it is on the computer, the announcement made, a Press Release and the Report is out and now everybody is lining up in terms of their position and can't get off their so-called high horse. And that's the problem, Mr. Speaker. And I understand why that's done sometimes. It's done because

there is a concern that 15 or 16 Members of Council somebody's going to walk out and leak it anyways. Well the reality is this Plan was leaked back in August and what was put out at the Council Seminar wasn't really that much different than what we read in the paper in August. So, what was the worry about having some time to have this discussion and I think, you know, Councillor Eadie's ideas and suggestions of your know and my guess is his motion will be defeated today to amend, is a victim of that process, you know, where we could have had that kind of back and forth before a Report gets published. Now I know EPC and IEPC have plenty of time for that discussion but the reality is the rest of Council does not, so that discussion, Mr. Speaker, I think would have been much appreciated but didn't happen. But the work he did and the work Councillor Eadie did in terms of coming up with a solution, the idea that, that there should be an equitable way to pay for garbage collection considering that by and large actually all of the garbage collection now is paid off the mill rate support which is somewhat progressive based on assessment values is not a bad idea. It's not a radical idea. It's an idea which makes sense. Now as you pointed out, the amount of money raised is less than projected. The surplus would be less but as you pointed out, the amount that it would raise would still be enough to do the program that's being proposed. So, Mr. Speaker, I think he gave good thought, he gave good advice, is giving good advice to Council and it makes sense. I don't think somebody who has a $400,000 plus house is rich. A lot of folks are house poor, so to speak you know. But Mr. Speaker, it is a way to somehow balance that in terms of the 25, 50 and 75. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I'll be supporting his amendment and when it comes to the actual clause, giving it serious thought and consideration, there has been a lot of hard work done on this Report. At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, no system that we're going to come out with is perfect. The existing system has its advantages and has its disadvantages. The new system will be the same. The reality is, Mr. Speaker, we have to, as a City, do our share in terms of waste diversion and reducing the waste going into the landfills and the impact in terms of greenhouse gases. Now I know the reality is Mr. Speaker, you know, maybe 50,000 vehicles is not a lot, I mean, in the big picture of things but you know you add up every Municipality and it does start to make a difference and I think we as a Council know that the last major change we made in terms of our garbage handling really was as far back as 1995 when Council voted to bring forward the blue box program. And that program, I think has worked well but again, it's subject to the diversion rate going up and down. In 2003 I believe it was, Mayor Murray at the time or was it 04, you know, offered free blue boxes and there was I don't know if you recall, there was like a mad rush. Remember a photograph in the paper at Garden City Shopping Centre people lined up in a mad rush to get their blue box and right after that, diversion rates shot back up again, because basically folks weren't buying another blue box after they lost it or it was blown away or stolen or whatever, right. Hopefully this with these larger bins they're more secure, more hefty, I mean no doubt there will be some who, you know, fall off the plate but the reality is I think they're more secure that we'll see the diversion rate continue so, and improve with this program. You know Mr. Speaker, I believe, that after there was a leak back in August, I made a point of phoning the Mayor and telling the Mayor that – you know, because I read his comments at the time and he was alarmed and concerned of the leak and not sure about this $50 charge. And I expressed, you know, I think it makes sense, you know. We have to move forward as a City. Now, there are some who would argue that, this is an unfair burden. I mean the last civic election, you know, it was a whole thing about one Candidate promising a 2% property tax increase and another Candidate saying that it will drive Seniors out of their homes, right, but I don't think, I think we've matured since back then, a year later and I think the Mayor is on the right path here.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Vandal moves Extension. All those in Favour? Opposed? Carried.

**Councillor Wyatt:** This project Mr. Speaker, that we are about to undertake is not unique to Winnipeg. It's unique to us only because we've never done it before, but it is literally happening across the country, the same methodology of collecting and diverting waste. It is the first step Mr. Speaker, to look at the organics because that, Mr. Speaker, is by and large, the bulk -- a good chunk of the household waste. And it is the part of the house hold waste which creates the large amount of greenhouse gases that end up coming out of our landfill. It is quite right what Councillor Eadie said about commercial and industrial waste. However, we know that, we as a City have not been in the business ever, that I can recall in terms of commercial waste other than smaller sized businesses that we pick up for. The commercial industrial waste Mr. Speaker is something they we have to deal with, with the private sector in my mind. We don't necessarily have to be but there should be solutions and maybe it has to be done with a carrot and a stick in terms of bringing the private sector in both commercial and industrial, to the table in the next few years to divert that waste because that's 50% of the waste folks, that's going straight, over 50%, thank you, going straight into the landfill and that's not acceptable. You know, we have to find solutions for that, so we're talking about less than 50% of the waste here, believe it or not. So those are my comments. Again, there's going to be a fault with any program that

you bring out. I think that if we were to reject this today, I think it would be a setback for us. I think we should try to move forward, I believe what Councillor Eadie is doing is right. I hope I'm wrong that it will be defeated; I encourage Council to look at this and to adopt his amendment because it's well thought out. He worked with Nelson Karpa of the Assessment Branch and it makes sense and is fair and equitable. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Swandel.

**Councillor Swandel**: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I want to make just a few brief comments. To me, this is a no brainer. We need to modernize our waste minimization and waste collection processes. Other cities have done it and other cities have done it at far greater cost than what we're doing it at. Let me start just on the motions. Councillor Gerbasi's motion which I think has some good intent. I'll support it or not support it. I don't think it really makes much of a difference. We've got a lot of advisory groups established throughout the City already that are waste folks interact with on a regular basis. They come here to interact with us on a regular basis. Good example is this morning. One of the groups showed up and made a presentation, so, I'm not sure that we need to be, creating sort of more process here when we can already get that information, so it's really sort of a non-entity to me. The second motion in front of us is Councillor Eadie's motion. And I just think it's fundamentally flawed. You know, Assessment is not an appropriate way of assessing fees for waste. A household produces waste not an assessed value. And so this is a fee per household you know. So if you want to base it on Assessed Value and your objective is to decrease the amount of waste that's going to the landfill, when you look at the rates of diversion, where they are in the City right now, in the inner city where a lot of lower assessed value, it's got some of the lowest rates of diversion, so if you take it from a waste minimization perspective and that's the objective, it's kind of backwards but at the end of the day, waste is a household issue not an assessed value issue so I won't be supporting that motion and I can understand how you can spend it and twist it and try and make is sound like there's an argument to be made there but hopefully hearing that statement Councillor Wyatt will be able to come down off his high horse and change his position as well. You know, on the substance itself of what's in the Report and what we're trying to do here, you can't base this decision on the micro or anecdotal level. This is something that is, has to be done at a very high level and to find a system that works for everybody on an individual basis is impossible. So we've been through a great deal of work here to get to what we have today, and I think that is going to bring us a great modernization of our waste services and deliver waste minimization and an appropriate level of diversion from the landfill. The Plan is cleaner, its greener and its transparent. Yes, it comes with a cost. We know it comes at a cost and many cities have been through this before. I think modernized -- one of the earliest people to modernize their waste system was Edmonton and they do an exceptional job of diverting from the landfill. They have different issues than we have. The distance to the landfill is far greater than we have here and the access to lands that are appropriate for landfill are fall more difficult; similarly in cities like Toronto, Calgary, Halifax and you know even just a small, I don't know if it's a city yet or still a town, but Kenora, just to the east of us, has some very serious issues with how to handle waste. But just, I was able to pull some costs for modernized services, off the Internet and what they cost on an annual basis and just so that we know where we are in the spectrum. Kelowna charges $187 a year. Calgary charges $144 a year. Edmonton charges $372 a year. Toronto charges $209 a year. Ottawa charges $86 a year. And what our plan is proposing at the present time and yes, there is an additional cost if we get into household organics; our plan is purposing $50 a year. So, I mentioned that it's cleaner, it's greener and its transparent it's also modern and it's sustainable. We look at this from a sustainability perspective, we're moving in the right direction where we're modernizing and it's part; to me it's part of building a great City and comes with a plan, a budget and a financing source. So, when you consider what we're getting here and what we're accomplishing, where it puts us, you know, you look at how this City is being looked at throughout North America, it's a City that's on the move in the right direction. To be able to modernize our garbage and to increase our diversion from the landfill of waste, is just another feather in our cap and as you drive through this City on garbage day and you see these carts out there, those of you that have experienced it, I think Councillor Fielding, Councillor Nordman and maybe Councillor Smith and Councillor Sharma. We've seen, they've been able to see the improvements it's brought in their Wards, just on the cart side. We know there's an opportunity for great improvement with these big auto bins in some of -- I think Councillor Eadie's area and a couple of other areas and Councillor Gerbasi's area in the Broadway Zone and we know the issues we have with them and this will help to clear up those issues, so we know we have a great opportunity in front of us that is affordable, reasonable, and helps to continue to put us in the movement towards a great City. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks Councillor Swandel, Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Today's debate isn't about making Winnipeg a world class City. It isn't about having a solid waste system that fitting a City with a N.H.L. Hockey Team. It's not about upping Regina. It's about being leaders on living sustainably and living within our means. Plain and simply; the primary purpose of a solid waste management system, a municipal solid waste system is to improve and protect public health. Mr. Speaker, do you think limiting garbage volumes with auto carts will help hoarders get out from under it? Do you think sending a third and fourth heavy vehicle down residential streets for yard waste and kitchen organics reduces greenhouse gas emissions from waste collection? Will the leachate or I nicknamed stink juice from organic collection trucks, both yard waste and kitchen scraps in the summer months promote healthy, safety communities? I'll tell you I was in Toronto last summer when those organic little carts were out on the streets on a hot day; it stunk. Mr. Speaker, today people are happy with the current system. Our City polling shows that in 2009, 89.2% of people were somewhat or very satisfied with the system and in 2007 it was 89.8. In 2004 it was 94.8. Mr. Speaker, however guess what. In 2010 it dropped to 82.2% and that's the year the auto carts were implemented in the northwest quadrant. Today, people, 88% of Winnipeg households participate in recycling but you know what our diversion rates are too low. 18% of items as been discussed earlier get diverted only; that's not good enough. So what's the problem; why aren't people are not diverting enough of their materials, why there not recycling enough? Well, many reasons. The number 1 reason sited that people don't recycle is they don't have a bin. We haven't handled out free bins since the late 1990's. When people fill their bin a lot of people stop recycling. The experience in my area if I drive up and down my street on recycling day there's about 50% garbage; 50% recycling they are doing their part. The other parts of the City that must not be the case. If we go back to the Report we had before us last February, February 2010 which proposed doing recycling carts city wide. They proposed a 240 litre cart for every residential household in the City of Winnipeg. The cost of that system including an annualized cost over the seven year contract for the carts was only marginally more or almost the same, as the current program. We could implement recycling carts now without the cost; without costing more than $75.00 per household we're spending today for solid waste pickups. I would encourage doing that with one small caveat. The proposal before us here today, which again I think gives us, puts us in the spot with a good problem or we would have an excess of recycled goods; doesn't recognize the fact that our current contracted recycling facility is at capacity; over capacity it's running evening shifts and weekend shifts but it doesn't propose until 2014 with the construction of a new recycling plant. Where are we going to store, where will we put all of our recycled goods between the fall of 2012 when the carts are supposed to be implemented and 2014 when this new recycling plant will come on stream? It just doesn't make sense. We need to really deal with people who are not recycling today. Or are not recycling enough and I think we can do that through education. We've done a fairly poor job I'd say in recent times telling people what they can recycle and can't recycle. We can get diversion rates up without this very expensive system. Sustainability has three pillars, Environmental, Social and Economic. The City stated as recently as 2009 that the Brady Landfill had over 200, sorry over 100 years of capacity. Many of the cities that have pushed diversion programs did so because they hit the wall of landfill space but that's not the case here. The total cost of solid waste collection and the net cost today after you know, collecting tipping fees at Brady, selling off recycled materials to the, in the open market, is $75.00 per household. Under this program within 5 years it will go $115.00 and within 10 years, $185.00, this is still escalating up. The new system with the construction of operation of a community resource recovery systems costs significantly more. We're talking about four depots for garbage and such and material depots. It costs significantly more. The cost of yard waste pickups, a separate pickup costs substantially more. Building an organic processing facility and yeah, there is this plan, which we're being asked to endorse today will cost $45 to $65 million dollars, that's what we're estimating today, it could be more. That doesn't even count the cost of collection and the operation of that plant. When we have pothole streets; hundred year old pipes; challenges of Community Centres and rampant crime the extents of this Master Plan, the extents that it goes to, the huge extents, I believe is a luxury and it doesn't meet the three pillars of sustainability in my mind. And I'd like to point out to Councillor Vandal, Regina is in the province of Saskatchewan; they have potash revenues. Saskatchewan is a have Province these days at this point Manitoba is still not unfortunately. To comment on Mr. Saleski's comments this morning, it is time though that we do move beyond the auto bins in the North End. We shouldn't implement a manual collection as we have elsewhere within the City in my opinion. Clean air and clean water are the elements of life. We can achieve vastly improved diversion rates with recycling carts without having to implement this garbage bin recycling fee and implementing all the extents of this Master Plan at this time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks Councillor Browaty. Councillor Havixbeck.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Mr. Speaker, today we're being asked to make a decision and it's really a strategic policy decision and it's for our City. Some are very supportive of the Report. It would seem some are luke warm and some are adamantly opposed. And we as a Council seem clearly divided. What's important here, to be mindful of is that we're trying to balance a decision about the environment and combine it with economics and that's really hard. It's very tough and over the last month or so, I've heard from many constituents and I've watched the polls on this issue and it's been split right down the middle 50/50 throughout our City. But, sometimes we need to take and have the fortitude and do what's right for our City and that takes courage and vision. So Mr. Speaker today, I will be supporting this Plan, and I want to tell you a few reasons about why I am supporting it.

First, let me tell you and my constituents and anybody else who pays attention, that the Mayor did not speak to me and ask me to switch my vote from the EPC meeting last week. I'm doing this because I heard from my constituents over the last week. Many people, and I thank them for their calls, their emails, for stopping me in Safeway, for stopping me at the gym, for stopping me when I'm dropping off my kids, to tell me how passionate they were feeling about this topic and how disappointed they were in my decision last Wednesday. So that's very significant to me because they were the people who elected me and I have to do the best job I can to represent them. Many raised the issue that yes we have Brady Landfill and yes it will be a hundred years before it's filled up but we can smell it now, we can smell it in Whiteridge, we can smell it in Charleswood. We can smell it in Waverley west. We're building new developments around it. It's problematic. But more importantly, my kids, our kids, our grandchildren, they deserve to have a better City. And when my ten year old says to me, Mom, do the right thing because you always try to do the right thing, well how can you disagree with that.

Second, I began to get more research into this and so I got confirmation from the Administration that the fee, the fee was the biggest thing for people in Charleswood to get their heads around because we already pay taxes. We already support a system. How can you ask us to pay another fee? I spoke with Councillor Fielding, with members of the Administration, because I thought we had earmarked money for this at some point last year in the budget. Turns out we didn't; but I have confirmation from the Administration that this would not be reviewed again until 2017 at which point the organics piece would be considered and we would be looking at that portion of it. 2017. So that, to me, is reassuring, that this fee isn't going to go out of control next year, for example. Many people did, in my, the area that I represent, felt that, "what's $50.00 to get what we can get". So what do we get? I went around this week. I went to Daniel McIntyre Ward on Monday because that's the day of garbage collection. I talked with people, I talked with the garbage collectors in that area. I looked at the back lanes and I asked what has improved for you? And these were streets from Arlington to Sherburn; that had collection north of Portage. The people that I stopped, and there was one gentleman on his way to work, one senior who lived in her house alone. The gentleman going to work said don't take this away. This is the best thing we got for our neighbourhood. I would be happy to pay it. Another person says to me that the issue with Farel cats is a problematic in that area. It keeps the cats out of the garbage so it essentially could be attributed to reducing the Farel cat problem in our City which we're dealing with. When I spoke with seniors, one senior female that I spoke with she said it's so much easier to move this cart to the curb and to get the garbage there and it's one container, it's not that I'm dragging something not on wheels any more. Yesterday, I went into Garden City where they happen to have pickups and that area is very similar to Charleswood in that there are lanes. Some lanes. There are some gravel roads, there are some ditches and there are some paved streets. And when I looked around at the area and how much cleaner it is. There is no garbage blown around. There is no excess left. It's done. The machine moves. One of the concerns some constituents raised with me was the fact that this would result in job loss. So I asked the garbage collector: How do you feel about your job?" Well it's different, it's cleaner for me and I like it, so how could we not want that for our City? It was almost ten years ago today, that we as a City had auto bins implemented in the North End and any other areas and when I went to the North End yesterday, where I grew up and saw the auto bins with no lids burnt, couches, coffee tables, all sorts of extra garbage in there and people literally telling me that they would just go to the next bin if it was filled up. That's ridiculous and all of that is ending up into our landfill right now, it's not being diverted anywhere.

Other concerns that constituents raised with me were we that we had the wild kingdom in Charleswood. We have raccoons, we have skunks, and we have all kinds of animals getting into our garbage. People put bungee cords around their cans now. I talked to you, Councillor Nordman, about it because your area is very similar… backs onto Golf Courses, lots of green space, problem reduced. And that's huge. So, I have some assurances and I have done

a lot of homework on some of the concerns that were raised. Another big concern is trucks down streets and as we know in Charleswood, we don't have the best roads. We have roads that are gravel, roads that have ditches, there's concern that trucks going up and down now we'll have four trucks and I'm told by the Administration that with the bidding process, there may be the opportunity to have it done by one vehicle. So in ultimate terms it may reduce that. Just to wrap up my thoughts, this equates to $1.00 a week to make this change; a huge policy change, a change for the better for our City, for our kids and our grandkids. I think it's a move forward in a progressive manner, and I don't think that it's going to be any cheaper if we look at this in another ten years to do. I think if anything, with construction costs, they will escalate and it will be even more expensive to try to do then. So, change is hard but I think we need to move our City forward together. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks Councillor Havixbeck. I think we're a bit past the twelve o'clock hour this is the last major item on our Agenda today. So, I'll seek the will of Council to proceed or not proceed. So, I'm getting more waves that I'm not. Well I have one person on the list right now. If you want to speak I need to know now.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in Favour? Opposed? Dim Sum will have to wait. Councillor Fielding, you're up.

**Councillor Fielding:** I don't want to be up right now. Okay. Thank you, Councillor Nordman. I want to address a number of different things on this topic. I want to talk about the pros and the cons of this Plan. I want to talk about the amendment and I want to talk about what some of my constituents are saying.

First deal with the pros and cons. I hear that from my wife all the time now, but my evaluation at home too, there are a lot of pros and there's a lot of cons of this plan, but I first want to talk about some of the garbage carts as the speaker well knows this is something that has been implemented in my area for probably about a year, year and a half now, I guess. When we first introduced it, I probably got; we counted them up and probably close to about 150 calls on the carts, everything from the cart size to the nuance of it and I think what probably happens is when there's change, it's sometimes hard to embrace change as some other speakers have said here today. You know, we probably made some mistakes at that point and we introduced it in February and there were issues of cutting out snow and probably could have saved some money by not putting carts on both sides of the lane. But what it is; it what it is. What I can tell you about the carts is they've been very effective and people love that they are in our area. You know, six months after we introduced this new plan, I went into an election, as most of you people did and probably knocked on close to 11,000 households in that process and I'll tell you for the vast majority of people, you know, they love the new carts. In fact, I repeatedly, you know, they almost thanked us for making the changes for the new carts that are there and they said they had a lot of concerns right off the bat, this is maybe before they actually saw the size. I can tell you from my own household, you know we've got two kids and another one on the way and we got two animals, the amount of times that I've actually had to hold back any garbage is very minimal, maybe once, maybe twice and probably because I didn't get it to the curb in time in terms of the garbage. So they've been fantastic. And I'm a very much a big supporter of that. What it has done too in the areas when you look at the numbers, it's shown that there's been a reduction in terms of the garbage collection and increase in the recycling piece that's there. So, very supportive of the garbage carts and I encourage anyone who's got some concerns, residents that it will work out. It's a fantastic new system. Recycling is something that I very much support as well. In fact, when it came to the floor of Council, I voted in favour in fact, the recycling City wide. So I think it makes a lot of sense, probably we should have done the recycling first and then the garbage, looking back on it because then it shows, not necessarily a cost savings thing, but it's for efficiencies that are there, but I very much liked that. The bi-weekly pickup I do support. Some of the issues that we've implemented this thing is in terms of the lawn and waste removal. You can take it to a few areas in your area, I think it's the Civic Centre is the one we go to all the time. Not a perfect solution to it, so I think pickup makes a lot of sense.

Auto bins, I'm with the gang here in terms of auto bins, we just have to get rid of them. I think that they are just horrible. They are collect -- every contractor around dumps things in there, there's fires that happen in there, we need to make a standardize system so I'm very excited to get the auto bins out of there. Like the diversion, the goal, the diversion that we're talking about, I mean obviously the numbers have been stated and we need to get that number up higher. Consultation piece I think was fairly well done, you know, the last number of years, been using the same principles they use with OurWinnipeg which I think was very effective. There's a number of things that I don't like about this plan. And I've been pretty vocal on this - the fee. I've never been a big fan of -- I come generally from

the school of thought is that raising taxes and everything else should be the last thing we take a look at or introducing new fees is something we could really address because I think there's an ability to get out of controls as Councillor Browaty mentioned, you know, they are this level but you could dramatically increase that so I am not a big fan of the way we finance this. My concerns are have we bitten off a little bit more than we can chew? Is this the Cadillac version that we're talking about here? There's a number of really good things that are a part of this plan, there's some things the recovery centres, for instance, I mean, great to have, but at the end of the day someone has to pay for it. The composting piece, you know what I think a lot of people are composting already. I'm not sure making it a mandatory system in 2000…I forget the date when it's supposed to be starting, 17 is there, so I'm not there yet, in terms of the composting, that's for sure.

In terms of the amendment, you know, Councillor Gerbasi's motion I guess is first I mean, sure, sounds reasonable that's there. Councillor Eadie, at first, I appreciate where he is coming from in terms of the work he's put into this because he has put a lot of work into it. I just find fundamentally disagree with the approach in terms of how you finance it. You know, I guess the question I would ask is just because someone in Tuxedo or Charleswood or whatever else has a higher assessment they're not producing more garbage, why should they have to pay more? I don't have an answer for that; I know the Free Press in their Editorial today talked about things like wealth distribution and all that sorts. I just don't buy into those things, you know, social engineering and that sorts, and I think with all due respect, it does tap into that a little bit. I'm not supportive of that, you know, I know if someone who had a higher assessment; if there's a motion that came to the Floor to someone who had a higher assessment should have a higher level of service, I don't think I would support, I don't think anyone a Member of Council would support that either. So I can't see how that would work and I don't think it makes a lot of sense but I do appreciate the work that Councillor Eadie put in, in terms of representing his views and his constituents use.

So most importantly, what are our residents saying? When we first started this process, you know, I pride myself on having a pretty good political sense on things of what people are going to think in my area and that's sorts and I was pretty sure that I would have the majority of people come and would be opposed to the fee. And so we kept a little track. I have a great gal, Destiny Watt who works at my office keeping track of all the numbers and that sorts of the calls that come in and interestingly enough, probably 2-1 people actually called and said you should be supporting this. This makes a lot of sense for our community. I had calls both ways but close to two-thirds of the people said I should be supporting this in one way or the other. So I think this is a very tough decision to make. I didn't support it at EPC for reasons that were stated. I was put into a situation where you know, if I vote for it there is a number of things that I think are fantastic and there also are some other things that I think were stretching it too far, we're making taxpayers pay for things that I'm not necessarily sure, might be a good thing, but I'm not necessarily sure is the benefit. If I don't support it I lose things I really like and have seen success at in terms of the garbage, the recycling, you know, the pickups, getting rid of the auto bins that are there. So it's a tough situation. I'm also as mentioned not thrilled with the financing piece of it. You know, I think there's still time to work out some, another plan in some respects in terms of how we finance this through tax supportive verses a fee but at the end of the day, you know, I am going to side with my constituents who are telling me to support this, so I am going to be supporting this here at Council today and with that, I look forward to the new system as we introduce it and I hope we can accomplish what we're trying to do in terms of the rates and increasing the recycling. So thank you Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks Councillor Fielding. Councillor Smith.

**Councillor Smith:** Yes. You know, let's look at what it says here. It says "Garbage and Recycling Master Plan". I'll repeat that. "Garbage and Recycling Master Plan" but it doesn't deal with most of our garbage. It deals with only residential. You know, it seems to me if we're really concerned -- these people who are concerned with the environment and want something done, they should be for a plan that deals with all the garbage in Winnipeg so that we reduce and increase the recycling. You know, I don't know why we settle for this. I mean sure they feel good, Councillor Vandal and Gerbasi feel good because environmentally it's some progress but it's so minute that I cannot be supportive. And also, there is the -- let me tell you, I really appreciate the Deputy Mayor what she had to say originally about this proposal. She says it's a flat fee that could be increased and you notice that in the motion by Councillor Eadie, we deal with that. The fact is you get a fee, you can increase it and increase it, and there is no limit. And people are worried about that. So you know, then there's the question of fairness. Councillor Eadie made it very clear. I mean, I'm willing -- I seconded it-- I'm willing to compromise. I don't like flat fees but I was willing to

compromise with the work that he has done making it fairer as a method of payment. But you know, many people will be paying $50.00 and have very low garbage and it doesn't make any sense whatsoever. I know the people who are environmentalists are going to put this above the interests of the people on low income. I'm concerned about people on low income being able to pay these bills. People on pensions. I cannot support this. I want a stronger Bill. I want something that deals with all the garbage in Winnipeg not just a segment of it. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Pagtakhan.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, I'll be brief. My area as well Mr. Speaker, was the recipient of the new roll out carts and when we had the roll out of the new carts, there was some opposition. I have yet a day, fast forward to today and people love them. Like all my other colleagues who have the carts, people do like them and they are working and they are affective. I think there is a lot of merits within this Plan Mr. Speaker, and I support a lot of the work that ourselves our waste department is doing relative to this Report and I also want to say that I really want to applaud the work of Councillor Eadie, what he has done here today. I think that at any time as a City that we can put on an equitable and fair lens in our policy and decision making; we are a better City, we are stronger City for that, Mr. Speaker and with that, with his amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I think that's a very friendly amendment that I'm willing to support the amendment. And my support for the main clause is subject to support of this amendment as well with respect motion No. 3, I have no problem with it and I will be supporting that and just wanted to put those comments on the table. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 15% is a national disgrace. Councillor Gerbasi on the floor of Council today describing where we're at. And Mr. Speaker, I believe, that this Plan helps us out of the deep, dark cellar that we're in. The facts are quite simple, Mr. Speaker. And I think -- I'm just going to quote Mr. Miller. Couldn't say it any better. Pass it, complete it, improve it. That's exactly what we need to do today. And Mr. Speaker, as far as the motion from Councillor Eadie, well intentioned, off base. Because what people have to realize and the thought was mentioned before, what we need to do with this Plan and this will happen, you can call it either economic incentive or I think Councillor Gerbasi called it reward environmental stewardship if I recall correctly, Mr. Speaker. And that's what needs to be done, Mr. Speaker down the road and that's what we should be working on. So, when you have someone like a Mr. Saleski, who only has one bag of garbage because that's all he puts out, we should work on a plan so he can pay less and I believe that is very realistic. That's how you address that issue and that's how you reward and sensitize people to basically put out less garbage, recycle more. That's what we need to do Mr. Speaker. The facts are I know there are many people here on the floor of Council who, according to them, went through hell many years ago with bid garbage debate, they said to me, the worse and most difficult thing I've ever been through on the Floor of Council. Mr. Speaker, we're moving in the right direction, 13 ½ cents a day is the cost and we know we can make it better. And when I hear people talking about, it can go up and up, nothing can go up without this Council approving it. We are the ones that we're in charge of the ship, you are the Captains. It's not any department; it's all of us here. So let's throw that one out. It's nonsense, Mr. Speaker. And when I hear people say, they cannot support it, you can. You choose not to, that is your decision but you can support it and you should support it, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's interesting because this has been a process that I think has been extremely thorough. As Councillor Wyatt talked about, you know, we had a Council Seminar far in advance of the Council Meeting. The information was already made public before that as we all know. Some people thought that was good because the public should be aware of it; some people may not think it was that good. The facts of life are this information is out there; we all have the opportunity today to vote on something very positive for the future of our City. Mr. Speaker, there was a commercial many years ago; I believe it was for the auto Fram filter commercial. "pay me now, pay me later". What I'll share with everybody, if you choose to pay later, your children and your grandchildren will be paying ten to twenty fold what we are talking about today. The time to do it is now. And you know, it was interesting, I believe it was Councillor Havixbeck that quoted 50/50. That's exactly what I heard, too. 50% of the public love it. 50% of it don't like it. So the realities are, no matter which way you vote, you can't make everybody happy. Some will love it, some will hate it. So why not just do the right thing for the City that you love; the reason that you're here. The reason you made the sacrifice to be an elected official, is to make Winnipeg a better place to live, to work, to play, to invest in, to raise a family. This is a step in the right direction. I thank the Chair of Public Works for moving this forward Mr. Speaker; I would love to see this supported unanimously to show that we all care, we all want to do

right, because, Mr. Speaker, there is never a plan that's perfect. Nothing is perfect. Councillor Smith said it doesn't go far enough so I can't support it. Through you, to Councillor Smith, every journey starts with a first step. This is our step. Support it. Support it now, stand up and be counted; make Winnipeg a better place to live. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Mr. Mayor. Any further comments before we close? We'll start with Councillor Eadie to close on Motion 4.

**Councillor Eadie:** Councillor Gerbasi's motion was spoken to first I think it's her turn to close that one. Is that not correct?

**Mr. Speaker:** No, reverse order.

**Councillor Eadie:** Reverse order. All right, that's okay then. Thank you Speaker Nordman for letting me know the rules as well, thank you. Well what can I say? Market value is flawed. It's flawed. Market value assessments for determining how we pay for our property taxes you know, from what I remember in the 90's, Mr. Filmon worked on it. Market value assessments are what felt was the way to go when we charge property taxes. So I heard a lot of discussion about how well the small carts work. 240 litre carts in certain sections of the City, those people it sounds like those people got an improved service and guess what, that improved service was paid for with the market value assessment method so they actually got that and what happened was, people who had a more expensive house, I'm not saying they are rich but they did have a more expensive house; that supposedly means that somehow you have a better ability to pay, they did pay more. They paid more. They paid more than the $75.00 that we talked about is the total cost of garbage. So, you know, you can have a fundamental problem with the philosophy but what this is - is, this is what the City does. This is the practical way that we've looked at to have people do this and yes, it's not directly connected to the service being provided but you know what, there's all kinds of services that this City provides that doesn't get connected directly to a thing because property taxes pay for it. There is no direct connection but you know what, again, the way we paid for this in the City, it's not a big thing really. It's not philosophical it's a practical way that the people came up for us to deal with expenses and core service expenses. This City garbage for sure is core service. Some people might describe others services not but the point is, this is flawed but it's a good idea. I don't understand why you can't vote for it. Improving the fee structure in the future, we heard in this Plan from our Administration that we can't move to the Toronto methodology where you can buy a smaller bin because they won't work here in this City. I don't know how you're going to come up with a better plan. This one here is something that's already being done. Yes, it's not totally fair and yes, I agree, everybody works hard but you know, this is what we need. So, in closing on this one, you really need to consider what I'm talking about here. Two-thirds of the vote is important as well. You know I heard somebody quote how much other cities are paying on their garbage fee. I heard as much as $386. You know what? A 51% vote on City Council is pretty easy to get because you will get today it sounds like for the plan. Not for my motion but for the Plan you're going to get 8 voters; that's great. That's fine. It's doing something. I agree, I don't mind. We're doing something, we're trying to improve our environment but we also need to take into consideration people's abilities to pay and deliver that fair but you know, two-thirds of the vote is a much stronger way of ensuring that these fees do not get out ahead and I don't understand why anybody wouldn't agree with that. Like really. It's very important. There's all kinds of different organizations and different entities that utilize a two-thirds vote and they do it because these are very important things. So, you know, I urge you and I just want; actually I really want to close on this. There has been a lot of talk about the work I did and you know, I was very frustrated in this process because I am one person and I don't have the things at hand and I really want to thank the Administration that supplied me with the actual facts of data that we have in this City. I appreciate that. It allowed me to come up with ideas so, but, what I also want to say is, that the people of Mynarski elected me to work for them; and so when you don't think about this motion that I did all this work, because you know what, really what happened is, the people in Mynarski hired me to work for them. And I'm working for them. We're talking about improving our garbage system while at the same time, recognizing that everybody in this City have different abilities to pay. Simple. Please vote for the motion and then maybe we can all unanimously vote for the whole thing because really there does need to be equity in this Plan and it's not because Ross Eadie did work, it's because the people of this City require it. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks Councillor Eadie. Councillor Gerbasi to close on Motion 3.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's a pretty simple and straight forward motion to create this Advisory Committee and I guess I just want to emphasize that; based on the discussion we've had today and the issues that we're talking about that are very important in terms of making this program better as we go forward. It really is important to have this kind of input from these experts; I know with the Active Transportation issues it's been really, really helpful. I can't imagine all the work that these citizens on the Active Transportation side, just as a comparable example, have given us essentially for free, to help make sure that things go well, and that our plans make sense coming from people with expertise. And that's all this is; it's just asking for that and I think you know, the Mayor's agreed and many of us have said that this should reflect more of how much garbage you throw out that you should pay less if you throw out less and I think most people agree with that, we just for some reason weren't able to get there this time. So, we're looking at improving this as we go forward; the people that; some of the people that would be on this Committee would have ideas about how to do that and how to achieve that; so let's not turn away expert advice on an ongoing basis. You know and Councillor Vandal, the Chair of the Committee supported this as well. It makes sense in how we work here and how we do things to have those kind of ideas and have an ongoing basis for them to be put into the process very early on as we're bringing this forward and maybe we can see the type of plan that we're all envisioning which is equitable, which encourages and rewards environmental stewardship which is what we would all like to see but do even more than that but it does overall, make a major improvement of what we have now regardless. But this is something that I think will make it much, much better and much more better going forward. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks, Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Vandal to close on the clause.

**Councillor Vandal:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's been an excellent debate. Relative to the financing of it, the motion of Councillor Eadie; I'm not going to support it. This is the comprehensive Waste Management Program that's in front of us that is financed through a dollar a week. 417 a month across the board for single family homes. That money is not going into the black hole of General Revenue where it could pay for library books; it could pay for corporate travel; could pay for a lot of stuff. That money is going into a reserve which is earmarked for all waste minimization initiatives present and into the future. My fear, very frankly, is that if we put it on the mill rate on the property tax side that every year it's going to go up into the budget process and it will be up against a whole bunch of police and emergency services priorities, fire priorities, it's going to go up against infrastructure priorities and it's going to go up against collective agreement increases, it's going to go up against pension increases. And my fear is that the first thing to fall off the table will be waste minimization initiatives. That's why I think it's -- I'm supporting the $1 a week to go into a reserve specifically for waste minimization initiatives. Councillor Smith's concerns, the City of Winnipeg doesn't even pick up most of the commercial waste and institutional waste and the commercial waste. Those are done by privates and that makes the whole waste minimization initiatives when they are done by privates; that much more complicated and that's why this is an excellent first step and I agree we need to go there and we need to go there with the Waste Minimization Advisory Committee and we need to consult and we need to draw up strategies to address that issue, I'm 100% with you but when we don't pick up the waste it's a huge problem. Mr. Speaker, I've never said this is a perfect plan but there is an old saying that's very applicable here that's perfection is the enemy of good. And in this case, I would say perfection is the enemy of very good, because this is a very good plan. I've talked about the greenhouse gas reductions 300,000 tons, the equivalent of removing 54,000 automobiles from the City of Winnipeg streets, increasing our diversion rate from 15% a meager 15% to over 50%, increased life for the Brady Landfill, improved air quality around Brady Landfill, getting rid of the stinky, inefficient, arson pro auto bins in certain areas of the City. Cleaning up back lanes and the streets from wayward garbage and I hope there is job creation, Mr. Speaker, through the whole resource, recovery management industry that is, is green, is efficient , it's the way of the future, that's where the Province and the Feds are going and that's where we need to be going. Mr. Speaker, the time is right to modernize, so I hope we can get unanimous support on this. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Vandal; just before we call the vote, I will speak to the Gallery for a moment. We have about -- once the Vote is over we have about 3 to 5 minutes worth of work to do and I'll indulge you to sort of stick with us until that's over and then we'll adjourn the whole thing and everybody can herd out of here like a whatever. Including the Council, yeah. So, I will first of all call the Question on Motion 3, Councillor Gerbasi's motion regarding the Committee. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Second Motion Number 4. Recorded vote of the motion put forward by Councillor Eadie. All those in favour please rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

Councillors Eadie, Pagtakhan, Smith, Wyatt.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed please rise.

**Nays**

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

**City Clerk:** The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 4, Nays 11.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is defeated. All right. So we'll call the Question on the amended Clause. Recorded vote. All those in favour please rise. Main clause.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Sharma, Steen, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed:

Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Pagtakhan, Smith.

**City Clerk:** The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 4.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion passed and we have a new Garbage Minimization Plan. Congratulations. We've dealt with the motions and Public Works and Infrastructure. We have no by-laws for consideration. Do we have a Question Period for Councillor Vandal? Councillor Eadie.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you Speaker Nordman. I know people are hungry and so am I but, you know what? I have a real issue and I would like the Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works to answer this question because I do believe that the new Master Transportation Plan will fall under his Committee's stewardship as well, and I would like to ask, I would really like to ask for real involvement. I want to know if you can get this for us. Real involvement before you've committed to a position of any kind, to at least allow some ideas to be introduced and discussed before it gets released and everybody has automatically clamped down and made their positions. Can I have the word of the Chairperson of that Standing Committee in this regard?

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Vandal.

**Councillor Vandal:** Absolutely Councillor Eadie. I think that I know the Plan is scheduled to come to my Committee. I know there is a Council Seminar coming up and absolutely. I'm free this afternoon to speak to you about how we can facilitate that starting right away.

**Mr. Speaker:** Last question?

**Councillor Eadie:** A follow-up yes. Just a follow-up on that. So just to confirm this, so either, so I think what you're saying then is, it won't automatically be released right after the City Council Seminar and then we could spend some time trying to figure out some ideas, or are you suggesting that somehow I can contribute before that Seminar?

**Councillor Vandal:** I'm saying you and I should sit down this afternoon and figure out a process on how you can get your ideas into our transportation planners already, in fact, I know there have been some Councillors who have spoken to the Administration about their thoughts on where our transportation system should go, and I'm not sure on the specific time lines on when it's going to get rolled out, but I'm free this afternoon to have a chat.

**Mr. Speaker:** Fair enough, no further questions? Question Period for Public Works and Infrastructure. The Standing Policy Committee for Finance, there's no Report. I see no Motions. No consideration of By-laws. Do we have a question for the Chairman of Finance? Seeing none, I'll ask Councillor Vandal because he sits on the Governance Committee, if he would move the Governance Committee Report please.

**REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL**
**DATED OCTOBER 11, 2011**

**Councillor Vandal:** Sure, I'll move Item 1 of Governance, which is essentially our Schedule of Meetings for 2012.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried and I guess that's it, folks. I'll accept the motion from Councillor Swandel to adjourn.

**ROLL CALL**

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Ladies and Gentlemen. Have a good afternoon.

The Council adjourned at 12:47 p.m.