COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, November 16, 2011

The Council met at 9:48 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Gerbasi.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We have with us today, Page Madison Fedyck from Glenlawn Collegiate who resides in the North Kildonan Ward. Thank you for being here today, Madison. She attends Glenlawn on a Soccer Excellence Program, and is with Team Manitoba. We have a condolence motion with us today for former Councillor Alice Balsillie, and we'd like to recognize her family in the audience today. Colleen and Bonnie, thank you for being here. We share something in common. My father sat with your mother on Council back in the 80s. They also shared the fact that they were in the restaurant business for many years, not in competition but certainly a similar career path. Having said that, the Clerk will read a Motion of Condolence and then we'll have a moment of silence. Would everyone rise?

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Councillor Alice Balsillie, which occurred on October 24, 2011.

Mrs Balsillie served the citizens of Winnipeg as Councillor for the Sisler Ward from 1980 – 1983.

This Council extends to her children Colleen, Bonnie and Robert and their families, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

(Moment of Silence)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you and our thoughts are with you. Thank you. On a happier note, we have the announcement of Councillor Fielding and his wife Michelle's baby boy yesterday, a young man by the name of Beck so we offer our congratulations to Scott and Michelle so we just put that on the record. And on one further happier note, we all have birthdays around City Hall but I think we had a special one in the last couple of weeks and we would like to recognize Councillor Smith's 75th birthday which I think we should all deserve a round of applause. (Applause).

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding is obviously off on parental duties so we'll have a motion in his absence.

Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

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

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you very much.

We'd also like to recognize in the audience with us today former Councillor, Donald Benham and his Politics and Mass Media class from the University of Winnipeg, Donald. (Applause).

Mr. Speaker: I have two kids at the University of Winnipeg so maybe they'll track you down. Are there folks here from the Taking Charge program at Red River? Yes? Okay. Congratulations, thanks for being here. Seeing that there is no other greetings here to go forward with...okay, I see that Councillor Vandal who's…

Councillor Vandal: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to…I know we have a delegation on the transportation plan so I would like to move that the rules be suspended to hear Chris Lorenc.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And Councillor Eadie, you have...that's appropriate. We'll get rid of the delegations.

Councillor Eadie: Speaker Nordman, I rise today to speak about the people who actually keep City Council organized. On behalf of the City of Winnipeg and the Clerk's Department, it was my honour to receive the 2011 Inclusion Award from the Vision Impaired Resource Network. You're asking why? The reason for the award is that the Clerk's Department in the City of Winnipeg implemented the accessible voting equipment in the 2010 election. The City Council…110 people utilized this accessible voting equipment in the 2010 election. And it is being used in today at this particular period's by-election for City Council in St. Vital as well as for the School Board elections. This equipment will allow people with disabilities to vote in privacy for their chosen candidate in an accessible way. So I'd just like to say you'll notice that the plaque is behind me here which is going to the Clerk's Department and I would just like to thank the Clerk's Department and the City of Winnipeg for facilitating municipal democracy. Thank you. (Applause).

Mr. Speaker: Congratulations to the Clerk, Marc Lemoine who's with us today. Having no more announcements, anyone? I'll invite Mr. Lorenc to join us. Sir, you have 10 minutes.

DELEGATIONS

Chris Lorenc: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Good morning, Mr. Mayor and members of Council. Before I address the substance of my presentation, I'd like to add my words of condolence to Councillor Balsillie's family. I had the privilege of succeeding Councillor Balsillie and representing Sisler Ward from 1983 to 92 and she most definitely left a legacy of contribution and I hope that her family recognizes that we all feel that way. And secondly, Harvey, 75, not quite there yet, but catching up. Members of Council, I wear today a different hat than I typically might in presentations to you. I represent the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce Trade and Transportation Committee, whose mandate it is to take a broad multimodal, look at transportation issues, strategies, investment approaches in order to service and serve, and enable economic growth in Winnipeg, as well as to meet the social and environmental responsibilities of an efficient, equitable, sustainable transportation network. Our members are very broad in terms of their interests and they include representatives from Bison Transport, Greyhound Canada, Economic Development Winnipeg, Winnipeg Airport Authority, the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association, James Richardson International, CentrePort Canada, Air Canada, Manitoba Trucking Association, the University of Manitoba Transport Institute, the Federal Express and Canada Post, to name but a few. So, you can see that around the table of that committee is a very broad-based group of individuals with a vast degree of experience in dealing with transportation issues and collectively, what we try to do, is advance policies that enable the public interest being respected. Now, as a committee, we are aware of and have considered a number of reports. We are aware of the Watts Report in the early 1960s and you may ask why that report is relevant. Well, it's relevant because the Council of the day rejected the notion of freeways in the City of Winnipeg as Major connectors between parts of the City of Winnipeg and as instruments by which we would move the needs of transportation within our city. And as a result, we have, since the early 1960s, been stumbling and trying to invent, reinvent, configure and reconfigure what our transportation plan ought to be what it might look like, how we might make investments in it. And it is a relevant document for yet another reason. I recently came back from the City of Calgary, a community of 1.1 or 1.2 million people and your Master Transportation Plan projects us hitting that level by in or around 2031. And that city has already made major and significant investments, not only in freeways but as well in Light Rapid Transit and that city is facing major congestion and gridlock issues. So, I would hope that Council of the 1960s, having made the mistake and us being the inheritors of that mistake that the same mistake is not made by Council in 2011. We're also aware and mindful of Plan Winnipeg and its transportation plan and priority component parts. We are aware of the two SERP Reports, both 1998 and 2000 which, for the first time, identified the condition of Winnipeg's existing infrastructure and its new asset requirements as it related to core infrastructure both horizontal and vertical. We are aware of the Mayor's Trade Council Report of 2008, which pioneered the development of CentrePort Canada, Canada's first inland port and the subsequent investment and now construction of CentrePort Canada Way, and the investment that is now being made into the extension of sewer and water services which will transform not only the capital region economy but certainly the economy of the city of the Province of Manitoba and the context of our global role as a trade, transportation and logistics hub. And we are aware as well of the Infrastructure Funding Council Report, which was released in May of 2011. Now, these Reports are important to reflect upon, to provide some context as you move forward to consider the Master Transportation Plan. The SERP Report in 1998, identified that the existing and new infrastructure deficit, the unfunded liability over the then next ten year period, at then current funding levels, hovered in the vicinity of $2.2 billion or roughly $220 million per year. The IFC Report released in May of 2011, based its analysis in part on 3 July 2009 Reports presented to Executive Policy Committee and Council. And those Reports identified that the existing and new infrastructure investment deficits, the gaps, over the then next ten years using 2008 dollars, amounted to approximately $7.4 billion or approximately $740 million a year. So, in the span of ten years, the annual investment

deficit facing the City of Winnipeg grew by approximately half a billion dollars. Regrettably, there have not been plans that have been materially reflective of either the two SERP Reports which, had they been implemented in Winnipeg by 2009/10, would not have been facing an infrastructure deficit. Those were not materially implemented. And I understand the competing challenges. By contrast the city of Edmonton, in 2003, did rely on the 1998 and 2000 SERP Reports in establishing its infrastructure investment strategy. And the Infrastructure Funding Council Report released in May 11 has regrettably not yet been the subject matter of a seminar presentation and discussion for Council, and it is the most current document which provides strategies for consideration by Council either by itself or jointly with the Province or by extension, with the Federal Government, and I know that the chair of the IFC quite well and believe that he would be more than interested in presenting such a seminar to Council. Now, the Master Transportation Plan is a brilliant document. It is excellent. It provides you with a long term strategic overview of the kinds of opportunities that the transportation system should enable. And it has been extremely well led by Kenn Rosin and Luis Escobar and you should heed the advice that they give you both in the context of the Report and in matters arising from the Report, but you also need to be mindful of another fact, fact number one is that your existing and new infrastructure challenges are not yet funded. They are unfunded liabilities for which you have no plan to meet. You do not have the existing revenue streams with which to fund that gap. You require the partnership of the provincial government and the Federal Government; you need access to grow tax revenues. Without that, you have no chance with the existing revenue streams to close that gap. You have some room but certainly not the gap that exists. So, when you add to that the Master Transportation Plan projected investments of up to $4 billion over the next 20- 25 year period, you now have an unfunded liability of almost $12 billion. How are you going to deal with that? What you also need to be aware of is that this is not a document to micromanage or minutiae to death at this point in time. Because it is a strategic plan which, in the Report, acknowledges will be subject to revision and evolution as circumstances require. So, within that context, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that Council of 2011 endorse the Master Transportation Plan as submitted. I understand there are some friendly amendments from Executive Policy Committee to which we have no objection. Secondly, that you establish a stand alone transportation management plan authority, resourced as recommended in the Report and it identifies the revenue stream of about $250,000. Stand-alone so that you have a visible and transparent body to which you can hold accountable and to which reports to you visibly and transparently. And thirdly, that that TMP authority be mandated to oversee the TMP Plan, along with it being mindful of the reporting recommendations that are contained in the TMP. So it's annual reports, a review of the plan every five years, it’s the development of revenue streams, it’s identification of the kinds of funding partnerships that will be required, in order to realize a master transportation plan that works for Winnipeg. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Mr. Lorenc. The Mayor, first up. Question?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Lorenc. I very much appreciate your comments and I do have a question for you. You made a very profound statement about unfunded liability when it comes to our infrastructure. And I know you've served on many committees as a member and as a Chair. As you know, in the past election, none of the political parties really made infrastructure a priority; did not get a lot of attention through the media. I think we've all talked about we need a source of revenue. You know the responses we've gotten. I'm wondering if you have any thoughts or ideas how we could make this more understandable, I guess, to the public so they can relate to the fact that this means their streets, their curbs, their sidewalks, their back lanes, their community centres, their ice rinks and hopefully, make everybody understand that this is a crisis situation, it has to be addressed with, and if you have any thoughts or ideas you might be able to share, we would be very appreciative.

Chris Lorenc: There isn't enough time in the response period allocated to properly give that question justice but it is a very important question. Overlying what I'm going to say or overlaying what I'm going to say is the absolute imperative of constructive collaboration with the Province of Manitoba. The Province of Manitoba will not extend a helping hand if it does not see, whether it's the City of Winnipeg or municipalities outside of the City of Winnipeg, making choices and decisions associated with both the manner in which they fund their infrastructure, and the manner in which they allocate the resources for that infrastructure. And the first step, therefore, that I would suggest to you is that Council have a seminar on the Infrastructure Funding Council Report, because the title of that Report talks, speaks to a new relationship, a new order, a balanced role and responsibility allocation for the funding of municipal infrastructure in Manitoba. It is a balanced responsibility. But with that balanced responsibility comes the need for the Province of Manitoba to accept and recognize that it has been the sole beneficiary of growth taxes generated by a growing economy. Municipalities see not a penny of the success of a growing economy arising from any revenue stream which comes to the coffers of municipalities and that is a fundamental, financial relationship error between municipalities and the senior level of government. That is a historical creature that was created at the turn of the century and it may have worked then but it does not work now and whether it's the current Mayor or your predecessors as far back as 1950, all referenced in the IFC Report, the refrain has been consistent. Municipalities need access to growth taxes. A sliver example: provincial growth taxes grew from 2.2 billion to 4.3 billion over a ten year period annually. A 2.3 billion annual increase in growth tax revenues to the Province of Manitoba. In contrast, the increase in revenues to municipalities over that same time period grew by $237 million. Now, allocate that between 198 municipalities in this province, and that

shows you where the wealth generation results went. They went to the Province of Manitoba. They did not go to municipalities in this province. The Federal Government growth taxes grew from 117 billion a year to 180 billion a year. A 60 or 70 billion dollar annual increase in growth taxes. Not a penny of that finds its way to the coffers at municipal governments. The Federal Government has a role. But, before you can credibly speak to the public about the roles of the Province or the role of the Federal Government, you need to look internally at the things that you are empowered and enabled to do with the existing revenue streams that you have, and those are identified in the IFC Report. So, I would suggest that the first step, the collaborative part, critical components to any success, the first step is to host a Council seminar to talk about the strategies that the IFC Report recommends. An outcome of that, in my opinion, is a public education campaign. I'm assuming that an outcome of a Council seminar could potentially be not only the definition of the problem, but an identification of the solution. And I think it's high time that we looked seriously at the referendum model. And I think it's high time that whether it's a referendum for just the citizens of the City of Winnipeg, hosted by the City of Winnipeg, led by the City of Winnipeg, supported by stake holders in the City of Winnipeg or a broad province-wide referendum on the issue of funding, that is a need, it's an imperative, it's a necessity. Do not ignore the ability of the public to understand that both the scope of the problem and the nature of the solutions that are available to it. And host that referendum. Be bound by that referendum. So those would be three steps that I would suggest respectfully, would be ones that would be immediate in nature.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor, do you have another? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Mr. Lorenc, thank you for your presentation. You know, the Federal Government had a G.S.T., they reduced the G.S.T. by two cents across this country a number of years ago instead of turning them and investing in infrastructure, they collect over six billion dollars in fuel taxes of which two billion goes to municipalities. The balance doesn't. It goes up and down depending on the infrastructure priorities. The Provincial Government has been cutting corporate and business tax rates. We as a Council have been, have not hesitated to support an initiative from the AMM in terms of pushing the Province, pressing the Province for better funding. We as a Council has not hesitated to bring motions forward asking for our fair share of revenue, right now, the majority of Winnipeggers pay majority of the fuel taxes in this province yet, vast majority of fuel taxes go to outside of the city, don't come back to the city. So, we have been attempting time and time and time again to appeal to the Provincial Government. And the fact of the matter is it's very convenient for the Provincial Government to turn to the citizens and say well, your roads are crumbling here and your streets are falling apart because of the state of your Council's not addressing these issues.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, you've got a question?

Councillor Wyatt: What can we do specifically to move the Provincial Government to start to address these concerns?

Chris Lorenc: Part of the answer Councillor is to continue the partnership with the AMM. The AMM was one of the two founding partners of the Infrastructure Funding Council Report and that report in one of its areas of recommendations in fact does recommend a referendum that is provincial wide in scope, to discuss the concept of perhaps a municipal infrastructure levy dedicated by legislation, exclusively to municipal infrastructure or the increase of the Provincial Sales Tax by one point with revenues going to municipalities specifically for the purposes of infrastructure. The Business Council has already come out in public, even in advance of the IFC Report, making a similar recommendation. There are existing partners. There is a recognition in our community, whether business or community at large, that there needs to be an increased level of investment and infrastructure. And I come back to my, I think the most important point, engage the public, educate the public, define for the public the scope of the problem, define for the public the nature of the solutions and trust that its capacity to make a wise judgment in a referendum.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: Fair enough but is the Chamber of Commerce or the Business Council, is the CAA, you know everybody is quick to all of a sudden say you know there is a problem, everything is crumbling but when the idea comes forward to raise the sales tax for example one or two percent, well we can't, you know that's maybe a little bit too much, can't do that. So you know it's great to say that but if the business community is not there supporting this Council on it, how are we going to get this done?

Chris Lorenc: Well, I can't speak on behalf of the Trade and Transportation Committee. What I can tell you is what has been reported in the media and through reports. And the Business Council in a Report released in April, I believe, of this year, publicly went on record and said that it would support an increase in the Provincial Sales Tax by one percent dedicated over a ten year period to municipal infrastructure, point number one. Point number two, it's challenged the Provincial Legislature to make that change through legislation, and point three, it said that if you are unable or unwilling to make that change to Provincial Legislation, that the Business Council would support leading a referendum, a province-wide referendum to increase the Provincial Sales Tax for a ten year period, Sunseted, ten years down the road

for the purposes of investment in municipal infrastructure. The Infrastructure Funding Council Report, which was…which had representatives from both AMM and the City of Winnipeg made that same point. I can tell you that the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association would support a province-wide referendum. The point is: define the problem, identify the scope of the solution, and trust the public's judgment in making a sound decision.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel moves to extend the question period. We have three requests for questions, so after the three are done. Councillor Smith. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Smith: My question is what have you been doing to communicate to the Provincial Government? Have you lobbied them? What communications have you had with them on the problem?

Chris Lorenc: Oh goodness. I've had…I can't count the number of meetings I've had with the Province over the last number of years. I can tell you that in the course of the Infrastructure Funding Council Report, we collaborated very closely with the Province to make sure that our analyses of the numbers of the revenue streams of the relationships of the programs that exist, et cetera, were accurate. The last thing that we wanted to have occur was the Report being released, making statements about what the Province has or hasn't done or what it could or might do, what its capacities were or weren't. And then have someone from the Province of Manitoba stand up and say well, they didn't know this, they didn't know that, they didn't know something else. So, we worked in close collaboration on the information side with the Province of Manitoba. I think that the fact that the Province has identified, the Premier has identified and legislation is to be tabled, which collapses essentially all of the existing infrastructure funding programs into one point of P.S.T., is in part an outcome of the discussions that were ongoing before the Report was even released. And that's not an insignificant advance in the context of public policy, because now you will have legislation that allocates at least one point of P.S.T. to municipal infrastructure. The problem with that, of course, is that that's only $5 million more than what the municipalities globally have been receiving from the Province of Manitoba. It's not even a drop in the bucket but it does establish the principal. It does establish a baseline. No different than when the government passed the gas tax accountability act which obliges all of the revenues received from fuel taxes to be reinvested in transportation and a report going back to the Legislature on an annual basis identifying monies received and monies spent. So, the discussions with the Province are ongoing. If you're asking me for my opinion as to what would make the Province come to the table, I think what will make the Province come to the table, whether it's for the City of Winnipeg or the AMM, is municipalities in this province embracing the intentions expressed in the recommendations of the Infrastructure Funding Council Report. That Report does not say that municipalities can or should shoulder the entire liability. The Report says here is what municipalities are capable within existing borrowing capabilities within existing revenue streams to do. But more importantly, here is the access to growth tax revenues, the benefits of a growing economy that municipalities should be entitled to from the Province and in the third box, this is what the Federal Government should be doing to shoulder its responsibility associated with municipalities and why? Because Canada's economy is funded and founded in municipalities. And without strong infrastructure in municipalities, we have no economy. With no economy we have no revenues to government with which to fund all of the other programs that we take for granted and which shape our quality of life in this country.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Let me start by saying Chris, I don't think the referendum idea is a good idea, that I think it is far too great a risk of failing. When you get taxpayers federations and others out there saying that we can't…we can't…they won't agree to it. They'll start a campaign against it and that they'll claim that there's enough fluff in the system already that this job can get done. So I think it's important to realize the risk in dealing with that. The Province's current policy of one percent of P.S.T., its annual growth is quite small. And I believe, in fact, it's less than what construction inflation is and will be. And in fact, that policy is setting us backwards. It's not moving us forward. Even though it's setting a starting point, it is actually going to be sending us deeper into the hole of transportation, our infrastructure deficit. The Federal Government eliminating its two percent of G.S.T. took about $250 million out of the City of Winnipeg. One, if you look at it from one taxpayer perspective, that's what was eliminated by that, $250 million a year. And they did it in a way that made it politically impossible for the Province to do anything. The Prime Minister I think, one of those one points even said, this creates the room for the Provinces to do something for municipalities. What government's going to turn around and raise taxes after another level of government's reduced them? It seems to me there's this constant political stupidity that goes on that the problem is obvious, it's not going away. Referendums, silly comments about one percent, equivalent of one percent P.S.T., that doesn't solve the problem. That sends it backwards. What we really need is a summit of all three levels of government sitting at the table with senior politicians, and senior administrators working to the solution. Would you support a tri-level summit of some kind to get a strategy in place, that at the end of the day says this is where the money is going to come from to fund our infrastructure deficit?

Chris Lorenc: I would not only support that, I would encourage you to take a look at the IFC Report which in its implementation section recommendations speak directly to the appointment of a, dare I say yet another committee, task

force, whatever you like to call it, with representatives from the AMM, the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba with a specific mandate to review the recommendations of the IFC, review all of the other reports that are out there and come back within a year, with a strategy to address funding of municipal infrastructure. You need to start at home first before you start exporting to the Federal Government. That's point number one. Point number two, we approach the IFC approached the Federal Government when we were deliberating in our areas of responsibility. And the Federal Government's answer whether we like it or not is that the existing plans that exist, the Building Canada Fund exist until 2014. Until we figure out what our plans are going to be beyond 2014, we really don't have anything to add at this particular point in time. So, in advance of that, this provides an opportunity not only for Manitoba municipalities and its Provincial Government, but I would suggest municipalities across this country and their respective provincial governments collaborating to identify what strategies are required. A summit at the end of the day with all three levels of government is an imperative, I agree.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie, last question.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. Mr. Lorenc, you mentioned that City Council shouldn't try to manage the little small details of what might fall out of the master plan for transportation, and you also mentioned the…this Council, if you want to call it that, which would be I guess what you're saying is oversight to make sure that this Transportation Master Plan is implemented and there is accountability. My question is, in this particular Council's mandate, are you suggesting that it's them who would take responsibility if an amendment needed to be made to this Transportation Master Plan over the next five years?

Chris Lorenc: Well, the comment with respect to micromanaging is in the context of what this document is and this document is a long term strategic plan. The document itself recognizes that and it also recognizes that fundamentally the plan will grow; it will mature; it will evolve as realities determine. And some of those realities will be funding streams. Without funding streams, it's just a plan, it's a document, it's meaningless. But, if you come upon revenue streams, if you come upon investment opportunities, if you come upon whatever those…those, whatever access it is to revenue, and whatever the pressures are for development or transportation, you will then have every opportunity to review whether this is the priority as proposed in the plan or something else is advanced. It's no different than your annual and five year capital budgets. Yes, you have a five year document and yes it projects where investments will take place, but sometimes the planned investment keeps being moved back. Charleswood Bridge was a classic example of an asset that was on the five year plan for 40 years before it was built. This is a plan that looks at the high level, long term Master Transportation Plan realities. At the end of the day, if there is a change, the Transportation Master Plan Authority, which I suggest would come to Council with recommendations for Council's adoption.

Councillor Eadie: So Mr. Lorenc, you're saying that if there was…this has been put on us today to vote on this for a long term master plan. I think there is a couple of long term policy things that are missing from this particular plan. So you're saying, City Council could move a motion to have this thing amended, say, in the next year or whatever, if there was need to be this sort of a planning hole, not a minutiae but a planning hole, like for example, the fact that while there is land set aside for the Chief Peguis Trail to go, continue westerly from Main Street, I don't think there's any policy in place that protects it from what happened in North Kildonan to the Chief Peguis Trail land set aside where there was no policy to sort of say, "Wait, before we build this through, let's not build a neighbourhood, let's not build it…a community around this and then we have to spend a whole bunch of extra money on an underpass for example or a bridge. Would you…what is your perspective on a need for setting a policy not to allow any building close to this set aside land for the westerly direction of the Chief Peguis Trail?

Chris Lorenc: Well, the way we see this going forward and the way that we would recommend it going forward, is that this is a track that is concurrent with your Annual and Five Year Capital Budget Program. But it is a set aside group, Transportation Management Plan Authority Group, resourced as the report recommends and its task and if you were to look at the executive summary's last page, its task would be annually to report to Council on the need to review, amend or update any of the components of the Transportation Master Plan. So, by simply adopting the plan today, you don't forever handcuff your inability to change the plan or adjust the plan depending upon the emerging circumstances. What you are saying is that the picture as we see it today is reflected in this plan. Now, let's empower that Transportation Management Plan Authority to begin the process of prioritizing, reporting back to Council not only on the priorities, but as well, the funding strategy. So, it's a concurrent, ongoing process, alongside your Annual and Five Year Capital Program which gives you as Council, the absolute authority, and the right to make the changes to the plan as you deem appropriate based on the reports that you get from the TMP.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Lorenc, Amber Trails is growing very, very fast. Community is building around land set aside for I believe the Chief Peguis Trail to go through that area. Are you saying then, in their review in this one year, this Council,

Authority would have the ability to change City Policy and say no, we're not going to let you build here until the five year capital project moves that road through? Is that what you're saying?

Chris Lorenc: No. In fact if you…again, if you go back to the Report itself, the Report makes some very important statements about the imperatives of ensuring that land use planning complements transportation and vice versa. So that we don't have emerging anywhere else in the City of Winnipeg, the kind of land use conflict that is now associated with Kenaston Boulevard. You go from 80 to 70 to 50 to 70 to 80. You are in a residential area. It's already beyond capacity. What the plan says and it identifies as an immediate priority is the assurance that there wouldn't be any development that would interfere with the long term transportation plans of the City of Winnipeg. So there is a marriage and a mutual respect of the principles of sound land use transportation planning and the principles of sound transportation planning, effective, efficient, sustainable, well maintained transportation systems. They are not mutually exclusive. They work hand in glove.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much, Mr. Lorenc. We appreciate you standing by to make the presentation today and I think it was a useful dialogue.

Chris Lorenc: Thank you very much, members of Council and Harvey, happy birthday.

MINUTES

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on October 19th and November 2nd, 2011, be taken as read and confirmed.

All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor. Executive Policy Report for October 26th.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 26, 2011**

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

Mr. Speaker: Standing down 2. All right. Seeing none others, all those of favour of 1, 3 and 4? No. 2, Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Tree Pruning – Replacement Tree Planting – Ban on Planting Ash Trees

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'd love to hear from Councillor Wyatt and then I'd be happy to address any issues or concerns he raises.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. I support the motion and I stood it down just to bring some attention to the item because I think it's important. This was a motion that was made at Council last month by myself. EPC dealt with it and has made some recommendations on it which I think are great and in terms of sending funding for the operating budget. This came out of just a, step back a minute here, Mr. Speaker. This came out of the a meeting of the MEAC, meeting of a Mayor's Environmental Advisory Committee, which I chair with Jeff Hartry from the Chamber, and we had a delegation from Dave Domke who is the Director or the Manager of Parks and Open Space Divisions of Public Works, who spoke to us about tree pruning, tree planting and other issues but those items plus what's happening right now in North America with the emerald ash borer beetle disease which is unfortunately coming our way and normally of course a motion is made and it goes directly to the Mayor. And then the Mayor in a form of a quarterly report which the Mayor brings to EPC and recommendations. I felt it incumbent based on the information we heard though that in terms of dealing with this in a timely manner rather than waiting for another quarterly report. That's why moving the motion on the floor of Council. And knowing full well we're going to be discussing the operating budget shortly. Just on the issue, first of all, we've done a huge amount as the Mayor's pointed out the past improving the tree pruning cycle greatly in this city. And right now, we're at about a 13, 14 year cycle. At one time, we were as high as a 30 year, 40 year, even higher cycle. But with the extra funding committed by this Council we've reduced that. The standard best practices across North America we were told was an eight year cycle. We're still not quite there. I'm not too sure what that funding increase would look like or

what that cost would be. It may not be that much to bring it from 14 to 8 year in terms of tree pruning. Second thing Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that we keep at the level of replanting with regards to trees lost right now. We're not quite there either. We're just below keeping up with, we have Winnipeggers…one of the things that came out of the process, apparently we were told by the Public Service out of Our Winnipeg, was how Winnipeggers really and truly love their urban forest in the city, how they prize it. And not just in parks and the Assiniboine Forest, but on every boulevard and every street. If you look at a photo for Winnipeg from the air, you can't even…it's like a sea of trees versus sea of cement, a huge urban forest with the last great stand of American elm trees of North America and you know Mr. Speaker, it's something that we can easily take for granted but it's something that Winnipeggers responded to in the Our Winnipeg open houses and so it was identified to ensure that as we lose trees that we have proper funding in place so that we can actually replant them and replace them. And the other part of this motion refers to the emerald ash borer disease which unfortunately it's a new disease that started south of the border. It came from apparently Asia. It's coming from the east, moving west and right now, the disease is actually in Minneapolis. They know that it's going to hit Winnipeg in the next, within five years, and for sure within 10, and it's devastating. Basically, it wipes out your entire ash tree population. And you just literally…there's no way to treat it officially or cost effectively, there's no chemical or a way that they can go in and treat these trees in an effective way. So the only way to do, deal with it is to remove the trees and unfortunately, when the American elms, when we, number of year, decades ago, hit the Dutch Elm Disease wave that started to come to Winnipeg, what was the tree that we started planting? After we didn't plan, we started planting ash and so for decades now we've been planting ash trees all over the city. So we have…our boulevards are lined with ash trees all over and our parks. So the concept or the idea that we could have a disease coming shortly to the city that could actually wipe out the entire ash tree population is really something that we should be concerned about and it's…our public service is quite aware of this. The Provincial Government and their officials are very aware of it. They've been working together in terms of preparing a plan, a strategy on how to deal with this crisis when it does hit us. But it's going to have a big impact on our budgets in terms of tree replacements, there's no doubt about it. And the fact, Mr. Speaker, is it could happen fairly quickly in terms of the…what has been seen in apparently American cities, it doesn't take long for this disease to spread and they actually go in and what they'll do is surgically remove whole streets of ash trees to try to contain the disease knowing full well that ultimately will spread but they're trying to slow it down that way. So, we're raising this to put on the radar screen because right now it came up, we're still planting ash trees right now in new developments. Why are we doing that when we know that there's a disease coming that's going to wipe them out? So the motion specifically says that we should formally ban planting ash trees anymore in the city, we should look at alternatives knowing full well the disease is coming. Why plant trees that we're only going to have to replace shortly and that's hard to do. It's easy to say, but it's hard to do because trees you know, the nurseries out there gear up and they're on a 10, 20 year cycle not a one year cycle in terms of planting, the seedlings and getting what could be ready for market. So it's easy to say, but we really have to press ourselves and the development community to look at other options other than ash trees. So that's what this motion is about and I raise it so that Council is aware of what the thinking was and why it's important, so thank you.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. First, I'd like to congratulate the Mayor for reducing the cycle from the former 29 years to a 12 year cycle. I support this wholeheartedly. You know, it seems to me that we can do more. I'd like to see it reduced to the 8 year cycle. It's important. Trees mean a lot to the people in my neighbourhoods and I really appreciate the fact and I hope we have a push in this direction to reduce the cycle again. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was happy to second this motion coming from the River Heights-Fort Garry Ward. Eight years would be great. Twelve years would be wonderful because I know when I go door knocking about my neighbourhood or just look on our whole streets and I ask the neighbours, they've been there for 40 years living in that house and they've never seen the trees pruned and we just have to wait till large wind comes through the neighbourhood and then I know in the morning those phone calls are going to come because there's huge, not talking about sticks because we haven't pruned, there's huge branches all over the place. I actually tell people, show me a picture and maybe we can get this moving a little bit faster because when we talk to the Forestry Branch about can you please address the lack of pruning on this street. They just don't have the resources and they say we'll get to it as soon as we can, which again…in some cases I would 40 years, some people have said and I look at those trees and I say, there's no way. So we have a safety issue. The other thing is addressed for us is Dutch Elm Disease. People want to…I know the ash borer beetles coming in, we are quite worried about it. But Dutch Elm Disease is also not gone away people. We're losing some key chemicals next year that we've been using to slow the process of Dutch Elm Disease however, we know that the battle…and if anyone wants to go down through rights, you're going to see these, they are called…I wish I could find the worst name for it called hot spots where whole, where we talked about with the ash borer beetle where the city is actually wiped out a quadrant ,with my approval, to quarantine and try to get rid of these hot spots where actually Dutch Elm is not going to be affected by it. It's got into the rooting system. So we have huge

blankets where this huge, beautiful canopy of trees and then you drive another half block and it's just open, and it's just open because we've had to make these really Draconian moves to try to stem the flow. So Dutch Elm Disease has not gone away. If we can increase our pruning that will help at least in the Dutch Elm when it crosses over on the tree limbs. So again, I support that. The ash borer beetle, there is no solution for that as Councillor Wyatt has said. The Mayor Katz has invested billions of dollars trying to figure out how to deal with this bug and they can't. So it's coming and we know that and I know there are stations set up outside of Winnipeg to follow this, and yes, the city did make an error, as I believe we kind of made an error before and I hope we have learned that we can't just plant one set of trees in one area. We've got to differentiate them. If we did that in River Heights and add some different things, they wouldn't get that rooting system going because they have some breakers in it. But again, the past is the past, we're moving forward. So I fully support this. It's a natural habitat that we have to invest in. It is…I'm not sure if it's counted as part of the infrastructure deficit but if it isn't, our tree canopy should be part of that infrastructure deficit.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Orlikow. Mayor Katz to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I very much appreciate the comments that were made. I think the appreciation of the public for the urban forest, for the tree canopy, I think we all know how much it means to our city and that makes a better city to live in and as Councillor Smith said, this has kind of been a mission of his since the day he was elected and the only thing, if I recall correctly, Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Smith, I believe we were doing it almost every 43 years and we have it down to something very realistic and I think to achieve the goal of 8 years, that would be a perfect scenario and I agree with Councillor Smith, we should strive for that. I also thank MEAC for making us aware of what's going on with ash trees and thank Councillor Wyatt for bringing it forward and the motion along with the…my apology, Councillor Orlikow as well. So hopefully everybody will support this.

Mr. Speaker: No further comments? All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Mayor Katz Committee date November 9th.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 9, 2011

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'd like to introduce the Report and move adoption of Consent Agenda, Items 1 to 5.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie. Item 1. Any other items to be stood down. Seeing none. All those in favour of 2 through 5? Opposed? Carried.

Item 1 – Sustainable Funding Model – CentreVenture Development Corporation

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to hear the comments from Councillor Eadie and then I certainly will be happy to address them.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Speaker Nordman. I am opposed to this decision to take money, funds from this reserve that was established to provide stability and sustainability for the permits process. This spring and summer, the Permits Branch had an emergency situation where electrical permits were taking as long as six months for getting approvals. Last year, I heard how the City of Winnipeg should and did raise permit fees to match what are charged in other cities such as Vancouver. There is still a long way to go to reach the kind of permit fees that are charged in these cities like Vancouver, but the City of Winnipeg…but the City of Winnipeg has an inferior, unsustainable permit process right now. I ask you, what about the sustainability of cash investments of private sector developers who need cash flow not to be tied up because of permits. How does taking the money for developing a better permits process really help downtown and inner city development? CentreVenture is good for downtown. But don't fund it while ruining a related service that the City provides to the private sector. And that's it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker. I just want to rise to speak on this. There is quite a bit of misinformation out there with regards to the permit reserve. Just so everybody is aware, we established the permit reserve a couple of years ago to create a balance between heavy permit years and low permit years. There's…we were experiencing problems where one year you would have a ton of revenue, the next year you would have a real drop in revenue so they keep staff in

place and be able to keep our permit system moving along, that's why we established the permit reserve. It was a balancing act. We've been in some pretty robust years so that reserve's been growing so we've actually capped that reserve at 200 million. And we believe right now, that there is capacity there over the next few years to use 300,000 out of it rather than just going straight to tax support to keep the CentreVenture funding going because we're in really robust times in our downtown, CentreVenture's doing a ton of work. They are having to bring in some more people to help keep those plans moving along. We do on the permit side as well. We do some extra work there. We…there's actually a reduction in permit fees for construction in downtown. So you know, you could be funding that out of the permit reserve as well just to create that balance. So there is some logic to this. There is the availability of the funds. We may see in the future that we dip below in the reserve and we'd have to use tax supported to bring that back up but from a cost perspective, as far as what it cost to deliver the permit service, what we…it looks like we need for the next few years, we think we're okay to do this, or we know we're okay to do this. Some of the industry comments were a little out of whack today as well. I've received a couple of emails and read an article in the newspaper. I can tell you as the former Chair of Property and Development and even as the Chair of Downtown Development, you know, I constantly get phone calls from people in the construction industry saying my permit's delayed, my permit's delayed, my permits' delayed. I would say 75%, if not 90% of those problems are the result of either incomplete or improper information being provided by the other side of the equation, the contractors, engineers, the architects or whoever. You know and that takes a great deal of time and resources away from the City. We have to get back to them. There is a ton of phone calls. They're pushing to get their work done. We end up sometimes doing the work that should be done by the applicant. Some of our plan examiners are actually making the amendments on the plans for them and are giving them back to them to make the appropriate amendments after doing the assessment of what the plans say. So let's not get too carried away here. Our permits system is one of the finest in the country. All permit systems are currently challenged. There's a deficit in the amount of professional expertise out there right now. It's been garbled up a great deal in the private sector. There is so much work going on to keep our economy going right now that a lot of those people that would be available for municipalities are out there working in the private sector on all this construction work that's going on across our country as part of the stimulus funding for the economy. So the permit reserve is there. It's properly funded. This allows us to do something more. We've got some of the best permit services in the country. They are not great and you'll never find a contractor that will tell you there is a great permit system. They always wanted a day earlier. You could do it in a day. They still want it a day earlier. So let's not get too carried away here and let's keep our drive in our downtown alive. This is a great way to do it.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Swandel. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: I'm just recovering from a cold, so apologize for my voice, but we've all received a number of emails on this issue, a number of…I've received a couple of telephone calls as well. The issue of funds being moved from the permit reserve with the perception of them being moved to support CentreVenture. Many contractors, home owners, people you ask in a coffee shop even tell me that the permits process in Winnipeg is slow. I think Councillor Swandel may have over glamourized it a little bit to say that it is efficient. I'm not so sure it is and as a result of that I checked with the department and with the COO. Permits, difficulty in obtaining the permits, the follow-up, there are follow-up issues. People can't get occupancy immediately and that's resulted in a lot of distressing situations. People can't occupy their homes right away, buildings being delayed. We've heard a lot of those concerns. But I do understand that the Director of the Planning Department has made this a priority over the last few months and moving forward and that we can expect some changes by next summer even as early as the new year. I'm confident that despite moving the funds from the permit reserve fund, the permit process will be improved upon because it is such a revolving fund. I ask the Director for more specifics and the Chief Operating Officer for more specifics and I'm told that the department will be hiring more certified engineering technicians and paying for overtime to address the permit backlogs as well they will be implementing a new system in the early in the new year and that is a result of the funds from that reserve. So, this will manage delays into the future and this, as my understanding is how that permit fund was intended to be used. The CentreVenture funding request uses the permit reserve as a flow through account. So it's not negatively affecting the reserve and it's a temporary funding model for 2011 to 13 for CentreVenture. What will be needed is a funding stream other than just using the general revenue account. The administration tells me that this permit reserve route made sense because of all the building developments CentreVenture does support. So with that, many of these projects will generate more permit fees into the future, so I'm supportive of moving this in the direction and supportive of the administration and all the activities that they have going on to stream…better streamline this. I think the City needs to be responsive to the concerns and in showing a great model for being more customer service oriented.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I very much appreciate the comments that were made. So first of all, let's address the fact that we've all heard about issues with permits. And I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that on the majority of occasions when I've responded to concerns from people who have been waiting. The majority of that blame has been because they did not complete what had to be completed. By the same token, that's not to say that we don't have

challenges because we do have challenges. And because we have challenges I can tell you right now that there are many things that are being done right now. Number one, we are working overtime to move things through the process quicker. Number two, we are hiring CETs right now. Keeping in mind, Mr. Speaker, it's not that easy as pointed out, to find experienced people. So you can't expect new people to have the experience of the ones that are no longer there. As well as, Mr. Speaker, we are working with the private sector as well and there's no question they'll have a role to play. Plus, Mr. Speaker, the department is working on improving the approval process so that issue is being addressed. On the other side, I think everyone on Council would agree that centreventure has done some magnificent work. That's number one. This is a three year plan, Mr. Speaker. They are looking at other long term sources of funding but keep something in mind, a lot of that revenue that comes into the reserve is because of the projects that CentreVenture is actually creating. So, in theory, as Councillor Havixbeck said, it's actually flowing through because it wouldn't even be happening if it wasn't for CentreVenture, so Mr. Speaker, this is a good solution to the short-term scenario and I certainly hope that all Council will support it.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further speakers, all those in favour of Item 1? Opposed? Motion passed. We have some by-laws, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 127/2011, 128/2011, 129/2011, 133/2011, 134/2011, 135/2011, 136/2011, 137/2011.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 127/2011, 128/2011, 129/2011, 133/2011, 134/2011, 135/2011, 136/2011 and 137/2011.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that by-laws numbered 127/2011 to 129/2011 both inclusive and 133/2011 to 137/2011 both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 127/2011 to 129/2011 both inclusive and 133/2011 to 137/2011 both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 127/2011 to 129/2011, both inclusive and 133/2011 to 137/2011 both inclusive, be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steen.

Councillor Steen: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor, in March of this year, the residents of East Elmwood suffered a big loss in their neighbourhood when their community centre burned to the ground. Since that time we have been working with members of the community and the Public Service to find a way to ensure that the community centre is re-built and that the needs of the community are met. It was announced in the spring that the centre would be re-built. In light of the fact that the Capital Budget is currently being worked on, can you give me and the residents of East Elmwood some assurance that there will be funding for East Elmwood CC and when will this be confirmed.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Steen, I thank him for the question and I'm obviously very much aware of that issue. I had the opportunity to meet with residents, as well as the Department, as well as Councillor Steen, and to give you the update right now, I am totally committed, as I've gone on the record in the past to having that facility re-built, and it will be a much better facility than it was prior to the disaster. That's number one Mr. Speaker. Our goal is to allocate approximately $1.8 million towards that project from the City of Winnipeg. I can tell you that I have met and spoken with the Province on many occasions about community centres and requiring more funding. Our goal is that they will match that 1.8 so we'd have a total of $3.6 million, and I am very confident that that facility will be re-built and when

the citizens of East Elmwood go to the new facility, they will truly say "wow" and be very pleased with the end result, and I want to thank the Department for working so diligently towards this goal.

Mr. Speaker: That's good? Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the Mayor what is the current status of the problem at the water pollution control centre?

Mayor Katz: It's one of those days! Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Sharma, I do thank her for the question and I can tell you right now we are hoping that later on today, we will have some results which will be very positive news. I can tell you that preliminary testing shows that we were getting back to where we were and the situation may be resolved okay? But I will wait for the final word from the Department, which I am expecting hopefully sometime today or tomorrow at the latest. I can also say that there are several theories out there, but due to some scientific evidence, it appears that one of the possible problems may have been some illegal dumping of diesel fuel or it may have been that was shipped in through truck, but it looks like we are almost back on track. I'm waiting for official word from the Department and I am hoping it will be the good news that everything is resolved and we're back to normal, so I would say within the next 24 hours I expect to hear that for sure.

Mr. Speaker: That's good?

Councillor Sharma: Second question?

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Sharma: Yes. The fact that the Mayor and Councillors found out about this problem by reading in the media is completely unacceptable. Have, or will measures be taken to ensure this irresponsible lack of communication does not happen again anywhere in our system here at the City?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Once again through you to Councillor Sharma, I think that…well I don't think Mr. Speaker, I know we've all expressed our disappointment. Yours truly, along with members of E.P.C., were actually informed on that Wednesday which I already appointed to well after the fact. There is no doubt in my mind that we should have been informed immediately. I think that is the responsibility of the Department to let us know. Even the Province found out a day before we found out and I can assure Councillor Sharma that I have spoken to both the C.A.O. as well as the C.O.O. and let them know that this was not acceptable and it cannot happen. Something like this should not happen within any department. We, the elected officials, need to know immediately and then we move it forward right away so there is no question that if this were to happen again, there would be some severe consequences one hundred percent, I can assure you of that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. That's good? Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. Mr. Mayor, did you read the National Freedom of Information Audit compiled by Fred Vallance-Jones, who wrote this annual report card giving a failing grade to Winnipeg? In his report he cites Winnipeg as the least forthcoming of Canadian municipalities in providing information under the Freedom of Information laws. Why does Winnipeg have the worst record of Canadian cities in providing information under the Freedom of Information laws? Are you prepared to have this changed?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Smith, no I have not read it, but I will make it a priority to review it and after that I will get back with my assessment to the Councillor…happy to do that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Second question?

Councillor Smith: Next question. Mr. Mayor on March the 2nd, the Executive Policy Committee referred the recommendations for the Mayor's Seniors Advisory Committee to the Winnipeg Public Service for report back in 120 days. The Public Service was to report back in July. When do you think the Public Service will report back?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'm not sure of the accuracy but I will take Councillor Smith as being accurate and I will follow up on that to take it under advisement and get back to Councillor Smith.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Many cities across North America have taken action to address public safety and human safety concerns at Occupy camp-out sites. What is the City doing to ensure that Occupy Winnipeg is safe for participants and onlookers, and is there any intention to shut it down?

Mayor Katz: Must be Wednesday Mr. Speaker. That's a fair question Mr. Speaker. I find it ironic because I see in the audience that there are some members of…thank you very much for acknowledging…there are at least four members of Occupy Winnipeg here in the audience. I actually had the opportunity to meet with some of them yesterday when they showed up at City Hall. Didn't have an appointment Mr. Speaker, but I did have a few minutes, so I invited them in and we chatted, so let me make a couple of comments on the specific question that Councillor Browaty put forward. Number one, there is absolutely no intention to shut them down Mr. Speaker, and the reason is quite simple. It's not within our jurisdiction. This is a Provincial park, Memorial Park. It's up to the Province to take no action or any action. That's just the fact, that's the way it is. Whether you like it or not, that's reality. That's number one. Number two is that I think we're all concerned about, you know, the health of everyone and I can tell you that yesterday, it was actually shared with me about, you know, washrooms being set up and actually donors coming forward to pay for them so obviously there is movement to basically make sure that if this is a long-term situation, at least proper bathroom facilities do exist and I can assure you as far as health that the Province and the City will definitely work together to make sure that no one is at risk. I mean, all citizens have the right to express their opinion. We do live in a democracy Mr. Speaker. I was more than happy yesterday to hear, you know, the raison d'être and why they were there from people that were actually there. I was also told Mr. Speaker that I wasn't aware but, every day at 7 o'clock, if anybody wants to show up they have a public forum and you can make comments, hopefully get your questions answered, but those are the facts and that's been my experience to date.

Mr. Speaker: Good. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wanted to just get back to some of the questions that were asked to Mr. Lorenc here this morning and maybe have the Mayor provide some comment. When it comes to infrastructure and infrastructure funding, it seems like we're in three different places as each level of government. We all share the problem when we drive across our roads. We're the most accessible level of government so we seem to take the greatest burden. I discussed the idea of somehow getting to the table maybe just provincially with our Federal counterparts, our Provincial counterparts, a group of politicians, a group of senior administrators from all three levels of government and trying to develop a strategy where we're all putting on the table our understanding of where the capacity is for funding and getting away from these political dynamics of bouncing the ball all around between the three levels of government and having the different organizations like A.M.M. or F.C.M. or whoever, just putting out these statements without having any understanding of what they mean and how deliverable they are from each level of government. What, if anything, can the Mayor do to get us to the point of solving the problem rather than bouncing around between three levels of government and not having a funding source?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you I thank Councillor Swandel for the question, I mean, I think it was addressed very profoundly by our delegation earlier today, Chris Lorenc, that when you look at Provincial growth revenues and how in a decade they went from 2.2 to 4.5 billion dollars, an increase of 2.3 billion and the City got 10% which I think I publicly called "peanuts" Mr. Speaker. That's just the facts, that's reality. The scenario is, unfortunately, there doesn't seem to be a will to address a very serious issue. I remember when the gas tax was created and how I had to go to Ottawa to fight to make sure that we could use that gas tax for infrastructure and our transit which is extremely important, the battle that we did win in the end, and we have been using those monies to address the issue. What I can tell Councillor Swandel is I do have a meeting with the Premier early next week and this will be one of the issues that I certainly will be bringing up and discussing it, but the facts of life are, you know, you can't get someone to share something if they just repeatedly say no and I believe in the end, it will take the public to force that issue which is why I am very open to a summit. If Councillor Swandel wants to know would I be more than happy to host a representative of the Federal and the Provincial Government and sit down at a table and talk about the realities and see how we're going to address them in the long term? Yes. Would I fly to Ottawa? Absolutely. As I've said before Mr. Speaker, this is a crisis situation and it's getting worse, and it's going to get to a point where because of construction inflation Mr. Speaker, we won't ever, ever be able to address the problems. That's just reality. It's not a pretty picture, but it is reality and I would hope that all of Council would be supportive of us working with the other levels of Government and finding a solution. It may be a solution we have to be creative and come up with, and I do agree with one thing. We all have a role to play; the City, the Province, and the Federal Government, but you know what? As simple as it may sound and as obvious as it is, it doesn't mean everyone's going to agree Mr. Speaker. So I will continue to champion this and I will have a meeting next week and we will try and do what we can, but by the same token, just because we're not getting the response from the other levels of government, doesn't mean that we sit by and do nothing. We need to do something and that's what we will be doing, I can assure you of that.

Mr. Speaker: Second question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned earlier, the elimination of the G.S.T., the two percentage points of the G.S.T. for the City of Winnipeg alone would be $250 million. I need to know from the Mayor, when you look at the dynamics that exist between the three levels of government, is there a way that we can get to the table to put that $250 million back into the equation, even half of it, even one percent, because the idea of having it go down as a…you know…we've created the room for the Province to raise taxes makes no sense. Perhaps the burden should be on the Federal Government to create that tax and let it flow through the Provinces down. But we can't do that if we're not at the table with all three levels of government, and we're not getting anywhere where we're going now. The only place we're getting is deeper and deeper into our potholes. So, we need a commitment to get all three levels of government at the table to deliver some outcome, so we need to know that we can find a way to fund this. Can I get an answer please?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is anyone sitting on the floor of Council who does not believe that when the G.S.T. went from seven to five, there was a glorious opportunity for all municipalities across the country to have that infrastructure deficit addressed, and you know, as I've said before, you talk about one percent property tax increase, approximately 1.4, 4.4 million dollars, we're talking about hundreds of millions of dollars, whether its P.S.T. or G.S.T. The realities are, Councillor Swandel is correct okay. The Federal Government at the time made that decision, they made a promise, they fulfilled their promise and they did say this gives Provinces the opportunity, so you know was it meant to play political gamesmanship, I don't know, but the realities are I do find it difficult for one level of government to decrease and another increase. Was that fair or not? Everybody will have their own opinion. The bottom line is, is that everybody was paying those two points and nobody was complaining, Mr. Speaker, so it would have been an ideal opportunity to fill that void, strictly dedicate it to infrastructure one hundred percent, not to general revenue, but never happened Mr. Speaker, so now we have to address the realities, and if you're asking…if the Councillor is asking me if I'm prepared to discuss with the other levels of government that there was an opportunity, it was blown unfortunately, but we need to go in that direction. From my point of view Mr. Speaker, whether it was P.S.T. or G.S.T. isn't relative. Wherever we find that pot of money and growth revenue, and there are many sources of growth revenue, this City and every municipality in the country needs that money. The system is broken Mr. Speaker. As Chris Lorenc stated, you know, all of the revenues are basically going to growth revenues, are going to the other levels of government. Our big source of revenue is property tax. I already told you what a one percent increase equals. You can figure out, if you increased it by five percent, okay, 20 million; ten percent, 40 million; it's not going to make the dent we need and more importantly Mr. Speaker, we need the long term commitment. If we were to have gotten that $250 million, if we were to get even one point, about $130 million, can you imagine what we can do knowing that we have a permanent long source of funding? We could actually take on debt, service it, providing of course there is room in the market place to get the work done, and we could actually start really addressing. We could be doing everything in our infrastructure Mr. Speaker; our roads, our bridges, our community centres, our sewers, rapid transit. There's so much we could be doing. But we're only fooling ourselves if we think we can do this alone because it can't happen. So yes, I do make a commitment to this Council that I am going to speak to both representatives of both levels of government. I'm not going to tell you that I'm going to be successful but I will continue to try and I think you know Mr. Speaker, perseverance is my middle name and that's what you have to keep on doing. May not fight, may not win the battle today but you've got to hang in there and keep on going.

Mr. Speaker: Last question Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. You know a one percent G.S.T. or infrastructure, or Federal infrastructure tax, would double our cash to capital; double our cash to capital! And at the same time it grows every year, you know, it's a no brainer. We've got to get it done but I think it's got to come with all three parties at the table and with the Federal Government at the top. My final question Mr. Speaker is this. The City of Winnipeg or the Province of Manitoba has the second lowest gas prices of any Province in the country; second only to Alberta. We currently have a fuel tax of 11.5 cents I believe it is on gas and we sell about 38 billion litres of fuel a year; 11.5 cents a litre. You do the math. I'm getting tired of doing all the math, but there seems like there is a significant opportunity there, if you were to raise that by a nickel, we would still be the second lowest gas prices in the country; second lowest gas prices in the country with infrastructure crumbling around us. Would the Mayor champion raising the Provincial fuel and gas tax by five cents so that we can generate, I don't know, some 17 to 20 million dollars more of revenue for us which would be about one-third of the cash to capital that we put in right now.

Mayor Katz: Through you I thank Councillor Swandel for the question I think. You know Mr. Speaker, I'm going to tell you that no, I will not champion that Mr. Speaker. I will champion getting our P.S.T. back that we, the City pay, which is somewhere in that $12 million mark. We're already getting a rebate of our G.S.T. so it's obvious the P.S.T. should follow and that would have a significant impact. I certainly would champion the fact, Mr. Speaker, of how much of that gas tax

is earned right here in the City of Winnipeg and how little, how little of it we get back. In other municipalities Mr. Speaker, the major roads are all being funded by the Provincial Government. I mean, the facts of life are the City of Winnipeg, considering its two-thirds of the population, is being treated very unfairly. That is something I will fight for and champion, but if I'm specifically being asked would I go fight for an increase in the gas tax? No I can't say I will Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question to the Mayor. Mr. Mayor, on May 25th, 2011, you were quoted during the debate to potentially regarding developing green spaces/golf courses, that from your point of view said "…my point of view, as Mayor, I want to hear if there are creative ideas out there. I want to know what they are. I want to know if they make sense. I want to know if they are going to serve a purpose." However, upon reading the Expression of Interest No. 497-2011 for select City-owned golf courses which include the Canoe Club, Crescent Drive, Harbourview, John Bloomberg, Kildonan Park, Tuxedo and Windsor Park, the tender actually reads, "The City of Winnipeg, in inviting interested parties to submit an Expression of Interest proposal for the development and/or operation of one of the more following golf courses as listed below." My question to you Mr. Mayor, do you believe that creative ideas such as a seniors' walking park, dog parks, urban gardens, community centre re-locations or other public uses for these public lands, are included in the language of the tender even though the Expression of Interest, which is for over 685 acres of public land at a value of over $50 million identifies developers and golf operators specifically to apply, but does not provide the same opportunity for the public or other interested groups, so therefore do you believe that those creative ideas that you wanted to come out through the Expression of Interest process, will those creative ideas be coming forward?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Orlikow for the question and I can tell you that as we all know, the Expression of Interest has gone out, and I can tell you from some of the very preliminary information to all of Council, and specifically Councillor Orlikow, that it appears there are some very creative ideas that are coming forward. You know, whether or not this Council will embrace them, that's a story that will be told down the road, but I have seen situations where there's been creative ideas involving seniors, involving active transportation walking spaces, involving partnering with existing golf courses and involving all forms of residential dwellings as well; so do I believe there will be some creative ideas? Absolutely. And I've only been told of a small part of it okay. So yes, the answer to the question is a definite yes. Are they going to be all the ideas that we're going to want to hear? I don't know Mr. Speaker. We'll wait and see because right now the Department is obviously assessing everything and we'll be going through it and reporting back to us in the very near future and I would ask Councillor Orlikow, I know he's a very patient individual, to wait for the Department to finish their due diligence and come forward and then actually he and all of Council can make their own decision on whether there's some creative good ideas.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Second question?

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Mr. Speaker. On a follow up to the previous question and the Mayor's response. I guess my concern obviously…it's not a guess…my concern obviously is that the initial proposals out there did not specifically say "not profit groups", it did not specifically say "other groups", it only specifically said "developers and golf operators". So again, I was approached by numerous community groups that said "what about us?" I said, "Well try your best". We can't do this in thirty days, which was the time frame that they were allowed to do it. The criteria regarding financial statements and everything else, again, it's a very for-profit type of modeling of an R.O.I. that discriminates against non-profit groups and community groups that don't have that existing infrastructure to be able to address these quickly, so my follow up question really is, will the City of Winnipeg be providing the public, in the event that Council considers re-purposing the public lands, an opportunity to explore alternative public uses for these public lands before any land is sold for development as was already afforded two developers.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Orlikow, but in this particular instance, I disagree with Councillor Orlikow's interpretation. Mr. Speaker, an Expression of Interest is very different than an R.F.P. okay. It doesn't need all of the details that Councillor Orlikow was basically referring to. You don't need thirty days. You can do an Expression of Interest in basically two hours Mr. Speaker, because all you have to do is say we're very interested. We have four or five ideas and you can sit down with the Department and elaborate and work with them. That's why the Department chose an Expression of Interest, so the creativity could flow. You don't need to hire accountants; you don't need to hire consultants to put together packages for you Mr. Speaker. These proposals can be one page or a hundred pages.

Mr. Speaker: Last question Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Well that's good to hear; therefore I'm not too sure why the tender listed out all the criteria you have to do before you can submit a proposal including financing and how you're going to finance these options. That really, therefore, should have been there, because that is what community groups look at and go "why am I even going to put a proposal in." They don't know what an R.O.I. is. They weren't even told that this opportunity existed. I've had to run around trying to tell people because we didn't inform them. We didn't inform community groups, we didn't inform non-profit groups directly as we did other groups in the City, so again, it's nice to hear that they could have wrote it on a piece of napkin or on a table and said "this is my idea", but that is not the understanding that the community groups that I've been contacted by have. But I have directed them over to the Golf Services to at least put their idea forward, so again hearing that from you, I'm hoping that we'll see some really creative proposals.

I guess my final question is in regard to the planning. Can you tell me why the City would have gone and bought up all these new lands for new fire halls and police stations with the opportunity to use lands that we already own and exist such as golf courses?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, when it comes to fire halls or police stations, I think we would realize that we're dealing with some major priorities for the citizens of Winnipeg and what I believe takes place is location is extremely important, and I'm not the expert on location but I can tell you, every location that has been identified has been because it served a purpose and basically as we know, with the emergency services, the idea is to make sure you can get from Point A to Point B within a very specific amount of time. I would assume that's the reason why the Department selected locations, but Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to take that under advisement as well.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. I applaud the Mayor today for his move to support the Maple Leaf operation to expand their facility and provide jobs to Winnipeggers.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan moves extension. Ask your question sir.

Councillor Eadie: Now the Federal Government is pushing to get rid of the Canadian Wheat Board which is basically 400 direct jobs here in Winnipeg and I want to know what has the Mayor done to this point to try to prevent the loss of these jobs at the Canadian Wheat Board, who is based right here in Winnipeg?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Councillor, I thank him for the question. As Councillor Eadie is probably aware of, when the initiative of Maple Leaf came, you're talking approximately a $95 million investment. You're talking between 345 to 380 jobs. You're talking something extremely positive and the fact they chose Winnipeg should make us all very happy. When it comes to the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker, I certainly have followed this through the media, etc. I have heard people in the industry say that jobs will be lost but other jobs will be created. The realities are Mr. Speaker is this was an initiative of the Federal Government. This isn't new. They've been talking about this for a long, long time, and in the Federal Government's opinion, okay, the fact that this was something that was on the table and they got a mandate in the next election, they believe they have the right to move this forward and that's exactly what they're doing. I have sat down and had meetings with people who are with the Canadian Wheat Board and heard all sorts of different sides, etc., and what's right and what's wrong and what should be done. Mr. Speaker, if Councillor Eadie is asking me would I go down to Ottawa and see if I can convince them to change their minds, I can assure you Mr. Speaker, I could fly down there, but I don't think I'd have any results, but I'm not sure specifically what it is that the Councillor wants me to do because the facts of life are, what we want to do is grow the City. We want to create jobs. We don't want to lose jobs. So if there is an opportunity where you think you're going to lose jobs, yes you want to be pro-active. But as I say in this great debate Mr. Speaker, you have companies saying that jobs will be lost here but we'll be hiring more there. What the net result is today, I don't know. It depends on who you listen to. Should this be a concern for people? Yes.

Mr. Speaker: That concludes Question Period.

All right. Next Committee is Standing Committee on Finance. We have no Report and no Chairman today so we will not have a Question Period. Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management. Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED OCTOBER 31, 2011**

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Where am I at here? The Report is only Item No. 1 which I believe has been filed.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, yes. It's been withdrawn, I'm sorry.

Councillor Swandel: So there is nothing else to that Report other than the by-laws.

Mr. Speaker: All right. We do have a by-law though.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Councillor Swandel: I'll move that By-law No. 143/2011 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 143/2011.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-law No. 143/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 143/2011.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 143/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All in those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period for Downtown Committee. Seeing none. We will move on to Standing Policy Committee for Property and Development. Report, November 1, Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 1, 2011**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the Report of November 1, 2011 and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 to 14.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none being stood down, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – FIRST READING ONLY**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that By-law No. 138/2011 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 138/2011.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that the following by-laws be read a first time By-law No. 130, 131, 132, 139, 140 all of 2011.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 130/2011, 131/2011, 132/2011, 139/2011 and 140/2011.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that the by-laws numbered 130/2011 to 132/2011 both inclusive and 139/2011 and 140/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 130/2011 to 132/2011 both inclusive and 139/2011 and 140/2011.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. I'd like to move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 130/2011 to 132/2011 both inclusive and 139/2011 and 140/2011 be read a third time and that the same be passed and order to be signed and sealed.

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

Question Period for Property and Development. Questions? Seeing none. We will look to the Standing Policy Committee of Protection Community Services. There is no Report. We have no by-laws. Do we have Question Period for Protection Community Services? Councillor Sharma is saying yes. Councillor Havixbeck, you can open.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Havixbeck: I'll hear what the Councillor has to ask.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Sharma.

Councilor Sharma: We're up to 35 homicides Mr. Speaker for this year and we're well over the total for last year and the year is not even over. I'd like to hear from the Chair what is being done to address this very serious issue.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, this is a very serious matter and a number of people have written me as the Chair and expressed their concern about the safety within our City, and we are at 35 homicides. The papers have reported that as well. This is much higher and we aren't at the end of the year. I believe last year's number was around 21, 22. I can tell you that the Mayor and I have met with the Chief of Police and that the Chief is undergoing preparing a strategy for release and it's my hope that we see in their numbers, in the reduction of 10 to 20 to 30 percent because the current levels are completely unacceptable and despite looking at the numbers in many different ways, whether our population has increased and it proportionate…to me it's completely unacceptable and my hope also is that our strategy will incorporate community involvement and going back to being more engaged with citizens and having citizens being more vigilant for these serious types of crimes that are existing. So I can tell you that a strategy is underway. It will be released very soon, likely within the week, and I hope that that will address some of the concerns the Councillor raises.

Mr. Speaker: Second question? No? Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Yes, thank you. Through you to the Chairperson, I am wondering as the Chair of Protection and Community Services if you have any information at all about the new Police Advisory Board, or the Police Commission that the Province of Manitoba had legislated a couple of years ago actually? Is there any new information as to where that's at, when approximately we see that being implemented for oversite of our police services?

Councillor Havixbeck: I'm not aware of when. I keep being told soon and so I will definitely take that back and follow up for Councillor Vandal.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steen. Oh, Councillor Vandal, second question.

Councillor Vandal: Second question, totally different issue. I know that the issue of snowmobiles, the banning of snowmobiles, was at your Committee on Monday or Tuesday and I'm wondering if you can just give us an overview of where that's at in the process.

Councillor Havixbeck: On Monday, we had a verbal update from Mr. Brad Sacher, the Director of Public Works, as well as the Police Chief. In Mr. Sacher's report, he provided an update about a telephone survey that was conducted throughout Winnipeg in early November wherein 451 citizens were surveyed by phone and they were asked a number of

questions, but essentially the results of the survey proved that over 60 percent were supportive of a ban in the City and were in agreement with what was being proposed. On the other side of that, the Police Chief's update provided information that enforcement would be beginning so that any…the motion that was passed at Council last June I believe, or July, said that there would be no more travelling on City routes including ditches, roads, trails, any City property, and so for now that enforcement will be starting, so the issue still I guess left with Police was whether or not the private property and how that enforcement would occur moving forward. So that Admin Report will be coming through the C.A.O.'s office, so that's my update on that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steen followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Steen: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Chair, I just wondered if you have any news on crime prevention. If there is anything new coming…programs?

Councillor Havixbeck: I guess further to Councillor Sharma's question, we did meet with the Police Chief recently, both the Mayor and I, and talked about a crime prevention strategy, and that will likely include a number of highlights about how crime can be reduced throughout our City. I'm thinking that that's the question Councillor Steen is asking, but maybe some clarification could be provided if that's not enough answered.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. To the Chairperson of the Committee on Protection and Community Services, my first question is in regards to the…I just want to…I would like the Chairperson first to clarify. I do believe the Police said nothing about enforcing any kind of ski-doos on private property. I believe what was still outstanding that was not going to be put in the By-law, which is why we did the survey that said 44 percent of the people believe that snowmobiles should be banned immediately in all areas within the City limits. Right now there are certain areas that you are allowed to ski-doo in which Police are not going to enforce until I believe we make a motion to amend that, but just to clarify that though, I heard that the C.A.O. was clarifying the new By-law changes for enforcement, but there was no mention because we have no jurisdiction over private farm property or anything like that, that what's left to do is to follow through on what the survey said. 44 percent of the people said that an immediate ban on snowmobiles, 17 said phased in and 35 said keep it as it is. Is that correct, Chairperson?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yeah, well 44 and 15 is close to 60 which is what I believe I said was in support of, so 44 percent said they were in support of a ban, 15 percent said they'd like to see a phased in approach, which is essentially in support of a ban, and then about 35 I think said no to it, so to just confirm the statistics but the media have been using 60 percent have been supportive.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Eadie: Second question is in regards to the topic of the Chief of Police and the Winnipeg Police Services' strategic plan for dealing with crime, and I'm wondering, Speaker Nordman, why this strategic plan isn't being released to the Protection Committee, the Committee that's responsible for the Police Service, or that the Police Service reports to.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: I'm afraid I don't have an answer to that. I believe the Police Chief initiated the strategic plan and is going to release it independent.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Last question?

Councillor Eadie: Okay. This goes to Councillor Steen's question. We've heard a number of things from the Winnipeg Police Service and others, and I understand at Community Committee, last eve, we heard about a new initiative. Not sure too much about it, where they're looking at integrating more of the Province, Winnipeg services to help deal with crime. Do you know anything about that and this is not the Citizens' Action Network, it's some new initiative. So are you aware of that and can you get us more information about it?

Councillor Havixbeck: I'm not aware of that and if it was at your Community Committee I'd be happy to find out more about it and we can discuss it further at Protection and Community Services if that's the Councillor's wish.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, did you have a…or were you waving at the Clerk…okay thank you. Alright, no further questions for Protection and Community Services. Thank you. We'll move on to Standing Committee for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Vandal.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED NOVEMBER 1, 2011**

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I…let me get teed up here. I will move Items 1 and 2 of the Report dated November 1, 2012…2011.

Mr. Speaker: No items to be stood down? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED NOVEMBER 4, 2011**

Councillor Vandal: I will move items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Report dated, what's the date there? I don't have the date. November 4.

Mr. Speaker: We'll stand down 2.

Councillor Swandel: Three as well please, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Two and three because of a motion that's coming. Three also.

Councillor Vandal: Two, three.

Mr. Speaker: No issue with 1, 4 and 5. All those in favour, 1, 4 and 5? Opposed? Carried.

Item 2 – 2012 Transit Fares

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel…Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is coming out of the Committee of Infrastructure and Public Works. It is essentially asking approving it administrative recommendations that all fares go up by 5 cents across the city. The Report is fairly clear as to the reasons why. So at this point I'm going to sit down and listen to what people have to say and sum up at the end.

Mr. Speaker: There's a motion further to that. So shall we deal with both? Councillor Swandel would you like to make your amendment.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS**

**Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Swandel,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,**

WHEREAS Council is considering including a 2016 Completion for the South West RT corridor in the Transportation Master Plan;

AND WHEREAS the current estimated cost is $300m;

AND WHEREAS there is no committed new funding from other levels of government;

AND WHEREAS there is no identified funding source for the City's yet unknown portion of the $300m cost;

AND WHEREAS the City is considering a 5 cent increase for 2012 Transit fares;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg's transit fares are the 2nd lowest in the country;

AND WHEREAS a 25 cent increase would bring us to the national average for transit fares;

AND WHEREAS the additional 20 cents would generate approximately $6.5m in annual revenue;

AND WHEREAS $6.5m to $7.5m would service almost $100m or 1/3 of the Southwest RT project cost;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 2 of the Report of Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated November 4, 2011 be amended to have transit fares be increased by 25 cents and the appropriate adjustments be made to senior's fares and passes to maintain the 50% reduction;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT 20 cents of said increase and adjustments be set aside in the Rapid Transit Reserve Capital Fund for new Rapid Transit Development;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT to accommodate agreement from the Province that there is no impact to the current operational funding that the additional 20 cents be implemented on June 1, 2012.

Councillor Swandel: I'd like to introduce the Motion please, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Sure.

Councillor Swandel: This motion, maybe just so that everybody is aware of what it is, some of the folks in the gallery don't have this but basically it's saying that in light of the fact that we have a Report coming to us that came through EPC at an earlier meeting this morning that suggests moving the 2000, or moving the southwest transit corridor work into 2000, will be done by 2016 but yet we have no funding source. I opposed the Report of the recommendations for Public Works this morning. I'm willing to support them if we have a funding source and that's what this Motion does. Basically it asks that there be a 20 cent increase on top of the 5 cents which would help to fund approximately, it's about a hundred million dollars depending on what your borrowing rate is. The last one we got at 4.2% is…your money. And you know so what this does is it says that we put an increase in place but the money being dedicated to go into the rapid transit infrastructure reserve for the purpose of funding future rapid transit development.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel, I have a Point of Order from Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: For clarification, through Mr. Speaker to the Clerks. I'm just a little confused. I've hearing this is an amendment or it's a new Motion? It's an amendment. So the document we don't…this is…the motion is an amendment to this, is that what it is to clarify?

Mr. Speaker: Correct.

Councillor Orlikow: So amendments. How..? Well there was a lot of other things in here, too. I don't believe it's…yeah, I know, I'm not sure…I guess I'm not sure of the process. I believe it's a new motion. It's another Motion to add on one. I don't see it as an amendment so I challenge that ruling. I it as a new motion.

(Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Sure.

Councillor Vandal: Perhaps I can clarify.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Let the Chair clarify.

Councillor Vandal: I see it as an amendment because if it is approved, the 25 cent increase would occur on June 1, 2012. The 5 cent increase which I have just introduced would occur on January 1. So…

Mr. Speaker: The additional 20 would take place...

Councillor Vandal: The additional 20 would occur on June 1, 2012 and would go directly into our rapid transit reserve to be used to fund Phase 2 of the Southwest Corridor. The Subject 2 is that we want to make sure or Councillor Swandel wants to make sure, that there is no disrespect or that the Provincial Government funding formula is on board with that.

We don't want to do this if we're going to get less money from the Province as they always do to us. (Inaudible) So, we want to make sure that or the Motion…

Councillor Swandel: I have the right to put this Motion forward.

Councillor Vandal: …to make sure that the Provincial Government is fine with this and we're not going to get any less money from the Province. That's how my interpretation of the amendment, but I'm not the Speaker.

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

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, please.

Councillor Eadie: I'm not debating this. I'm making a point. I'm talking to the Point of Order, thank you. Thank you, Speaker Nordman.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, excuse me. I recognize Councillor Eadie. Councillor Swandel will get back to you.

Councillor Eadie: My Point of Order is simply this. In terms of the Motion itself, the twenty cents is asking for capital money, capital money.

Mr. Speaker: This is not on the…

Councillor Eadie: No. Just wait. This…the original Report to increase the fares by five cents is about operating expenses. Number one is the one component is the inflation related which the administration itself decided but then there was this presentation that increased operating costs

Mr. Speaker: All right. Okay…

Councillor Eadie: …that led to the requirement for a 5 cents increase which is all operational. This Motion is simply about finding capital dollars. I believe it is not in order to amend this particular Report.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I rule in favour of it being an amendment to the original Motion. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Those are all fair and valid comments and they can be brought up during the debate process. That's our process here and I encourage my colleagues to read the rules and procedure in the by-laws that govern us here on this floor. As I was saying before I was interrupted, we have an issue in front of us. We've got a very high level Transportation Master Plan that is coming in a few minutes. That Transportation Master Plan has been amended by Public Works with a very, very difficult timeline in it that's saying that we will complete the Southwest Transit Corridor. We will complete the transit, the Southwest Transit Corridor by 2016. How you do that without having a funding source in place, I don't know. Seeing that this fares Motion was coming today, I seized the opportunity as being a responsible leader in this city, to try and generate the revenue from an appropriate source. This is transit, these are transit fares. We are building rapid transit and rapid transit improvements. My colleagues are all able to vote as they see fit. I believe that this Motion gets the ball rolling, gets the job done and it represents one-third funding approximately if it was a $300 million project. It doesn't limit it to just that project. There are other projects out there, Mr. Speaker. I think we get a little bit carried away sometimes and just thinking of rapid transit as two ribbons of concrete. When I was first introduced to bus rapid transit, it was talked about on street and off street improvements. I see low hanging fruits throughout the city where we can get great gains so I haven't limited it to just the southwest transit corridor. I used that as an example in the whereases. You know, on that Southwest Transit Corridor there are a couple of places where you should get off the road, where the real choke points in bottle necks are at Plaza Drive and Point Road. They might be other better places to get off the roads, in other places in the city if you were investing your dollars wisely. I know in 2013 and I keep referring to this asset management strategy and I don't know how many of my colleagues really understand what that means but they would be sort of trying to direct us to put our dollars where we get the most value for them and where it is most appropriate. I know this has come at the last minute. I didn't have a choice. The Public Works Committee made some amendments to further their agenda. Being someone who wants to be fiscally responsible, who wants to ensure that we have appropriate funding in place and to ensure that those funds come from the appropriate pockets, we often hear our great debate "raise taxes, don't raise taxes". What I know is we have to raise revenue in this city. That's what I know Mr. Speaker. We need to raise revenue. If you want to build a super transit system, rapid transit, improve transit, rail, light rail, bus rapid transit, whatever you want to call it, you better be at the same level of fares as other cities are that are building those systems. This increase of 20 cents would get us to the national average of about $2.32, a little bit more than the national average. The national average is about 2.32 on a cash fare, I believe. So here

we are, we take this, it enables us to move ahead on rapid transit. It makes sense. It's fiscally responsible. It's economically sustainable and it's driving us towards environmental sustainability. While at the same time, driving us in the area of social sustainability where we can implement some of the principles of our transit oriented development strategy. So in closing Mr. Speaker, it's a funding source for a much needed program that is going to help us meet the objectives of Our Winnipeg and complete communities, our transit oriented development strategy. Our fiscal policies because we're bringing in a revenue source in to offset the debt that we would get and I think it would be very difficult for any of my colleagues not to support this.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, as we speak, we'll speak to both issues here, both the 5 cents for January 1st and 20 cents for June the 1st. First to speak, Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. You know, on December the 17th, Council gave the Chief Financial Officer the authority to approve annual all fees and charges up to the rate of inflation. Otherwise they have to go to Council. Now, what they're saying here is we need more money over the rate of inflation. Look, they haven't justified it. We don't have any records of the past increases in when it's occurred with Winnipeg Transit. The rate of inflation is .8 percent. Increase in the full cash fare is 2.1 percent. For seniors, the increase is 2.6. And with Councillor Swandel's comments about adding another 25 cents, look it, this is clearly a cash grab. It may not seem like much but considering the other tax increases such as the frontage levy, the 50 dollar garbage levy as well increased food costs, make it a burden to those on fixed income and do we have the financial figures showing how the Transit Department faired since last increase? No, we don't. I suggest we should vote against this as well as the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm quite shocked by Councillor Swandel's proposal so I'm just trying to…although I did mention it this morning, I didn't think he was really serious. But I'd like to say that first of all, right now, Winnipeg transit riders pay 60% of the cost of running the transit service. We have a 50/50 funding agreement for the other 40% or so, so compare…and this isn't really in the Report but this was backed up by our Transit Director at Public Works Committee and it is the case that 60% of the cost of the transit service is paid by regular transit users already. Most other cities in Canada's are 50%. Five, six years ago when we did the Rapid Transit Task Force, we were at 53% and they were…and the rest of Canada was at 40% or so was that an average or at North American, the average was 40%. Look it up in the Rapid Transit Task Force. And my point is that the burden of the cost of the public subsidy of public transit is being increasingly put on riders now. I was going to rise and will be opposing just the regular five percent, five cent increase on the basis of that. Now we're talking a 25 cent increase. But there's other concerns about this. First of all, we have a 50/50 funding agreement with the Province which we're renewing today. I hope people realize how fortunate we are to have that agreement. Ontario doesn't. The municipalities pay the full cost of their transit service without that provincial 50/50 funding agreement anymore. So we are out of sync with other cities already. Now, the other thing that really frosts me about this is that we're the moving of the Rapid Transit Project, spell it, just specify…we already said we were going to build four or five transit ways in the master plan by 2031. Are we going to do them all in 2030? I mean, we have to start doing them. There's four of them. All that we decided today was to put a time line on it to put some pressure on it. I believe that's a reasonable time line. But, why is it that we have to identify the funding source to have the transit project completely funded and ready to go whereas we don't with the roadway project? Look at the list of the roadway projects we have to have done in the master plan by 2016. Those aren't funded. Do we have all the funding in place for Kenaston? No. That's going to be done by 2016. So like, let's put this in perspective. Let's calm down about this. We have people who ride transit who are single mothers, who are students, who are struggling to make ends meet and a five cent fare increase is an issue and now, 25 cents to…to addition to that with no consultation I might add with the Transit Department I'm sure, or the CAO, is this even legal when we have a 50/50 agreement with the Province, to just change something like this? I mean, even out of common courtesy we should be talking to our partner who funds 50/50 very generously who we are about to vote or we already have voted of the Consent Agenda with the new agreement. I'm sure they're not going to be impressed to hear that the city is it gouging transit riders with this big increase. And another point that I think that's been missed here is that why is it that we expect transit riders to pay the full cost of the infrastructure to ride the bus but we don't expect or more of it, when we don't expect drivers? Why aren't we talking about a licence charge or vehicle charge? They have those in any other cities. Because we know that the single use automobile costs our environment, costs our city, costs our infrastructure, costs our wear and tear on our infrastructure and is contributing to the greenhouse gas problem. People riding the bus are doing a service to the planet and to all of us and making our city more sustainable. And they also tend to be in this city, people of lesser means some of the time although that's changing as more and more people take transit and ridership is increasing. Has there been any look at the impact on ridership of this? Has there been any discussion with the Director of Transit? No. Has there been any discussion with the CAO? No. Has there been discussions with the Province? No. Let's just wing a 25 percent, 25 cent increase because if you want rapid transit okay, you transit people pay for it. Well that's just wrong. We all need to sit down and have a financial plan that makes sense, we all agree and when we get to the debate on the master plan. I think we'll all agree that we need to deal with the funding problem. We've already done that in Question Period. We've

had those discussions. We need to find funding or all our infrastructure needs. All of them and all I'm trying to say by putting time lines which EPC agreed with, all except Councillor Swandel. Most people agree that it is important to invest in rapid transit. If you read the master plan, that's what it says, that that's almost important and that all of those things are important and why should we just pick out the transit staff and say the people who take the bus have to pay for it because we aren't willing to? Well that's just not how it's done. It's not how it's done and it's wrong. It's wrong. It's terribly wrong. It's a double standard. And I mean if you're going to introduce a new funding mechanism, you know there should be some thought into it, there should be some vetting it through the Transit Department. What is the impact on ridership? What is the impact on partners' agreements? I mean, there's been very little thought. I think this has been done you know, as a reaction to the change that happened. I realized fairly quickly in the Transportation Master Plan so obviously set some people off but I guess I just want it clear to make it clear to explain that change that it's really not a change. All of the transit projects that were in the master plan as was originally presented are still in there; they just spell out a time line to get started on it before we are all senior citizens. And I think it's a reasonable time line. The time line was raised with Dave Wardrop. Yes, it has to happen soon in terms of getting the funding. But I think you could argue, I think you could argue Councillor Swandel that through the Speaker to you, Councillor Swandel who's seemed to be listening. (Inaudible) Good for you. I think it's really a reasonable…the amendment that was made is a reasonable time line. But to react to that by saying okay if we're going to build, that we have to have the funding solutions solved tomorrow, well even if we do come up with a new funding mechanism for us, we still have to talk to the Federal and Provincial Government; we're not going to fund 100% of any project. I mean, this hasn't been thought through and it really concerns me, the heartlessness of putting such a fee on transit users. You know, single mothers, people struggling to get to work, they don't have a choice and there needs to be more thought when we make this kind of policy decisions and I hope Council will set this aside and then when we're done with the master plan is approved and we sit down and we deal with our infrastructure problems as the Mayor has talked about today, doing some sort of summit and some sort of action, we all agree we need that but to just single out and say okay if you want to do transit before we're 100 years old, pay for it for the people taking transit. That is despicable. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm the seconder of this Motion. I found Councillor Swandel approached me as I was literally walking into the Council Chamber here to ask me if I'd be open to this idea. And I gave it some thought, I said send me something in writing and he did, and I looked at it and it seemed reasonable to me. I mean, we should be able to walk and chew gum at the same time in this Council Chamber and that's what we're trying to do here, Mr. Speaker. We obviously have got the creative juices stirring in terms of making these things happen, in terms of the Motions and amendments coming out of Public Works created those that activity which is great and now we're seeing more ideas coming forward. You know I'm a political junky like a lot of us are and I remember watching a television show…BBC used to produce it called "Yes Minister" and there was a line in that show where the Deputy Minister says to the Minister, "You know, Minister, this is very courageous of you." and the Minister says, "Really? Courageous? I don't want to do that. Heaven forbid we should be courageous." This is believe it or not, leadership. We, just last month, Councillors, voted, I'll remind you, we voted a strong majority to have a garbage master plan. Not just a plan but a funded plan. And a plan which was funded through a charge which we knew was going to affect folks. There is no doubt about it, but we knew it made sense because those who produce garbage should help to pay for the recycling diversion to encourage the same waste reduction rates that we see in other Canadian cities and Councillors by in large, majority…the vast majority of Council supported that on that basis. How different is that from what's being proposed today? I would suggest it's virtually the same. You have those who are using the transit contributing towards the expansion of rapid transit. You're encouraging a transportation shift in terms of motive transport away from cars to buses and rapid transit. It's exactly the same progressive environmental policy that we argued for last month is being put forward here today, believe it or not Mr. Speaker. Maybe it's got some Councillors shell-shocked in terms of who may be moving the motion, but don't look at who's…look at the idea. It's an idea, Mr. Speaker, which I think is fair and balanced. It was said that the transit users are paying for this expansion. The full cost is being…that is not true. It's actually incorrect. Read the Motion, the $300 million cost to finish the Southwest Transit Corridor, Mr. Speaker. This will raise 100 million, the other 200 million will come from our funding partners, the Province and the Federal Government. So two-thirds of the cost, probably more than two-thirds of the cost will come from general tax revenue of the other levels of government, Mr. Speaker. So at the end of the day, one-third or less is actually going to be coming from the transit users and should not the transit users actually maybe contribute a little bit of the cost? Mr. Speaker, every year we increase the transit fares. Councillor Smith speaks eloquently about how every year with five cents increase, five cents increase. But does that give us more buses? No. Does that give us improved services? No. It…we are keeping up, which is for the gas prices. Gas is going up, Mr. Speaker. We're trying to keep up with that. Yes, this is an increase, a 10% increase when you look at it actually overall, but Mr. Speaker, this is now an investment into Transit. The Rapid Transit Task Force was raised and I'm glad it was raised by a previous speaker. The Rapid Transit Task Force recommended I'll remind the Chamber, that we should build the entire Southwestern Corridor from downtown to the University of Manitoba and the reason that was it was put forwarded by many of our learned colleagues on that task force, Dr. Barry Prentice from the University of Manitoba, Dr. Distasio from the University of Winnipeg, it was that until we build an entire rapid

transit corridor, Winnipegers will not be able to see, will not see the benefit, will not understand how important this can be for our entire city. Mr. Speaker, we're building, you know typical Winnipeg, we're always building half of it. We're building half, we're building half, we're going to…not even half. We're only going only to Jubilee. Where is the rest of it, Mr. Speaker? When are we going to build it? The Motion moved courageously, our Public Work to move it up to 20...before 2016, to build it by the U of M. Great. But how are we going to pay for it? When the time comes Mr. Speaker, to actually pay for it, well, you know, gees, listen, listen…you know, we've got all these problems, which can't…we can't do this, we can't do that. Chris Lorenc, we heard him speak this morning. He said, "Look to yourselves, Councillors before you look to the other levels of government when you're starting to ask for money. Look to what sources of revenue you potentially are ignoring or funding options you're ignoring, maybe for political purposes, before looking to the other levels of government. Mr. Speaker, how can we go to the other levels of government without knowing exactly where our one-third is coming from? And that we've looked at all sorts of options. This Mr. Speaker, is credible, this makes sense, this is dedicated, this is transparent. We already have the rapid transit reserve fund to set up by the City, set up through the leadership of the Mayor who drove, may should have rapid transit reserve fund was set up. It's now funded on a mill rate support. This would ensure that it's funded, dedicated through a source which is sustainable and funded for new capital construction. Through leadership of the Mayor, we were able to get the first leg of the rapid transit corridor under way and under construction and open next April, 2012. This Mr. Speaker, will keep the ball moving. Why wait? We could have all the conferences in the world, Mr. Speaker. We could have all the…you know, get everybody in a big tent and everything but at the end of the day somebody has to say yes, this is how we're going to do it and this is how we're going to pay for it. And you know, I don't want to see where the magic wand is to find this money to be quite honest with you, Mr. Speaker. I don't see knowing what our operating…knowing we're going to probably be, not probably, we're facing a tax increase in the coming year knowing property tax, that's not a secret. These are the challenges we're facing, Mr. Speaker. We want to see the city grow. The city is growing. We want to see how. Now let's put in perspective. The transit fare increase that's being proposed here, if you look at the rest of the country, we're at the low end right now in terms of transit fares. And those cities, ladies and gentlemen have great rapid…a lot of them have great rapid transit options. What we're suggesting here through this motion is to invest so that we can have a full rapid transit line and that we can actually be on par with every other Canadian city. Our fares would be basically right in the middle of the pack of Canadian cities in terms of the average and we would now have options in terms of offering our riders at least in one leg of the city because the reality is if we're not going to finish building the southwest, we're sure it's heck not going to be building the eastern or any other rapid transit. Keep that in mind Councillors, when you're looking at your ends of the city. Okay. If we can't finish the southwest, you can forget about the other quarters. This, Mr. Speaker is a solution. Sometimes the best solutions come out of a process where you get creativity and ideas flowing and you know what Mr. Speaker, we could study it further. We could study it to death, I'm sure we could. But the reality is Mr. Speaker, we are elected to lead. This is leadership. This separates the debate here and makes it very clear that we're no longer just talking about a nice, fancy, dancy goal in a book. The Mayor spoke earlier about 2016 and the deadline at EPC this morning, about the deadline of putting the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor in the book.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel moves extension.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, this addresses our share of that cost. Now, if the Province were to turn around to us and say you know what : I'm sorry and you know we know we have a formula with them and this motion addresses that concern that was raised earlier that they have to be part of the solution. They have to agree to amend the formula so that this funding goes directed towards our share. But the province says they are publicly in favour of rapid transit,. If they come on board with this and with the Federal Government, we can do something, Mr. Speaker. If it doesn't happen, we've tried. We've actually come to the table. We've shown the initiative. We've shown the leadership; we've shown the funding which we can get, now the Province has to be at the table as well, and there's nothing wrong with that Mr. Speaker. We have in the book in 2016. Now we're funding it. Last month, we had a garbage master plan for all those of you supported it, you should be supporting this as well because it's exactly the same. Those are my comments. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Before we go forward, we have three speakers left which would be Councillor Eadie and then Councillor Swandel and Councillor Vandal to close, at which time…should we…do you want to break for lunch now, do you want to hear the last three speakers? Okay. So we'll break for lunch at this point and adjourn and we'll be back for 1:30. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
November 16, 2011, at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: We adjourned shortly after 12:00 and we had one speaker to the item and then we had the two sponsors of the amendment and the item to close, so we'll invite Councillor Eadie to make his thoughts known. Ross. Oh, okay.

Councillor Eadie:. Thank you, Speaker Nordman. In regards to overall both these packages, I…you know, there's been a discussion about leadership and taking leadership to make sure that we build the kind of transit system that the city needs. And I just wanted to first speak out about what it is to be…what I think leadership is and it's to understand why we have a transit system. There's two major reasons that we have a transit system. If you go back to the past before the City actually owned and ran the transit service, the private sector had a really hard time in providing a transit system that was affordable to the people who needed to get to work. They couldn't afford cars, they couldn't afford what people making better money were, so the transportation system needed to provide transportation to people so they could get to work if they couldn't afford a car, they were able to get around, they could get to places to shop or participate and enjoy the facilities of our city. The other component, of course, rapid transit and any good transit system, if it's offering a quality service, one that is convenient for the customer, what happens is you get rid of those single cars because you make it more efficient, more effective and you also make it cheaper for them to…instead of drive their cars, to take the transit. So, those two concepts need to be taken into context when we look at taking leadership with our transit system. So speaking to the Motion, the amending Motion which I still believe is out of order because nobody referred to our policy on transit fare fees, but I don't know that even if this policy allows an increase in transit fares to come directly to City Council in this manner. I haven't even the foggiest idea if a capital…and this is to fund capital projects. I don't even know if that's part of the transit fare policy. So, I just wanted to point that out. But it is a 20 cent fee, transit fee to pay for capital improvements. Now, we're about to pass a transportation master plan which is the reason given as why the motion to amend is here. Well, when you amended the time lines in the master transportation, in the Transportation Master Plan, what you do is you actually are telling the administration now, we need to somehow meet these deadlines of 2016 for finishing off the Southwest Corridor, and when we do that, when you pass this Transportation Master Plan what you're also doing is telling the Province that the City and the people believe this is a priority and I agree with EPC. They made a good decision that you know what, we need to get this done because the people of Winnipeg want an actual quarter to go right to where it's close to…from downtown all the way to the U of M, let's get it finished. I think that you can use that to negotiate with the Province because you're already throwing out 20 cents and you don't even know what the Province is willing to give to us to complete that transit system. They say they're in favour of completing it, well, why are we going ahead with 20 cents when we don't even know if we have to do that. Maybe the…we don't know what the Province is going to pick up. So, I really don't understand why we have…and I try not to use too many explicit words but technically, this 20 cents was thrown out after a meeting about an hour or two hours. There is no real evaluation here. It was brought up about the garbage plan and how the garbage plan came up with a fee. Well, the garbage plan cannot be compared to this 20 cents. The garbage plan when they calculated their fee, the administration went through this. There was a whole report, they did all this evaluations, they just said, this is how much we need, you know the decision to make a flat fee was made, but you know that's neither here nor there. Those decisions were made with the administration and a whole bunch of people consulting and making sure that these things can be done and this is what we actually need. So, I just point that out. So this 20 cents, this is just like throwing it out of the blue and I'm supposed to believe that this is going to be the way to get there. Like come on, let's run it through administration. Bring it through as a separate Motion which it will be anyway. If you pass the transit master plan, you laid it out it means that in the capital budget process, you have to try to deal with this and it also means that you go to the Province and say here, we've come up with this, now you need to negotiate it to its heart and you can put pressure on the Province. So I think that this motion is just really out of order at this point and shouldn't be part of it. To speak on the actual five cent increase, now, so point eight cents is related to inflation as I understand it. And the rest of it is because we have some rising costs. I didn't see any numbers when it was pitched to Public Works on their report. But we're told that fuel costs are going up and so on. I would point out and there is a whole bunch of things I need to point out here, so and this goes to the 20 cents increase too, in terms of finding money. First of all, if gas prices are going up, that means single motor vehicles costs are going up. So that means that people are going to be looking at options and I know in my family, my wife made a decision instead of driving downtown all the time when the gas prices went up, that was it, she's on the bus, park and ride. That's what happens, okay so and that saves her a lot of money, saves our family a lot of money. So, gas prices are going up. We heard about and No. 3 Item on the list today is talking about changes in routes and such to compliment the new rapid transit corridor when it starts running. And I want to point out something. These plans look really good. I think they are providing what will be a convenient service even though the corridor ends at Jubilee, the buses will still continue on to destinations, it just won't be in the corridor. So it's going slower, yes, not quite as rapid but diamond lanes have brought another feature to the transit system in this city. The bus system is really fast. And we also heard from the Public Works Committee last month.

Mr. Speaker: Ninety seconds.

Councillor Eadie: Sorry, we also heard from the Public Works last month that we had improvements where we will put two buses in place of one where we know it's too full. Well, now we're making it convenient. More people will ride the bus. We will derive more money I believe from just the things we've done. We're going to generate revenue without having to raise the actual rate. So I'm saying to you today, I am voting against both the Motion and against the Report itself calling for transit fare increase because it just doesn't make sense. We're going to actually be providing a really good service. I know it's not complete, but this service will be excellent and I believe, truly believe more people will be

taking our buses, therefore you will be generating more revenue and you know what, 60% you're taking from the customers I will point out to you that the flat fee garbage and this fee that you're going to throw on the poor people who ride this system, you are just basically telling them "we don't care about you and if you're working for minimum wage, we don't care how you get to work, if you can't afford it, too bad, so sad". I just want you guys to think about that when you start talking about taking leadership on transit. Think about it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck followed by Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In between EPC or EPC meeting this morning and Council, I walked down the hallway with Councillor Swandel and we argued all the way to our office about why he didn't support the Transportation Master Plan and yet when I think about his logic, it is very sound. How are we expected to increase the priorities and the costs of certain items if we aren't going to attribute some way and some source of obtaining some revenue to pay for those services? And there was discussion a few weeks back now; I can't recall exactly the date, at our informal EPC meeting, about these transit fares and year over year they go up a nickel. And so, I commend my colleagues, Councillors Swandel and Councillor Wyatt, for having the fortitude for bringing this forward in such a direct fashion. I think that they have connected the pieces together to actually have users support a priority that the users also have identified as something that they want for a city. It's really easy for us to have announcements and ribbon cuttings and raise the levels of importance of different things such as rapid transit. But to actually put the money and to try to fund at least our portion of it or a portion of it is fairly significant. Otherwise, all we're doing is raising priorities and we're elevating the importance of things and essentially adding costs, and costs that we may not be able to sustain over the long term. When you get to the end of the month and you don't have any money left, you kind of have to stop spending. Or, figure out where you're going to get more money from. So, I support the amendment that was proposed. And further to some thoughts on the Transportation Master Plan, when I initially heard it as a member of EPC, I was told it was a fluid document, that it could move, that at times in the future some of the priorities may change, depending on development, depending on needs. And so I fully expect that that will still be the case, despite it being a document going in history. I think as Winnipeggers we come to expect things to be at somewhat of a bargain, and transportation is one of them, and you know, I live near the zoo and people tell me all the time, why is it still only $5 to go visit the zoo or why is the rate for this only this? Because the cost to maintain these pieces of infrastructure in our system and our assets, our assets, and that's what this corridor and the rapid transit corridor will be is an asset to our city. So I think that there needs to be a direct correlation. We did obtain some information or I obtained some through the Chief Operating Officer and the Chief Financial Officer. The regular cash fare comparison puts Winnipeg at the very bottom at $2.40. Next to it is Vancouver at $2.50, Hamilton, Calgary, Quebec. The average is 2.81. With this increase to our fares of 25 cent, it puts us at $2.65 and that's right in between Hamilton and Calgary and still third from the average across Canada. The top I might add is $3.25 in Ottawa. So, we are still below the national average for transit fare collection. And I think that's something that we can still hold some pride in and that we have an effective bus system, it will…this increase will enable us to elevate the priority and have a higher priority to the rapid transit system. If we look at other cities and I know Vancouver a little bit better because the former CEO of the Workers Compensation Board went there and she was someone that I worked for. She went to TransLink and oversaw the ferry system, the bus system and all of that is linked together. But my point is that in preparing for the Olympics, which were held, and developing a light rail transit system, that was funded throughout the entire province by the Province, by a gas tax. And I think we have heard…I know I've heard in my one year tenure here, repeatedly, we have pushed the Province to try to get a gas tax, to try to get 1% of P.S.T. and we always fall short. And so if this is one tool to help us leverage in getting the Province to buy in and elevating the importance, they have said publicly that the bus rapid transit system is important to them in priorities, so I'm hopeful that they will come to the table and support us and meet the necessary funding. Many have argued today that it becomes unaffordable for some people to get to work, for them to use the transit system, and affordability and levels of poverty, those are all issues that need to be addressed with the Province, however, I will say that it's the city's responsibility to begin the dialogue and continue the dialogue with the Province to ensure that recipients who receive social assistance are getting the adequate levels and that the costs are not overrun. So, the end of the day I support the amendment put forward by Councillors Swandel and Councillors Wyatt and I also will be supporting the Transportation Master Plan because it is an effective tool for us to move forward. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the main Clause, Mr. Speaker, we're here today because the administration requires approval to raise the fares above the rate of inflation. Back in December 2008, Mr. Speaker, I supported the clause that allowed the Chief Financial Officer to make a five cent increase consistent with the rate of inflation and we knew back then, Mr. Speaker that it was going to be a give and take. There will be some years where we'll ask the citizens to swallow a five percent, a five cent increase and some years, as Council, we'll have to also swallow that extra burden. Today Mr. Speaker, on the main clause. It's our turn to absorb the $1.53 million so I won't be supporting this 5…this request for a 5 cent increase. On the amendment, Mr. Speaker, this is policy on the fly, and without consultation. And is it fair Mr. Speaker, to be asking the citizens, our users who use transit to strictly be paying

for rapid transit? We all know, we've all heard from case studies that transit oriented development will benefit tourism, will benefit business, will benefit neighbourhoods. There's a lot of spinoff benefits Mr. Speaker, not just the…the end users of the transit system aren't just going to be realizing them but the whole City of Winnipeg. We should be coming up with the funding mechanism, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that all citizens of Winnipeg are paying for this in terms of a funding mechanism so this really is a slap in the face of the people who need to use our transit system Mr. Speaker without consultation. I haven't heard anything from my constituents or other Winnipeggers to say that they support a 20 cent increase in transit. I've heard other Councillors say here that you know, our transit fares are the second lowest or the lowest across Canada, but Mr. Speaker what is the service levels like? You know, I applaud our Transit Department for trying to keep our service levels high, but we've got to compare apples to apples, Mr. Speaker. So I really can't fundamentally support this amendment and I can't support the main clause today. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further speakers to the amendment or clause. We will go in reverse order so, no, Councillor Swandel, you'll go. Do your close.

Councillor Swandel: I am in reverse order. I'm the only one with a Motion. Let me start by thanking everyone for speaking on this. I know it's an important issue to us all. Not just fare increases but rapid transit and running an efficient transit system. I want to comment on some of the things that were made. I've only got a short period of time to do it in. There was some mention about the 50/50 funding with the Province and how this might have impact on it. If you read the last clause in the Resolution, it says be it further resolved that to accommodate agreement with the Province that there is no impact to the current operational funding and that the…that the 20 additional cents be implemented on June 1, 2012. So we've created the buffer to ensure that there won't be a negative impact on the other side of the budget so that issue is dealt with right off the hop. When you look at other cities, I just turn to Councillor Pagtakhan talking to other cities and their great transit oriented development. Well, you look at the chart that Councillor Havixbeck referred to where the fares are, those are those cities that have that great transit oriented development. It's paid for on the backs of transit fares, a large portion of it because you can't have a transit oriented development until you have the infrastructure there, so just putting that in perspective. There was a comment about…I think it was Councillor Gerbasi said that she put a time line in place to put pressure on it rather than to make it actual policy. I thank Councillor Gerbasi because it's work. You did put pressure and now we're getting it done. I think today we're going to walk out this Chamber, hopefully with unanimous decision to move ahead, getting the next leg of rapid transit done and further transit improvements done. There was also comment about this being put on the backs of transit users and that cars and other modes don't have the same issues. We charge frontage levies for streets, there's gas tax on the streets, there's insurance levies, there's public subsidies given to transit that aren't given to automobile users. So there already creates double…there is already an equity, another double standard so we can take that argument off the table. Rapid transit, by the way will also create a 20% increase in ridership. These are the numbers that we're working with that we just earlier on...and this, we approved the expansion of all of these routes out to the south end and the additional buses and everything we need to deal with the growth. Twenty percent increase in ridership to the Southwest Corridor is significant new revenue as well. This continuing all the way out will bring further revenue on top of the money that we're talking about here today. When you consider that fares right now are making up 62 to 65 million yeah, add on 20% and perhaps more growth. We're easily going to be in the 65 or 6.7 to $7 million range by implementing this increase. And that will fund the improvements that we all asked for. The fixed income issue I think Councillor Havixbeck alluded to this. It really is -- when it comes to people with fixed incomes and people who struggle on a day to day basis and need transit. There are great opportunities out there for people and they are provided mostly by the Province. We provide the Province with a transfer of money of about $23 million a year. That's right, $23 million a year. I don't know, I guess about seven and a half, eight percent of a hundred million dollars or of the 300 million required to build a rapid transit piece. We give to the Province for social assistance and to deal with those issues. We as taxpayers and ratepayers in the City of Winnipeg give that to the Province. So there is an equalization that you can work with there as well. Mr. Speaker, the 20 cents represents at least $6 million of new revenue and with our last borrowing we know that a hundred million dollars cost us about $6 million to service. I verified that with the CFO over lunch. So we know that the math works here. I don't know why people want to go out and do further research and do more rather than getting the job done. Other cities that have been referred to…I want to go to Vancouver in particular. Vancouver has a gas tax on transit. You pay a transit tax when you buy gas in Vancouver. You also pay a carbon tax. Their transit tax, Mr. Speaker, I think is about…it's 12 cents. And then another 2.3 cents carbon tax. Our gas tax alone in this city is 11.5 cents. That's the only tax we have in this city, 11.5 cents, in this province, not just in the city, in this province. The Province you know, we mentioned we were talking about infrastructure this morning, I brought up the issue of what would it mean if we were raised, if we added a nickel on to that 11.5 cents. We'd still be the second lowest gas taxes of any province in the country. We would have over $10 million of new revenue. I don't know the exact amount, it's probably closer to 15, 18 million dollars but I'll just use the term over 10 million. The Province tomorrow could come out announce a gas tax of 5 cents to fund the rest of their portion of rapid transit. We gotta pay for it somewhere, and guess what? They control that gas tax, we don't, Mr. Speaker and that you put on the backs of automobile users. You can find the balance in here. I say it again like I said earlier; we can't do it on our own we need to do it with other levels of government. This starts us doing it. They need to come to the table and do the rest. And we also know at the same time right now that both the Province and the Federal Government are running

deficits. So there are challenges there. The chances of getting money quickly from them are difficult without them bringing new revenue sources into play. I guess you know, if you support rapid transit then support funding it. If you don't support it, then don't support funding it. I think we all support rapid transit as long as it's done sensibly and as long as its got some funding. I'll fight to build a great city, with a leading edge transit system. I need this Council to get on the bus and help build it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you. These last two days have been pretty tumultuous in terms of amendments and changes to plans. Speaking to my Reports, the five cent increase, Mr. Speaker, anyone who's cast any sort of eye as to what's going on in Winnipeg Transit in the last couple of years know that the five cent increase is necessary and much needed. Mr. Speaker, if you read the Report you'll realize fuel, diesel fuel, in 2010 Winnipeg Transit spent 13.3 million in 2010 and in 2011, we're up to 17.1 million in diesel fuel and 2012 we're probably going to be up to close to 20 million. Those expenses are real. They are not…they are not something that we can simply defer or we have to pay for them somewhere. We have to develop the revenue streams in order to pay for the diesel. Transfers to the transit bus replacement reserves. In 2007 the department contributed, no the price of a bus in 2007 cost $390,000. In 2010, it was up to $435,000 a 12% increase in four years and we all know we don't have enough buses. We all know about the changes that occurred in 2012 and 2012 is going to be a great year for Winnipeg Transit, Mr. Speaker. I want to refer to the document that we are going to discuss in a few seconds. The next I believe Item No. 4 because there is some pertinent information to this discussion. Mr. Speaker, there are two new routes proposed in 2012 for the rapid transit line and there are 15 routes which will be reworked to provide an extended service. We are going to be hiring, Mr. Speaker, in 2012, 49…let me just find my documentation here, 49 bus operators, 2 inspectors, one video safety coordinator, three settler servicers and a mechanic in 2012 to service all the new lines and the service we're going to provide. In 2013, 2 new general operators, 2 industrial mechanics, 2014 a carpenter, an electrician and an industrial mechanic. Mr. Speaker, all tolled there are 75,000 extra service hours in 2012 compared to 2011. And if you assume that people work 40 hours a week, Mr. Speaker that's upwards of 2,000 weeks of extra service in 2012 compared to 2011. That's significant. We have to pay for that somehow. Mr. Speaker, we've been talking about rapid transit for the last 40 years. We know how far we've gotten. The first line is going to open in April of 2012. We've been talking about it since I've been here in '95. It's going to open in December of 2012. I never thought, Mr. Speaker, that in my life we would see the completion of the southwest line from the downtown to the U of M. Thanks to Councillor Gerbasi who was aggressive and assertive in her vision, she had the power of her beliefs. She made the Motion to move that rapid transit up to 2016. We supported it. Executive Policy supported it this morning. Thanks to Councillor Swandel and Councillor Wyatt and demonstrated by the Reports that I've just read, we've clearly indicated work that needs to be done, service that needs to be paid for. Mr. Speaker, this is not something that's hairy fairy. This is something that's going to go for the completion of Phase 2 of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. That's something that we can all believe in. That's something that we know is going to make our city a better place to live and that's something that's certainly I can support. So Mr. Speaker, in closing I'm going to be supporting the Motion moved by Councillor Swandel and I hope it gets support around the table so that we can move on to the Transportation Master Plan. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Vandal. So first we'll vote on the amendment. I would suspect you want a recorded vote. Yes, we're having a recorded vote. All right, those in…all in favour of the amendment as proposed by Councillor Swandel, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Smith.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 6.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is accepted and passed. Now, on the original item, the Transit Fare Item 2, all those in favour of the…including the amendment that we just adopted, all those in favour? Those opposed? The ayes have it. Thank you. Now, Item 3 was set aside was it not? Okay

Item 3 – Transit Service Changes for Implementation Upon the Opening of Southwest Transitway

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I briefly referenced this in my previous remarks. There is an incredible amount of service improvements, 75,000 extra hours in 2012 when you compare it to 2011. Again if you assume people work 40 hours a week, that's over 2,000 weeks of extra service and this is just identifying how it's going to be rolled out and of course it's in tandem with the opening of the Southwest Transit Corridors and an incredibly positive story for Winnipeg and I hope it gets unanimous support around this table. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Who's on…who originally stood it down? Councillor Smith, did you stand down No. 3? (Inaudible). Two. Okay, all right. Well, having said that, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. All right, now we have the November 15th, 16th meeting I guess with regard to the Transportation Master Plan.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED NOVEMBER 15, 2011**

Item 1 – Transportation Master Plan

Councillor Vandal: I will move the rules be suspended to deal with Transportation Master Plan.

Mr. Speaker: And we need two-thirds, am I not correct? Two thirds, all right. Recorded vote then. All those in favour of suspending the rules? All those in favour?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Pagtakhan and Smith.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 3.

Mr. Speaker: I think we have our two-thirds. All right. Councillor Vandal, please proceed.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce this plan. This is the plan that's been in the works for a few years beginning of course with Plan Winnipeg or Our Winnipeg through the consultations. It's been out to the community for at least 3 or 4 public meetings. There's been extensive consultations and workshops and Council seminars downstairs as well as some very good discussion at our Standing Policy Committee on Public Works and Infrastructure Renewal. We have had two meetings. It's a high level policy document that's going to be the guiding force behind our strategic transportation infrastructure both in roads and rapid transit and an active transportation. It's guided by five key strategic goals and I just want to take one minute to read them into the public record, Mr. Speaker, once I get my glasses on. The transportation system that is dynamically integrated with land use, a transportation system that supports active accessible and healthy lifestyle options. A safe efficient and equitable transportation system for people, goods and services. Transportations infrastructure that is well maintained, and a transportation system that is financially stainable and this morning, through an addition from the Standing Policy Committee which was approved by Council, by Executive Committee, that we will have a transportation system that reduces its greenhouse gas emissions footprint and meets or surpasses climate change and emissions reduction goals set by the City and the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, there are accompanying maps which identify and in general terms set time lines for the construction of key projects both rapid transit and road, as well as our goods movement throughout the City. This is a plan that is living and breathing. It is dynamic. It's not static. It's going to change. It allows for flexibility and it allows for growth and anticipates growth and all aspects of geometry of the City. And I think it provides an excellent blueprint for the future. That's my introduction Mr. Speaker and I'll stand down and listen to comments and wrap up. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No one's talking? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. It's really difficult, you know, there is a lot of really good things in this transportation master plan that I wholeheartedly agree with but I'm having a hard time and really there's been a few amendments made to it that's given my schedule and given the schedule that EPC has decided they want to move on, on this particular plan, I'm not sure that I can support it because there's a couple of things missing, I believe, that should be in here involved. This is the high level tool that's provided and it talks about a number of tools that can be utilized in terms of moving forward a good transportation, overall transportation plan for the City. And I'm somewhat confused as I know that the heavy construction industry is quite involved in the initial consultations and improvements and I know that the maps that are attached to this which are developed are based on a lot of information and input that's been given by Mr. Lorenc and I guess I was a little confused today. I was looking for…he almost made it sound like it's in the document but I guess it's not, this sort of authority that would overlook just the city's transportation master plan. I only read in here about a potential regional authority of some kind to overlook not just transit but overall roads and all that kind of stuff. But, that aside and I know that the Committee Chairperson, who's stewarded this plan through, will answer some of these questions for me. And hopefully what I'm saying right now is I'm not really decided on whether to vote for this plan yet or not. I also wanted to point out some other problems I have for this thing. Now, it does recognize the aging population of the city in terms of its…it says it's going to have some kind of impact on Handi-Transit and I know that when it talks about providing transit service to 95% of the people in Winnipeg through a policy that right now basically states 400 meters bus stops, given that idea, I still don't really see in here how we're going to manage what is going to be the biggest, hugest resource draw on the city and that's going to be the demand for Handi-Transit in place of regular transit because of this difference between 150 meters and 400, which I brought up at many of the seminars but I didn't read anything in there where we necessarily have stated some kind of tool that we will utilize to do this other than try to reach out the 95% of the citizens of Winnipeg with a transit servicing. That in itself, it's hugely difficult, and I applaud our administration for being bold enough and for everybody to put that plan in there but really, I think that there should've been more discussion and provided a few more higher level tools to talk about how we're going to deal with this huge rise in cost, I believe for Handi-Transit. And you know, being that this is…it is a person's…it was determined that if you're providing a transit service to the population, they actually have a right to the transit and that's an interesting concept, but one that might even reflect to people who work for minimum wage who aren't eligible for any subsidies in terms of transit, I'm going back to a previous argument, but the overall plan here what…I have another concern in the math. This inner circle concept verses what we can as a city really afford. There is no statement here that says, "We're going to look at a better way", maybe than what was the recommended inner ring trade routes or whatever it is which includes oddly enough, the Plessis Road which was approved today and I thought it was going to be stand it down and I wanted to say that I'm actually not in support of that because I think that there are other possibilities to create trade corridors through the city that will get you to the CentrePort and all these other wonderful places that we need to do transportation but we can do it a better way, a way that's more affordable for the City because all I've heard today is and I heard the Mayor say it again this way, "There is nothing we can do about the inner city's roads, it's crumbling apart and it's the Province's responsibility." Well, you know what, I had a question. Eight million dollars for residential streets from the Province and two million from the City. We pay a frontage fee for on our taxes which is really regressive but we are unable to utilize it in terms of using some of that money to borrow to speed ahead and fix what I think the newspaper reported the other day was 20% of our streets are beyond failed. They are just shot. So how are we fixing that? We need to deal with that and we have to take responsibility and there are ways we can't do it but you know what we can't do it because some of the other ideas we've had for funding, there is a higher cost associated with having someone lease us a roadway called Chief Peguis and lease us a bridge and lease us another bridge and so on and when you do that, yeah, well maybe it's…you know, we maintain it because we give them good contracts for maintenance but you know it is a higher cost method to financing our road, our good transportation plan. And what that does is you guys passed a financial management plan that says you have to meet certain ratios. Well, this transportation master plan that we have here and your time lines and all that kinds of stuff, what it's saying is, is basically we've already run out of money to borrow and our ratio say that now we can't even use the…we can't even use the frontage fee to borrow a bit more money instead of having $10 million for fixing our neighbourhood streets, streets that you know our people who live in their homes and using and driving with their cars and so on and it's costing extra money driving on these roads. It's crazy and the back lanes, I won't even get into that. So you know this plan, I don't think really, well, it does talk about strategies and how to get money and I wholeheartedly support 2% request from the Province being collected on our behalf to pay for infrastructure so that we can have control over that money but what I'm afraid of in this master plan, what I'm afraid of I see in this master plan is our growth stuff will continue to suck all the money out of the city's coffers.

Mr. Speaker: One minute.

Councillor Eadie: And we won't be able to afford still to fix the inner city problems that we have. We are so negligent it's easy to blame the Province but you know what, really, I wanted to point out another point and this is related to the Transportation Master Plan because it talks about trying to find ways of funding this. Well you know, it says that there is this huge increase in Provincial Sales Tax. Now it was just recently that the Provincial Government said that they would try to fund infrastructure to 1% of P.S.T. Now they didn't say they were just going to give us the ones instead they said that they are going to give us grants for that much or whatever it is. But what it didn't say is how the Province's actually

found money. You know, if anybody took some time to study what the Province has been doing to find new money that it gave, if you recall Gary Doer gave the City an extra $50 million. I know it's been used up because the deficit is huge. I'm not saying that that was the greatest thing.

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

Councillor Eadie: but what I'm saying is that the way the Province funded it wasn't through a Provincial sales tax, they funded it was through a registration fee on your driver's license, which is a great idea because if you're going to drive single cars you know, that money should go to pay to fix roads in the province and the city. We should be asking for share of that, like these are ideas we've heard of before. But that's actually how the City. So I'm hearing debates about money and all this stuff and people are saying all this thing about P.S.T. Well, the Province uses it, most of its P.S.T. if you want to…it's just general revenue, you could say it uses it all for the health care increases or for the increases in the education system. What have you? It doesn't matter but what I do know is the Province has been finding extra money through raising registration fees for all your automobiles. That's where lots of that money's been coming. That's for enlightenment, so I guess in conclusion I still don't know how I'm going to vote on this because I still want some clarification on all the amendments. I've been very busy this week. It's not just the Transportation Master Plan. We've got all kinds of things going down here. It's amended a huge document.

Mr. Speaker: One minute.

Councillor Eadie: The huge document was amended and I'm not quite sure other than time lines and I agree with the time line. I think that's a great idea, 2016. What a…that's really good. That will push it. We are able to…and that's why this plan would be good in those terms but I hope that I will be told what the other amendments were to this plan that happened earlier this week which is yesterday or whatever. So, I think I'm just going to leave it at that. At this point I still don't even know if I'm going to vote for this thing because just the way I think it's been handled. It's…you know I threw out some ideas, I was assured that these things would be addressed when I was talking to them at the seminar and when I read through the details, I'm not necessarily convinced that my concerns have been dealt with. So thank you, Speaker Nordman, for allowing me to speak.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this document we have before us, it was questionable before whether it was a living, breathing document but clearly it is that…what we're adopting here is a plan which will actually be able to be implemented. We know so often the cynical view that you write plans and then they go and sit on a shelf. Mr. Speaker, this plan we can actually go forward and say we're able to implement significant portions of the plan, especially the major portions of the plan. I want to thank Councillor Gerbasi and the members of the Standing Committee of Public Works and the Chair of Public Works for bringing forward the amendments that they brought forward. There is no doubt that moving rapid transit up in the document both in terms of the southeast corridor in the short term and the eastern corridor in the mid-term was a major improvement to this document. It strikes a balance, Mr. Speaker, that's so important. I know there's huge pressure on us as a Council to deal with transportation issues both not just from private vehicle users but also from the truck industry that's throughout our city and just the state of our roads and congestion. We hear it all the time. So the immediate reaction is to upgrade roads and to build bridges. The reality is Mr. Speaker, we have to have that balance. We have to be able to say we're investing in rapid transit because we know ultimately Mr. Speaker, we cannot build our way out of congestion. To put another overpass at an intersection simply transfers that congestion to the next intersection Mr. Speaker. That's the challenge that we're faced with. We know we have to offer alternatives in terms of transportation, and alternatives that actually, if you like to compete with the private automobile and offer a realistic that alternative in terms of being frequent and rapid and convenient. And that's why we've had this debate in the City for 20 or 30 years about rapid transit. And that's why Mr. Speaker, this is a living document now because thanks to the Committee, they've moved up the recommendation to have these projects in the short-term and mid-term and now Mr. Speaker, thanks to the previous debate and the previous discussion, we're actually going to be building rapid transit, continue to build rapid transit in the city. They're all saying Mr. Speaker, that only Nixon could go to China. He was a known and a strong anti-communist and when he went to China the first guy as President to recognize red communist, Red China. Only Nixon could go to Red China and no one else could because he had the credentials as an anti-communist. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say only Katz could build rapid transit and that's a fact. Because the man who's known to have slain rapid transit, many people put that moniker on him, but the reality is Mr. Speaker, he is the one building it; with this Council's support and with this Council with the leadership. We're building this Southwest Corridor and we're going to now continue that Mr. Speaker, and God help the Provincial Government or anyone who stands in our way. We've passed the resolution. We're moving forward, Mr. Speaker. This is a great thing for our city. It's exciting, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry if I'm getting excited, but I'm excited about this. There's not many days where you're in public service…we know what it's like, right? There is the daily grind, there's the issues we

address but there's…there's the rare days Mr. Speaker, the rare moments where we actually make decisions that we know are not just going to be a decision that affect us here today in our immediate lives but we'll have a ramification for generations to come for the better, Mr. Speaker and we've done that today and Council should be proud of themselves. We beat ourselves up on so many times on so many other issues so let's just take a moment to say this…we're moving in the right direction. We've done something dramatically important and positive for our city. This plan puts us in that direction. Previous to this debate Mr. Speaker, we're now funding and we're actually finding the funds to make a rapid transit project possible that we never realistically putting it into having built by 2016, that's great, but how do you pay for it? How do you pay for it, Mr. Speaker? So I give great…I know the Public Service worked extremely hard on this document over the last number, the last year or so, actually longer than that. They did extensive public consultations. This is a culmination of the money that this Council spent on a first time doing an origin destination study that we hadn't done in years. Mr. Speaker, we spent $900,000 on that. We used to do them every 5 or 10 years, we hadn't done it for a decade. We finally have that. That feed into the result. The challenge we're facing Mr. Speaker, as the City is that the first time in decades we're growing and we're not just growing in one year. We're growing consistently and the Conference Board of Canada statistics have indicated that we're growing an average of 10,000 people a year and so far their numbers have been right on in terms of their predictions, Mr. Speaker. So there is no reason to think that that will not continue. We're in the centre of the country. We have relatively clean air. We're a peaceful place compared to a lot of places in the world. People want to live here. You know, we have a decent education system. People want to raise their families here. Mr. Speaker, we have a great future ahead of us. We know we're going to grow as a city. This Transportation Master Plan is timely, it's crucial, it's necessary. It should have the unanimous support of all of Council because with this plan we can actually go forward and have a plan to build, and you know we always, Winnipeggers like to say you know, you hear it everywhere, "It only takes 20 minutes to get anywhere in Winnipeg. It's only 20 minutes. I can get anywhere in 20 minutes". Well, guess what, that's changing and we see in certain parts of our city, it's not taking 20 minutes in some parts of our city to get anywhere, anymore. And before we know it, if we don't have a plan and we don't have…and we don't implement that plan in terms of improvements to our transportation system, in 10, 20 years from now, it's going to take a heck of a long time. I was at a transportation seminar put on here by the Transportation Institute at the University, by the U of M here in Winnipeg and there was a speaker from Toronto and they were talking about their transit system and their transportation system in Toronto and just to put things in perspective. Right now the average commute time in Toronto is 90 minutes. Ninety minutes, Mr. Speaker , in Toronto today. They're planning to make a massive investment in transit and in rapid transit over the next 20 years, in the next, a massive, we're talking billions of dollars improvement. New subway lines extensions and you know in 20 years what they're going to go from 90 minutes to Mr. Speaker, in terms of commuting time, 89 minutes, one minute improvement and they are excited because they are growing and they're actually holding the commute time at what it is today, you know put that in perspective. We're growing as the city too. It's a different scale, but we're growing as a city. We could be facing, maybe not 90 minutes, but new challenges if we don't invest and make these changes. So we're doing that. It's a positive document. I encourage everyone to support this plan, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess some days, it's you know, bright lights and some days it's dark nights. I think Councillor Wyatt's change of heart over this Transportation Master Plan regarding its validity and its basis, it's quite remarkable after having two months ago, we heard about how he wasn't able to get a meeting with the administration to talk about it, how this is all not the way we do things, which I just want to follow up to Councillor Vandal's comments about how great this process has been. They're engaging people and talked about how this process had public seminars. Well yeah, the last one gave people two days notice. How we could also gone to Public Works and made inquiries. I did so, got no replies back, trying to engage people at all, very little engagement that I see. However, there are some interest groups that we talked to. The reason I bring that up is that this isn't all rosy, this plan and I actually in a great democracy I take the other side. I find this plan detrimental to Winnipeg and I'll tell you why. I'm voting to put Winnipeg taxpayers first and make fixing our existing infrastructure a top priority in the City's Transportation Master Plan. The Transportation Master Plan presented today at Council. It's designed allow those people working outside of Winnipeg easier access into Winnipeg, which raises a question of fairness to Winnipeg taxpayers. Why is EPC's main priority spending money, in my opinion, on infrastructure that mostly benefits those people who do not even live in Winnipeg and don't pay taxes? The TMP presented today, if you look at the maps in the back, you'll see majority of the road work that's coming is on the outsides of the city. However, there is no money that is dedicated to this and that new money we have to be understanding if there's new money that isn't put into the roads that's going to have to come from somewhere else and in the past where it's come from as at the cost of old infrastructure. New infrastructure has predominantly taken stronger and you can just look around my neighbourhood. You look at all the old metro Winnipeg areas, Unicity, pre-Unicity days. All those areas have deteriorated to a point because we keep doing new infrastructure on the outsides of the city and we're continuing that trend and I don't see this plan doing this. This plan will only drive more cars into Winnipeg further exasperating the problem for mature communities and other older communities located in the central part of the city. For example, the Waverley bypass continues to be delayed. Councillor Vandal talked about how excited he is to be here that after so many years maybe we'll get the last part of the

rapid transit line done. Well, I've been hearing a lot from my communities, they are talking about Waverley bypass was on the books in Metro Winnipeg days. So I guess we're talking a little bit longer, they're going to have to wait for that. Again, we also look at some of the priorities. I didn't get an answer why. I'm not sure why some priorities with flow rates of 1400 cars are over Waverley bypass which has over 35,000 cars on 24 hour basis. Other lines, other higher priorities only have maybe 14,000 cars on an annual…on a daily basis; so again, those priorities were never explained to me properly. Cars and trucks will continue to drive on our roads that are so bad, we're going to bring in so much more traffic into the city on this existing old, failed infrastructure and the ramification to communities such as River Heights primarily because I get it right now, is increased load on streets on our collector streets in our residential and our regional streets. The roads are in such bad shape, the houses are breaking. They're shaking. Things are falling off the wall. Again, is this going to solve that problem? Absolutely not. It's going to make it a lot worse by driving more cars through those neighbourhoods. Cut through traffic. That's what I was hoping for again, when I asked the opportunity to have more of a working group. TMP group so we can talk about some of maybe…how we look at it locally that was denied by EPC. However, my point was, fix the middle part first before we start bringing more people in. So again cut through traffic. Cut through traffic creates a huge safety issue in older neighbourhoods. Is this going to help that? Absolutely not. This is going to make that worse. It's also I think very important as we raise today what is not in the TMP, like how the City pay for all this. Sure we got maybe today, using a user fee model that just jumped out at us today, for one little piece of the rapid transit in line, that's very nice. However, millions, hundreds of millions of dollars are dedicated for new roads in this plan. There is nothing there. So we even have an infrastructure deficit of $3.8 billion on old infrastructure. Is this going to help that? Absolutely not. I don't see any plan at all. There is not an unlimited amount of money available. There's no plan on how to deal with the existing infrastructure deficit and the TMP outlines a long list of new infrastructure projects. We need a plan, not a Christmas list. The concept of dedicated user fees and sources revenue such as debt financing from new Public Works which we have done today. We've got…we have a bypass we're going to debt finance. We have a Yards that we're going to debt finance, however those user fees must be equal to all. We must be looking at all. Today we had one for rapid transit. I think the idea, concept to talking about user fees is very valuable but it should be done in the context of all. So the I would've been maybe a little more supportive of 20 cents if we had another Motion that talked about some kind of revenue generator for cars to pay for all these new roads. That would have been and Councillor Swandel to his defense suggested a gas tax. He suggested that today. The Mayor was quite clear that he's not going to support something like that. So again it raises questions about how fair is this whole modeling. Are we just going to pick on transit or are we going to pick on complete communities, or are we going to start making people pay for new sidewalks and concrete communities model? It's user fee. If you want to use your sidewalk, you've to pay for it. You know, is this what the model we're going to? These are discussions that should happen when we 're talking about a plan, not just these one off, off the hip moments. So, therefore, I will be voting against this plan as new infrastructure at the cost of old infrastructure promotes urban sprawl. Does not deal with the existing neighbourhoods transportation problems, and with the additional traffic from non-Winnipeggers and Winnipeggers using our roads to get to work and back out to the suburbs, will only make the situation worse to the central parts of the city. There's no money identified in the plan except for that second, like I mentioned the user fee. And we need to have money identified for this plan. I think that is a plan. We have both concepts together. Here's the plan, here is how we're going to pay for it. At least when we looked at Motions such as Our Winnipeg there was no punitive moments here, they were just saying, these are some of our by-laws in fact, but there were no fees associated with that because really no internal cost. So again, I wish I could support this. I wish that they dealt with the TMP, dealt with more of those core area problems however, I see this model being unsustainable, unfundable and will only increase urban sprawl, so I'll be voting against it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi, followed by Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Wow, it's been quite a day. I'm trying to focus back into the issue at hand and these are very big issues we're dealing with. I'm excited that there's been such a focus on rapid transit today. I think that's the right thing to do and if you look at a lot of what the plan talks about, if you look at the guiding principles and you look at the strategic policies or whatever all the things we're going to do supposedly in this plan, you know, they point towards emphasizing public transit, emphasizing walkable communities, multi-modal transit and all those things. So the talk is all in there and the transportation, the Transit Plan within this plan if you were just to look at that, I think is a very good Plan over the...by 2031 we're going to see a real rapid transit system and I'm really pleased of the support for the amendments to put some time lines to it. I don't really see it as we're adding in transit when it wasn't there. It's just that we had a list of road projects and we had a list of transit projects and the road projects were slotted into time lines of when we hoped to have them done by. All we're doing with the amendment is putting the rapid transit projects into time lines of when we want to see them being done. I think that's completely reasonable. I mean if they are just in there with no time lines, that's hardly a driver to make them happen. Of course this was before we created a new revenue source today that transit riders are paying for and I just want to make it clear. I support searching for new sources of revenue to pay for all of this, but I just think it should've been done differently. I think it should be done with some consultation. I think it should've been thought about in terms of a way that's more fair than just transit users because transit users here do already pay 60% of the cost of the service but we've had that debate. I'm going to be moving on. In terms of this particular plan, I'm as you know, I'm a big believer in planning, having a plan, basing things

on a plan. I think Councillor Orlikow has raised some very valid concerns and I hope that some people can answer some of those concerns especially when it comes to, before the end of this debate, especially when it comes to the issue of the existing infrastructure. It's almost like the elephant in the room when we're having this discussion, hasn't really come up. I think that's because we all know we want these new projects. We're going to be growing. We're going to be building the communities. We want them to be complete communities; we want all those things. We also want a robust transit system but we can't forget the other deficit we have and there is a real problem that the funding isn't there. I guess I think that we also have a huge funding problem when it comes to the roads that people desire, and Councillor Orlikow points out many of which are regional, benefiting not just our city but the whole province and around the city. And so, you know when I saw the list of road works and the time line, the very, very aggressive time line for the, every road that anybody almost ever want is in there. You know, I'm concerned about that, but having said that there was also a balance of building a rapid transit system, which we also don't have the money, you know we don't have the money for either. So I sort of…because my amendment was accepted which I'm very pleased about, I agreed to go with this plan and hope that we will make the right choices in the infrastructure we build. One of the things is how do we make those decisions and my hope with this master plan was that there would be some kind of a mechanisms to look at obviously connecting it to land use and it's important, and that's a new step that this plan is supposed to do. I also think we have to look at issues like the effect on the environment, the sustainability of the plan. We made a commitment to that recently with Our Winnipeg Plan and I'm also pleased that the amendment to add a sixth…where did I write this down? A sixth strategic goal to the Transportation Master Plan was also added yesterday and for the benefit of those who missed yesterday's meeting a transportation system that reduces its greenhouse gas emissions, footprint and meets or surpasses climate change in emission reduction goals set by the City and the Province. That's something we need to be talking about, thinking about, conscious of and now it's written in the plan and I know it's…maybe it's another elephant in the room because we're talking about all these roadways and we're talking…you know we have a climate change crisis. Some people may want to believe we don't, but we do and it's acknowledged by our, certainly our Provincial Government, I can't speak for the Federal Government at this point, but you know, even they are recognizing the economic costs of climate change are going to be huge on the economy and have to be dealt with. FCM certainly has been incredibly involved in that and working on that, so the fact that it spells out that commitment is important. I understand this document is fluid you know, I'm hoping as these wish list of road extensions come up, we actually look at them in terms of cost benefit analysis. I hope you look at them in terms of the impact, like Russ mentioned, you can't build your way out of congestion. It almost seems like we're still trying to do that. At the same time almost in two spheres, we're also building this rapid transit network which is the right thing to do so you know, we've got to try the balance all of these things including the exhibiting infrastructure. So it's very, very difficult thing to do. I think that we have to keep this fluid and we have to look at what resources we actually have. I am excited by the amendments which as I mentioned would have us completing this out for this corridor by 2016. And the eastern corridor which in 2005, in the Rapid Transit Task Force, that was identified as this, the next priority, it's really, really important if we're going to have a system. A system isn't one transit way. A system covers large areas of the City and most other cities in Canada have that, Calgary and even Hamilton is now building a transit…rapid transit system. You know, everybody is looking at it or doing it. Most of the places our size already have significant system rapid transit systems. And it will, this will get us moving in that direction, it will send a commitment to the Federal to the government, the Provincial Government. I know it's tough times with the Federal Government and we don't have a clear funding source there, but I also know that they know that this is a priority for all the major cities in Canada. Even smaller communities are wanting transit systems all over the country. There's a lot of advocacy going on and I'm confident that if we're poised with a plan in place and we're even prepared to come to the table and showing that leadership which I think has been a little bit unclear till now, you know it's really exciting for me to see that support for rapid transit and I think when you look at this plan, you cannot support rapid transit because it's spelled out so clearly in here why it matters when you look at the transit part of this report. So I think we're going to be successful and we're going to get this done and we're going to change our city. I hope we don't lose sight of the transit rider. The cost issue I know it's already been decided but you might notice that it was the inner core, older neighbourhood Councillors that had trouble supporting this big increase in transit fares and that's because those are the biggest transit ridership perhaps is there at least at this point and you know, for a single mother struggling, it's not everyone who struggles to pay their transit fair is on social assistance and is eligible for programs. So this is a real true hardship for people so I'm a little sad about that.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: And I guess just to focus back on this, it seems to me that we have to find funding mechanisms that are fair; we have to find funding mechanisms for the road improvements that are laid out here. We also have to find funding mechanisms for the existing infrastructure that's crumbling that we have here and we can't just rebuilding our city for the capital region or for the rest of people to cut through our city and we have to factor all that in so I think John has raised some really, really important points. The enabling strategies is several pages of them, you know it's almost too much to read and you go, "Wow, we're going to do all that." And there's a lot in there that makes our streets more walkable, more accessible. You know there's some really positive things in there and so every plan is going to have some positives and negatives. I do have some real worries about the aggressiveness of the road, the commitments

we're making in terms of debt and roads that we want to build beyond. It's such an aggressive time line for that. I do still feel deeply concerned about that, but having said that, we're going to go forward with a plan. I would rather go forward with a plan that has some really good things in it than be going just randomly without a plan. So you know you can't always get what you want and you don't get every aspect of it. But I think Russ spoke quite passionately about you know, we all come together, sometimes the Council all comes together and something very positive can get done when we work together. And it's difficult because there's different sets of values here, there's different goals here but I think…I would be prepared to support this today with the reservations as noted and I hope that we can keep our minds open to the reasons why we're building these things and not forget the existing infrastructure as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Swandel, followed by Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me start by saying we've really got to get our hands, heads around the fact that this is a very high-level plan. Some of this, and probably all of us are trying perhaps too much to drill down this specific projects and there's groups who're self-interested that will talk about their specific self interest but this is really a high level plan. It's important to remember too that it's flexible and we need to be cognizant of where our funding is and how we set our priorities. I know far too often I bring up our Asset Management Strategy. One of our biggest challenges is that we're going to have, maybe I'll just start by commenting on something that Councillor Eadie said. Councillor Eadie made reference to the roads budget that has $8 million from the Province yet only $2 million from the City. That's one of our biggest challenges especially when we're going to do an asset management strategy. The Province tells us or indicates to us where they want their money to be placed. You know, when you look at the Disraeli bridge, for example, there is no provincial money in there. I believe there was a grant for the AT Bridge that was done, but the actual bridge itself because it was a P3 I think the Province didn't want to be involved. So it's 100% borne by city taxpayers and federal gas…there's federal gas tax money in there, there's 50 million? Pardon me, 50 million on the AT…from the Province for the AT component. Another good example is the Pembina Underpass. It's been…it was in this year's budget. It's out in years 2013, 2014. It's funded 50% by the City, 50% by the Province. It's because that's where the Province wants their money to be seen and that's one of our biggest challenges. You know when you look at doing an asset management strategy, it's…the whole idea of political parochialization. We all do it. You know, we do it at a local level, the Province does it. The Feds do it. But it is going to be a huge challenge and if you want to get the value out of an asset management strategy, and it will give us value, it would actually get our money in the right place and save us some operating dollars if we do it right, other cities have proven this that that you will, yes, you'll have an increase at the very beginning but after a few years you start to see the decrease and the leveling out, so overall it's going to bring us huge value but if we have to put dollars in place because of political parochialization, we're never going to get anywhere. Councillor Wyatt's spoken as…I didn't realize it took so much to get Russ excited but he was certainly excited today. I guess the next was Councillor Orlikow got into talking about people coming in from the outside of the city. I remind everybody that this is part of Our Winnipeg Complete Communities, it's all part of those documents and in Our Winnipeg Complete Communities very clearly talks to us about we're not just growing up to deal with our issues, we know we're going out at the same time. And so that growth is very important to the City. That new development represents a positive cost benefit ratio. That new development pays and you know that when it comes to residential streets, a large portion of the funds go into the older communities. The newer communities don't get that money. It's put on an as needed basis but the reason you can do that is because the new communities have that cost benefit in place to provide those funds, so older communities like River Heights, I think Councillor Smith has a lot of it, Wolseley and other areas of the inner city, Councillor Gerbasi. They benefit from those new communities. And not just on the tax side but also on the rate payer's side. Much of our older communities have combined sewer systems. It's paid for by all the rate payers in the water and sewer utility payments. So you know that new development is bringing extra dollars to rejuvenate your communities, the older communities. So let's not throw the baby out with the bath water here. We know we don't want sprawl and urban sprawl is often misused term. If you go into the United States, you see these almost towns/cities 20, 25 miles outside of these huge cities. It was the American freeway system that created the term "urban sprawl", where there was this leap frog outside. Our growth is orderly growth. It's…and we're trying to become more orderly. We…at the same time, we've made a commitment to go up as well as out and we all know the challenges of trying to go up in our…in our backyards. There's no way you can get density in without a fight so let's be aware of that. I have a note here that says transit is heavily subsidized by tax support. I guess they just…the new funding, let's not forget that it's not just fares that pay for transit. There is already a lot of tax support that both civic and provincial tax support that goes into paying for transit. And this is not…it's not my plan, it's not Russ's plan, it's not John's plan, it's Winnipeg's plan that we're trying to do here. I want to…this plan moves us towards sustainability. It doesn't mean that we stop doing other projects when we're doing what's talked about in this plan. These are at the very high level, these sort of their…we're talking about corridors. You don't stop doing. Councillor Steen has an issue with Molson, Panet Road . Councillor Gerbasi just saw Osborne Bridge, I don't know how many millions of dollars were spent there, 12, 15 million dollars, maybe more. Those projects don't stop. I mean, we need to get that work done. We know we have this old infrastructure to deal with, they don't stop. In the back of…or you know, there is a section in here on Enabling Strategies. To really understand what this document is talking about and what it's doing, I'm going to use an example, maybe and take a bit of a shot here, but it's a good example of why we need to read through these things and

understand them in detail. On page 78 under Enabling Strategies, 5.3 sub C which is transit, here is what it says under sub 3, it says, “Adopt a fare strategy that prioritizes service improvements over fare freezes or reductions.” We just did it this morning. We followed our plan, the plan that many of us want to support. I didn't want to support it when it came out of EPC because we didn't have some funding in there. I can now support this plan. We’ve got a piece done that says yeah, we're listening and we’re doing the right thing. We've done what our implementing strategies or enabling strategies tell us we should be doing. This is an important document, Mr. Speaker, important not just for us today but for many generations to come. If it's done right, it will…our city will continue to be one of the most affordable cities in the country to live in. It’s shown over and over again, yes, we get in here and we fight and argue about nickels and dimes sometimes but we forget to talk about the value that those nickels and dimes get when you actually put them in place and what it means to the overall well being of our city, and where we stand on it on a national or even international level. This Human Rights Museum that’s going to be opening in not too distant future is going to bring millions of visitors over numbers of years to our city. We know what we have here. We know the jewel that we have here. We know how affordable it is. We know that we've gone through a period…and continue to go through a period of recovery where we saw some downturn but we're on the right track again. This document and all the documents to do with Our Winnipeg Complete Communities and Enabling Strategies that go along with this continue to push us in that direction. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Sure, I'll just try to make some points said I haven't already heard yet today. But you know, just to further on Councillor Swandel's point. If you go down to C, further to the fare strategy it talks about developing partnerships with social agencies to increase funding for subsidized transit fees, so it's also what we talked about. I must say I'm disappointed in Councillor Orlikow's comments as my neighbour here at Council and my neighbour to the Ward just east of the one I represent being Charleswood-Tuxedo, I think if you look at page 11 of the executive summary, Kenaston Route 90, Ness to Taylor, that's probably the number one traffic concern that people in my ward have had and I can't help but believe that that's also been a concern in Councillor Orlikow's ward and it's right there. Number one, top of the list. And I think what further elevates the…I know this is meant to be a high level document, but I pull that piece out because we have Kapyong to deal with, we have issues around possible expropriation of property on Kapyong and whether that’s actually doable and yet we’ve got a time line up by 2016. That’s five years away, and from what I’m hearing, the Kapyong issue and that being before the courts may not be dealt with for another eight years. So I think that this is a very aggressive, just that one piece, I mean, just further… the other item I wanted to comment about is the William R Clement Parkway Extension because I think that’s a significant, important to people in Charleswood. I can't tell you how many complaints, probably hundreds about traffic issues. Right now, I have 11 streets in Charleswood who want speed humps and Bill Clement, a former Councillor for the area would’ve been out there putting signs up, putting more speed humps and trying to redirect traffic and I think that this document is a really good strategic plan for how to get now into the how. This is the what and where we want to go and next we have to look at how do we get there because you know some of these are lower in the levels of priority. I think we’re going to see significant growth particularly around IKEA and on Kenaston, Sterling Lyon, those of joining streets, Seasons of Tuxedo, it’s expected that that will bring some 200,000 to 300,000 more vehicles into that area alone in the next year and a half or so. And if we don't have a plan like this, I think that we're going to be lost and people are going to be encountering even more traffic issues. And with that, comes a development opportunity that can help support even more growth. It's really nice and sexy to have new stores like IKEA, like all the other ones that are going to be coming that will be new to Winnipeg. Roads are not sexy and traffic flow is not very exciting but I think that what this document does is that it elevates the importance and I hope that this won’t be something that will sit on the shelves in our Planning Department and Public Works areas and that we will use this as a guiding tool as well when we’re working with developers and other projects. The inner ring road system that is outlined in the maps throughout this document, these are necessary now ever more, with all the development that we have in the city in moving truck traffic. And I talk about truck traffic because it needs to be there to support the retail growth that we've had, as well as the increase in vehicular traffic because this is Winnipeg and we are a very vehicle reliant city and that's the fact. But it also does address bus and other kinds of modes of transportation other than vehicles, so that's why it's good because there’s something in here for everyone, I think. Just to reiterate again, I can't tell you how many people I have heard from about traffic issues and that's mostly because, in particular on the Chief…or on the William R. Clement Parkway. It ends, it ends and traffic needs to go somewhere so it continues on on residential streets. We’ve increased police presence to address that and try to limit truck traffic but I think a plan like this actually looks at a more proactive approach and a proactive way of dealing with that issue. I had the opportunity to tour the Chief Peguis Trail progress in August or so. And I can tell you that I think that will expedite traffic. As well, growing up I used to live at that end of the city so that inner ring road system and linking it all together will be essential. So I would appeal to some of my Councillor colleagues who may be on the fence about supporting this, and having them appreciate what a strategic policy piece this is and how this, like many of the other pieces that we've had like our garage and recycling plan, have been legacy building and something that we will leave for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Havixbeck. Councillor Browaty followed by the Mayor.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think almost everything at this point has been said, but I have a couple of comments just to add to the record here. They say if you fail to plan, you plan to fail. We haven't had a really good look at our transportation network in a good long time and this is the appropriate time to do it. This is integrated with our land use plan. We just went through a very extensive process with Our Winnipeg which came into full effect this past August. One of the key pieces I was looking at our employment land strategy. Absorption rights for industrial space in most of the city are coming down. There's no good point; there's no good reasons to have industrial pockets through now what our very much urban neighbourhoods, well, it makes a lot of sense to in fact, you know when we do have new industrial opportunities, they go out from the suburbs to the city or beyond the city in places like CentrePort Canada. The infrastructure for CentrePort Canada is being built, makes good sense to me. I mean this whole process started really with the Mayor's sustainability symposium back at the Winnipeg Art Gallery a couple of years ago. We heard from the public. They wanted to see things like active transportation. They wanted to see better road networks. This all falls…flows into it and the Transportation Master Plan you know is fairly high level…it's a very high level looking document that ties in all those key pieces. There's an original destination study. That was a neat piece to do. I participated in it one day, described every trip you've taken over the course of the day and how you got there. It happened to be a day when I used three or four different modes of transportation. So, it was kind of neat. We've had plans in the past and we haven't implemented them. That's why it's been one of our concerns. You look at Watts from the 1960s, Chris Lorenc was talking about it. The Winnipeg area transportation study talked about things like the inner ring road. It's nice to see parts of these things are coming together now. We've got things like the Chief Peguis Trail extension, that's going to be opening in mere weeks. That's very exciting. We've got, thanks to Councillor Swandel earlier today in his Motion, we're now finding ways to fund the extension of rapid transit Phase 1 out to the University of Manitoba. These are good things. Are they hard to bite sometimes? Is there a big price tag attached to them? Yes. If we leave them longer, would they cost more? Absolutely. So it's good that we're taking the initiative to find the ways to fund them and get them done now. So again, transit is a big piece of this active transportation. You wouldn't believe how much active transportation is growing whether it's recreational trails or transportation for work purposes. I would never have guessed that the Northeast Pioneers Greenway up north in Kildonan and in the East Kildonan-Elmwood would be just as popular as it is, it is very well used all times of the day and night so again I'll be supporting the Transportation Master Plan and I'd like to thank the administration and everyone who's been involved to get to this point and let's make sure that we focus on finding a way to get through to some of these things and make sure that they are implemented.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, let me adequately say that I will be supporting the Transportation Master Plan. Let me also say for the last half century, you know, we've been wandering in the desert Mr. Speaker, and trying to figure out where we're going because we were lost because we never had a plan. We now have a plan and the realities are Mr. Speaker, there were mistakes made many years ago that we will continue to try to address with great difficulty. But that's our job and that's why we're here. Most importantly, I want all Councillors to understand this is a transportation master plan. When I hear which I quite often do, there are many things in here that I like but...this master plan doesn't go into detail on every minute scenario that has to be done. It's a master plan. There will be changes depending on what type of development we do, et cetera, et cetera. That's part of it. So that's not a reason not to support it. Mr. Speaker, I very much want to thank the Committee, Councillor Vandal, Councillor Sharma and Councillor Gerbasi. As you know, they dealt with this last week. They had more work to do, they laid it over, there were delegations that came forward, there were changes that were made which I think addressed some key issues and then we moved it forward, Mr. Speaker. This should, talking through you to Councillor Orlikow; this should go through unanimously, Mr. Speaker. This is good. We need a plan. We haven't had a master plan. This was a makes work and from there we broaden it and address the issues. Are there issues? Of course. Are legitimate issues that have been brought up by different Councillors? Of course. We address them through this plan, Mr. Speaker. I certainly hope this will be unanimously supported.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Katz. Councillor Vandal to close.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to first of all, try to address a few concerns that were brought up. And then perhaps go through the amendments. The whole issue of funding was brought up several times. People describe or several of us described it as a wish list or Christmas list and there is no way in heck that we're ever going to do everything but there is an enabling strategy on funding and I want to make sure we all have read it. Enabling Strategy C, work with the Federal and Provincial partners to secure infrastructure investment, D, encourage the establishment of a federal and or provincial transportation infrastructure delivery strategy. E, work with the Province to outline a stable and predictable long term funding strategy for rapid transit. F, explore and assess the applicability and acceptability of new financing tools and revenue sources to fund infrastructure projects within existing frameworks. And G, assess applicability and accessibility, getting late in the day, of those new approaches to financing such as those recommended in the 2011 Infrastructure Funding Council Report. Mr. Speaker, this is a high level policy framework. I don't think we're

going to deliver absolutely everything that's on the wish list based on over the next 20, 25 years but certainly it's not a budget document. This is something that influences and inspires budget priorities over the next 20 years. And without a better deal from the Provincial Government and the Federal Government, we all know there is no way that we can possibly ever implement all of this. Ross Eadie talked about a transportation authority, there is existing funding in the system and I believe there is enabling strategies to try to develop some sort of transportation authority. I think that's an excellent idea, we need to do more work on that. Handi-Transit. We're committed to Handi-Transit. That is something I think that we're committed to in the long term and is actually more of a year to year operational funding issue that we will have to make sure there's enough money there. I know when the operating budget begins that we're going to have those discussions at Committee. Councillor Orlikow, issues with funding which I went over, how the City is going to pay for all of this? Urban sprawl, well, I can only repeat what Councillor Havixbeck said. Priority 1, Kenaston Road, Route 90, Ness to Taylor, $129 million. Chief Peguis Trail which is basically already done, so that's another priority, Pembina Underpass, certainly not an urban sprawl issue. Marion Goulet connection, something that's in one of the oldest neighbourhoods of Winnipeg. The Louise Bridge and the Plessis Road widening, which we approved earlier this afternoon. I just want to quickly go over the recommendations or the amendments that were approved by EPC through Public Works. Number one just gives us flexibility on when we do construct the eastern rapid transit corridor to Transcona. Number two with some wordsmithing on the Marion Street improvements. It's Marion street widening, grade separation and improvements. Archibald to Lag.. Number three is the big one and I want to thank the Committee, specifically Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Sharma for supporting this. Councillor Gerbasi is right. You can't have four priorities all saying by 2031. You've got to choose one and say, we want to do that one and we want to do it quick, quicker than the other three. That's exactly what we've approved southwest by 2016, and the eastern corridor to the cross roads in Transcona by 2021. I think it's feasible. If we roll up our sleeves with the other governments. I believe it's taken them an important first step this morning. And the other amendment is on the greenhouse gas emissions footprint. I think we all are on same page on that. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the administration through Deepak Joshi for at least a couple of years, probably longer of hard work and consultation specifically with the public. I think you're…certainly the staff have done a tremendous job on this and I congratulate them and I think we all know what the issues are. This is a high level policy document that will influence budget documents over the next 20 years and I hope it goes through unanimously. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Vandal. Seeing no further speakers, I'll call the question. Do we require a recorded vote? No? All right. All those in favour? Opposed. Motion carried. Congratulations, Councillor Vandal. We have a couple of other items on our Agenda. We have a Motion coming forward from Councillor Pagtakhan that we will refer to the Public Works Committee. And we have some by-laws, Councillor Vandal.

Motions No. 1
Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

WHEREAS the Exchange District is designated as a National Historic District:

AND WHEREAS the Exchange District is a highly pedestrian traveled destination in the City of Winnipeg:

AND WHEREAS some streets such as Bannatyne, Arthur, Albert, McDermot, etc. are categorized as Priority 2 streets and Priority 2 sidewalks relative to snow clearing;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT relative to snow clearing, the streets and sidewalks within the Exchange District be designated and cleared as Priority 1.

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

Councillor Vandal: I'll move the following by-laws be read a first time By-law 141/2011, By-law 142/2011.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 141/2011 and 142/2011.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that by-laws 141/2011 and 142/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 141/2011 and 142/2011.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that the rules be suspended and by-laws numbered 141/2011 and 142/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.
Mr. Speaker: All in those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Do we have a Question Period? Councillor Vandal…

Councillor Orlikow: Councillor Vandal, regarding the recent spillage at the south plant there, my question is in regards to Veolia, and what role did they have in a) not preventing this from happening in the first place, because we know that they're working in our waste treatment facilities right now. We know that they're on contract with the City. I may, if I had an opportunity to read the contract and see what the terms of reference of their work are, would know this but I haven't been allowed that opportunity, so my question to you, and hopefully they have, have Veolia, were they involved and they provide solutions to this problem that we have? What kind of benefit have they provided us in this regard?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: To the best of my knowledge, they had no role in the cause of the problem, and in reality we're not sure. The City of Winnipeg is not sure why we're having this difficulty. I can tell you that there's a briefing at 3:30 I believe. Mike Shkolny is giving a briefing at 2:30 and in my communication yesterday, we're encouraged by the improvements that are taking place. I can tell you that we have the private sector looking at solutions, the University of Manitoba and the Province of Manitoba as well, as well as our own experts, so we're searching far and wide. We have the best and the brightest to try to find a solution to what's happening there now.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? Seeing none. Oh Councillor Eadie, one for the road.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I just had a quick question just as a follow up for Councillor Orlikow. You know, I guess I'm confused because I was at the briefing with Veolia and there's all the talk about contracts and all this stuff. Maybe just answer me a simple question: Is Veolia assisting us in managing all of our sewage facilities or not?

Councillor Vandal: No, they are not, but I will do better than that. Rather than me trying to wing an answer in one minute on the floor of Council, why don't I get the Administration to send a short note on the role of Veolia in the Water and Waste Department?

Mr. Speaker: Fair enough. All right, ladies and gentlemen. It was a good day of work. I'm sorry Dan Lett wasn't here to see the good work. (Laughter). I doubt that. In any event, Councillor Wyatt moves that we adjourn. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 3:10 p.m.